YORDAN KALEV ZHEKOV

The Rise of Hierarchical Leadership

Historical and Theological Survey of the Formation and Development of the Hierarchical Leadership in the New Testament and Early Church

YORDAN KALEV ZHEKOV

The Rise of Hierarchical Leadership

Historical and Theological Survey of the Formation and Development of the Hierarchical Leadership in the New Testament and Early Church

This book was originally presented in 1998 to Dr. Meic Pearse as a research assignment in fulfillment of the requirements for the course of Early Church History part of the degree of Master of Theology at the Evangelical Theological Seminary, Osijek, Croatia.

COMMENDATION BY MEIC PEARSE

For *The Rise of Hierarchical Leadership: Historical and Theological Survey of the Formation and Development of the Hierarchical Leadership in the New Testament and Early Church* by Yordan Kalev Zhekov

"I am very happy to commend this careful — and, above all, carefully argued — work on the development of hierarchy in the early centuries of the church. Debate has long raged, and will doubtless continue, over the legitimate extent of authority structures among the people of God. This contribution takes careful account of all the factors involved: the teaching of Jesus; the practice and instruction of the apostles; the influence of culture; the life of the earliest churches; and development within the churches during subsequent centuries. It is to be hoped that Yordan Zhekov's work will move the discussion forward."

Meic Pearse who has completed his M.Phil. and D. Phil. in ecclesiastical history at Oxford University is associate professor of history at Houghton College in Houghton, New York. Books he has written include *Between Known Men and Visible Saints, Who's Feeding Whom? The Great Restoration* and *We Must Stop Meeting Like This.* He has articles published in *Church History, Anabaptism Today, Third Way* and other periodicals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

> Jesus called them together and said, "You know that the rulers, of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be your slave - just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." (Matt. 20:25-28 NIV)

Jesus answered the questions of his disciples, which concerned the hierarchy between them. But how we should understand his answer? How did all these first generations of Christians understand it? In order to find the answers for ourselves, we need to search the history of the New Testament and Early church.

I want to submit this thesis for research in the area of hierarchical leadership because I believe that the dynamics of hierarchy, namely exercising one's authority over others is shaping our everyday lives. "Life without authority is unthinkable and would be unlivable. Life is surrounded by authority; we live in a context of authority."[1] Therefore it is important for us to know what the New Testament and Early church believed about hierarchy and through this knowledge to build our leadership systems in our churches, clubs, home groups, and the community as a whole.

I will construct this work of research in two main areas, the area of the New Testament and the area of the Early church. Two fundamental principles will guide me while dealing with the issue of hierarchy. First, my work will involve a broad scope of arguments in order to represent the most balanced and trustworthy conclusions. Secondly, my personal presupposition on the subject of hierarchical leadership will be thoroughly shaped by Judy Gundry-Volf's principle of outward framework and inner dynamic of the Christian hierarchical systems.

The following questions will shape my discussions and finally reach their answers. First I will look to see if there is any hierarchy in the New Testament church. Moreover is there a foundation in the New Testament for development of the complex hierarchy in the Early church? If so, then what is the continuity of the formation and development of the hierarchy between the New Testament church and Early church?

---

[1] William Barclay, *By What Authority?* (Great Britain: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1974), back cover.

Then what are the reasons for this continuity? Parallel questions will be asked about the discontinuity. But in order to reach the point of answering these questions, I need to develop the first main sections, looking primarily at the setting and theology of the New Testament and Early church. Finally, after answering the questions, I will make an analysis of other scholars' opinions about the reasons for the hierarchical development of leadership in the Early church. This final section will serve to restrict me from being extreme and balance my ideas.

PART I. The rise of hierarchy in the New Testament church - historical, cultural, religious and theological survey of the formation of hierarchy in the New Testament church

In this part of my work I will represent the setting of the New Testament church, and I will discuss its theology in regard to the hierarchy in the church government.

A. The setting of the New Testament Church formed through the perspective of the community, religious and political structures.

In the beginning of our discussion concerning the setting in which the church order developed, I would like to stress the crucial role of the surrounding environment with regard to the formation of the different aspects of the Christian church in the first century. Moreover I want to introduce a very important principle which deals with it. This principle will serve to shape my presuppositions concerning the discussed subject in its proper form, and it will be a guiding tool for interpreting the historical data in the second part of my work. It is based on the understanding of the formation of the Christian household-codes in the New Testament church. This formation was basically led by implementing the existing household-codes in Greco-Roman society into the Christian church. Andrew T. Lincoln explains it in the following way.

> The early Christian codes, despite their distinctive Christian motivations, turn out in practice to be in line with the variety within the consistent patriarchal pattern throughout Greco-Roman society, where subordination of wives to husbands, children to parents, and slaves to masters was the overarching norm (cf. Also Verner, Household, 27-81, who notes some differences in the legal status of women under Greek, Roman, and Jewish law but concludes that in both Greece and Rome 'the household was conceived as a patriarchal institution, whose male head… exercised sweeping, although not entirely unrestricted authority over the other members' and that 'from the social structure alone, one would have a difficult time distinguishing pagan from Jewish households in the cities of Hellenistic-Roman Diaspora' [79-80]). They reflect a stage in which Christians were conscious of criticisms of subverting society and of the need to adjust to living in the Greco-Roman world without unnecessarily disrupting the status quo.[2]

---

[2] Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians. Word Biblical Commentary*, vol. 42 (Dallas Texas: Word books, Publisher, 1990), 359, 360.

As we can see, two distinctive lines appeared in the understanding of the author of the household-codes in the New Testament Christian families: the inner motivations and the outward framework of their development. This understanding is more clearly represented and formulated as a principle by Judy Gundry-Volf in her explanation of the household-codes. In order to remove the unnecessary problems with the guiding principles in the society, Christians adapted the already existing household-codes. But this adoption was formed on the basis of the purely Christian form of inner attitude. Hence, the hierarchical principle of the society was accepted, but its inner motives, which led the actions, were built on the basis of love. And the principle is that we have the hierarchical framework but a nonhierarchical dynamic working in it. The result of the application of this principle is that the church followed and reflected the culture but at the same time changed it. The guiding motive is again one of love. And in order to change society the church needs to integrate it first.[3]

But the question may be asked why I see it as so important to involve in the discussion the principle applied to household codes in the setting of the formation of the church government. This question is very important and the following answer will provide the justification of my view.

There was a strong connection between household structure and state structure in the Greco-Roman world. Actually Romans saw the household as the foundation of the state. And as Lincoln explains it "…any upsetting of the traditional hierarchical order of the household could be considered a potential threat to the order of society as a whole."[4] The latter formed one of the reasons for the adoption of the existing codes of society by Christian families. Therefore, it is logical if we accept such a relationship between the society and Christian families, to accept that the importance of household-state relationship in the Greco-Roman community was also reflected in the formation of the church government. Actually if the state reflects the household structure and Christian household structure is influenced by society's household structure, it could be presupposed that the Christian government structure is influenced by the household

---

[3] Judith M. Gundry-Volf, "Exegesis of Epistle to Ephesians" (Personal notes taken by Yordan Kalev Zhekov during the lectures on Ephesians by Judith M. Gundry-Volf, Spring 1997, Evangelical Theological Seminary-Osijek, Croatia)

[4] Andrew T. Lincoln, 358.

structure as well. Moreover, the nature of the presented principle is not limited to the formation of the Christian household but also to the formation of the church order since the first churches were not institutionalized, but home-churches. Finally, the principle is not derived just on the basis of household codes but also on the basis of the whole subject of Ethics. As we can see it is not a principle of the subject itself but of a way of constructing it. Hence, having this important guidance, we can step further in the discussion of the environmental factors which shaped the Early church order.

1. Jews' heritage

Rudolph Bultmann gives a short description of the second part of the story of Israel in relation to her community transformations, which is helpful in establishing the solid background of our discussion. Israel's relation with urban cultures in Canaan brought some political changes to the structures of her community. First, the social differences emerged. Second, the institution of monarchy was inaugurated which introduced the conflict between God's kingship and the earthly monarch. (I Sam.8:1ff) In relation to the latter, several further changes took place.

1. Monarchy was popularized through the reign of David
2. Tribal structure was replaced by organized state
3. A new aristocracy of bureaucrats and officers appeared

Bultmann argues that during the time of exile Israel finally reached the theocratic ideal through the re-establishment of the hierarchical structure of community. He defines this change as the transformation of the nation Israel to a church. Let's carefully follow his thought

> When Israel lost her independence at the exile the Utopia of the prophets lived on and became the mainstay of the nation in its bondage to foreign rule. To begin with, the old aristocratic order of the patriarchs was re-established, though this was increasingly supplanted by the rule of the priestly caste. Israel was now organized on an hierarchical basis, with the high priest at its head. In this way the theocratic ideal of the sovereign rule of God was realized at last- but at a cost. Israel ceased to be a nation and became a Church.[5]

---

[5] Rudolph Butmann, *Primitive Christianity. In Its Contemporary Setting* (New York: A Meridian Book World Publishing, 1972), 42.

After the exile of the nation he describes it as a new community of a combination between church and state. The latter was defined as national community, which preserved Israel's identity through the rituals.[6] The characteristics of Israel as a church described by Bultmann previously are obviously the same as in this new peculiar community. The conclusion might be drawn that Bultmann sees Israel as transformed to a church by means of the hierarchical development. So it could be assumed that the model of the church which occurs in the New Testament, according to the view of Bultmann, is precisely hierarchical. Furthermore, it is obvious that for him the New Testament church appears to be a hierarchical organization, which has its roots in Israel's national history.

F. F. Bruce explains that in the beginning Christian leaders were basically similar in their functions to those called 'elders' in the Jewish communities in Palestine and the Diaspora.[7] In the same direction, Adolf Schlatter argues that the title 'elders' was used later in Judaism to refer to the prominent teachers of Israel, such as Shammai, Hillel, and Gamaliel.[8] Also discussing the important role of the church in Asia Minor in the process of transition from the apostolic church to the later stages of the life of the church, Everett F. Harrison explains that the leaders of the churches from this area were frequently called elders which is, according to him, obviously Jewish influence.[9] Actually the importance of these people was acknowledged by this title not because of their office since the title did not refer to the office in the local congregation at all, but by this term they were "regarded as mediators of the authentic tradition and reliable teachers."[10]

David M. Stanley argues for the hierarchical parallel between the constitution of Jewish community and constitution of the Christian community as represented by Luke in

---

[6] Ibid., 42-45.

[7] F. F. Bruce, *The Spreading Flame. The Rise and Progress of Christianity form its First Beginnings to the Conversion of the English* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985), 202.

[8] Adolf Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Matthaus* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1929), 477-78, quoted in Everett F. Harrison, *The Apostolic Church* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986), xii.

[9] Everett F. Harrison, *The Apostolic Church* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986), xii.

[10] Bornkamn, "Mimneskomai," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament,* ed. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, trans. Geoffrey W. Gromiley (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1964-76), 4:676, quoted in Everett F. Harrison, *The Apostolic Church* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986), xii.

Acts chapter 1. "Following an ancient source at his disposal, he [Luke] points out that they numbered one hundred and twenty, sufficient in Jewish law to form a distinct community with its own sanhedrin. This Sanhedrin is indicated by a repetition of the list of the Twelve with Peter at their head."[11]

It is good for us to consider the influence of the Qumran community upon the formation of the church organization. Two important grounds of searching for this are that Jerusalem was very close to the place where the Qumran community lived and the latter was active exactly at the time of the beginning of the Early church. Moreover, the excavation of the Dead Sea Scrolls offered sufficient grounds for research of the relationship between both communities. So a close parallel is found between the structure of the Qumran community and the church, even though it is not quite evident to what extent it should be sustained. The two basic facts are the following. First, an obvious similarity is found between the ruling assembly of Qumran called *rabbim* (the many) and the response to the leaders group called by Luke *plethos* (multitude) (Acts 6:2, 5; 15:12, 30). Second, the Qumran community had a council of twelve on the top of which stood three priests, the actual leaders of the community. Some draw a parallel with the group of the twelve apostles as a presentation of the twelve tribes of Israel and the top three: James, Cephas, and John called "pillars" in Gal.2: 9. The potential problem of this view is that the latter are not priests, and there are other problems which arise when the comparisons are searched not just on the basis of the terminology but on the content which lies under it.[12] But it is evident that the apparent picture formed by this parallel is representative of the hierarchical structure.

Let us also see what influence the government of the synagogue had upon the church government. This point is raised by Everett F. Harrison while discussing the necessity for the supplementation of the leadership of the apostle with another type of leadership after the death of James and the flight of Peter. His basic argument is that Luke did not mention at all the selection of elders at this particular time, and Luke's account about the leaders is far ahead in Acts 11: 30. Hence against Lindsay, who argues that the Seven ought to be regarded as the leaders, Harrison believes that "influenced by

---

[11] David M. Stanley, S.J., *The Apostolic Church in the New Testament* (Maryland: The Newman Press, 1967), 8.
    [12] Everett F. Harrison, 108-9.

the organization of the synagogue, the church could quite naturally have taken over this form of leadership for itself." Therefore, Luke did not find it worthy to mention elders due to the long leadership in Israel or the overshadowing popularity of the apostles.[13]

On the basis of so far presented arguments, although containing some differences, we can conclude that the New Testament church followed the hierarchical pattern of Israel. This takes place in two directions. First, the church was firmly rooted in Israel's history. Secondly, at the beginning, the church was strongly related to the Jewish religious units, in synagogues and in communities like this in Qumran.

Let us now take the next step looking at the influential relationships between the church and Hellenistic culture.

2. Hellenistic framework

In the environment in which early Christians lived Hellenism had the very important role of shaping the cultural, religious and political life. Therefore it is very important for us to consider some of its features.

a) Greek view of the State

In Pericles' funeral oration found in Thucydides II, 37, I. we read about the Greek constitution of the State.

> Our constitution does not copy the laws of neighbouring states; we are rather a pattern of others than imitators ourselves. Its administration favours the many instead of the few; this is why it is called a democracy (dhmokratia). If we look to the laws, they afford equally justice to all in their private differences; if to social standing, advancement in public life falls to reputation for capacity (apeth), class considerations not being allowed to interfere with merit; nor again does poverty bar the way, if a man is able to serve the sate, he is not hindered by the obscurity of his condition.[14]

Even though latter crises of the religious nature of the State[15] and development of the individualistic understanding of the justice[16] interrupted this democratic constitution of the State, we need to acknowledge the existence of this important element of Greek

---

[13] Ibid., 108.
[14] Thucyd., II, 37, I. Trans. Crawley, quoted in Rudolph Butmann, *Primitive Christianity. In Its Contemporary Setting* (New York: A Meridian Book World Publishing, 1972), 107.
[15] Rudolph Bultmann, 108.
[16] Ibid.,116.

understanding of the society structure because as Harry R. Boer says, Greek thought controlled the thinking of the people in the Roman Empire.[17]

b) Stoicism

Stoics viewed the true constitution of the State as a reflection of the constitution of the universe. They stressed the fact that the city of God is in whichever foundation lies the law of the Logos, which on the other hand appears to be the basic element of the construction of their system of beliefs. Also, the place of men in this State is represented in a very positive light.

> Fundamentally, man is 'cosmopolitan,' a truth which he realizes when he lives according to nature. Thus all the accidental differences of history, the differences between one man and the other, are unimportant. All distinctions of rank and dignity are unreal, and must be set aside, even the distinction between free man and slave. All men are equal by nature, and all have the capacity for freedom.[18]

c) Mystery Religions

Bultmann understands mystery religions like new cults formed in the Graeco-Roman world by the ones which have come from the Near East. He represents the following structure of the mystery cults. First, all distinctions which exist in the secular world are abolished. All the people of community are brethren. They are divided neither by their class differences, economic and social positions nor by their nationality and race. Moreover, even women freely associated with men. Second, the community organization was built on the hierarchical pattern. This means that there was a head of community-the father who played the role of the priest or *mystagogue*. Bultmann's conclusion is that like some other elements of mystery religions, their structure is similar to that of the Christian community.[19]

Basically through the discussion of Hellenistic thinking, we are lead into two fundamental considerations. There was a very strong emphasis on democracy, equality,

---

[17] Harry R. Boer, *A Short History of the Early church* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William b. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984), 7.
[18] Rudolph Bultmann, 137.
[19] Ibid., 157.

and personal liberty. Also, there was an appearance of hierarchical structure, especially in the mystery religions.

The third important element which played a prominent role in the formation of the church order is the Roman's pattern of community structure.

3. The Roman's framework

The kind of government which the Romans had until 27 BC was a republic. The main function in it was played by the senate. The influence upon the government by a single individual was diminished totally. But after 27 BC, the nature of government turned from republic into imperial or autocratic. The function of the senate was just nominal and dictators took the power into their own hands. This happened after a long time (around hundred years) of extremely harmful civil wars. The first of the dictators who took the government into his own hands was Gaius Octavianus, the nephew of Julius Caesar (conqueror of Gaul and one of the greatest Romans).[20]

What is obvious from this brief analysis of Roman government is that during the time of the development of the church order, we have the explicit hierarchical structure of the Roman's Empire.

4. Conclusion

Two important features might be identified in the setting of the New Testament church. First, there was a strong hierarchical model for the formation of a community structure represented by Jewish, Roman and Greek social, religious and philosophical framework. Secondly, there were hints of, democracy, human liberty, and equality in all three nations, but especially strongly represented by Hellenistic thought. So applying the principal which we established at the beginning of our discussion, we may identify that the influence of the cultural, religious and political environment upon the New Testament church appears in two directions: the outward hierarchical framework and the inner democratic dynamic. By speaking about the inner dynamics, we will see going through the New Testament writings that their level in Christian communities surpassed any democratic hint of the existing religious or societal thinking.

---

[20] Harry R. Boer, 2. And Everett F. Harrison, 3.

Let us turn now to the New Testament in order to reach the exact understanding about the establishment of the Christian community structure.

B. The New Testament data in respect to the issue of hierarchy - outlook through some of the basic New Testament elements concerning the formation of the church government and hierarchy

In this section I will basically discuss two lines of thought in relation to the church government and hierarchy, those of Jesus and Paul. The teaching of Jesus is important for the discussion because I found it foundational and crucial for the formation and development of the order, government and hierarchy in the church. It will represent the New Testament data of the Gospels. The teaching of Paul also requires consideration since it involves the two main sources, according to some scholars, that speak for the church government in the New Testament, I Timothy and Titus. Moreover Paul's teaching includes a very important discussion that concerns the establishment of the proper notion from the New Testament evidence about the main subject, which will serve an interpretative role in the second part of the thesis. The rest of the New Testament data concerning the issue of hierarchy will be integrated into the discussion of Paul's thought.

1. Jesus' teaching concerning the hierarchy and church government[21]

In this section of the thesis I will not discuss the questions of Jesus' establishment of the church nor will I try to argue that Jesus found a formal system of church government or hierarchy. What I want to do is briefly to exegete the most crucial passages from Jesus' teaching, which suggest a hierarchy or system of order among the disciples in their future stage as a community.

Four passages could command our attention concerning the issue. They are: Matt. 20:24-28; Mark 10:41-45; Luke 22:24; John 13:12-17. All four passages discuss one equal event from different perspectives (Matthew's and Mark's; Luke's and John's). As I view them, they are all Jesus' teachings on the subject of hierarchy by which he corrected the disciples' misunderstanding. They are all given Jesus' personal example and in the third passage even with a practical lesson, the washing of disciples' feet. All of the

---

[21] Sources used: *Novum Testamentum Graece*, cum apparatu critico curavit Eberhard Nestle novis curis elaboraverut Erwin Nestle et Kurt Aland Editio vicesima quinta (Germany: Gesamtherstelllung Wurttenbergische Bibleacstalt, 1971); Barclay M. Newman, *A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament* (West Germany: Bilia-Druch Stuttgart, 1971).

17

passages suggest future[22] time for their application, and this is one of the reasons why I relate them to the time of the church. I will deal with some intentionally selected words from these portions of the Scripture that I believe covered the issue in the best way, since my goal is not deep exegesis but a simple scheme which will establish strong understanding of Jesus' teaching about hierarchy in the church.

Several words appear to be key for understanding Jesus' intention and teaching on the subjects of authority, government, ruling and hierarchy. The first three terms are related to the Gentile government: οἱ μεγάλοι, κατακυριεύω and κατεξουσιάζω. They describe the status and the actions of the Gentile leaders. The first one (οἱ μεγάλοι) means "the ones who are great" and derives from the adjective μεγας, η, α, great. The second one (κατακυριεύω) means "have power over" and in the usage in the first two passages appears as Present Active Participle κατακυριεύουσιν, "having power over," and it modifies the rules of the gentiles. It derives from the word κυριος, lord. The third one (κατεξουσιάζω) means "rule over" and derives from the word εξουσιάζω, "have power over." So we can see that the first two words explain the status of the rulers and the third their actions. The picture is absolutely monarchical. But in total contrast concerning the Christian leaders, in the case of the twelve disciples, Jesus uses other terms like: διακονος, δουλος and διακονεω. The first two relate to the status, servant and slave, which disciples ought to have when they are in the position of leadership. The third one relates to the actions of Jesus serving, which he came to do and which ought to be done also by the ones who will be leaders. Actually here hierarchical presuppositions of Jesus' disciples could be seen from their reaction to the request of James and John or from their mother. But Jesus' answer does not so clearly presuppose hierarchy since he is saying: "whoever wants to become great among you….whoever wants to be first," "ος εαν θελη εν υμιν μεγας γενεσθαι," Matt.20:26,27, the current wishes are not pointing out to the future status. But in the account of Luke, Jesus' presuppositions are more clearly connected with the future hierarchy of the church, he says: "the greatest among you ….and the one who rules," "ο μειζων εν υμιν…. ο ηγουμενος," Luke 22:26. The usage

---

[22] Of course one of them go further in the final eschatological consummation of the kingdom, Luke's, and one of them speaks not in a time fashion, John's, but basically they suggest an expectation of the change of an attitude, change of character of the listeners, which ought to start from that same moment and continue in the future.

of these words and their meaning basically represent the picture of the first three accounts. The fourth portion of scripture (John 13:12-17) is a little bit different. The key words in it are the following: ὁ κυριος, ὁ διδασκαλος, ὁ δουλος, ὁ αποστολος, and του πεμψαντος. The first two (ὁ κυριος and ὁ διδασκαλος) relate to the titles by which Jesus described himself, Lord and Teacher. The last word (του πεμψαντος) which is Present Active Participle, "the one who is sending" probably also relates to Jesus. The third and the fourth words (ὁ δουλος and ὁ αποστολος) are related to the disciples describing their future role in the church. The point which Jesus made in his teaching using the example of washing the disciples' feet is that, if he who is their Lord and Teacher may serve them, they also when they become leaders will be no greater than Him, the one who sent them, therefore they should do the same as him, that is to serve.

The conclusion that could be established on the so far presented discussion is the following. The disciples clearly presupposed a future hierarchy in the Kingdom of God so they wanted to participate in it as clergy. Jesus corrected their wrong understanding by teaching them that even though there will be a hierarchy among them as a community of his followers, it will not be like the Gentile rulers they know. The structure of the hierarchy will be reversed. The leaders will be the greatest servants. But we need not go so far with the structures and systems since this was not Jesus' intention. Since he was more concerned with the inner attitude, we therefore do not just have reverse hierarchy, from which we may conclude that now the slaves and servants must rule over others. But applying Gundry-Volf's pattern we need to understand Jesus' teaching of hierarchy in the monarchical cultural context. In other words, we have the framework of hierarchy, although it seems as He crushed it totally, but the inner dynamic is completely changed, it is the dynamic of servanthood, of brotherly love of the leaders toward the other members of the Christian community.[23] So with this foundational understanding of hierarchy in the teaching of Jesus, we may go further in discussing the other New Testament data in relation to our subject.

---

[23] This kind of framework of Jesus' teaching of hierarchy ought to be expected in his monarchical society but ought not to be kept in our democratic society, since it relates to the culture, but since the dynamic is important, it should be persistently and strongly kept.

2. Other New Testament data in relation to the hierarchy and church government

In light of the evidence of the New Testament in respect of the church government and hierarchy and their understanding by the New Testament scholarship, we may form three distinctive points of view.

1. The ones who believe that there is no evidence for strong church government and no hierarchy at all in the New Testament church.

2. The ones who believe that the evidence about the church government and hierarchy in the New Testament church appears basically just in the Pastoral Epistles which are dated as being subsequent to the other New Testament writings.

3. The ones who believe that there is evidence for church government and hierarchy in the New Testament church.

Through the presentation of these three general views in respect to the arguments offered by them, I will attempt to reach a conclusion to represent in the most balanced way the New Testament data in connection with the hierarchy.

a) These who believe that there is no sufficient evidence for strong church government and no hierarchy at all in the New Testament church

(1) Use of the terms related to the Church government

Paul speaks little about organization and leadership in the church apart from the cases of correcting the faults of the churches in these matters. These issues did not have primary place in his concerns. Moreover the exegetical studies of "order" show that it is a charismatic process which involves constructive participation of all believers and is not the product of a few. Also the studies of authority as the issue, strongly linked with the question of government, suggest an intentional diminishing of its use as against its widespread handling within the Greek society.   The type of authority represented in Paul's writings is charismatic and does not defend a certain position or office.

Throughout Paul's writings, the word "priest" is used metaphorically and includes a range of functions which are practiced not just by particular people, for example

apostles, but by all believers.[24]   Another obvious fact is that "the word 'priest' and 'priesthood' are never applied in the New Testament to the office of the ministry. Even in the extensive list of Church officers and activities in I Cor.12:28-30 and Eph.4:11,12 there is no mention of priests. In fact, there are but two forms of priesthood in the New Testament-the priesthood of Christ (Heb.6:20 and 7:26, 27) and the priesthood of all believers (I Pet.2: 9 and Rev.5:10)."[25]

Paul uses the term "office" (*arche*) only in connection to Christ's governing role in the church (Col.1:18). In contrast to the word "office," we find that the servanthood terminology dominates. The term elder (*presbyteroi*) basically does not occur in Paul's writings except in the pastoral letters. The terms *episkopoi* and *diaknoi* occur just once in plural form and not as titles or designation of offices (Phil1:1) outside of Pastorals. In Pastoral letters, they are referring to the ones, together with their families, who are hosts of the church.

(2) Use of metaphors and models related to the church government

Paul uses different metaphors in order to show his and his colleagues' relationship with the church. Metaphors served different purposes for the apostle.

- Family - served to represent parental relationship, father and mother to their children (ICor.4:14-15; IICor. 12:14; IThess. 2:11; Gal.4:14).
- Builder and farmer - represent the picture of designing of the church (ICor.3:6-9; 3:10-15)
- Body - represents the function of the members of the church in unity (ICor.12:12-27; Eph.4:1-16)

Paul uses models as Christ (Rom 6:4; 15:7; Eph 5:2, 23-25, 29), he himself as imitator of Christ (I Cor 11:1), believers who sacrifice themselves for the ministry (Phil 2:22-30), and even whole churches (II Cor.8:1-7) in order to show that the importance does not lie in the office or position but in the virtuous way of the life of the person

---

[24] R. Banks, "Church Order and Government," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1989), 132.

[25] C. Eastwood, *The Priesthood of all Believers, An Examination of the Doctrine from the Reformation to the Present Day* (London: The Epworth Press, 1960), x, quoted in Yordan Kalev Zhekov, "Church Government" (A research paper prepared for Mr. Odell Jones in the partial fulfillment of the course Eccles/Eschatology TH 313 (E), Spring 1996, CTS - Sint-Pieters-Leeuw, Belgium), 4.

exercising this position. Moreover, the models are examples to be followed by all believers.

(3) Dynamics and functions of the church order in Paul's writings

Looking on the dynamics and function of the church order in the church communities throughout the writing of Paul, we can find that there are no special people appointed to conduct the liturgy and sacramental rites. What is apparently clear is that Paul stresses the participation of all by the diversity of their functions as gifts and ministries in conducting the liturgy and sacramental rites (the Lord's Supper and Baptism). Of course in the particular context, the certain roles of some believers are underlined because of the need to practice of different gifts. This might be seen in the case of the liturgy in the role of some who have greater prophetic or spiritual discernment (ICor. 12:10; 14:30) or in the case of the Lord's Supper in the role of host or hostess in whose homes the meals have been served. But in all these contexts (Liturgy, Lord's Supper and Baptism), there are no leading figures that conducted the rites.

(4) Ordination for ministry

To speak about the ordination of any kind of minister within the context of Paul's letters is inappropriate. The references to the laying on of hands are particularly connected with the "procedures as receiving of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:17), healing from illness (Acts 9:17), restoring a person to the church (ITim. 5:22, though many see here a reference to the ordination of elders), and commissioning for itinerant service (Acts 13:2; cf. 2Tim. 1:6)."[26] The particular part of the mission of Paul and Barnabas, the appointment of elders in churches (Acts 14:23) ought to be understood properly in the context of the selection of the Seven (Acts 6:3-4) as "ratifying the community's choice."[27]

---

[26] Banks, 135.
[27] Ibid.

(5) The Apostolic role and significance

Paul's role as apostle in the context of the church governments was crucial in the sense that he established the communities and gave them sources for establishment and leading of independent government by themselves. Otherwise his work and the work of the other apostles was basically outside of the churches in the form of evangelism and church planting. In dealing with church affairs Paul uses his authority only in cases of practicing discipline but not from the position of "an external, hierarchical authority."[28] His language is basically not in the form of commands but of appeal. Also, he restricts his pre-eminent position just to the churches, which he founded. [29]

Goppelt provides a good argument concerning the apostle's status in the New Testament church. He compares the role of apostles of pre-apostolic age with the role of bishops of post-apostolic age with regard to church unity. The difference appears in the emphasis of these two offices. The first are not mentioned as keeping the unity of the church, even though they are mentioned in establishing the foundation of the church (Eph.2:20), but the second, plus some other offices, "are seen as humanly expressing the unity of the church which exists spiritually in God, Christ and the apostles."[30]

(6) The Apostolic succession in the New Testament church

Everett F. Harrison evinces that actually apostolic succession may not be established on the basis of the New Testament accounts. He explains, using the argument of "not succession of James the brother of John," [31] that the case of the succession of Judas is extraordinary. The beginning of apostolic succession is found in the writings of Clement (I Clement 44:2).[32]

(7) Egalitarianism in the New Testament church

Meic Pearse argues that the actual basis of Early Christianity was equality, or in other words the members of the Christian communities saw each other as equal. This

---

[28] Ibid., 136.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Leonhard Goppelt, *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*. Translated by Robert A. Guelich, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1970), 180, quoted in Everett F. Harrison, *The Apostolic Church* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986), 106.

[31] Everett F. Harrison, 106.

understanding was strongly established on the Jewish-Christian belief that every human being is made according to God's image.[33] Also, along this line stays the argument of F. F. Bruce. "To the Christian, the slave equally with the free man was 'thy brother, for whom Christ died,' by contrast with Roman law, in which he had no personal status, or even with Aristotelian philosophy, in which he was defined as a 'living tool.'"[34] On the basis of Paul's claim that there is neither bond nor free in Christ, the differences between free and slave in Christian community disappeared. Slaves proved that they could suffer in the persecution as courageously as the free man, their marriages become legitimate in the Christian communities, and with the other Christians they equally occupied leader's positions in the churches.[35]

b) Those who believe that the evidence about the church government and hierarchy in the New Testament church appear basically just in the Pastoral Epistles which are dated as being subsequent to the other New Testament writings.

(1) Explanation of the New Testament evidence outside Pastorals, which suggest church order

Apart from the Pastoral Epistles, the New Testament does not represent a strong view of church government and hierarchy. There are some hints about these issues but they are not as clearcut as those in the Pastorals. Here are the strongest ones:

- In Rom.12:8 (cf. I Th.5:12) we read about people who exercised pastoral duties over the local churches. But these ministers are not as the ministers of the ordained clergy described in the Pastorals.

- In Phil.1:1, there is a reference to two church offices *episkopoi* and *diakonoi*, but it is very mysterious and difficult to interpret because of their unique character.

---

[32] Ibid.

[33] Meic Pearse, *"The Constantinian Revolution"* (Personal notes taken by Yordan Kalev Zhekov during the lectures on Constantinian Revolution by Meic Pearse, Fall 1996, Evangelical Theological Seminary-Osijek, Croatia), 3.

[34] F. F. Bruce, 191,

[35] Ibid., 191, 192.

- Some other references appear in Acts 11:30; 15:2 which suggest a hierarchical structure of a Jerusalem church which consisted of twelve apostles and under their authority a group of 'presbyters.' Moreover, the mission of Paul and Barnabas involved the appointment of leaders in Cilicia (Acts 14:23). But the probable explanation of these facts remains in the influence of the office of elder in the synagogue to the church in Jerusalem.

- Consulting the meaning and usage of the words *episkopoi, presbyteroi* and *diakonoi* in the New Testament and outside of it, the conclusion could be drawn that the first two are used interchangeably and denote the same office (Acts 20:17,28), and all of them neither carry special liturgical or cultic meaning outside of the New Testament nor they had Jewish cultic background.

(2) Evidence for church government and hierarchy in Pastoral letters

The picture that the Pastorals represent in regard to hierarchy and church government is different. The twofold offices of bishops-presbyters and deacons that are represented in the New Testament and in I Clement are not in the Pastorals. But in them, we have a presentation of the monepiscope status at least when the singular form of *episkopoi* appears, which is exactly the figure, described by Ignatius in his letters. The strongest argument for this hierarchical point of view is the different nature of authority described to mere *episcopos-presbyteros* leader from the group of ministers in the local church and the *episcopoi* in the Pastorals. The latter office had a more extended authority than the former. This can be seen in the authoritative actions which Timothy and Titus were expected to exercise. Some of them were the following: ordination of clergy I Tim.5:22, guiding of financial affairs I Tim.5:17, disciplinary actions I Tim. 5:17, conducting of public ministry I Tim.2:1f, deliverance of the teaching office to those shown II Tim.2:2. This nature of authority is exactly the same as we find in Ignatius' letters. But even though we have an obvious description of a monarchical bishop in the Pastorals, the language of the author is not unambiguous. The reason for this is that during the author's time (which is little bit earlier than Ignatius), we have just the beginnings of the office of a monarchical bishop during the time of its emerging. Therefore, we have no sharp differences between the functions of bishops and of the

presbyters except in the case of Timothy and Titus of their monepiscopal nature of authority. Also, because these were just at the beginning of this office, we do not have the list of professional qualities but only characteristics which are also applicable for the laymen (Tim.3:2-7; 3:8-10; Tit.1:6-9; cf.Tit.2:2).

The other evidence for the development of a strong form of hierarchy in the Pastorals is the establishment of the difference between clergy and laity on the basis of the ordination of the first group. Of course its nature was not yet sacramental, and the succession in the ministry had just the form of teaching rather that the form of "apostolic succession." The argument on behalf of this view is the ordination of Timothy by the laying on of hands by the group of the presbyters in the local church, which was the practice during the time of the Pastorals. This ordination is strongly connected with the monepiscopal authority exercised by Timothy. Moreover, mention of the prophecy in the Pastorals appears only in the case of Timothy' ordination, which exactly fits in the picture of the importance of prophets during the time of the Pastorals. The link between prophecy and ordination also finds a parallel in Ignatius since he himself was a prophet and exercised monepiscopal ministry (Philad.7:1). This important attitude of honour which prophets ought to receive in the local churches is also found in Didache 15:1-2. Probably the best explanation of the connection between prophesy and ordination during the time of Pastorals is this as God's proof for the person who is ordained by the prophetic word. The basic reason for the establishment of an ordained ministry of the monepiscope in the religious context of Pastorals was the false teachings with which ought to be dealt with in a strong monarchical manner.[36]

---

[36] A. T. Hanson, *The New Century Bible Commentary. The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982), 31-38.

c) Those who believe that there is evidence for church government and hierarchy in the New Testament church

        (1) New Testament evidence, outside of the Pastorals, which suggests church order

Even though we do not have a representation of uniformity in church government in the Pauline corpus since Paul was very sensitive and flexible of church order on the basis of the particular culture and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we do have some evidence which suggests an accomplished system of church government. The strongest argument for church government is Paul's view of church organization found in his words to the Ephesians elders (Acts 20:28). "Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God." So we can see the fully operative elder-system even before the time of Pastorals. Other evidence for church government is the existence of offices found in Phil.1:1 where bishops and deacons are mentioned. The uniqueness of the motive of Paul, to express a gratitude for the gift, which established his reason for writing the Philippians, offers two further arguments. First, it describes Paul's recognition of these two groups of leaders or offices as the ones who were in charge of the gathering of money for the gift. Second, it explains why there is no mention of offices in any other of Paul's writings (instead of Pastorals). Also, we can see the establishment of the church order in the New Testament church on the basis of Paul's and Barnabas' ordination of elders during their missionary journey.[37]

Some more evidence is offered by F. F. Bruce. He describes the apostles as "natural leaders at the outset" of the Jerusalem church. Moreover, he suggests that the seven deacons chosen to lead the distribution of the food are "the first institution of officers in the Jerusalem church"[38] in addition to the apostles. Harrison has modified Bruce's view a little, although he agrees with the inclusion of the new offices of deacons, he argues that Luke does not describe them as becoming a constant component of the organization of the Jerusalem church. We cannot see them receiving financial help from

---

[37] Donald Guthrie, *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Inter-Varsity Press, 1984), 24-32.
      [38] F. F. Bruce, 189.

the Antioch church, rather we see the elders who received it (Acts 11:30). Also, even though this argument can find probable explanation in ceasing the daily ministration of the life of Jerusalem church, the ministry of Philip of preaching the gospel and the spiritual character (Acts 6:3,8) of the qualification of the Seven could lead us to conclude that they prefer to take a part of distribution of the gospel.[39] Furthermore Bruce suggests that at the time of Paul's organization of the collection of money, the churches had their individual governments, which were independent of each other, comprised of a plurality of bishops or elders.[40]

The other form of ministry suggested by Bruce which appears in the New Testament is that of prophets, which in nature is of a more unsettled character in comparison with the bishops and deacons who could be described as "settled administrators of the individual churches."[41] So as we can see, according to Bruce, the early authorities represent four basic offices of ministry in the Early church government, apostles, prophets, bishops or elders and deacons. The first two are more universal in character, the latter two more local.[42]

(2) New Testament evidence for church government and hierarchy in Pastoral letters

Several arguments might be submitted for refuting the argument of the second group that we have the same picture of monepiscope in I Timothy and Titus as in the letters of Ignatius. First, the authoritative actions which Timothy and Titus were expected to perform are explained by Ignatius in regard to the monepiscope since they could perform these actions as "apostolic delegates."[43] This understanding of Timothy and Titus as "Paul's apostolic delegates" that carried full apostolic authority and exercised it during their special mission is argued also strongly by Gordon D. Fee.[44] Second, the words 'bishop' and 'elders' are used interchangeably even though the first word is singular, which ought to be understood in a 'generic sense' which means that it is

---

[39] Everett F. Harrison, 107.
[40] F. F. Bruce, 189.
[41] Ibid., 203.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Donald Guthrie, 24-32.

not a single figure but a presentation of the class of bishops (Tit.1:5-7), and the second word is in plural form. This argument also found strong support by Fee[45] and Bruce.[46] Third, if the author has in mind the establishment of the office of monepiscope he should have made more provision, more effort to prepare this. Fourth, we should not regard the Pastorals "as manual of church order" in the sense in which later manuals were used.

Although the evidence shows that the church government and hierarchy presented in the Pastorals is not the same as that presented in Ignatius' letters, we ought not to diminish the order found in them. It has an obvious parallel to the church order in the rest of the Pauline corpus, but it also makes provisions in regard to it for the time when "no apostolic witness will remain."[47] The following are some of the characteristics of the church government represented in Pastorals.

1. Apostolic delegates and church leaders carried the apostolic teaching. The strong system of teaching is formed.

2. Ordinations for church officials by the laying on of hands as a symbol of the transference of particular gift which would help the carrying of the office were the usual practice of the church.

3. Qualities were desired for the varieties of offices existing in the churches.[48]

d) Conclusion

The conclusion which will be established is primarily concerned with the New Testament thought about church government and hierarchical leadership. Therefore again the principle of Gundry-Volf will be applied to the whole New Testament data in regard to the hierarchy so that it might be comprehended properly. Therefore, through the principle, we can see that the disagreements between the groups arise on the basis of their emphasis on the different portions of the Scripture, not on the difference of the facts contained in the New Testament. The first two groups basically agree about the nonexistence of hierarchy and church government in all other parts of the New Testament

---

[44] Gordon D. Fee, *New International Biblical Commentary. I and II Timothy, Titus* (United States: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988), 21.

[45] Ibid., 78.

[46] F. F. Bruce, 203.

[47] Donald Guthrie, 24.

[48] Ibid., 24-32.

except the Pastoral Epistles, because they both emphasise the inner dynamic of church structure. The second group insists that there is a hierarchical leadership in the Pastoral Epistles in the form represented by Ignatius because it emphasises the outward framework of church government. In spite of these two, the third group agrees with the first in a sense that the Pastorals contain the view similar to the other New Testament writings, but against the first, by arguing that both parts represent church order and hierarchy. Also, the third group agrees with the second, to some extent that there is a hierarchy in the Pastoral Epistles but disagrees with it that there is no hierarchical leadership in other New Testament writings. What the third group does is to find the most balanced way in regard to the emphasis in order to represent the complete picture of the government of the New Testament church. Hence, it exactly finds this twofold line of thought which is going on throughout the New Testament writings that represents the two sides of the subject of hierarchy, the outward framework and the inner dynamic.

- outward framework

     We have a hierarchical leadership structure in the New Testament, not as it appears later in the writings of Ignatius and other church fathers, but we still have it although in an embryonic form. This is how the conclusion looks in the case of the Pastoral letters through the perspective of Philip Schaff. He says that the Pastoral Epistles represent "the most advanced stage of ecclesiastical organization in the apostolic period," [49] but they do not diminish the priesthood of all believers.

- inner dynamic

     The inner dynamic of the church government and hierarchical leadership is going on throughout the whole New Testament in the forms of the priesthood of all believers, equality of all believers, attitude of love and servanthood of the leaders toward the body of believers and all other definite Christian forms of thinking which are the basis for Christian actions.

---

[49] Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church. Ante-Nicene Christianity, AD 100-325*, vol.2, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), 125.

C. Conclusion

The following conclusive points can be formed on the basis of the discussion developed in the first part of my thesis. First, the setting of the New Testament church influenced it in two directions, the outward hierarchical framework and inner democratic dynamic. However the second had much deep religious meaning and completion for Christians. Secondly, Jesus' teaching presents the picture which fits in the cultural context. He presupposed a future hierarchy in the Christian community, which is a hierarchical framework, but also he stressed the inner dynamic of this kind of organization very much, a dynamic that will actually move the functioning of the whole structure. Finaly, what Paul's teaching and the rest of the New Testament offer in regard to hierarchy is that of the twofold understanding, the outward framework and the inner dynamic of the structure of the Christian community. Therefore, the organization which we have in the New Testament church is hierarchical in its framework and nonhierarchical in its inner dynamic.

Having this fundamental understanding of the matter concerning the hierarchy in the New Testament church, we can move further by dealing in the same manner with the development of this hierarchy in the Early church.

PART II. Rise of hierarchy in the Early church - historical, cultural, religious and theological survey of the development of the hierarchy in the Early church

Throughout this section of my work, I will make an attempt to represent the setting of the Early church and to discuss its theology in regard to the hierarchy in the church government.

A. The setting of the Early church

In order to understand better the theology of the church fathers and the whole process of the development of the hierarchy in the Early church, we need to look first at the setting in which all these grew. Of course since the period is not too large, we can consider these factors in the surrounding environment which have already been discussed in the setting of the New Testament church. Basically just one new aspect could be added, Gnosticism, which probably arose at the end of the first century or the middle of the second century. Also, since we did not discuss Platonic thought in the first part, we need to consider it. Again, we will look briefly at Jewish thought, but only its influence in the fathers' writings.

1. Gnosticism

The whole structure of Gnostic's belief was based on a dual understanding of the cosmos. God is a pure and good Spirit, and the matter is bad. Because of this difference, there is no connection between the two, and therefore they need mediators. The mediators are small gods who are hierarchically structured. They are called "aeons" or "emanations." The lowest in the heavenly hierarchy is the so called *Demiurge* who is the creator of the world. Since he is the "ignorant, hostile aeon," he is the lowest in the hierarchy, and as a bad figure, he created the evil world comprised by evil matter.[50] But in some of the human creatures, during the process of creation, the spark of divinity failed. This produced the division between the people. Therefore Gnosticism insists that there is a strong hierarchical system among men. There are three levels, according to their possession of the divine spark (spiritual substance). The ones who possess it formed

---

[50] William Barclay, 114.

the highest level, and they are called spiritual (pneumatikoi). The spark that is in them will be delivered by the special gnosis brought by Jesus. The intermediate class is formed by people called psychic (yucikoi,)[51] and the Christians are associated with them by the Gnostic writers. They will reach no more than the lowest heavenly realm, since they lack the Gnostic enlightenment.[52] The third and lowest class is formed by the people called fleshly or material (sarkikoi, or ulikoi). The last group do not posses either spiritual substance or the gnosis of redemption.[53]

2. Platonism

One of the most influential works of Plato is his *Republic*. This is a partly allegorical work. In it, Plato represents his utopian idea about Ideal State. This is the community which is hierarchically organized by three levels of people. The first level is comprised of the people called "guardians," who are well-trained soldiers and politicians. Throughout the training process among them are the chosen few who are called philosophers. They are actually the kings of the Ideal State. So these kings appear to be above all the classes. The middle class people are called "*auxiliary*." They are the police of the state. And the lowest class is constructed by human beings called "labours." They are primarily farmers and artisans. So the Ideal State is the community based on the "rigid aristocracy of power." Moreover Plato argued that these people were all predestined for their level, and they can function prompted by their inner impulses best.[54] Since the Early church was inclined to allegorize the Bible, this partly allegorical work of Plato could have had particular influence on some of the church Fathers engaged in Platonic studies like Clement of Alexandria and Origen.[55]

---

[51] F. L. Cross, ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church,* "Gnosticism" (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

[52] Everett Ferguson, ed. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity,* "Gnosticism" (New York: Garland Publishing, INC, 1988).

[53] F. L. Cross, 1990.

[54] Paul Edwards, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy,* vol. 5 and 6, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1967), s.v. "Plato," by Gilbert Ryle.

[55] Paul Edwards, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy,* vol. 5 and 6, (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1967), s.v. "Platonism and the Pltonic Tradition," by D. A. Rees; J. D. Douglas, ed. *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Grand Rapids, Michingan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974), s.v. "Jystin Martyr," by G. L. Carey; Ibid., "Platonism," by Gordon C. Neal; F. L. Cross, ed., "Platonism."

Platonic thought also represented radical dualism. There are two worlds. This world, which is made of mater and the other world, the world of ideas, which is a better one. The latter is an ideal world based on knowledge. Actually the former is not the true world but just an imitation of the ideal world.[56] Because of this radical dualism between spirit and matter, the necessity of mediation appeared. God is so far from the world, how could man reach him. Therefore, Platonism satisfied this need by the construction of a strong hierarchical system. This understanding of the relationship between God and man through the mediatorial hierarchy strongly influenced Christianity. This is where the mediation between laymen and God passed into the hands of the clergy, the priests.[57]

3. Jews' heritage

The whole idea of the priesthood in the Old Testament influenced the church fathers especially in the development of hierarchy in church leadership. In Justin, the priesthood of the Jewish nation, which was under the old covenant applied to the whole church; believers who are under the new covenant "are the true high-priestly race of God." But in Clement of Rome we have a different kind of application. He first started to speak about the laymen. Moreover he argued about the parallel between the hierarchically structured Israel community and the church, on which basis he insisted on the distinction of the clergy from believers (I Clement 40:5 cf. 41:1, 2).[58] He also used the Levitical priesthood to shape the body of the clergy in the church.[59] Tertullian[60] identified the bishop with "the high priest" and his pupil Cyprian easily followed his example. Chrysostom continued this practice writing the whole work *On the Priesthood*. He also related the role of the priest in the Old Testament sacrificial system in the New Testament Eucharist. "…the Lord being sacrificed and laid upon the altar, and the priest

---

[56] *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol.4 (USA: The Catholic Universaty of America, 1967), s.v. "Dualizm," by R. M. Mcinerny.

[57] Meic Pearse, 10.

[58] Cyril C. Richardson, ed. *Early Christian Fathers* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1970), 62.

[59] Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition. A history of the Development of Doctrine, vol.1, The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)* (Chicago an London: the University of Chicago Press, 1971), 160.

[60] Even though in his Montanistic treatise he argued that "the Spirit of new prophecy," erase the differences between the clergy and laity. But in the same treatise he insisted that the distinction between the two should be preserved. Jaroslav Pelikan, 160.

standing and praying over the victim."[61] For Origen, there is continuity between the Levitical priesthood and the apostolic ministry. He mingled the definitions of both ministries into one, "… the apostles and their successors, priests according to the great High Priest… know from their instruction by the Spirit for what sins, when, and how, they must offer sacrifice."[62]

The picture represented by these factors forming the environment of the Early church is basically hierarchical. Just a slight hint of preservation of the inner dynamic in the priesthood of all believers is found in Justin. Of course we should not forget that some of the factors represented in the first part of the thesis are also relevant here because, as I said before, we are not dealing with a large gap between the two periods. However we need to recognize this reinforcement on the behalf of hierarchy.

With this picture in mind, we can now turn to the theology of the church Fathers.

---

[61] Jaroslav Pelikan, 25.
[62] Ibid., 59.

B. The Theology of the church fathers in respect to the issue of hierarchy - outlook through some of the writings of the Early church fathers concerning the development of the hierarchical leadership63

1. Clement of Rome

       The basic problem with the Corinthian church, that they deposed their leaders, led Clement to set forth a hierarchical view of the ministry. This same reason guided him to stress the importance of the believers to submit to the elected clergy. The process of the election is not thoroughly clear, but it seems that Clement stressed the leaders' special connection with the apostles. This is the so-called apostolic succession.[64]

       On the basis of the example of Moses in choosing the priesthood of Israel (I Clement ch. 43) Clement established the belief in the apostolic succession. Yet, through the formulation of this view, we may identify the setting of a hierarchical pattern of leadership in the church.

> The apostles received the gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus, the Christ, was sent from God. Thus Christ is from God and the apostles from Christ... They (the apostles) preached in country and city, and appointed their first converts, after testing them by the Spirit, to be the bishops and deacons of future believers... (I Clement 42:1-4)
> Now our apostles, thanks to our Lord Jesus Christ, knew that there was going to be strife over the title of bishop. It was for this reason and because they had been given accurate knowledge of the future, that they appointed the offices we have mentioned. Furthermore, they later added a codicil to the effect that, should these die, other approved men should succeed to heir ministry. (I Clement 44:1, 2)[65]

       This hierarchical pattern which we see just as a hint here is clarified by Ignatius, who based his belief on it of the heavenly model of the authority of the monepiscopate, which seems to be influenced by the Platonic way of thinking.[66] "Let the bishop preside in God's place and the presbyters take the place of the apostolic council, and let the deacons (my special favourites) be entrusted with the ministry of Jesus Christ who was with the Father from

---

[63] The order of presentation of the Church Fathers is chronological. For exact dates consult the Appendix chronological table.
    [64] Cyril C. Richardson, 39.
    [65] Ibid., 62, 63.
    [66] Ibid., 76.

eternity and appeared at the end [of the world]." (Magnesians 6:1)[67] One may argue that here we do not exactly have hierarchy since it seems as if Christ is put under the office of the apostles. But this probably relates to the fact that not his position is in view but his ministry on the earth as a servant is revealed. Harry R. Boer also sees in the writing of Ignatius similarity to this hierarchical structure.[68]

2. The Didache

The Teaching of the Lord to the Gentiles, through the Twelve Apostles, so called *The Didache* is comprised of two parts, "The Two Ways" (ch.1-6) and "an old Manual of Church regulations" (ch.7-16). Concerning the time of origination of this document, the importance of the second part should be stressed. The time of origination is the end of the first century, which is characterized by the fact that, "traveling missioners were still the chief officers of the Church and bishops had not yet become distinguished from presbyters." In other words, this is the period between the New Testament and church of the second century, the latter characterized "with fully developed organization."[69]

Our discussion on the subject of hierarchy allows us to consider two important details of this ancient work. First is the attitude toward prophets, which are called "your high priests" meaning the believers' high priests and probably also teachers fall into the same category (ch.13:1-3).[70] This title carries three particular connotations. It suggests that the priests were gaining support based on argumentation derived from the Old Testament practices; it indicates a background in the Israel hierarchical order, and it implies an association with the mediatory sacrificial system of Israel. Hence we may presuppose that this is the embryonic form of the future development of the hierarchy and priesthood in the church. This point is also made by Jaroslav Pelikan.[71] Second, the

---

[67] Ibid., 95.
[68] Harry R. Boer, 31.
[69] *The Didache. Introduction*, ed. Betty Radice, *The Penguin Classics. Early Christian Writings* (Hazell Watson and Viney Ltd. Aylesbury: Maxwell Stanifoth, 1968), 225, 226.
[70]*The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles Commonly Called the Didache. The Text*, ed. Cyril C. Richardson, *Early Christian Fathers* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1970), 177.
[71] Jaroslav Pelikan, 25.

equalization of the prominence of the place and the possessed authority of bishops and deacons (overseers and assistants[72]) with prophets and teachers.

> You must, then, elect for yourselves bishops and deacons who are a credit to the Lord, men who are gentle, generous, faithful, and well tried. For their ministry to you is identical with that of the prophets and teachers. You must not, therefore, despise them, for along with the prophets and teachers they enjoy a place of honor among you. (ch.15)[73]

From this passage it looks like the preparation for the substitution of prophets and teachers by bishops and deacons is taking place. The continuity between *The Didache* and Ignatius' single bishop in regard to the localizing of the ministry of the apostles, prophets and catechists is also argued by Richardson.[74]

3. Shepherd of Hermas

In his third vision about the church (ch.9:1-10:9) Hermas sees the church as a tower built by six young men (10:5). Guided through the vision by an elderly lady, whom he called Madam, Hermas writes about the foundation of this tower (the church).[75] He describes it as found by joined together square stones. "Hear now about the stones that go into the building. The stones that are square and white and fit their joints are the apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons…."[76] So the stones are the apostles, bishops, teachers and deacons. In the same context this group is mentioned again but now without the apostles. "…and who have sincerely and reverently served the elect of God as bishops and teachers and deacons."[77] It seems from the second account that the group of the apostles disappears when the author speaks about the service towards the elect, which in a time period probably refers to the author's present time. When we compare this account of Hermas with the text of Ephesians ch.2:20: "built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone,"(NIV) we can see the obvious difference of the groups referred to as the

---

[72] *The Didache. Part 2. A Church Manual*, 234.
[73] *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles Commonly Called the Didache. The Text*, 178.
[74] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Introduction*, ed. Jack N. Sparks, *The Apostolic Fathers, New Translations of These Early Christian Writings* (New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978), 76.
[75] *The Shepherd of Hermas*, ed. Jack N. Sparks, *The Apostolic Fathers, New Translations of These Early Christian Writings* (New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978), 167-171.
[76] Ibid., 171.
[77] Ibid.

foundation of the church. In Hermas, there are four, apostles, bishops, teachers and deacons, eventually reduced to three, bishops, teachers, and deacons. What is clear from this comparison is that the groups of bishops, teachers, and deacons become the substitution of the groups of apostles and prophets who were already dead during the time of Hermas. So the importance of the position of the former group received prominent attention during the time of Hermas. Moreover further stress was put on the office of the bishops. Their distinct place, their high moral standards of Christian life, and their relation to God were brought to the surface.

> …bishops and hospitable persons who were always glad to entertain (cf. I Tim. 3:2), without hypocrisy, the servants of God in their homes. And the bishops, in their service, always sheltered the destitute and widows without ceasing and always conducted themselves with purity, all these, then, will always be sheltered by the Lord. So those who have done these things are glorious before God, and their place is already with the angels, if they continue serving the Lord to the end. (ch.104:2,3)[78]

4. Ignatius bishop of Antioch

Ignatius represents the authority and the position of the bishop and the believers' attitude toward this figure in the following words.

> And the more anyone sees the bishop being silent, the more one should fear him. For everyone whom the master of a house sends for his stewardship, we must receive as the one who sent him (cf. John 13:20; Matt. 10: 40). It is obvious, then, that one must look upon the bishop as the Lord himself (cf. Gal.4:14). (Eph.6)[79]

Ignatius encouraged and in some cases required from believers that they obey the bishop and presbytery. "…It is fitting, then, in every way to glorify Jesus Christ, who glorified you, so that you may be made perfect in a single obedience to the bishop and the presbytery and be sanctified in every respect, (Eph.2:2)."[80] He based his argument on the basis of the pattern of Jesus' relationship with the Father. "As, then, the Lord did nothing apart from the Father (cj. John 5:19; 8:28)… so you must do nothing apart from the

---

[78] Ibid.
[79] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Ephesians*, 79.
[80] Ibid., 78.

bishop and the presbyter, (Mag.7:1).[81] Some more references to encourage believers to obey the bishop are in Eph.20:1[82], Mag.13:2[83], Trall.2:1.[84]

For Ignatius "to run your race in accordance with God's purpose" is strongly connected with the existence of the bishops since Christ expresses God's purpose and bishops clothed Christ's purpose, (Eph.3:2).[85] Moreover, Ignatius emphasizes the importance of the figure of the bishop and also the figures of the presbytery and the deacons for the purity of the believers' lives. "He who is within the sanctuary is pure; he who is outside the sanctuary is not pure- that is, whoever does anything apart from the bishop and the presbytery and the deacons is not pure in conscience," (Trall.7:2).[86] So the bishop, presbytery, and deacons are the ones who not only appeared to be in the sanctuary but also they are associated with it. A believer who is in the sanctuary (synchronizing his actions with the desires of these three) is pure and one who is outside the sanctuary (not acting in accordance with the three) is not pure. The importance of the bishop for the believer's relationship with God is clearly underlined. "…He who honours the bishop has been honoured by God (cf. 1 Thess. 5:12, 13); he who does anything without the bishop's knowledge worships the devil," (Syrn.9)."[87] Also any action of the believers different to or without the support of the bishop is forbidden. "Therefore it is necessary that, actually the case that you do nothing apart from the bishop…."[88]

The hierarchical order is presented by Ignatius. "I exhort you: be eager to do everything in God's harmony, with the bishop presiding in the place of God and the presbytery in the place of the council of the apostles and the deacons most sweet to me, entrusted with the service of Jesus Christ..." (Mag.6:1).[89] It is not exactly a clear representation of the leader hierarchical system, but we can see its main focus, the bishop is at the top as the representative of God. Also, the other offices, presbytery and deacons, are defined. This hierarchical order finds divine support in the following claim. "…I spoke with a loud voice, God's own voice: "Pay attention to the bishop and the presbytery

---

[81] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch:* Magnesians, 88.
[82] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Ephesians*, 84.
[83] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Magnesians*, 90.
[84] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Trallians*, 92.
[85] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Ephesians*, 78.
[86] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Trallians*, 94.
[87] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Smyrnaeans*, 113.
[88] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Trallians*, 92.

and deacons,"(Philad.7:1).[90] Moreover in the hierarchical scheme the twofold division appears on a different level to the previous three divisions (bishop, presbytery, and deacons); which is the division between the laymen (merely believers) and clergy (bishop, presbytery, and deacons). Also the top of the whole system is emphasized first - the bishop. This is clearly depicted in the exhortation concerning the duties of the Smyrnaean Christians in relation to the upper level of the hierarchy: "Pay attention to the bishop so that God will pay attention to you. I am devoted to those who are subject to the bishop, presbyters, and deacons; and may it turn out for me that I have a portion with them in God,"(Polycarp 6:1).[91] Some other references in support of this hierarchical form are Mag.13:1[92], Trall.3:1[93], Philad. Salutation[94], Smyrnaeans 12:2.[95]

5. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons

In his work *The Refutation and Overthrow of the Knowledge Falsely so Called,* Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons wrote against a system of beliefs which could be associated with the Gnostics. Two of the basic figures related to the movement are Marcion and Valentinus.[96]

Aiming to show that the tradition of the apostles is now the teaching of the church, Irenaeus argues about the position and authority of bishops which are established on the basis of their apostolic succession. "We can enumerate those who were established by the apostles as bishops in the churches, and their successors down to our time, none of whom taught or thought of anything like their [heretics] mad ideas."[97] Developing the theme of succession of the apostles, Irenaeus argues that the bishops are represented as successors of Peter and Paul. Here his basic purpose again is to show that

---

[89] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Magnesians*, 87.
[90] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Philadelphians*, 104.
[91] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Polycarp*, 118.
[92] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Magnesians*, 90.
[93] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Trallians*, 93.
[94] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Philadelphians*, 104.
[95] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Smyrnaeans*, 114.
[96] *Selections from the Work Against Heresies by Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons: "The Refutation and Overthrow of the Knowledge Falsely So Called." Introduction*, ed. Cyril C. Richardson, *Early Christian Fathers* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1970), 343-345.
[97] *Selections from the Work Against Heresies by Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons*, 371.

the tradition of apostles is in the church, so he argues this speaking about the faith of

Peter and Paul which reached his time through the succession of bishops.

> But since it would be very long in such a volume as this to enumerate the successions of the churches, I can by pointing out the tradition which that very great, oldest, and well-known Church, founded and established at Rome by those two most glorious apostles Peter and Paul, received from the apostles, and its faith known among men, which comes down to us through the successions of bishops, put to shame all of those who in any way, either through wicked self-conceit, or through vainglory, or through blind and evil opinion, gather as they should not.[98]

The example of Polycarp of carrying the apostolic tradition to his successors is

very important in regard to the significant place given to the bishop's office in this

process. "Similarly Polycarp, who was not only taught by apostles, and associated with

many who had seen Christ, but also was installed by apostles for Asia, as bishop in the

church in Smyrna…."[99] So Polycarp is not only taught by the apostles and associated

with those who had seen Christ but also he was installed by the apostles as bishop. What

is clear from this reference is that Irenaeus is especially concerned to stress the

importance of bishops in the apostolic succession. But Irenaeus is also concerned to

preserve the priesthood of all believers. Therefore he writes, "all the righteous have a

priestly order…all the disciples of the Lord are Levites and priests."[100]

6. Clement of Alexandria

Clement of Alexandria argues for the strong hierarchical system in the Church.

This system is built by bishops, presbyters, and deacons, and the sample for this structure

comes from the heavenly hierarchy of the angels. The last claim, according to Johannes

Quasten is innovation in the theology of the angels.[101] Let's look at the account of

Clement.

> Since, according to my opinion, the grades here in the Church, of bishops, presbyters, deacons, are imitations of the angelic glory, and of the economy which, the Scriptures say, awaits those who, following the footsteps of the apostles, have lived in perfection of righteousness according to he Gospel.[102]

---

[98] Ibid.

[99] Ibid., 372, 373.

[100] Jaroslav Pelikan, 160.

[101] Johannes Quasten, *Patrology. The Ante-Nicene Literature After Irenaeus*, Vol. 2 (Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics, INC, 1992), 27.

[102] Clement of Alexandria *The Stromata, or Miscellanies* 5.13.107.

But actually what does he want to prove by this explanation? This is clear from the context. He argues for the unity of the church. He mentions "one God," "one Lord," "one unchangeable gift of salvation," "one unity of faith," and his stress is on the one clergy established from the people of both nations Greek and Jew. Moreover, he develops the following image of the clergy comprised of bishops, presbyters, deacons.

> And the chosen of the chosen are those who by reason of perfect knowledge are called as the best from the Church itself, and honored with the most august glory- the judges and rulers- four-and-twenty (the grace being doubled) equally form Jews and Greeks.[103]

So on the basis of this account we may understand the view of Clement about the clergy. They are the chosen of the chosen, the best, honored with the most august glory, the judges and rulers.

7. Hippolytus

The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus of Rome, written about the year 215 AD is "the earliest and the most important of the ancient Church Orders,"[104] after *Didache*. One of the aspects of the Church order in which it provided rules is "the ordination and functions of the various ranks of the hierarchy."[105] As the pupil of Irenaeus, Hippolytus spoke about the hierarchy in the church in the same manner as his teacher. His basic goal was to prove the truthfulness of the church as carrier of the apostolic tradition through the apostolic succession of the bishops.[106]

Several things are very important in regard to the image of bishop formed by the writings of Hippolytus. They can be seen especially in the prayer for bishop's ordination.

> …Thy servant whom Thou hast chosen for the episcopate, to feed Thy holy flock, to present before Thy eyes the primacy of the priesthood, that he may serve Thee blamelessly by night and by day, that he may unceasingly propitiate thy countenance and offer to Thee the gifts of Thy holy Church, and that by the high priestly Spirit he may have authority to forgive sins according to Thy command, to assign lots according to Thy bidding, to loose every bond according to the authority Thou gavest to the Apostles and that he may please

---

[103] Ibid.
[104] Johannes Quasten, *Patrology,* 180.
[105] Ibid.
[106] Johannes Quasten, 202.

Thee by meekness and purity of heart, offering to Thee and odour of sweetness through Thy Child Jesus Christ our Lord, ...[107]

What we see about the bishop is that: first, he is part of the clergy (the episcopate), second, he will fulfil the highest priesthood role, third, he will serve as a mediator between the church and God offering the gifts of the church to God, fourth, he is possessed by the "high priestly Spirit," sixth, he can forgive sins, seventh, he is an apostolic successor.

8. Cyprian of Carthage

The two controversies which dealt with the entering of the believers who are considered not so holy in the church, namely this of the "readmission of the 'lapsed'" of those who deserted the church during the persecution and "the rebaptism of those who had been baptized by heretics," shaped the Cyprian view of the holiness of the clergy.[108]

Cyprian's understanding about the doctrine of the bishop's authority was very "high." He believed that the bishop possesses an "uniquely priestly character." His Episcopal authority was equal to the apostolic authority. Particularly, he viewed the bishop of Rome as the successor of Peter. Moreover in the context of the Novatian' schism Cyprian expressed his belief that in the city just one true bishop could lead the followers of the Catholic Church under which they could have sacraments and obtain salvation.[109]

9. Cornelius

The first of the two letters survived from the correspondence of Cornelius to Cyprian of Carthage which enlightened the development of monarchical hierarchy during his time. In his letter Cornelius cited the words of the followers of Novatian who were coming back after their apostasy from the church.

> We know that Cornelius is bishop of the most holy Catholic Church elected by Almighty God, and by Christ our Lord.... For we are not ignorant that there is one God; that there is one Christ the Lord, whom we have confessed, and one

---

[107] Ibid., 188.
[108] Jaroslav Pelikan, 158, 159.
[109] F. F. Bruce, 212, 213.

Holy Spirit; and that in the Catholic church there ought to be one bishop. (Epist.49,2 ANF)[110]

10. Jerome

Jerome represents a strong hierarchical structure in the church, although he sometimes mingles the office of presbyters and bishops. From his letter we may identify four levels of hierarchy. A bishop was chosen from among the presbyters, and archdeacon chosen among deacons. All of them he identified with the priest. Insisting on their authority, he represents a twofold argument. First they (bishop, presbyters and deacons) are representatives of the parallel with Aaron, his sons and the Levites. Second they "all alike are successors of the apostles."[111]

C. Conclusion

On the basis of this developed research through the writings of church Fathers, and the hierarchical influence of the cultural, political and religious environment, we can conclude that their view about the leaders of the church (clergy) was advanced enormously. The hierarchical leadership form of government of the church with the emphasis on the role of the bishop experienced rapid development. The figure of the monarchical bishop received its clear portrait in the minds of the early Christians. Let us look on some brief definitions of the monarchical bishop.

According to Cyril C. Richardson the bishop was the living centre of the Christian tradition. He was a prophetic as well as a sacramental person; and nothing more clearly reveals the second century attitude toward the episcopate than the description the Smyrnaeans give of their martyred bishop, Polycarp: he was "an apostolic and prophetic teacher" (Mart. Poly. 16:2).[112]

Harry R. Boer describes him in the following terms.

> The monarchical bishop was not a church dictator. He was in constant touch with his elders and deacons and with the church as a whole in his city or area. As such, he was the representative who was to give leadership in expressing and upholding the common life and faith of the church.[113]

---

[110] Johannes Quasten, 236.
[111] Jerome *Letters* CXL VI 1,2
[112] Cyril C. Richardson, 21.
[113] Harry R. Boer, 29, 30.

What is clear from these descriptions is that even though the hierarchical leadership developed a lot in comparison with the New Testament church, we still have hints of the inner dynamic expressed in the attitude of the clergy especially in the person of the bishop toward the rest of the believers. Of course the inner dynamics are quite diminished from what we have in the New Testament church. Yet, for a clearer distinction between the two periods of the church in regard to the hierarchy, let us establish their continuity and discontinuity.

PART III. Establishment of continuity and discontinuity of the rise and development of the hierarchy between the New Testament church and the Early church

Throughout this section of the work, I will discuss the two basic aspects of the relationship between these two periods of the church. These are continuity and discontinuity, with which I will deal by considering their nature and reasons.

A. The nature of continuity between New Testament church and Early church in formation and development of the hierarchy

Our so far developed research shows two basic sides of the nature of this continuity, namely the hierarchical framework and nonhierarchical inner dynamic. Of course as we saw, the weighty side is this of hierarchy. The hierarchy was borrowed from the setting of the New Testament church and established as its framework. Later, this framework was developed by the Early church to the extreme. Yet, we should not forget to mention that the inner dynamic which was active in the beginning of the church, although declining, still finds its place in the Early church. But what were the reasons for this continuity?

B. The reasons for continuity

Two basic reasons could be clearly identified. They are the outward environment and the inner dynamic.

1. The outward environment

As I mentioned before, the most obvious reason for this was the quite similar setting of the two periods of the church. In both of them, we found a strong influence upon the formation and development of the hierarchical framework.

2. The inner dynamic of the hierarchical structure

The priesthood of all believers appears to be one of the basic reasons for the inner dynamic of the continuity. Most of the church fathers preserved the priesthood role of all

believers in different areas. Polycarp and Origen found it in the high priesthood of Christ.[114] Cyprian together with Clement of Rome argued for the right of the congregation to choose its ministers, including the bishop. Moreover, this right of the congregation continued for a long period of time. Cyprian also insisted that the bishop do nothing "without the advice of the presbyters and deacons, and the consent of the people."[115] Tertullian in his latter days as Montanist argued in behalf of the priesthood of all believers. "Are not we laymen priests also?…He hath made us kings and priests (Rev.1:6). It is the authority of the church alone which has made a distinction between clergy and laity."[116] Origen argued for the believers' free access to the presence of Father.[117] Hippolytus refers to the believers as "ministers priests," and "high priests."[118] Finally, laymen still practice teaching. Also, it is not surprising that the large number of church fathers as Hermas, Justine Martyr, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, Anobius, and Lactantius were in the position of laity or mostly of presbyters.[119]

---

[114] C. Eastwood, xi-xii.
[115] Philip Schaff, 129.
[116] De Exort. Cast. c. 7, quoted by Philip Schaff, 129.
[117] C. Eastwood, xi-xii.
[118] *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.* s.v. "Priesthood in the New Testaments," by W. J. Moulder, In BibleWorks for Windows 95/NT v.4.0.025e [0]. Lotos Development Corporation, 1996.
[119] Philip Schaff, 131.

C. The nature of discontinuity between New Testament church and Early church in the formation and development of the hierarchy

The discontinuity was basically of a twofold nature: the decreasing of the inner dynamic and the increasing of the framework of hierarchy.

1. The swallowing of the inner dynamic by the framework of hierarchy in church development

The first step of the process of developing the hierarchy in the church was made by Ignatius. He moved one step further from the priesthood of all believers by showing the importance of clergy as the medium between God and believers (Ad. Trall.c 7).[120] Following him, Irenaeus also insisted on the primacy of the bishops and "an unbroken episcopate succession" founding in these arguments the means for "doctrinal unity in opposition to heretical vagaries." Nevertheless, he did not make a difference between bishop and presbyter.[121] Tertullian followed Irenaeus and went further in his understanding of hierarchy making the distinction between bishops and presbyters. However in his later writings as a Montanist, he moved away from his former understanding of hierarchy.[122] Cyprian moved forward to develop the hierarchical leadership of the church. He was the first who firmly established the mediation functions of the clergy. Cyprian argued that "the bishop is in the church and the church is in the bishop and if any one is not with the bishop he is not in the church." (Epist. 1 xvi. 3.)[123] Moreover during the third century, the title priest started to be applied primarily to the leadership and especially to the bishops. A firm distinction between clergy and laity was finally established.[124]

2. Development of the complex hierarchy

The represented data shows us that there was an increase of the hierarchy in the process of the development of the church. Increasingly the church Fathers put more and more emphasis on the church leadership. The twofold Early church local ministry

---

[120] Ibid., 125.
[121] Ibid., 150.
[122] Ibid.
[123] Ibid., 126, 149, 151.

transmitted to the threefold order in the last quarter of the second century. This order was constructed of one bishop, several presbyters, and several deacons. As this transition changed the early belief about the apostolic origin of the plurality of the office of bishop, Christians started to think that the monarchical bishops were appointed by the apostles. The transmission from plural to a single bishop was realized throughout the whole church by the middle of the second century.[125]

The other culmination point in the complexity of the hierarchical structure of the clergy was reached with Constantine's establishment as emperor of the Roman Empire in 311 AD. This complex system was based primarily on the strong distinction between the laity and the clergy. The separation was set by the ordination of the clergy and developed by its involvement in the church business. All the church work was done by the clergy offices and as the work multiplied, the offices developed. Hence, the hierarchy reached the form of three levels: "the lower clergy, the higher clergy, and the episcopate." The lower clergy involved exorcists, readers, acolytes and sub-deacons. The first two were basically involved in the liturgical services and the second two were the staff of the bishop. [126]   Philip Schaff includes some other officers of the lower clergy as: presenters, janitors, catechists, and interpreters.[127] The higher clergy consisted of deacons and presbyters. The deacons assisted the bishop in the administrative work, and presbyters basically supervised the administration of the sacraments.

The episcopate included different levels of bishops. The lower one was the country bishop who was subordinate to the city bishop, who was subordinate to the archbishops, who on the other hand was subordinate to the patriarchal bishop. Of the latter, there were three bishops during the fourth century, one in Rome, one in Antioch, and one in Alexandria. Each of these patriarchal bishops governed particular provinces.[128] As we can see by the middle of the third century the hierarchical structure was fully developed in all its levels.[129]

Let us now consider the reasons which prompted this discontinuity.

---

[124] Ibid., 126, 127.
[125] F. F. Bruce, 205.
[126] Harry R. Boer, 134-136.
[127] Philip Schaff, 131, 132.
[128] Harry R. Boer, 134-136.
[129] Philip Schaff, 131, 132.

<div align="center">**D. Reasons for discontinuity**</div>

There are three most important reasons, which ought to be considered, the understanding of the Eucharist and Baptism and also the attempt to keep the unity of the universal church.

1. The understanding of the Eucharist influenced the development of the hierarchical leadership

The development of the high sacramental understanding of the Eucharist developed the high view of everything connected with it. Following closely the thinking of some of the church Fathers, we can easily see this process.

Justine Martyr's understanding of the attributes of the Eucharist, the bread and wine, is ambiguous. It is not quite clear whether he thinks about them as the real blood and body of Christ or not. "For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Savior, having been made flesh by the Word of God…"[130] In relation to this presentation, his view of the role of "the president of the brethren" and deacons in conducting the Eucharist is quite balanced, even though he puts slight emphasis on the actions of these figures. This emphasis underlines the importance of "the president of the brethren" and the deacons in performing the two crucial roles in the whole rite. First, the delivering of the prayers and thanksgivings for the cup and bread to the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit is accomplished by the president. And the second, the distribution of the bread and the cup to the rest of the congregation is performed by the deacons. [131]

For Hippolytus, the attributes of the Eucharist are still called antitypes and subsequently the role of the bishops and deacons did not have receive such a strong emphasis. However in his account of the Eucharistic service performed in Rome 215 AD, we have representation of the leading role played by the bishop himself, a fact explicitly noticed by the comment of F. F. Bruce.[132]

---

[130] Justin Martyr *I Apology* 66.
[131] F. F. Bruce, 195.
[132] Ibid., 196.

Yet, Gregory of Nissa had a really strong substantial understanding of the attributes. "Again, the bread is, to begin with, common bread, but when the sacramental act has consecrated it, it is called, and becomes, the body of Christ."[133] In parallel to this new understanding, all things connected with the Eucharist become very special including the place of the bishop and deacons who are now called priests, and who are strongly distinguished from the laity. In equal manner, John Chrysostom follows this view of Gregory.

Clement of Rome stressed the important liturgical function of the presbyter-bishops who are apostolic successors. They are the persons who have the right to lead worship and to "offer the gifts" (ch.44: 4). This conclusion Clement based strongly on the parallel with the Old Testament role of the priests in the performance of the ceremonies of sacrifices (chs.42 to 44). This suggests that in his thinking, the author makes a strong connection between the development of the high view of the Lord's Supper and the office of those who are apostolic successors. And even though the usage of the terms "presbyter" and "bishop" showed their interchangeability, the leading role of a single bishop in the body of presbyter-bishops who governed the church becomes more and more clear.[134]

Cyprian insisted that the clergy, including the bishop, ought to be holy because of the Eucharist. Since taking the Eucharist purified the simple members of the church, those who administrated it were also required to be also pure. Moreover, this understanding of Cyprian about the holiness of the church led him to conclude that outside of the church there is no salvation.[135]

Ignatius expressed the importance of the bishop in the liturgy in the following words. "If the prayer of one or two has such power (cf. Matt 18: 19, 29), how much more does that of the bishop and the whole church?"(Eph.5:2)[136] More clear reference is found in Smyrnaeans 8:1, 2

> …A valid Eucharist is to be defined as one celebrated by the bishop or by a representative of his. 2. Wherever the bishop appears, the whole congregation is to be present, just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the whole Church. It is not right either to baptize or to celebrate the agape apart

---

[133] Gregory of Nyssa *On the Baptism of Christ.*
[134] Cyril C. Richardson, 38.
[135] Jaroslav Pelikan, 158, 159.
[136] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Ephesians*, 79.

from the bishop; but whatever he approves is also pleasing to God (cf. Matt. 18:18-20; John 20:21-23) – so that everything you do may be secure and valid.[137]

What is also clear from this passage is that the bishop is the figure, who stays instead of the church and this argument finds support on the basis of the parallel with Christ's relationship with the church.

Tertullian's accounts of the Eucharist appear everywhere in his writings. He offers the phrase, which points to the two important characteristics of the performance of the ritual, "before daybreak and from the hands of the presidents only." I want to give attention to the second one. The emphasis, which Tertullian made, is obvious that only from the hands of the president is the Eucharist valid, or properly done.[138]

2. The understanding of Baptism influenced the development of the hierarchical leadership

For Tertullian, baptism was usually administrated by the bishop, presbyters and deacons, but was possible even by laymen when extraordinary circumstances required it, because "for what is equally received can be equally given…."[139]

On the other hand, Ignatius stressed the impossibility of performing the rite without the bishop. "It is not right either to baptize or to celebrate the agape apart from the bishop; but whatever he approves is also pleasing to God (cf. Matt. 18:18-20; John 20:21-23) – so that everything you do may be secure and valid.[140]

Gregory of Nyssa expressed the high view of water baptism and called it "the sacramental rite of baptism." "Baptism then is a purification of sins, a remission of trespasses, a cause of renovation and regeneration, when the grace from above hallows it." Moreover he used some phrases as: "the grace of baptism," "deed and of regeneration of baptism," "perfect and marvelous baptism," and "sacramental grace." These showed his understanding of the sacrament. In order to defend his view of the water regeneration, Gregory gives some examples which we find among the ordination of the priests.

---

[137] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Smyrnaeans*, 113.
[138] F. F. Bruce, 198.
[139] Johannes Quasten, 279.
[140] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Smyrnaeans*, 113.

The same power of the word, again, also makes the priest venerable and honorable, separated, by the new blessing bestowed upon him, from his community with the mass of men. While but yesterday he was one of the mass, one of the people, he is suddenly rendered a guide, a president, a teacher of righteousness, and instructor in hidden mysteries; and this he does without being at all changed in body or in form; but, while continuing to be in all appearance the man he was before, being, by some unseen power and grace, transformed in respect of this unseen soul to the higher condition.[141]

3. Attempt to presere the unity of the church through development of the hierarchical leadership

Cyprian of Carthage, the African theologian, in his treatises *The Unity of the Church* mainly concerned with the schism of Novatian argued about the preservation of unity in the church. His argument was grounded in the words of Jesus toward Peter by which he arranged the origin of that unity to begin from one. One of the most important agents of keeping this unity is the figure of bishop. "This unity we ought firmly to hold and assert, especially to those of us that are bishops who preside in the Church, that we may also prove the episcopacy to be one and undivided…"[142] In his interest in accomplishing his goal, Cyprian goes further in presenting the relationship between the bishop and the church. "You should understand that the bishop is in the Church and the Church in the bishop and that whoever is not with the bishop is not in the Church (Epist.66,8)." He rebuked sharply those who were not with the clergy and the bishop.

Does he think that he has Christ who acts in apposition to Christ's priests, who separates himself from company of his clergy and people? He bears arms against the church, he contends against God's appointment... a hostile brother, despising the bishops, and forsaking God's priests, he dares to set up another alter, to make another prayer with unauthorized words, to profane the truth of the Lord's offering by false sacrifices…[143]

Moreover he offers the other argument, the apostolic succession of bishops, but not only this, for according to him the apostles were the first bishops. "The Lord chose the apostles, that is, the bishops and rulers (Epist.3,3)." And in this direction he claims that the church is actually built on the foundation of the bishops. "…forasmuch as the Church is found upon the bishops and every act of the Church is subject to these rulers. Since

---

[141] Gregory of Nyssa *On The Baptism of Christ. A Seromn for the day of the Light*.
[142] Johannes Quasten, 350.
[143] Cyprian of Carthage *On the Unity of the Church* 17.

then, this order has been established by divine decree… (Epist.33,1)."[144] So we can say, according to his argument, that the bishops precede the church.

The basic concern of Ignatius was the unity of the Church, which he emphasized throughout all his letters. The basic role in this unity according to him was played by the bishop. The figure of the bishop lay at the centre of this concept.[145] "Let there be nothing in you that can divide you, but be united with the bishop and with those who preside…"(Mag.6:2)[146] "Be eager, therefore, to use one Eucharist-for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup for union with his blood, one sanctuary, as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons…" (Philadelphia's chapter four)[147] If we compare this text with the text of Ephesians 4: 3-6 we may see that the parallel is obvious even though it is not complete. What is taking our attention is that in the former text, the letter of Ignatius, the three offices are also represented as the cause of unity. Other references in the line of this argument are: Trall.7:1[148]; Philad.3:2[149]; Philad.8:1[150] So we can see that the strong relation was established between the unity of the church and the formation of the monepiscope in Ignatius' epistles. This fact brought Jaroslav Pelikan to conclude two important things. First, that "the most important aspect of the church for the apostolic fathers is its unity." And the second, this unity is firmly established on the basis of the sacramental and hierarchical institution.[151]

E. Conclusion

The work of examining the continuity and discontinuity of the rise and development of the hierarchy between the New Testament church and the Early church guided us through the process of investigating their nature and reasons.

First we identified two basic sides of the nature of continuity, namely the hierarchical framework and nonhierarchical inner dynamic. The strong side is the one of hierarchy. It found its extreme development in the Early church. Also two basic reasons

---

[144] Johannes Quasten, 374, 375.
[145] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Introduction*, 87.
[146] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Magnesians*, 87.
[147] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Philadelphians*, 105.
[148] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Trallians*, 94.
[149] *The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Philadelphians*, 106.
[150] Ibid.
[151] Jaroslav Pelikan, 159, 160.

for continuity were clearly identified, the outward environment and the inner dynamic. The former played its crucial role in establishing and developing the hierarchy in the New Testament and the Early church. The latter was basically found to some extent in the preservation of the priesthood of all believers.

Second, the nature of discontinuity is also twofold, the decreasing of the inner dynamic, which is seen mainly by the disappearance of the priesthood role of all believers, and the complication of the framework, namely the development of the complex hierarchical system of government. The three most important reasons for this discontinuity were determined, which were the understanding of the Eucharist and Baptism and also the striving for preservation of the unity of the universal church.

PART IV. Considering the opinions of different scholars on the reasons for development of the hierarchical leadership in the Early church

In this section of my thesis, I want to consider the opinions of different scholars in regard to the reasons for the development of hierarchy in the Early church. This short survey will serve to shape my understanding of the issue in its most balanced form.

F. F. Bruce suggests several factors, which influenced the transition from the plural ministry of bishops to the single one.

- According to E. Hatch on the basis of the parallel found in "the pagan friendly societies" a single bishop was established in order to control "the church's charitable fund."[152]

- Some suggest that the committee government is weak unless there is a strong leader whose actions are deeply rooted in his strong personality and spiritual strength.

- The motive that Ignatius had in introducing the monarchical bishop was with an apologetical nature. Since the danger of the Docetism threatened the churches, the necessity of a strong bishop who could stand against the heretics and who could only conduct valid baptism and Eucharist, became a reality.

- The influence of the mystery religions concerning early Christian practices, which have not been in synchrony with the apostolic teachings, is quite possible. In this context the influence of the mysteries upon the special rite of the bishop in the administration of the sacraments might be presupposed. This could be seen particularly in the interpretation of the converts with the pagan-mystery backgrounds of Ignatius' restriction of conducting the rite to the bishop. They have seen in this innovation the parallel in mystery cults with the role of hierophants, specially set aside in order to interpret the secret drams.

- Some argue on the basis of the apostolic succession that only those Christian communities who conserved the inherited monarchical episcopate practiced the true apostolic ministry. But Bruce submits two contra-arguments. First Ignatius did not

---

[152] E. Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches* (Bampton Lectures, 1880), 26ff.F, quoted in F. Bruce, *The Spreading Flame. The Rise and Progress of Christianity form its First Beginnings to the Conversion of the English* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985), 208, 206.

speak at all for the episcopal succession. Irenaeus was the first who spoke for episcopal succession in about 180 AD, and in a form different from the one which existed now. In his writings there is no emphasis "on Episcopal ordination or the transmission of grace," and the crucial point is of the preservation of the apostolic faith and teachings. Secondly, he argues that the true apostolic succession does not relate to the way the Christian community was administrated, but that it preserves the apostolic teachings and signs.

- In the context of the previous claim, some suggested that the threefold ministry of apostles, presbyter-bishops and deacons of the first century have been substituted by the threefold ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons in the second century. But the weaknesses of this understanding are that of the differences in the geographical nature of the apostles' and bishops' ministry. The latter was characterized with by its local character, which was not true for the first one.

- The most obvious reason for establishment of the monarchical bishop for Bruce is the following. Since the necessity of the situation for monarchical episcopate was seen through the perspective of Ignatius, the single bishop was chosen from the midst of his fellow-presbyters in order to perform a leading role and to be the representative of his church.[153]

Philip Schaff argues for the following reasons for the development of the monepiscopate.

- The necessity of unity. It became the weapon against persecution and heresy. He calls it "Church spirit of the age" for centralization.

- Administrative and other practical reasons in regard to the guiding of the charitable functions of the church such as care for the widows and orphans, poor, sick and etc.

- "For a continuation of, or substitute for, the apostolic church government."

- In parallel to Jewish arcisunagwgoj.

- The author insists that monepiscopate was good for his time. "Whatever may be thought, therefore, of the origin and the divine right of the episcopate, no impartial

---

[153] F. F. Bruce, 208, 209.

historian can deny its adoption to the wants of the church at the time, and its historical necessity."[154]

Meic Pearse represents the following causes for the development of the hierarchical leadership.

- Development of the high-substantial view of the Eucharist.

- The tension in the church which started with the increase of persecution and heresy.

- The process of evangelization from big cities to small villages established the high authority and importance of the bishops of the big cities.

- Development of the dualistic view of the Christian community on the basis of the question, who possesses the power in the church. In this regard, basically the clergy hold the authority to baptize.

- Through the process of church growing, its leaders' places become occupied by people with social power.

- Platonic influence introduced the role of the priest as an inter-mediator between God and laymen. Moreover the complex Platonic hierarchical system prompted the development of the complex hierarchical system in the church.

- Moving of the church from a home setting into the specially prepared buildings and its involvement in public life as an institution increased the development of a strong hierarchical system of clergy.[155]

Harry R. Boer defines four basic reasons for the rise of the monarchical bishop. First, on the basis of the Early church setting of persecution and administration, there was a natural tendency of one single leader with a strong personality to secure the authority into his hands. Secondly, the fast enlargement of the church with all its needs of established teaching, care for the poor, exercise of the discipline, and contacts between the churches, etc. called for the establishment of a more centralized church authority. Thirdly, the growing persecution formed the necessity for a strong leadership to represent the church, speaking and acting on its behalf, and also to be its example. Fourth, the appearance of

---

[154] Philip Schaff, 141, 142, 144.
[155] Meic Pearse, 9, 10.

heresies required strong leadership to deal with them, holding and strongly defining the proper doctrines of the church. [156]

Cyril C. Richardson suggests three causes for the rising of monepiscopate: the economic comfort to support only one full-time official; the single leader personality prevalence, and the suitability to have a single leader for the worship ceremonies.[157]

The analyses of the views of these scholars brought, with some exceptions, the following results. The most important cause stressed by all of the scholars is the growing persecution and heresies. Then the other two primary reasons, which appear in the arguments of the three of them are the following: the influence from the mystery religions, Jewish background, Platonism and the strong personality of the leader. Two of the scholars argue for the reasons of controlling the church's charitable fund, historical necessity, and suitability of having a single leader to conduct the liturgy and Eucharist ceremonies. Also, the rest of the suggested reasons are offered by each one of them. They are: the process of evangelization, the dualistic view of Christian community: clergy and laymen, leaders - people with social power, buildings and church involvement in public life as an institution, the economic comfort to support only one full-time official, enlargement of the church with all its needs, and the necessity of unity.

---

[156] Harry R. Boer, 29, 30.
[157] Cyril C. Richardson, 20.

Conclusion

Now the final conclusion can be offered by briefly presenting the final answers to the introductory questions.

The setting of the New Testament church influenced the formation of its outward hierarchical framework but still preserved its inner democratic dynamic. The theology of the New Testament represented the picture of hierarchy, which fit in the cultural context. The outward framework showed a purely hierarchical system of church government, but the inner dynamic was completely nonhierarchical, and it was defined by the terms as: the priesthood of all believers, their equality, the attitude of serventhood expressed by the leaders, and a Christian way of life.

The research developed through the writings of the church Fathers, and the influence of their setting led us to conclude that the hierarchical framework developed enormously in comparison to the New Testament church, and the inner dynamic suffered the process of diminution.

There is a continuity in the rise and development of the hierarchy between the New Testament church and the Early church. Its nature is built by the hierarchical framework and nonhierarchical inner dynamic. The reasons established by this continuity are two - the outward environment and the inner dynamic. The latter was primarily focused on the preservation of the priesthood of all believers to some extent. On the other hand, we found that there is discontinuity between the two periods of the church in regard to the hierarchy. It is found in the decrease of the inner dynamic and the intricacy of the framework of the hierarchical leadership. Three reasons were brought to the surface, the understanding of the Eucharist, Baptism, and the fight for preservation of the unity of the universal church.

We need to acknowledge the opinions of the scholars regarding the most important reasons for the development of the hierarchy in the Early church. They are the growing persecution and heresies, the influence from the mystery religions, Jewish background and Platonism, the strong personality of the leader, controlling the church's charitable funds, historical necessity, and the suitability to have a single leader conducting liturgy and Eucharist ceremonies.

Bibliography

Banks, R. "Church Order and Government." In *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*.
    Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne Ralph P. Martin, and Daniel G. Reid. Illinois:
    InterVarsity Press, 1989.

Barclay, William. *By What Authority?* Great Britain: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1974.

Bornkamn, "Mimneskomai." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by
    Gerhard Kittel. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1964-76.

Boer, Harry R. *A Short History of the Early Church.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B.
    Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1984.

Bruce, F. F. *The Spreading Flame. The Rise and Progress of Christianity form its First
    Beginnings to the Conversion of the English.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B.
    Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1985.

Bultmann, Rudolph. *Primitive Christianity. In Its Contemporary Setting.* New York: A
    Meridian Book World Publishing, 1972.

Clement of Alexandria. *The Stromata, or Miscellanies.* Edited by Alexander Roberts and
    James Donaldson. Vol. 2, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Grand Rapids, Michigan:
    Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.

Cross, F. L. ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church,* "Gnosticism." New
    York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Cyprian of Carthage. *On the Unity of the Church.* Edited by Alexander Roberts and
    James Donaldson. Vol. 5, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Grand Rapids, Michigan:
    Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.

Carey, G. L. "Justin Martyr." In *The New International Dictionary of the Christian
    Church.* Edited by J. D. Douglas. Grand Rapids, Michingan: Zondervan
    Publishing House, 1974.

Eastwood, C. *The Priesthood of all Believers, An Examination of the Doctrine from the
    Reformation to the Present Day.* London: The Epworth Press, 1960.

Fee, Gordon D. *New International Biblical Commentary. I and II Timothy, Titus.* United
    States: Hendrickson Publishers, 1988.

Ferguson, Everett. ed. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity,* "Gnosticism." New York:
    Garland Publishing, INC, 1988.

Goppelt, Leonhard. *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*. Translated by Robert A.
          Guelich. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1970.

Gregory of Nis. *On the Baptism of Christ.* Edited by Philip Schett and Henry Wace. Vol.
          5. *A Selected Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*. Grand Rapids,
          Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.

Gundry-Volf, Judith M. "Exegesis of Epistle to Ephesians.*"* Personal notes taken by
          Yordan Kalev Zhekov during the lectures on Ephesians by Judith M. Gundry-
          Volf, Spring 1997, Evangelical Theological Seminary-Osijek, Croatia.

Guthrie,Donald. *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. The Pastoral Epistles.* Grand
          Rapids, Michigan: InterVarsity Press, 1984.

Hanson, A. T. *The New Century Bible Commentary. The Pastoral Epistles.* Grand
          Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982.

Harrison, Everett F. *The Apostolic Church.* Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B.
          Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986.

Hatch, E. *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches.* Bampton Lectures, 1880.

Lincoln, Andrew T. *Ephesians. Word Biblical Commentary.* Vol. 42. Dallas Texas:
          Word books, Publisher, 1990.

Martyr, Justin. *I Apology.* Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Vol. 1,
          The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing
          Company, 1989.

Mcinerny, R. M. "Dualizm." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol.4. USA: The Catholic
          Universaty of America, 1967.

Newman, Barclay M. A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament. West
          Gemany: Biblia-Druck Stuttgart, 1971.

Novum Testamentum Graece, cum apparatu critico curavit Eberhard Nestle novis curis
          elaboraverut Erwin Nestle et Kurt Aland Editio vicesima quinta. Germany:
          Gesamtherstelllung Wurttenbergische Bibleacstalt, 1971.

Pearse, Meic. *"The Constantinian Revolution."* Personal notes taken by Yordan Kalev
          Zhekov during the lectures on Constantinian Revolution by Meic Pearse, Fall
          1996, Evangelical Theological Seminary-Osijek, Croatia.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition. A history of the Development of Doctrine.*
          Vol.1. *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600).* Chicago an London:
          the University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Quasten, Johannes. *Patrology. The Ante-Nicene Literature After Irenaeus.* Vol. 2.
Westminster, Maryland: Christian Classics, INC, 1992.

Rees, D. A. "Platonism and the Platonic Tradition." In *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy.*
Edited by Paul Edwards. Vol. 5 and 6. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.,
1967.

Richardson, Cyril C. ed. *Early Christian Fathers.* New York: Macmillan Publishing
Company, 1970.

Ryle, Gilbert. "Plato." In *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Edited by Paul Edwards.
Vol. 5 and 6. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1967.

Schaff, Philip. *History of the Christian Church. Ante-Nicene Christianity, AD 100-325.*
Vol.2. Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.

Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Matthaus.* Stuttgart: Calwer, 1929.

*Selections from the Work Against Heresies by Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons: "The Refutation
and Overthrow of the Knowledge Falsely So Called." Introduction.* Edited by
Cyril C. Richardson. *Early Christian Fathers.* New York: Macmillan Publishing
Company, 1970.

Stanley, David M. *The Apostolic Church in the New Testament.* Maryland: The Newman
Press, 1967.

Sparks, Jack N, ed. *The Apostolic Fathers, New Translations of These Early Christian
Writings.* New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978.

Strachey, Marjorie. *The Fathers Without Theology. The Lives and Legends of the Early
Church Fathers*. New York: George Braziller, INC., 1958.

The Didache. Introduction. and *Part 2. A Church Manual.* Edited by Betty Radice. *The
Penguin Classics. Early Christian Writings.* Hazell Watson and Viney Ltd.
Aylesbury: Maxwell Stanifoth, 1968.

Moulder, W. J. "Priesthood in the New Testaments." In *The International Standard
Bible Encyclopedia.* In BibleWorks for Windows 95/NT v.4.0.025e [0]. Lotos
Development Corporation, 1996.

The Letters of Ignatius of Antioch: Ephesians. Edited by Jack N. Sparks. *The Apostolic
Fathers, New Translations of These Early Christian Writings.* New York:
Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978.

_____. *Magnesians*. Edited by Jack N. Sparks. *The Apostolic Fathers, New Translations of These Early Christian Writings*. New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978.

_____. *Philadelphians*. Edited by Jack N. Sparks. *The Apostolic Fathers, New Translations of These Early Christian Writings*. New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978.

_____. *Polycarp*. Edited by Jack N. Sparks. *The Apostolic Fathers, New Translations of These Early Christian Writings*. New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978.

_____. *Smyrnaeans*. Edited by Jack N. Sparks. *The Apostolic Fathers, New Translations of These Early Christian Writings*. New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978.

_____. *Trallians*. Edited by Jack N. Sparks. *The Apostolic Fathers, New Translations of These Early Christian Writings*. New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978.

The Shepherd of Hermas. Edited by Jack N. Sparks. *The Apostolic Fathers. New Translations of These Early Christian Writings*. New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1978.

The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles Commonly Called the Didache. The Text. Edited by Cyril C. Richardson. *Early Christian Fathers*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1970.

Appendix

Chronology Table

of Secular Rulers, Bishops of Rome, Church Leaders and Writers in the Context of Their Time Period and the Most Important Events During the First Three Centuries

Dates	Secular Rulers	Bishops of Rome	Church Leaders and Writers	Events
BC 27 –14 AD	Augustus			
BC 4				Birth of Jesus
14-37 AD	Tiberius			
30 AD				Death of Jesus
37-41 AD	Caligula			
41-54 AD	Claudius			
54-68 AD	Nero	?Petrus-Apostolus (42-67), (63-64)		
62-68 AD				Deaths of James, Peter, and Paul
68 AD	Galba	?Linus-Presbyter (67-79)		
68 AD	Otho			
68-69 AD	Vitellius			
70-79 AD	Vespasian			
70 AD				Fall of Jerusalem
79-81 AD	Titus	?Cletus or Anacletus (79-91)		
81-96 AD	Domitian			
96-98 AD	Nerva	?Clement I (91-100)	I Clement (96)	
98-117 AD	Trajan	?Evaristus (100-109)	Ignatius (115)	
117-138 AD	Hadrian	?Alexander I (100-119)		
		?Xystus or Sixtus I (119-128)		
138-161 AD	Antoninus Pius	?Telesphorus (Martyr) (128-139)	Shepherd of Hermas (100-150)	Valentinus constructs Gnostic doctrine
		?Hyginus (139-142)	Didache (100-150)	Marcion disfellow-shiped (144)
		?Pius I (142-154)	Justin Martyr (150)	
		?Anicetus (154-168)		Death of Polycarp (155)
161-180 AD	Marcus Aurelius	?Soter (168-176)	Tatian (170)	Montanist movement (172)

Dates	Secular Rulers	Bishops of Rome	Church Leaders and Writers	Events
180-190 AD	Commodus	?Eleutherus (177-190)	Irenaeus (180)	
190-191 AD	Pertinax	?Victor I (190-202)	Clement of Alexandria (190-210)	Monarchian controversies (190-230)
191-192 AD	Didius Julianus			
192-193 AD	Niger			
193-211 AD	Septinius Severus		Tertullian (200)	Beginnings of catacomb art
211-212 AD	Getan			
211-217 AD	Caracalla	Zephyrinus (202-218)	Origen (185-251)	
217-218 AD	M. Opilius Macrinus			
218-222 AD	Heliogabalus	Callistus or Clixtus I (218-223)		Schism of Hippolytus
222-235 AD	Alexander Severus	?Urbanus I (223-230)		
222-235 AD		?Pontianus (230-235) resigned in exile		
235-237 AD	Maximin I (the Thracian)	Anterus (235-236)	Hippolytus (236)	
237-238 AD	The two Gordians	Fabianus, Martyr (236-250)		
237-238 AD	Masimus Pupienus Balbinus			
238-244 AD	Gordian the Younger		Julius Africanus (240)	Christian church at Dura (240)
244-249 AD	Philip		Cyprian (248-258)	
249-251 AD	Decius	The See vacant till March 251		
251-252 AD	Gallus	Cornelius (251-252) in exile		Schism of Novatian
251-252 AD		Novatianus, Antipope (251)		
252-253 AD	Volusian	Luciaus I (252-253)		
253-268 AD	Aemilian	Stephanus I (253-257)		
256-259 AD	Valerian	?Xystus (Sixtus) (257-258)		
259-268 AD	Gallienus	The See vacant till July 21 259		
268-270 AD	Clausius II	Dionysius (259-269)		Anthony retires to the desert
				Great Persecution
270-275 AD	Aurelian	Felix I (269-274)		

Dates	Secular Rulers	Bishops of Rome	Church Leaders and Writers	Events
275-276 AD	Tacitus	Eutychianus (275-283)		
276-282 AD	Probus			
282-284 AD	Carus	Gajus (Caius) (283-296)		
284-305 AD	Diocletian (d. 313)			
286-305 AD	Maximian, joint emp. with Diocletian			
304 or 307 AD	Constantius (d.306)	Marcellinus (296-304)		
	Galerius (d. 311)	The See vacant (304-307)		
	Licinius (d. 323)			
308-309 AD	Maximin II (Daza)			
309-323 AD	Constantius the Great		Esebius of Caesarea (315-339)	
	Galerius(d. 311)			
	Licinius (d. 323)	Marcellus (308-309)		
	Maximin (d. 313)	Eusebius (309-310)		Edict of Milan
	Maxentius (d. 312)			Donatist schism
		Miltiades (311-314)		
323-337 AD	Constantine the Great-sole ruler			Pachomiuss monastery (323)
				Council of Nicaea (325)
330-390 AD			Athanasius (328-373)	Founding of Constantinople
			Jerome (345-420)	
			Three cappadocians: Basil of Caesarea Greagory of Nazianzus Gregory of Nyssa	

Sources used:

Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church. Ante-Nicene Christianity (AD 100-325), vol.2* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1910), 166.

Everett Ferguson, ed. *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity* (New York and London: Garland Publishing, INC, 1990), xviii, xix.

Marjorie Strachey, *The Fathers Without Theology. The Lives and Legends of the Early Church Fathers* (New York: George Braziller, INC., 1958), 233, 234.