generation, and from day to day,—*the only true God and Jesus Christ.*

By the pursuit of this knowledge we come to acknowledge that the difficulties which press us most sorely are really the discipline through which God is teaching us: veiled promises of coming wisdom. We learn through the living lessons of our own experience that the eternal Gospel covers the facts of life, its sorrows, its needs, its joys, its wealth. Through every conflict the Truth is seen in the majesty of its growing vigour. Shakings, shakings not of the earth only but of the heaven, will come; but what then? We know this, that all that falls is taken away, *that those things which are not shaken may remain.*

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT.

LIGHTFOOT ON THE IGNATIAN EPISTLES.

II. *GENUINENESS AND DATE OF THE EPISTLES.*

i. GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLES.

THE Epistles of Ignatius, as is well known, have come down to us in three different recensions. Mainly through the researches of Zahn,[1] it is now generally admitted that of these three recensions the shorter Greek recension (containing seven Epistles) is the earliest, and that it alone can be taken into account in the discussion regarding genuineness. Lightfoot, who was previously disposed to regard the Curetonian Epistles as the earliest, has now expressed his thorough agreement with Zahn. In two comprehensive chapters,[2] he has discussed the longer Greek recension and the Curetonian Epistles, and has shown that the former

[1] *Ignatius von Antiochien*, 1873. [2] See vol. i. pp. 222-266; 267-314.

was fabricated in the fourth century,[1] and that the latter is a harmless collection made about the year 400 or somewhat earlier. The demonstration is so complete that it is no longer necessary to spend words on this question.

There remains, therefore, only the shorter Greek recension of the Epistles. Whether these Epistles are genuine or not, is one of the main problems of early Church history. Upon the decision of this question depends more than can be indicated in a short sketch. After repeated investigations, the genuineness of the Epistles seems to me certain, and I hold the hypothesis of their spuriousness to be untenable.

In this conclusion I agree with Lightfoot, and I also thank him for having removed many difficulties in detail which I had previously felt. But, on the other hand, I can subscribe to only one of the deductions which he has drawn in the sixth chapter—that entitled "The Genuineness."[2] To me it seems that neither in the section on the External Evidence, nor in that on the Internal Evidence, is everything so very plain and so completely free of difficulty as the reader would be led to suppose from Lightfoot's representation.

I begin with the External Evidences. Lightfoot has here summed up in four propositions the conclusions reached by his investigations.[3] 1. No Christian writings of the second century, and very few writings of antiquity, whether Christian or Pagan, are so well authenticated as the Epistles

[1] Lightfoot has rejected Ussher's hypothesis that the compilation of the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*, and the working up of the Ignatian Epistles were by the same hand. He assigns the Pseudo-Ignatius to the second half of the fourth century. In opposition to this I hold firmly to the conclusions which I reached (See *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. II. p. 241, sq.). I believe that the proofs of the identity of the Pseudo-Clemens and the Pseudo-Ignatius brought forward by me are so complete that they cannot be overthrown. Lightfoot has unfortunately not been able to enter more fully into these. See, however, vol. i. p. 738.

[2] See vol. i. pp. 315–414.

[3] See vol. i. p. 407.

of Ignatius. In the Epistle of Polycarp be accepted as genuine, the authentication is perfect. 2. The main ground of objection against the genuineness of the Epistle of Polycarp is its authentication of the Ignatian Epistles. Otherwise, there is every reason to believe that it would have passed unquestioned. 3. The Epistle of Polycarp itself is exceptionally well authenticated by the testimony of his disciple Irenæus. 4. All attempts to explain the phenomena of the Epistle of Polycarp as forged, or interpolated to give colour to the Ignatian Epistles, have here signally failed.

I can subscribe to these propositions in regard to all they say about the Epistle of Polycarp and the value of its testimony. This Epistle is undoubtedly genuine; it is not interpolated; it can by no means be understood as the attempt of a forger to authenticate the Ignatian Epistles; and it consequently affords testimony to the genuineness of the Epistles as strong as any that can be conceived of. But with this the external evidence is exhausted. If we do not retain the Epistle of Polycarp then we must allow that *the external evidence on behalf of the Ignatian Epistles is exceedingly weak, and hence is highly favourable to the suspicion that they are spurious.* This fact, however, is kept out of sight by Lightfoot, and that indeed for these reasons, because Lightfoot (1) produces very doubtful witnesses for the Epistles,[1] and (2) has not strictly enough considered the form in which the earliest witnesses for the Epistles make their appearance. From the time before Eusebius, we possess only these testimonies to the Epistles, one by Irenæus, and one by Origen. How do these speak?

(1) Irenæus, in order to maintain the necessity of tribulations for those who would be saved, appeals to the words of a martyr whom he does not name, for he writes:[2] ὡς εἶπε

[1] In the Epistle of the Smyrnæans, the Epistle of the Churches of Gaul, Lucian, and even—though hesitatingly—Theophilus.

[2] *Adv. Hær.*, v. 283.

τις τῶν ἡμετέρων διὰ τὴν πρὸς θεὸν μαρτυρίαν κατακριθεὶς πρὸς θηρία. This is followed by a sentence from Ignat. ad Rom. iv.

(2) Origen, in his prologue to the Song of Songs,[1] cites words from Ignat. ad Rom. vii., with the formula: denique memini aliquem sanctorum dixisse, Ignatium nomine, de Christo. In his sixth Homily on Luke, he quotes a sentence from Ignat. ad Eph. xix., with the words:[2] *καλῶς ἐν μιᾷ τῶν μάρτυρός τινος ἐπιστολῶν γέγραπται—τὸν Ἰγνάτιον λέγω, τὸν μετὰ τὸν μακάριον Πέτρον τῆς Ἀντιοχέας δεύτερον ἐπίσκοπον, τὸν ἐν τῷ διωγμῷ ἐν Ῥώμῃ θηρίοις μαχησάμενον.*[3]

Up to the beginning of the third century, that is, up to the time of Origen, apart from the Epistles and the testimony of Polycarp, we have absolutely no evidence that there was an Antiochian Bishop Ignatius.

In the third century, Origen reports that Ignatius was the second bishop of Antioch; it is the only testimony that is not derived from the Epistles themselves; but more than this no one even in the Church of Ignatius was aware of, for everything else, which was reported later, and is not in the Epistles themselves, is utterly fabulous.[4]

Irenæus, Origen, and even Basil[5] have referred to the author of the Ignatian Epistle with a *τίς*, and thereby prove that there was no continuous tradition regarding the Epistles in the Church.[6]

Thus, apart from Polycarp's Epistle, there is really no

[1] *Opp.*, ed. Delarue, T. iii. p. 50 A. [2] *Opp.*, T. iii. p. 938 A.

[3] The sentence in Origen, *de Orat.*, 20 (comp. Ignat. ad Rom. iii), *οὐδὲν φαινόμενον καλόν*—is probably not copied from Ignatius.

[4] On the report that Ignatius suffered martyrdom under Trajan see below.

[5] See *Hom. in Sanctam Christi Generationem*, 3 (*Opp.*, ii. ed. Garnier, p. 598), *εἴρηται δὲ παλαιῶν τινι καὶ ἕτερος λόγος ὅτι ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαθεῖν τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦτο τὴν παρθενίαν τῆς Μαρίας κ.τ.λ.* See Eph. xix.

[6] The Acts of the Martyrdom of Ignatius are not to be regarded as affording such testimony, but are pure inventions. The Roman Acts date at the earliest from the 5th century, and perhaps only from the 6th century; and even the Antiochian Acts are not ancient. That they contain an historical element is nothing more than a possibility. See *Lightfoot*, vol. ii. pp. 363–472.

external evidence. The early Church was indeed in exactly the same position in which we are. It possessed only the Epistles themselves, nothing more. It was not even known whether the writer of the seven Epistles actually suffered a martyr's death. On this fact are founded the doubts as to the historical character of an Antiochian bishop Ignatius, which many entertain. A difficult historical problem is here presented, which we are not able to clear up. How has it come about that the writer of the seven Epistles has left behind in the memory of the Church no other trace than just these Epistles! If the genuineness of the Epistle of Polycarp be acknowledged, it is clearly no longer admissible to answer this problem by declaring the figure of the Ignatius of the Epistles a fiction; but the problem still remains and cannot be overlooked. But in Lightfoot's work it is not acknowledged.

We now pass to the Internal Evidence. Lightfoot has summed up the results of his investigations in ten propositions.

1. "The external testimony to the Ignatian Epistles being so strong, only the most decisive marks of spuriousness in the Epistles themselves, as for instance proved anachronisms, would justify us in suspecting them as interpolated or rejecting them as spurious."

2. "But so far is this from being the case, that, one after another, the anachronisms urged against these letters have vanished in the light of further knowledge. Thus the alleged refutation of the Valentinian doctrine of æons in Magn. viii. depends on a false reading which recently discovered materials for the text have corrected. The supposed anachronism of the 'leopards' (Rom. v.) has been refuted by the production of passages overlooked by the objector. The argument from the mention of the 'Catholic Church' (Smyrn. viii.) has been shown to rest on a false interpretation which disregards the context."

3. "As regards the argument which Daillè calls 'palmary' —the prevalence of episcopacy as a recognised institution —we may say boldly that all the facts point the other way. If the writer of these letters had represented the Churches of Asia Minor as under Presbyterial government, he would have contradicted all the evidence, which, without one dissentient voice, points to episcopacy as the established form of Church government in these districts from the close of the first century."

4. "The circumstances of the condemnation, captivity, and journey of Ignatius, which have been a stumblingblock to some modern critics, did not present any difficulty to those who lived near the time, and therefore knew best what might be expected under the circumstances; and they are sufficiently borne out by examples, more or less analogous, to establish their credibility."

5. "The objections to the style and language of the Epistles are beside the purpose. In some cases they arise from a misunderstanding of the writer's meaning. Generally they may be said to rest on the assumption that an apostolic Father could not use exaggerated expressions, overstrained images, and the like—certainly a sandy foundation on which to build an argument."

6. "A like answer holds with regard to any extravagances in sentiment, or opinion, or character. Why should Ignatius not have exceeded the bounds of sober reason or correct taste? Other men, in his own and immediately succeeding ages, did both. As an apostolic Father, he was not exempt from the failings, if failings they were, of his age and position."

7. "While the investigation of the contents of these Epistles has yielded this negative result, in dissipating the objections, it has at the same time had a high positive value, as revealing indications of a very early date, and therefore presumably of genuineness, in the surrounding circum-

stances, more especially in the types of false doctrine which it combats, in the ecclesiastical status which it presents, and in the manner in which it deals with the evangelical and apostolic documents."

8. "Moreover we discover in the personal environments of the assumed writer, and more especially in the notices of his route, many subtle coincidences which we are constrained to regard as undesigned, and which seem altogether beyond the reach of a forger."

9. "So likewise the peculiarities in style and diction of the Epistles, as also in the representation of the writer's character, are much more capable of explanation in a genuine writing than in a forgery."

10. "While external and internal evidence thus combine to assert the genuineness of these writings, no satisfactory account has been, or apparently can be, given of them as a forgery of a later date than Ignatius. They would be quite purposeless as such; for they entirely omit all topics which would especially interest any subsequent age."

The largest portion of these propositions has been actually proved by Lightfoot. In fact the inner grounds for the genuineness of the Ignatian Epistles are overpowering. They are apparent indeed only to the careful investigator, not to the dilettanti. It may be said: Epistulæ Ignatii obiter inspectæ fraudem, plene perspectæ veritatem commendant. Zahn already in this connexion brought striking arguments, which Lightfoot has further confirmed. His careful deductions regarding the situation, regarding the individuality of each separate Epistle (especially the Epistle to the Romans), regarding the route along which Ignatius travelled, regarding the relation of the Epistles to the New Testament, etc., are just so many incontestible proofs of the genuineness of the Epistles. Two of the statements, however, which are here set forth as facts, I can by no means recognise as facts which are of decisive importance

for the question of the genuineness of the Epistles, namely, the episcopate,[1] and the delineation of heresy.[2] On account of the importance of this matter, I must enter more fully into this question.

1. The Episcopate. Lightfoot makes the assertion: "If the writer of these letters had represented the Churches of Asia Minor as under Presbyterial government he would have contradicted all the evidence, which, without one dissentient voice, points to Episcopacy as the established form of Church government in these districts *from the close of the first century*." Even should we take it for granted that this statement is correct, the matter of fact is very imperfectly set forth by it. The most remarkable thing is, not the monarchical-episcopal constitution in itself, but the way in which this constitution is spoken of. Lightfoot certainly is quite right, when he remarks that Ignatius' conception of the episcopate is to be completely distinguished from that of Irenæus.[3] But we must observe (1) that Ignatius' conception of the position and significance of the bishop has its earliest parallel in the conception of the author of the Apostolic Constitutions (Original text, l. i.–vi., Sæc. iii. extr.), and (2) that the Epistles show that the monarchical episcopate in Asia Minor was so firmly rooted, so highly elevated above all other offices, so completely beyond dispute,[4] that, on the ground of what we know from other sources of early Church history, no single investigator would assign the statements under consideration to the second, but at the earliest to the third century. On account of

[1] See No. 3, p. 14. [2] See No. 7, p. 14.

[3] Ignatius does not speak of an institution of bishops by the apostles; he does not consider bishops as successors of the apostles. He knows nothing yet of applying the name bishop beyond the realm of the local congregation.

[4] It was a very unfortunate hypothesis to imagine that the Epistles were composed for the purpose of first securing the adoption of the episcopate or helping to secure its triumph. Nothing of this sort is to be traced in the Epistles. Ignatius rather exhorts that the already naturalised or adopted order should be turned to account as the best means against heresy.

the other facts which afford evidence of the genuineness of the Epistles, we are compelled to assign them to the first half of the second century, and therefore from this we must feel ourselves compelled to admit that our knowledge of the second century is very defective, and that we cannot be careful enough in forming conclusions. But it would be a reversal of facts, if one were to affirm, that from the way in which Ignatius has spoken of the bishop, and from the impression which one receives of the supremacy of the bishops of that time, he could obtain proofs of the genuineness of the Epistles.[1] The matter rather stands thus: *the doubts are overcome, but the enigmas still remain unsolved.* The statements of Ignatius regarding the rank to which the episcopate has attained, occupy, so far as our knowledge goes, an altogether isolated position in the second century.

But is the state of the case such, that, as Lightfoot thinks, we should be very greatly surprised, if there were nothing said in the Epistles regarding the monarchical episcopate? Are there actually witnesses to show that already, in the later years of the Apostolic age, monarchical episcopacy had been developed? Lightfoot affirms this,[2] and seeks to prove its existence in Asia Minor from historical witnesses. He refers, (1) to Irenæus' testimony to Polycarp, (2) to the Epistle of Polycrates of Ephesus to Victor of Rome, (3) to Clement of Alexandria, *Quis Div. Salv.* 42,

[1] In saying this I by no means deny that a series of characteristics in the representation of the episcopate, which we obtain from the Ignatian Epistles, give the impression of extreme antiquity, and that much that is strange is to be explained by the rhetoric of the bishop.

[2] See vol. i. pp. 377 sq.: "It is there shown, if I mistake not, that though the New Testament in itself contains as yet no direct and indispensable notices of a localized episcopate in the Gentile Churches, as distinguished from the moveable episcopate exercised by Timothy in Ephesus, and by Titus in Crete, yet there is satisfactory evidence of its development in the later years of the Apostolic age: that this development was not simultaneous and equal in all parts of Christendom; that it is more especially connected with the name of St. John; and that in the early years of the second century, the episcopate was widely spread and had taken firm root, more especially in Asia Minor and Syria."

and (4) to the Muratorian Fragment.[1] Against these witnesses I have very serious objections, both in general and in regard to details.

(1) All these witnesses belong to the end of the second century, that is, to a period when the Catholic Church was already established. By that time the New Testament was recognised as a collection of apostolic writings; by that time the rule of faith was accepted as an apostolic heritage; by that time the monarchical episcopate had secured its place as an institution ordained by the apostles. The statements, therefore, of writers during this period regarding the earliest ages of the Church in most cases *could* not be correct.

(2) As concerns Irenæus' testimony to Polycarp, upon which Lightfoot places the highest value, it is to be considered, that Irenæus communicates a list of bishops of Rome, which reaches from Paul and Peter to Eleutherus, and declares that the Apostles had ordained Linus as bishop in Rome. That this is false, can be proved, and is not denied even by Lightfoot. But what reliance then can we have in the statement of Irenæus that Polycarp was ordained a bishop by the Apostles? If to this it be replied that Irenæus was personally acquainted with Polycarp, and that consequently his testimony has here quite a different weight, it must still be said that by an uncritical interpretation of the historical succession—Irenæus, Polycarp, John—the entire system of catholicism can be dragged into the Apostolic Age. Take an example. Irenæus has the New Testament and says nothing as to when the New Testament had its origin; he compares the four Gospels with the four parts of heaven. Hence his honoured teacher must have already possessed the New Testament, and since he [Poly-

[1] The testimony of Polycarp (*Ep. ad Philipp. inscri.*), Πολύκαρπος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ πρεσβύτεροι, is no certain testimony to the existence of a monarchical episcopate.

carp] has faithfully preserved the heritage of John, nothing taken from and nothing added to it, the Apostle John must already have had the New Testament. Take another example. Irenæus regards the bishops as the successors of the apostles, who have received the *charisma veritatis.* Since he can have brought forward nothing new, which he had not learned from Polycarp, this must already have been Polycarp's view. No considerate critic will accept these conclusions, nor admit that from the statement of Irenæus[1] —*Πολύκαρπος οὐ μόνον ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων μαθητευθεὶς καὶ συναναστραφεὶς πολλοῖς τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἑωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων κατασταθεὶς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἐπίσκοπος* — it will follow that Irenæus knew on sure historical grounds that Polycarp was ordained a *monarchical bishop* by the Apostles.[2] He will rather, either assume that the assertion of Irenæus is simply a combination on the model of the Gallican bishop, or he will at furthest regard it as credible that some apostle or other entrusted Polycarp with the office of the *ἐπισκοπή*, while in this office he gives the blessing alongside of other bishops of the same community. But Irenæus in this passage undoubtedly supposes that Polycarp by apostolic ordination has become what bishops of his time (about 185) were, namely, successors of the apostles endued with special official grace. That this is incorrect, even Lightfoot cannot dispute, but then he should not borrow from the passage a testimony to the existence of *monarchical* episcopate in the age of Domitian and Trajan. Irenæus does not distinguish between monarchical bishops and episkopoi: Lightfoot himself distinguishes between them, and knows very well[3] that there were *ἐπίσκοποι* in many Churches but yet no *ἐπίσκοπος*. But how will one prove that from the

[1] *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 3, 3.
[2] The general character of the expression should be noted.
[3] See *Philippians*, p. 181, sq.

beginning Polycarp was the *one* bishop in Smyrna? It cannot be proved from the testimony of Irenæus.[1]

(3) Still less weight is to be given to the testimony of Polycrates (in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, v. 24). Polycrates wrote about the year 195. He enumerates several famous bishops in Asia Minor from the age of the Antonines, and says that seven of his relatives had been bishops, and that he himself observed Easter in accordance with the tradition of his relatives. More than this he does not say. How from these words it should follow that there were already in the age of Trajan and Hadrian monarchical bishops in Asia Minor is to me utterly inexplicable. A sceptic might indeed draw the conclusion, from the fact that Polycrates speaks of seven relations who had been bishops, that in Ephesus there had been presbyters who were at the same time bishops. I do not draw this conclusion, but for the period from A.D. 90 to 140 the statements of Polycrates are without any value.

(4) The testimony of Clement of Alexandria[2] depends upon an altogether unverifiable source. It consists of a legend whose voucher Clement has not produced.[3] From such legends one cannot accept proofs. But even apart

[1] After quoting many passages from Irenæus, Lightfoot concludes with the words (vol. i. p. 379): "After every reasonable allowance made for the possibility of mistakes in details, such language, from a man standing in the position of Irenæus with respect to the previous and contemporary history of the Church, leaves no room for doubts as to the early and general diffusion of episcopacy in the regions with which he was acquainted." But as observed above, Irenæus has also regarded the monarchical episcopate in Rome as primitive. From the words of Irenæus there is absolutely nothing gained in regard to the origin of the episcopate and its spread during the period between A.D. 90 and 140.

[2] *Quis Div. Salv.*, 42;—*ἄκουσον μῦθον, οὐ μῦθον, ἀλλὰ ὄντα λόγον περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου παραδεδομένον, ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου τελεστήσαντος . . . μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἔφεσον, ἀπήει παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πλησιόχωρα τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὅπου μὲν ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων, ὅπου δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἁρμόσων, ὅπου δὲ κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος σημαινομένων.*

[3] Clement himself is not at all sure about the credibility of the story: he has it from hearsay, and he does not once name the city in which that which is related took place.

from this, the testimony is evidently worthless, for it proves too much. According to it already in the time of John the distinction between clergy and laity had been firmly established in Asia Minor, and the congregations had not chosen their own office-bearers, but John had appointed them for them. It comes then to this, that *ὅπου μὲν ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων* cannot by any means be so understood as to imply that there was only *one* bishop appointed in each city, particularly as in the legend of the bishop, a presbyter also is named.

(5) Least of all can I understand why Lightfoot should have referred to the Muratorian Fragment. The passage in question reads: "Johannes ex discipulis cohortantibus condiscipulis et episcopis suis dixit etc." Now that which I have already advanced against all these witnesses under (1), applies in a special manner to the Muratorian Fragment. Then no one knows who are to be understood by the *episcopi sui.* The episcopi of the Ephesian congregation may indeed be intended. Such an acceptation of the term would actually rest on the supposition that the author of the Fragment has faithfully reported an old story. I am not of that opinion; but whoever regards the notice as historically valuable, cannot turn away from this interpretation, for it is nearer the truth than the other, according to which those episcopi were monarchical bishops from the province of Asia. But the proper explanation is this, that the author of the Fragment has thought of John as the Metropolitan of Asia.

Thus are all the witnesses exhausted. I may now sum up my judgment. *Apart from the Epistles of Ignatius, we do not possess a single witness to the existence of the monarchical episcopate in the Churches of Asia Minor so early as the times of Trajan and Hadrian.*[1] We do not indeed

[1] Lightfoot, too, does not regard the angels of the Seven Churches in Asia Minor (*Apocal. of John*, ii. 3) as bishops. See his *Comm. on Philippians*, p. 197 sq.

possess any witnesses that show that it did not exist,[1] and this is sufficiently important; but the Epistles of Ignatius as a source of information stand alone, not only in assuring us that the monarchical episcopate was thoroughly naturalized in the Churches of Asia Minor of his day, but also in testifying to the existence of this episcopate.[2] But if this be so, then one cannot obtain any evidence for the genuineness of the Epistles from what is to be read about the episcopate in the Ignatian Epistles. The conviction of the genuineness of the Epistles obtained from other grounds must rather be defended against the objections which obtrude themselves when the constitutional matters are considered. Only in three points can we recognise a relatively high antiquity for the Epistles in regard to these matters; in so far as (1) their author does not name the the bishops successors of the apostles, (2) reports nothing about an institution of bishops by the apostles, and (3) only takes the bishop, as representative of God and Christ, to be the head of the particular Christian community.

Giessen. A. HARNACK.

[1] With reference to the Roman Church we do possess such a witness in the Shepherd of Hermas.

[2] The question of the origin of the episcopate has only been touched upon by Lightfoot in his works. I have, therefore, not found any occasion for entering into it more fully. When he remarks (vol. i. p. 739): "The document entitled Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων seems to me to confirm very strongly the historical views put forward by me in the Essay on the Christian Ministry (*Philipp.*, p. 181 ff.) to which I have here (vol. i. p. 376) referred,"—I cannot give to this judgment an unqualified assent. I regard that Essay as excellent; but the meaning of the author in reference to the origin of the episcopate did not seem to me quite plain, and I believe further that the newly discovered Διδαχή renders it necessary that in answering the question about the origin of the Catholic church constitution other factors should be taken into account besides those which Lightfoot has given attention to in his celebrated treatise. See my edition of the Διδαχή, Prolegg. S. 88–158. It must be conceded to the Episcopalians that there were already ἐπίσκοποι in the Apostolic age, and that not every πρεσβύτερος was an ἐπίσκοπος. But on the other hand, it can be shown that the monarchical constitution of the Churches cannot be traced back to the apostles.

(*To be concluded.*)