

- 1) Lightfoot's Presidential theory
- 2) Passing of the itinerant, ubiquitous gen. authorities.
- 3) Survivor = successor?
- 4) The Coptic organization.
- 5) Ignatius' silence on a) Apostolic episcopate, b) apostolic succession
- 6) Jas. the presiding Bp., did NOT succeed the Aps. who ordained him.
- 7) Lower PH also lost p. 25
- 8) The Shadow of the synagogue: Bp. a Jewish title; Bps. still below to Aaron
- 9) Xtn. PH modeled on OT lines
- 10) p. 37 Episcopos a very anc. city title and office
- 11) p. 36 How the Xtns. adopted old terms with new meanings.
- 12) Too many Bps. to be gen. authorities.
- 13) Qualifications for a Bp. 42. Their activities NOT those of gen. authorities.
- 14) Trach. of the Leading Man in the city, 48ff
- 15) A Bp. must be a candidate and campaign 52.
- 16) The city church; mother cities.
- 17) Municipal hierarchy & eccles. Hierarchy. 53ff
- 18) Prima sedes & emergence of the big 5.
- 19) The Ch. of the Capitol has priority also. 62ff
- 20) Politicing Bps.: mobs, rivals, etc. 66ff
- 21) Fights among the great cities, 70ff
- 22) Divine authority unlimited: the theory & the growing claims, 74ff.
- 23) 83ff: clamping on the lid: desperate devices to assert leadership
- 24) Ch. councils follow the civil pattern: terminol., protocol
- 25) Nicea the classic instance, 91ff
- 26) The Petrine succession claims: 95ff Clement to Jas. Bps.: moment of transition
- 27) Silence of the record on Peter at R. 104ff
- 28) List of rival Bps. of Rome: 106ff
- 29) Rise of the Cardinals 111ff.

①
It is astonishing how little is known about the nature and organization of the early Church. So little is known, in fact, that a large and influential number of Port. churchmen were able to maintain for many years that there never was a Church in the time of Christ and the Apostles. By the same reasoning some of them also concluded that Jesus had never lived. But there is a great difference between a little information and none at all, and today it is not only generally agreed that there was a Church, but that ~~the~~ Church ~~was~~ organization was all-important in the ministry of the Lord and the Apostles.

Renan in the spirit of 19th century liberalism claimed that the early Christians "knew little else than the law of love." Lightfoot had suggested the theory that "the episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localization, but out of the presbyteral by elevation." That is, the Bp. was not an office bestowed from above by general authority, but one that grew up locally. This was the "Presidential Hypothesis," that each Church had its own college of Elders governing it, of which the Bp. was merely the president. The Church was thus a local community, a human society and nothing more; everything was interpreted in purely political terms. Churches existed because they were found by experience to be a practical expedient, and for no other reason: "The Church can exist without any organization, but the church cannot PERSIST without organization." The prevailing doct. of the 1860's designated by Linton as the Consensus went even further. The High Church theory of the time was that the foundation of the Early Church was the necessary and indispensable office of Preacher. The Consensus abolished both that and the Apostolate, and, says Linton, thereby abolished the religious nature of the Church! "The Church organization is a purely secular (profane) structure." Edwin Hatch in 1881 The Orig. of the Early Xtn. Church claimed that the church developed by a gradual evolution, and did so by absorbing elements which were already present in the society, following Pagan and esp. Jewish patterns.

R. Sohm went to the opposite extreme while still denying the Church any real organization: Ekklesia means public assembly, "the ruling ~~xxx~~ popular assembly of the great city state," its equivalent is the Heb. Kahal, "the solemn assembly in the presence of God of the People of Israel." This is the sense of Ekklesia in the

NT. "The word has NO social content, but is purely dogmatic. Any idea of a LOCAL community can have nothing to do with this idea of the Church: only the Church is organized, but it cannot be put into any LEGAL organizational structure."

Kalr Holl argued that the 12 were historical, but that they had no OFFICE. This agreed with Sohms theory of absolute opposition between Amt and Geist--a theory which Gunkel easily disproved. On the other hand, Schuetz said the 12 was all office and therefore could not be historical. So there were two schools: the Apostolate was genuine but not hierarchic, the other it was hierachrich but not genuine! A "standard statement" of the case was that of Otto Scheel in 1912: The "Churches", he said, were corporations, that is Societies. They arose independently (autonom) and spontaneously side by side. There was no common bond between them. Every Church chose its own officers." Against this Joh. Weiss "discovered" that for Jesus the Kingdom of God was no mere community of pious people but a divine institution. That meant that the Kingdom and the Church must be very different things. The one spiritual, the other official. Harnack objected: what is wrong with having Amt and Geist together in the same institution--even dependent on each other? The scholars simply could not see it: it had to be one or the other!

The great controversy: granted that there was a Church, does that posit an ORGANIZATION? The Ch. by its very nature is an organization, the phenomena of Primitive Xty. cannot be explained on any but a Corporational basis: there are motions passed, elections, etc. The "spirit" controversy: the charisma as a free, formless Principle vs. the spirit can and does bring about order, law, discipline.

Today that tendency is no longer to regard the Ch. as a late emergence, but to seek its origin even in the time of Jesus. In all camps the DEPENDENCE of the individual is now being emphasized. It was Harnack who started this: "The development goes from the WHOLE to the PART." "Ekklesia," says Sohm, MEANS Gesamtkirche of which the local Churches are only copies. In Mt. 18:17 Harnack, Batiffol, H. Leclercq, W. Koester believe that Ekklesia refs. to a single local Church (vs. Sohm) but that the idea of the gen. Ch. was derived from it--very soon, in time to be used by Paul. Vs. the Consensus, Sohm said that Gemeindebeschluesse were merely local

3)

Annerkennungshandlung, accepting ^{on} central decrees. He points to the basic Primitive Xty. belief that the Church must act as a Totality, a Unit: a majority vote is not enough--the minority always joins the majority so that all things are done in perfect unanimity. The "Consensus" had identified authority with the force of personality (the "personality of Jesus," of Paul, etc.), but it is now recognized that this is NOT the early Christian view, which always traces the authority to a gift from God and insists that it rest on God's approval. The Consensus had modernized, i.e. humanized, the idea of 'Charisma' (Crane Brinton). What the local branch is is a reproduction of the Heavenly Ecclesia. THEREFORE it must be organized just like the Gesamtekklesia: the local Church is a scale model (Abbild) of the Church." This is the present state of things.

To support this, Schermann observes that without an organization there would be no rites, no ordinances, no liturgy. H. Lietzmann notes that the earliest records speak of the process by which one joins the Church, an Aufnahmsritus which meets us fully developed in the Acts and the Epistles and which without a definite and even strict organization would be impossible. This is NOT however apparent in the Gospels, says Lietzmann, yet T.W. Manson notes in 1950 that it is precisely in the Gospels that "we begin with the fact that Jesus did gather a community around himself DURING THE COURSE OF HIS MINISTRY; and we may well ask what it was, if it was not the Church...It will not do to regard this group merely as ^{the} a more or less regular disciples of a somewhat unorthodox travelling Rabbi....The more the Synoptic evidence is studied, the more clearly the fact emerges that what Jesus created was something more than a new theological school. It was a religious community, of which he was leader." "It is plain," Lake wrote in 1911, "that a community which is momentarily expecting a complete and catastrophic change in the character of society is unlikely to possess more than the necessary minimum of organization; it is not less plain that as soon as this expectation passes into the background the need of organization will be increasingly felt." This is typical of the orthodox theological seminary type of thought: of course it is plain--other things being equal, but ~~with~~ the mission of the Lord means nothing if it does not mean that other things are not equal: the Lord prescribed a special organization, however illogical

that might seem to the man in the seminary. When the Parousia failed to transpire, according to Lake, then it is plain that an organization was indicated--yet it is precisely at that time that the organization disappeared, leaving the Church in a vacuum until the 4th century!

The Apostolic Office *J. P.?*

1st
Holl, pointing to the well-known fact that the earliest Christian Church was a missionary organization, drew the obvious conclusion that "No Missionary Church begins with autonomous branches." Missionary work spreads from a center and is concerned with bringing others into a well-defined group (Linton 19th). "Apostle" means missionary and the whole activity of the Apostles is conditioned by this fact, which of course posits the existence of a Church. They succeeded in converting the world, according to present Catholic doctrine: "not gradually and by successive instruction," says Pighi, "but by the interior instruction of God in an instant suddenly...all nations which are under heaven heard, and believed in the Son of God." He quotes Chrysostom to prove this, forgetting the worried conclusion that Chrysostom draws from this interesting premise: "If that is so," John Chrys. asks himself, "then the END should have come long ago, since it was explicitly stated that when the Apostles had once preached to all nations, then would the end come." John's only ^{possible} conclusion, which he swallows with a wry face, is that the Apostles cannot have accomplished their mission after all, since the Church is still on the earth. But all agree that the Apostles did spend their time preaching to the nations and then passed away, almost all at once and suddenly, leaving no Apostles in their place. They must have been special officers of some sort, it is assumed. Their work was closely centralized in Jerusalem--the main office to which they would prepare for yearly conferences to make reports on their missions in the presence of the whole church and to which at other times they would steadily send ⁱⁿ written reports on their work. The gathering of Israel and Judah, that was the missionary work of the Apostles, says Eusebius, confusing the first with the second coming of Christ and forgetting, as all do, that the specific nature of their mission is very clearly stated in the Scriptures many times. Then he goes on to describe how later they came together and worked at uniting the Church, "no longer going forth

as they had done originally." Many studies have shown the name ^Aostles when specifically applied to the 12 to mean more than a messenger or missionary--it but means a special delegate. "Our Lord was not introducing a new term ~~by~~ adopting one which from its current usage would suggest to his hearers the idea of a highly responsible mission," wrote Lightfoot. Further investigators have come to almost general agreement that the genius of the Apostolic office was that the holder of it was a ~~SEE~~ SPECIAL WITNESS. There were many "Apostles" as we read in the Didaché, but the twelve, "the perfect year of the Lord," were something very special. "At the Present time," says Peter in the Clem. Recogn., "do not look for any other prophet or Apostle except us. There is ONE true prophet and 12 Apostles ^{pg} (I, 1330)," he explains that no one is to be accepted as a true missionary who does not have a duly signed certificate from the main office at Jerusalem. The discovery of the Didaché led Holl to the discovery, in which most Prot. scholars now concur, that the Apostolic authority did not come as was once thought purely as a charismatic gift, but that it was an ordained office along with all its spirituality. "From the beginning," wrote Lietzmann, "the 12 appear as a compact group in which only three men stand out as individuals." These were, he says, Peter, James, and John "The Pillars of the Primitive Church." The importance of these three is significant. It puzzled the experts from the first that while the office of Apostle HAD to be accompanied by the gift of prophecy it did not come spontaneously in a spiritual way nor was there among the Apostles a perfect equality: in fact the 12 removed any validity to the claim that all believers must have been of equal spiritual authority. There was a definite hierarchy in the earliest Church (Acts V, 22). The Church is a Totality and acts not as a majority but as a unit, Harnack noticed, but at the same time "the Church was an abgestufte Totalität." While we see in the Church a definite local organization," wrote Ed. Meyer, "The highest authority was held by the Twelve, and at their head was Peter." (Ursb. III, 263). Harnack's thorough study of non-Christian sources regarding Peter showed that he was far and away the most important man in the Church. After he and James were dead for at least 24 years Eusebius specifically states that "John the beloved returned from Patmos and continued to GOVERN the CHURCHES." He cites a very old source telling

B

how as long as an Apostle remained alive the spoilers and dissenters had to contend themselves with lurking in dark corners (III, 32) only to throw off all disguise and come out boldly into the open the moment the last Apostle was dead. Plainly the Apostles had a kind of authority that none of their successors had. They were conceived of as the twelve Judges of Israel, and so were limited to that number. The persistence of Jewish Ideas in the Church is being more recognized all the time. Harnack and Schm both recognized that the missionary pattern of the Ch. was that of the Jews and not of the Hellenistic local missions of travelling wise men and reformers. On the other hand, Holl notes that while the Jewish system might also have produced "Apostles of the Churches," it could not possibly have produced "Apostles of Jesus Christ," which was something absolutely unique. A Jewish scholar Herm. Vogelstein has shown that the general idea of an Apostle as "an authorized representative" was familiar to the Jews, that it was not a "mystical" concept, and that an Apostle could only be one actually sent out by Christ himself. Paul, he says, changed all that--unmindful of the direct nature of Paul's calling as a missionary. However, among the Jews, according to Vogelstein, "the name of Apostle does not confer an absolute position, but it merely determines his relationship to one who assigned him his commission." This, he concludes, makes the Christian Apostle an office entirely dependent on Christ and NOT a Jewish institution at all. Mk. 3:14, he notes, shows that "the Apostolic office is as original as Jesus himself."

B

From the fact that "the Apostles went from place to place without remaining long anywhere," Harnack says there are three possibilities to be deduced: either 1) they went forth without any care for the future, or 2) they committed the direction to local men (this would explain James the Just), or 3) they kept the direction of things in their own hands. Harnack thinks the first of these is the most likely, though "the second possibility was at a very early date accepted as normal procedure (Apg. 11:23, I Clem. 44, 2) No. 3 appears in Paul and the general directorate at Jerusalem under James. Jerusalem was always very important. But on one thing all are agreed: the Apostles were travelling general authorities, "essentially itinerant," "a nomadic Apostolate," "A fraternity officiating in the establishment of a

world-wide institution, forming itself everywhere into identical Christianities, cooperating among themselves, having the same faith, the same cult, the same AUTHORITIES." This is a surprising thing, says Batiffol: "Christianity was born catholic." (Eg. Naiss. xi). But if the system was so strong and so workable, why did it suddenly disappear? "In the earliest times," writes Msgr. Du Chêne, "there was a perpetual circulation of Apostles, of missionaries, of prophets, of teachers." This is WITHIN the Church, please note, not merely to the Gentiles). "But when the first age of the Church passed away this itinerant, ubiquitous (i.e. GENERAL) personnel DISAPPEARED ENTIRELY, and nothing was left but the local ecclesiastical organizations." What had happened: didn't the Church NEED general officers any more? Could they be trusted independently to follow the right path? As we know, this led to frightful results (Culte 14). And there was to be no more general authority until it emerged in the 5th century in "the great Babylon of the West, so accursed to the Jewish prophets..."

The cold comfort to the Church with the passing of the Apostles was, that if the Apostolate was gone, other offices remained, and that these offices were not invented to fill the Apostolic vacuum, but had existed along beside the Apostolic office from the very beginning. Yet the antiquity and authenticity of these ancient offices was a very strong argument against their possibly representing a SUCCESSOR to the Apostles. Bishops, priests, readers and deacons had functioned for many years during the lifetimes of the Apostles: in no way did they compete with or duplicate the work of Apostles--they had their own work to do and it was a full-time job--to expect them ever and above that to take over the totally different business of governing the General Church is out of the question. Duchesne comments on the perplexing fact that the great Bishopric of Rome while equipped with all the offices and machinery necessary for administration of a city bishopric had no slightest trace of any of the equipment, offices, assistants, traditions, etc. necessary for running a Church. What makes this disturbing is that Jerusalem from the beginning to have such an administrative set-up. But no one expected the Bp. of any city to take over the work of an Apostle. This is amusingly shown in the famous forged letters of Clement to James, in which Peter is represented as assuming the bishopric of Rome

(8)

only to leave the city immediately after having appointed no less than three bishops to act in his place, since he had to be about the business of an Apostle and could not possibly spend his days in the city.

Vacuum

All concede that the Apostles were men of unique station and endowment--special witnesses possessing prophetic gifts. When men thus endowed were removed who could take their place? An Ersatz was necessary, Sohm observed, and "from this necessity arose the episcopate." The Bishop is therefore "a highly spiritual substitute, the direct predecessor of our present-day Pastors." But how can one be a SPIRITUAL substitute? Only by a spiritual calling and ordination, Sohm decided: the Bishop must have been a presbyter, but his office does not belong to the presbyters (as the "Presidential school" maintained). The Presbyters are only a social class enjoying an honorable position in the society. Thus Sohm amended Harnack: there were two priesthoods, but they were BOTH spiritual. This is Sohm's usual incapacity to see any possibility of reconciliation between Amt and Geist--it is now seen as a quaint miopia: no necessary conflict exists between the two which far from being mutually exclusive may well be mutually dependent. Many have insisted that the episcopate and the presbyterian offices were identical. Certainly in very early sources the "successors" of the Apostles are consistently depicted as the "presbyters". In the Agape, says the Const. Apost., the Presbyters represent the Apostles as counsellors of the Bishop and the crown of the Church, for they are the sanhedrin and council of the Church. But this sort of equivalence has nothing at all to do with actual succession. Harnack had noted that the local Church is but a scale-model of the main Church, if it has officers corresponding IN THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO EACH OTHER to higher functionaries they certainly do not share the power of those functionaries, which they only reflect or resemble. The fact that all share the same SPIRIT does NOT mean, as is so commonly maintained, that all share the same office, authority and function. Thus the reader takes his portion at the Agape "in honor of the prophets," the Pastor or Bishop receives his share "as a priest," the deacons receive double shares "as the reward of Christ," and the laymen must make any appeals to authority to the deacons only, since God can only be approached through his son Christ. All appeal to the Bishop must be

(9)

thru the Deacons, as appeal to God must be through Christ." All Kings, princes, etc. must be obeyed in religious matters "as the deacons of God." "Let a virgin be pure as the temple of God, as the house of Christ, as the lodging-place of the Holy Ghost. "Let the widows and orphans be the equivalent of the altar and the virgins of the censers. "If God made Moses a God to Pharaoh with Aaron as his prophet," says the Ap. Const., speaking of the higher offices of the church, "why should not you think of the mediators of your doctrine AS prophets, and reverence them as gods?" As the Bishop represents Moses, so the deacon does Aaron; as Christ does nothing without the Father, as the Deacon does nothing without the Bishop, "as the Son is the messenger and prophet of the Father, even so the Deacon is also the messenger and prophet of the Bishop." The Deacon must not even give to the poor without first asking permission of the Bishop, for were not Aaron and Miriam rebuked for acting without consulting Moses? "Let the GOOD Bishop be honored, lived, and feared AS a Lord, AS a master, AS a high-priest of God, AS a teacher of piety. For who hearkens to him hearkens to Christ (Luc. X,16). "Follow ye all the Bishop as Jesus Christ," says Ignatius, "and follow the prebyterium as the Apostles" (PG V, 949)...We must look upon the Bishop as upon the Lord himself." "As our Lord never did anything without the Father, neither by his own authority nor through the Apostles, so may you do nothing without the Bishop nor try to be justified of yourselves." Quoting Ps.81,6: "Ye are gods, and all sons of the Most High," the Const. An. explains: the Bishop presides over you AS ~~God~~ being honored by the esteem of God, by which he rules the clergy and heads all the people. And the Deacon stands by and supports him as Christ does the Father...For the Deacon is to be honored by you as the type of the Holy Ghost, and as no one can believe in Christ without the Holy Ghost, so no woman may approach a deacon or Bishop except through a deaconness. And the Presbyters (priests) are to you the type of the Apostles whom Christ sent through the world to teach the Gospel. "I am one with the Bishop, the presbytery, and the deacons," says Ignatius, "with them I shall have my share in God." "The prebysters are the true successors of the Apostles," he explains...~~Walk with the~~ Give heed to the Bishop that God may give heed to you."

Here we have to do with equivalent this--but equivalent not in absolute kind

10

or degree but only in relative authority to each other. Would anyone maintain that the deacon is Christ on earth? He is merely like Christ for the sake of illustration in one respect. The presbyters are not Apostles or successors to Apostles, they are compared to such as a sanhedrin, a body assisting the Lord in his work. Deacons are compared, for example to Christ, Aaron, the Holy Ghost, the Apostles, and Bishops. All are engaged in the same sacred calling, all hold offices of varying degree, but the fact that the work is all for the same purpose and that all priesthood ~~is~~ functions at certain clearly marked levels, and that these levels resemble each other does NOT mean that these offices are all the same. It is necessary to insist upon this, since the claim that the Bishop continues the Apostolic office rests precisely on this argument of equivalence. Thus Batiffol, noting that the Church "is not a society in which all are equal, but one in which a divinely instituted power is perpetuated, some being invested with it to sanctify, teach, govern the other. The Bishops, successors of the Apostles are THUS not an office or ministry bestowed upon them by the faithful, but a potestas of divin right." Such is the principle of the hierarchy." But aside from the fact that the perpetuation of the offices WITHOUT the potestas is just what Tertullian objected to in the Church so the third century, M. Batiffol assumes that the mere statement of the proposition proves it: there was a hierarchy, and so it happens that Bishops ~~succeed~~ Apostles. According to a letter attributed to Anacletus, there are TWO types of priesthood: 1) the Lord sent the APOSTLES into the various provinces, but when their converts became too numerous to handle he then sent out 2) the 72 disciples. "Now the Bishops occupy the place of the Lord's Apostles, while the ~~72~~ presbyters do that of the 72 disciples." They "hold the places" (locum tenent) ^{one} held by these, but it Does NOT follow that their priesthood or authority is identical, but only that those earlier officers had been REPLACED by another kind (Ex. PG II, 812). Note that "Anacletus" is here trying to explain how Presbyter and Bishop should have identical functions--the 72 simply took over the work of the Apostles. But if the 70 were the true successors of the Apostles, then the Bishops must have succeeded THEM, and the presbyters, the followers of the 72, must thereby be also the successor of the Apostles. It is a very confusing attempt to explain something. After all

Repl. - R.M. Grant, "2nd & 7th"

The Mood & Ap. J.

with 1/2 = NT

S.S.S.

Opportunity

mod.

11

Ignatius did say just that. It was long maintained by many that episcopus and presbyterus held one and the same office (Acts 20:28, 17; Tit. I, 7, Jerome), and the theory was that the President of the College of Presbyters gradually became the Bishop of the entire local Church. Hatch points out that in the earliest churches only the Bishop and deacons are mentioned, NEVER the Presbyters, indicating that the title of Presbyter "had been for the time being shoved aside." The reason for this, Hatch believed, was that Bishops and Deacons were strictly functionaries, while the Presbyters had more of a spiritual office but no part at all in Kultus: "They probably had no more than the place which the Jewish presbyters had in the synagogue--seats of honor and dignity, but no official part in the service." Harnack seconded this distinction between Episcopal-diaconal vs. presbyteral organization. In the 60's it was fashionable to believe that the Episcopal and Presbyteral offices were identical. Confusion of offices seems to be the rule, and nothing is easier than to read any office bestowed by an Apostle as "apostolic."

1983 The discovery of the Didache in 1883 led Harnack to announce a discovery which "was in opposition to everything that had ever been claimed before," namely that the primitive Church was endowed not with one priesthood but with T.C. Harnack pointed out--that has since been universally accepted--the presence in the earliest Church of travelling synagogue authorities, and institution of great significance for the study of the existence of an original ~~Church~~ centralized Church organization. These travelling agents, he noted, were not elected but had their office by "a mandate from God: it were the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, and they had, Harnack concluded, no administrative or judicial function. The Bishops and Deacons on the other hand had such functions, but they were exercised only in the local branches. Having determined that administration was important in the early Church, and 2) that General Authorities were also important, Harnack left unanswered the question, "Who would administer the whole Church." It was the Apostles, of course: Harnack remained under the spell of Sohm's thesis that one could not function in a practical or regular way and still exercise spiritual powers. That the Spirit is not directed or controlled does NOT mean that it cannot itself direct and control--that, we are told, is its specific function: the function of the Spirit is to

lead and direct in all things, and not merely to give a vague emotional surge.

If they operated wholly "in the spirit" that is all the more reason for thinking the Apostles were engaged in guiding and directing the affairs of the Church among which they constantly travelled, and not for denying them any official function at all. What we find in the Didache is, according to Harnack, "On the one side... the Central ecclesiastical Organization of those inspired teachers under the direction of the spirit, and on the other side the local organizations with their administrative officers." This is "the DOU BLE ORganization of the Primitive Church." It was soon pointed out that Apostles also had function, while Bishops ~~and~~ presbyters and deacons were also expected to be full of the spirit, in other words, the division into spiritual and non-spiritual offices was not valid. But this in no way challenges the existence of the double priesthood. The LDS Church, claiming to have "the same organization that existed in the primitive Church," has two priesthoods, ~~both are spiritual~~, but one functions locally and the other administers the Church as a whole, but BOTH are purely spiritual and there has never been any conflict between them. As in Harnack's system "the basis of the entire system is the duality of the General Church and the individual branches." The latter are, as we have noted, organized on lines exactly similar to those of the Church as a whole. So it was anciently: that accounts for the ease with ~~in~~ which the offices later became "identified" and the possibility of claiming the the Bishop was a successor to the Apostle who ordained him--though the Apostle might well outlive the Bishop, and it was very common for Bishops to hold their place only temporarily. I Clement does NOT say that a Bishop is elected for life, even on good behavior, though the ~~subject~~ question asked had been exactly that. On the other hand, no one doubts that an Apostle held office for life.

Though all officers of the Church should be inspired, the great endowment of leadership is the Prophetic gift. That was the great principle that set the Christians off from other religions. "Neither by nature nor by human intelligence," says Justin, in defiance of modern Catholic teaching, "is it possible for men to

know great and divine matters, but by the gift that descends from above upon holy men, who do not need the learned arts, neither skill in controversy and debate, but rather to resign themselves to the power of the Holy Spirit, which if they are in tune will come down like a divine plectrum from heaven, and play upon them as upon instruments, making use of righteous men and REVEALING to them the divine and heavenly Gnosis. These men, unlike the philosophers, all tell the same story and all agree among themselves." Herein Christian leadership differed from that of other churches—it was led by prophets under direct divine inspiration, whose wisdom was NOT the fruits of philosophy or training. In accusing the Church of having lost the power while retaining the forms of godliness, Tertullian makes a sharply marked levels sharp distinction between two ~~extremely opposite types~~ of religious operation, both are good and necessary, but the higher one has departed from the Church. The higher type is Apostolic and Prophetic and its genius is power—potestas, against this the present Church, according to Tertullian can only set up "a succession of Bishops with discipline, ~~in~~ officium, in the place of potestas. The ~~xxxx~~ old Church had Imperium—the authority to initiate organization, doct., etc.—while the new one had insted ministerium—a prescribed routine; the temple was the center of the old church, the Synagogue the model of the new; the Spirit was the highest guide in the former, the Scripture in the latter; enthusiasmus was the guiding principle of interpretation then, allegory now; revelation was the source of doctrine then, reason now; the visions, tongues and prophecy have ceased, as predicted and in their place are left only faith love and hope; the High Priest has departed, the Bishop is in his place; the Holy Ghost has become an intellectual exercise; inspiration has yielded to tradition, oracles to councils. "To James the Just and to John and Peter, the Lord gave the Gnosis after his resurrection," says ^{Evangel.} Clement, "they gave it further to the other apostles and the rest of the apostles in turn gave it to the Seventy," --but there is no account of its ever having got any farther. Why was it not handed to the Bishops, if they were to carry on the work--that is what one would logically expect, as Irenaeus observed. But could a Bishop succeed an Apostle?

When it came about that the highest office in all the Church was that of Bishop it was an absolute necessity to make that office the equivalent of the Apostolate if one would not face the terrible alternative of admitting that the Apostolic power--the whole stay and support of the Church of Christ--had been withdrawn. If it had NOT been withdrawn, someone, of course, would have to have it--and who could that be but the one in highest authority, the Bishop? Faced with this clear and desperate alternative, many simply said the Bishops were the successors of the Apostles and there an end--they had to be, because if they were not the alternative was too dreadful to think of! Such is Batiffol's attitude. "The deacons should remember," wrote Cyprian, "that the Apostles, that is to say, the Bishops and those in charge, were chosen by the Lord, while the Deacons were appointed by the Apostles for themselves AFTER the Ascension of the Lord into heaven as ministers of their Episcopate and that of the Church." (PL IV, 408). [This admission that the deacons, though ordained by Apostles and therefore "Apostolic" were actually of a lower order is significant, since we have no case of a Bishop] According to Clement of Alexandria, "the Apostle Clement wrote the letter to the Corinthians." A note to this says that "apostolic men were ~~often called~~ sometimes called apostles by the ancient Fathers." ~~Notoriously, was~~ This is a clear recognition on their part that the leaders of the Church SHOULD BE Apostles, though they never come anywhere near proving that they were such. The normal "succession of the Faith" among the 11th century polemists was "Patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs--none elective offices, as that of Bishop always was: they are another sort of thing, the bearers of direct powers from the other world. If the Apostles had departed, so had the prophets, and so the Bishop naturally falls heir to their honor: "the Bishops are the mouth of God," says the Const. Apost. There are no more visitations of angels: so there is nothing for it but that the Bishop himself be God's second gift to the Church, namely the visitation of angels. A writing contemporary with this statement insists that the Bishops are not merely successors to the Apostles, they ARE Apostles, "and since they have inherited the POWER of baptizing and anointing the great spiritual gifts of the ancient have also descended upon the Bishops, with the power of loosening and binding that goes with

(15)

it. Though he offers no proof, this is a significant admission of a thing of which the fathers were well aware--that ONLY and A⁺postle could be the successor of an A⁺postles, and that the divine gifts could not be SUCCEEDED or replaced by anything--if they were to be handed down, it could only be the gifts themselves and not a substitute for them. Since the LXX were commonly regarded as taking over in the place of the A⁺postles, Hippolytos lists the names of "the Seventy APOSTLES."

B⁺shops were not appointed or prepared to administer the affairs of the whole C⁺urch; they were strictly local officers. We have noted Duchesnes perplexity at the absence of any machinery in Rome for the management of anything more than the local C⁺urch there: the B⁺ of Rome was not set up to be a General Authority. "Follow ye all the Bishop as Jesus C⁺rist," wrote Ignatius, "and follow the Presbyterium as the Apostles. Wherever the Bishop appears THERE IS THE CONGREGATION, just as wherever Jesus C⁺rist appears, THERE IS THE GENERAL (Cath.) C⁺urch." The Bishop is to the local Church as NO LIVING OFFICER is to the WHOLE C⁺urch. No one knows better than Ignatius than ~~that~~ the general authorities have passed away--only Jesus C⁺rist now presides over the whole C⁺urch. "Shall I," writes 'the third B⁺shop of Antioch after Peter,' the head of the largest and next to Jerusalem alone the oldest C⁺urch in C⁺ristendom, "shall I reach such a pitch of presumption...as to issue orders to you as if I were an Apostle?" Plainly being "apostolic" did NOT give him the authority of an Apostle. "It is impossible to dispute," wrote Reville, "that the episcopate as represented in the Epistles of Ignatius is essentially a LOCAL function the authority of which is limited to the community in which it was exercised. Never does Ignatius appeal to his title of B⁺shop of Antioch to give more authority to his instructions." This is the more remarkable since the whole subject of Ignatius' letters is episcopal authority. Certain C⁺urches are having trouble choosing and sustaining bishops and Ignatius is appalled by the wild disorder and vicious atmosphere he finds in the churches everywhere, takes it upon himself to correct them. "Here we have a series of letters which are distinguished before all else by the ardor with which their author pleads the cause of the episcopate, demanding absolute submission of the

faithful to their bishops: and the two ~~arguments~~ ^{catholic} main arguments, the two columns on which the very concept of the/episcopate itself has reposed from the beginning do not appear!" One of these columns is the axiom that the B^{ishops} were general Authorities in the C^hurch as they had to be if they were successors of the Apsotles: yet Ignatius, searching desperately for a general authority to appeal to finds none, he explicitly disclaims being one himself and says he speaks not because anyone has ordered or permitted him to, but simply because his love will not let him hold his peace. "One cannot insist too much on this curious fact. ~~xxxxxx the complete~~ in the Ignatian literature...: the COMPLETE ABSENCE of ANY allusion to the APOSTOLIC nature of the episcopate, and to any justification of the episcopal power by the principle of apostolic succession." Could he have made such an appeal Ignatius would have had the solution to his problem--but h^{is} will not make it, though he is perfectly aware of what a treasure it would be, if he could only "give orders" like Peter and Paul: "THEY were A^postles," he wrote to the Romans, "I am but a man in ~~xxxxxx~~ chains." F^urthermore, Reville observes, "if the authority of the B^{ishops} had really been as well established as Ignatius wants it to be, it would not have been necessary to insist with such energy that people respect them." No one viewed them with awe as "apostolic officers. in the ~~fix~~ end of the first century. Moreover there is in Ignatius "not yet the slightest trace of those conferences ~~of Bishops~~ at which the B^{ishops} concerted, as in the second half of the second century. The B^{ishop}...not only does not yet have a sacerdotal character, but he does not even have the character of a General Authority." Exactly like Ignatius, Polycarp, ³ writing to the Churches, must confess that he is in no wise to be considered on a par with the A^postles: "F^or neither I, nor any other such one, can come up to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul. He, when among you, accurately and steadfastly taught the word of truth in the pr^esence of those who were then alive. And when absent from you, he wrote you a ~~xxxx~~ letter...which will build you up in t^he faith which has been given you." Now this was written to the Philippians, and by all counts the Letter to Philippi is the weakest thing in the whole Bible--yet the most influe tial B^{ishop} of his day in the entire Ch^urch, the man whose presence in Rome to settle the Easter controversy was for Irenaeus the surest claim that

that Church had to Apostolic guidance, thinks of his own authority as being infinitely below that of a brief and not very informative letter from a real Apostle! In pleading for Episcopal authority Clement preserves the same remarkable silence as Ignatius: he fails to mention any office of his own, to give any direct orders (he is much more apologetic than Ignatius in this), to appeal to Apostolicity in the office of the Bishop which might make the latter sacrosanct: he merely ventures as an opinion, and because that opinion has been asked for, that there is nothing in the Scriptures which says evil men should depose good, and so there is no reason for deposing a good Bishop. But he is completely silent as to any PRINCIPLE of tenure, such as we find in the holy office of the Apostles. "Christ came from God," writes Clement, "and the Apostles from Christ,"--we wait for the next step, but it is not forthcoming: Clement like Ignatius resolutely refuses to say what in later ages would be so obvious as to be mechanical: "and the Bishops from the Apostles." Instead, he makes a statement later that the Apostles set up the Bishops after the old Jewish pattern, and "knowing that there would be trouble about this office of Bishop, they passed an epinome, i.e. a by-law or special order, arranging for worthy men to take over and worthy successors to follow--that is all. The EPINOME puts everything on a level far below that of General Authority. Consider here that all along the Bishops and Apostles existed side by side as contemporaries: we never here of Bishops travelling with Apostles to be trained up as their successors, for the activities of the two were totally different. Very early orders penalize a bishop for leaving his city: a Bishop COULD not travel, and Apostle, as an emissary HAD to travel. The fact that the two offices existed as full-time functions side by side for many years without overlap shows that each was doing its own work: was the strenuous work of an Apostle ADDED to that of a Bishop when the Apostles fell asleep? "The Apostles were a type, preserving the image of an archetype," says Chrysostom, but he does not carry it on to the Bishops. Since the Bishops are Shepherd and Christ is the Archshepherd, says the Catholic Schermann, their offices are analogous--but so are they analogous with the Kings of the East who often called themselves shepherds, and for that matter with the functions of real shepherds--analogy is not enough, even if it has scriptural justification. ALL who were ordain

(18)

to any office by the laying on of hands of an Apostle formed the Episkope (the body of overseers), says Scheermann, "and could therefore have the name of Bishop." "As long as the Apostles lived, they personally performed the liturgical functions, conformant to the instructions of Christ, setting up in the cities where they founded ~~Churches~~ Christian congregations Presbyters, who carried on THEIR official functions there...THESE local Liturgists and officiants of the local churches were also called, according to their office Episkopoi." This is the common and understandable but typically myopic view that ~~anyone ordained to any office by an~~ an Apostle could not ordain anyone to any office at all without giving him thereby Apostolic authority! Irenaeus makes much of the fact that the Bishops were "instituted by the Apostles in the various churches, where THEIR successors have come down to our time." Like the passage in Clement, this makes it clear that ~~these~~ when successors are first mentioned they are not stated to be successors of the Apostles, but only to officials installed by Apostles. The tradition, says Irenaeus, "has been handed down from the Apostles and preserved in the Churches by successions of Presbyters" (III.i.2). Tertullian, the greatest authority of the third century on the nature and institutions of the primitive Church, was impatient with this loose equating of everything that came from the Apostles with a full grant of Apostolic power. "The keys and the promise were given to Peter," he says, but to Peter only; there is not a word said to indicate that they were at a later date to be transferred to someone else." What good are your "successions"? he asks: the real Church is "the Spirit working through an inspired (spiritual) man, the Church is not a succession of bishops." Yet so important was it to tie up Peter somehow with the office of Bishop that at an early date the attempt was producing a rich outpouring of contradictions and absurdities. We have seen the preposterous results of trying to make Peter both an active Apostle and the Bishop of Rome. Some people believe, says Chrysostom, that there must have been TWO Peters! The ~~gospel~~ Gospel of the Twelve Apostles simply has CHRIST ordain Peter and Archbishop, though such an office did not exist before the fourth century! But what else could you do? According to the Ap. Const., when the Church was being formally organized Peter suggested first of all ordaining a BISHOP in the presence of ALL the Apostles, including Paul, and James Bishop of Jerusalem--pouring all their

(19)

united authority into one vessel, and then doing homage to him! Absurd it may sound, but is it not what the later Christian claim amounts to?

The mention of James the Brother of the Lord, whose title Catholic writers usually put in quotes--controlling the texts to conform to their theories rather than correcting those theories by the texts--reminds us of the unique and important position he held in the Church. Here was a Bishop who was actually a General Authority. How does one account for that? According to the most respected authorities, one does not--James was a freak, a mistake, a flash in the pan. After all, he had ² ~~no~~ successors, ~~did~~ he, in his strange and exalted office. But then, neither did the Apostles! How strange that all the General Authorities should simply disappear, not only the travelling ones but the sedentary ones as well. One of the earliest Church writers, Heresippus, quoted in Eusebius II, 23 says "The brother of the Lord, James, took over the church along with (meta gen.) the Apostles," which is true, since he was strictly contemporary with the apostles and did not succeed them but was killed before any of them. ^{30 years} Yet Jerome translates this passage: suscepit ecclesiam Hierosolymae ~~post~~ (meta with ACC.) apostolos frater Domini Jacobus--which ~~in no way~~ totally changes James' position, making him a successor to the Apostles, when he did not succeed at all--not using violence is necessary if we are to establish an Apostolic succession through Bishops. Eusebius, seriously afflicted by doubts and misgivings as a result of his experiences at Nicaea, set himself to establishing official ties between his own Church and the Apostles. He did it, as Ireneus had, by tracing lines of Bishops. All Ireneus was interested in in his arguments with the Gnostics was to establish proof that certain DOCTRINES went back to the Apostles, so Eusebius is able to announce at the outset of his study: "I have ~~never~~ not found until now a single writer on ecclesiastical affairs who has concerned himself with this question" of Episcopal succession. Getting about "to record the lines of succession of the holy apostles...and those who led and presided in the most conspicuous positions in the Church..." i.e. looking for ~~the~~ succession to the Apostles NOT in any particular office but assured for the sake of argument that ALL important function in the church must be Apostolic if it can be

traced to an Apostle as the "instigator,"—Eusebius reviews the Bishops lists of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch and Alexandria. These are mere SAMPINGS, chosen, he tells us, because of their relative importance, but only a few among many. In EXACTLY this sense Irenaeus cites Rome as one of many examples—a good example to use, he explains, because of its outstanding antiquity and leadership, but by no means the only one. Addressing himself to his task, Eusebius quickly discovers that the documents are totally inadequate even in those great Churches to prove ~~any~~ direct derivation of office from the Apostles: the beginnings of these churches he finds, are a complete mystery. As to the Apostles, "they are like men standing on the other side of a huge gulf, from whom we catch only a few faint syllables vague, incoherent—snatched away by the wind." What a powerful—and significant—image! It reminds one of Polycarp's equally grave and significant pronouncement: "In Asia the great lights went out."

In the 6th Book of Clement's lost "Institutions", a work on the organization of the Church, Eusebius found the famous announcement that "Peter, James, and John did not dispute for first place, but made James the Just Bishop of Jerusalem without debate." Of what "first place" is he speaking? Can there possibly have been any such dispute or question among the three as to the presidency of the Church? Of course not—the Lord had already settled that long before. There is no mention here of their disputing among themselves for any first place. "Peter and James and John after the ascension of the Savior, as those set at the head by the Savior, did not set themselves to establishing their relative degrees of authority, but chose James the Just to be Bishop of Jerusalem." Here we are told that they were already the presidency and acted unitedly as such. They did NOT appoint James the Just to take over their office or be their successor—they all outlived him. Yet that is the absurd interpretation that is put on the passage to make it seem that a Bishop is a successor to Apostles. James having received a high office was still not president of the Church—Peter, James and John were. Here we have two supreme offices COEXISTING. How is that possible? Very easily—James was the presiding Bishop of the Church—not its president, for that was Peter. "Consider the

history of the early Church," writes John Chrysostom, "how James the brother of the Lord was at that time overseer (Bishop: he "pishoped") of the Church at Jerusalem in the beginning, and also ~~MINISTERS~~ presided over ALL THE OTHER FAITHFUL JEWS. When Jews in Antioch also started to believe, because of the long distance from Jerusalem and the fact that some Gentiles there were also believing, Peter went and lived among them as a member of their race (ethnikos)." This is an attempt to explain how there could be TWO heads of the Church, but Chrysost. cannot claim what would appear to be a simple and logical explanation, that James presided over the Jewish element in the Church while Peter took care of the Gentiles, for that was simply not so, Peter himself "representing the Jewish element." John himself gives us the clue to the answer when he describes James' functions as those of a but a Bishop--~~a~~ presiding Bishop, indeed, one who "looked after the affairs" not only of his city, but of all of them. He was as is well known, not a travelling authority like the Apostles, NOT a missionary. He "held the fort" so to speak in Jerusalem and managed the General Offices. To him the Apostles sent in written reports, to him AS A BISHOP Element must report his doings and his pseudo-claims to the presidency; at General conferences it was James who acted as master of ceremonies, as it was James who kept the records--all for the sake of order and regularity.

Since this office of Presiding Bishop of the Church disappeared as completely as that of Apostle and of the First Presidency it is not surprising that students of succeeding ages have all been perplexed by it and thought it a freak, a mistake, a fifth wheel--with Peter James and John alive and well, why should they choose yet another chief in the Church? Not to supplant them, certainly--the nature of the work for which the Pastor had chosen them from the beginning had not changed and they had no intention of turning over that work to another--but to preside along with them over the lower priesthood. We have seen that the discovery of TWO priest-hoods in the ancient Church came as a complete surprise when it was announced in the mid 1880s. The implications of the discovery have not yet been fully realized since it requires a complete ~~TRANSFORMATION~~ of our whole concept of the organization of the early Church, an adjustment which established Churches are of course extremel

DSD

reluctant to make. But once that necessary readjustment is made in the light of the discoveries of recent years, the office of James at last makes perfectly good sense. He presided over the lower priesthood--the Priesthood of Aaron. After his Resurrection, according to one of the oldest fragments, Christ gave something very special, something the Jews did not have, to Peter James and John, they in turn transmitted it to the rest of the Apostles who transmitted it to the Seventy--but there is no mention of its getting any further than that. Where do the Bishops come in? Their office was not something brought to earth first by the Lord--the Jews already had it, as literal descendants of Aaron. The oldest of all mentions of the episcopal offices states explicitly ^{that} "This was no new thing, but was had among the Jews: 'The Apostles have preached the gospel to us by command of the Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ by command of God. Christ was therefore sent forth by God, and the apostles from Christ,'" at this point one naturally expects the next link in the chain, for some claim that this letter is being written the by Ep. of Rome specifically to assert his primacy in the rule of the Church--somehow he forgets to mention this, the whole point of his letter, and goes on, without mentioning any central directive office in the Church: "Preaching through the countries and cities, they appointed the first fruits, having tested them in the spirit, to be the *episcopoi* and helpers (*diaconoi*) of those who should later believe." Nothing at all is said about their being Apostles in office or function or directing the affairs of THE Church--they are the local overseers to stay on the spot and take general charge. "There was nothing new in that," Clement continues, "From of old it had been written of bishops and deacons, for somewhere the scripture saith: I shall establish their bishops (*episkopoi*, *prophetai*) in righteousness and their deacons (*hagadai*) in faith. (Is. 60:17). This shows that episcopal office as a continuation of a Jewish institution, and there is much to bear that proposition out. The upstart sects that claimed to preserve the primitive Church intact and attempted without authorization to reproduce its powers, gifts, and offices, did not fail to note that the office of Bishop COULD not be the highest office in the true Church--and the great and learned Tertullian was convinced of that also--to the point of joining one of these

sects. It was one of their most powerful arguments against the main Church, that it no longer had any offices higher than Bishop. "Among us," wrote Jerome, "the Bishops hold the place of the Apostles: but they put the Bishop in third place..." Yet Jerome recognized that their doctrines and practices are thoroughly orthodox save on that one point--they insist on prophecy and recognize spiritual offices higher than those of a bishop. Some of these revivalist groups went so far in imitating the early Church as to have twelve Apostles. Such bold but unauthorized claims met everywhere with enthusiastic reception, indicated a general awareness that something was lacking in the main church--a feeling of loss and dissatisfaction that expressed itself in many ways. When the historical approach to the problem of the organization of the early Church supplanted the conventional dogmatic approach in the 1860s, it became apparent, says Linton, "that the episcopate is NOT a continuation of the Apostolate," and this led to all sorts of theorizing and speculation. Though the theories have changed ~~through the theories~~, the basic premise remains unshaken. "While it is obvious enough that the Apostles ~~ADMITTED~~ Bishops and Presbyters, Luke observed--and who would doubt it?--" it is not less clear that the functions of an Apostle were WHOLLY DIFFERENT from those of a presbyter or bishop, and that functionally the apostle is akin to the prophet, NOT to the presbyter." This is proven, Luke points out, by the Didache. ~~That~~ Strange that one of the most celebrated ^{devout} scholars of the day could have announced as late as 1911 as a ^{a thing that the world had known for generations, that} notable contribution to knowledge, that the functions of bishops and priests are quite different from those of prophets and Apostles, and the fact that the former could be ordained to their offices by the latter does NOT make their office "apostolic"! "If we ask who were the most important people in the Christian church in the first generation," Luke writes further, "the answer undoubtedly is, the Apostles and Prophets. If we go further, and ask who was the most important person in the church ~~at the end of the 2nd century~~ (NOT, observe, in the EARLY Church), the answer unquestionably is that it was the Bishop. But the difficulty comes when we inquire how this change took place; for that is precisely the problem to which

Th...

Silence

no undoubted or unquestionable answer can be given." The great Ed. Schwartz designates the theory of the "hierarchical Episcopate as bearer of the Apostolic succession" as a "legal fiction." ~~He summarizes~~ the true nature of which is apparent in many things.--In the earliest Church, says Th. Brandt in a recent study, "Apostolate and Diakonat had as yet nothing to do with the official degrees of the later hierarchy," which was another thing entirely. "The Bishops recognized the ~~unquestionable~~ superior authority of the apostles," wrote the Catholic Duchesne "...founders and spiritual masters...of ALL the CHRISTIAN SOCIETIES IN GENERAL," i.e. over against the Bishops he sets their superiors--the General Authorities.

"As these great leaders disappear," Duchesne continues, "one sees appearing a definitive hierarchy, i.e. the LOCAL organization of Bishop, Priest, Deacon. This is the old Jewish system, he says, which was already on the ground and is a natural hierarchy for any such organization to fall into. But these offices do NOT appear to take over in place of the General Authorities--they had been there all along doing a full-time job, with no thought of qualifying for Apostolic functions--NOT can B. say they WILL when they were there already? Because he CANNOT say it if there are to be any successors to the Apostles. But who says there have to be? ~~WELL~~ had the Ch. continued, that B. ~~WILL~~ have been able to write, had the Apostles not come, as they themselves announce "last", is: "As these leaders disappear, other such leaders took their place" as happened anciently with the election of fathers. But instead, all he can point to is that when the great lights went out there were lesser lights still shining--
: a 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th, 28th, 29th, 30th, 31st, 32nd, 33rd, 34th, 35th, 36th, 37th, 38th, 39th, 40th, 41st, 42nd, 43rd, 44th, 45th, 46th, 47th, 48th, 49th, 50th, 51st, 52nd, 53rd, 54th, 55th, 56th, 57th, 58th, 59th, 60th, 61st, 62nd, 63rd, 64th, 65th, 66th, 67th, 68th, 69th, 70th, 71st, 72nd, 73rd, 74th, 75th, 76th, 77th, 78th, 79th, 80th, 81st, 82nd, 83rd, 84th, 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, 89th, 90th, 91st, 92nd, 93rd, 94th, 95th, 96th, 97th, 98th, 99th, 100th, 101st, 102nd, 103rd, 104th, 105th, 106th, 107th, 108th, 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th, 113th, 114th, 115th, 116th, 117th, 118th, 119th, 120th, 121st, 122nd, 123rd, 124th, 125th, 126th, 127th, 128th, 129th, 130th, 131st, 132nd, 133rd, 134th, 135th, 136th, 137th, 138th, 139th, 140th, 141st, 142nd, 143rd, 144th, 145th, 146th, 147th, 148th, 149th, 150th, 151st, 152nd, 153rd, 154th, 155th, 156th, 157th, 158th, 159th, 160th, 161st, 162nd, 163rd, 164th, 165th, 166th, 167th, 168th, 169th, 170th, 171st, 172nd, 173rd, 174th, 175th, 176th, 177th, 178th, 179th, 180th, 181st, 182nd, 183rd, 184th, 185th, 186th, 187th, 188th, 189th, 190th, 191st, 192nd, 193rd, 194th, 195th, 196th, 197th, 198th, 199th, 200th, 201st, 202nd, 203rd, 204th, 205th, 206th, 207th, 208th, 209th, 210th, 211st, 212nd, 213th, 214th, 215th, 216th, 217th, 218th, 219th, 220th, 221st, 222nd, 223rd, 224th, 225th, 226th, 227th, 228th, 229th, 230th, 231st, 232nd, 233rd, 234th, 235th, 236th, 237th, 238th, 239th, 240th, 241st, 242nd, 243rd, 244th, 245th, 246th, 247th, 248th, 249th, 250th, 251st, 252nd, 253rd, 254th, 255th, 256th, 257th, 258th, 259th, 260th, 261st, 262nd, 263rd, 264th, 265th, 266th, 267th, 268th, 269th, 270th, 271st, 272nd, 273rd, 274th, 275th, 276th, 277th, 278th, 279th, 280th, 281st, 282nd, 283rd, 284th, 285th, 286th, 287th, 288th, 289th, 290th, 291st, 292nd, 293rd, 294th, 295th, 296th, 297th, 298th, 299th, 300th, 301st, 302nd, 303rd, 304th, 305th, 306th, 307th, 308th, 309th, 310th, 311st, 312nd, 313th, 314th, 315th, 316th, 317th, 318th, 319th, 320th, 321st, 322nd, 323rd, 324th, 325th, 326th, 327th, 328th, 329th, 330th, 331st, 332nd, 333rd, 334th, 335th, 336th, 337th, 338th, 339th, 340th, 341st, 342nd, 343rd, 344th, 345th, 346th, 347th, 348th, 349th, 350th, 351st, 352nd, 353rd, 354th, 355th, 356th, 357th, 358th, 359th, 360th, 361st, 362nd, 363rd, 364th, 365th, 366th, 367th, 368th, 369th, 370th, 371st, 372nd, 373rd, 374th, 375th, 376th, 377th, 378th, 379th, 380th, 381st, 382nd, 383rd, 384th, 385th, 386th, 387th, 388th, 389th, 390th, 391st, 392nd, 393rd, 394th, 395th, 396th, 397th, 398th, 399th, 400th, 401st, 402nd, 403rd, 404th, 405th, 406th, 407th, 408th, 409th, 410th, 411st, 412nd, 413th, 414th, 415th, 416th, 417th, 418th, 419th, 420th, 421st, 422nd, 423rd, 424th, 425th, 426th, 427th, 428th, 429th, 430th, 431st, 432nd, 433rd, 434th, 435th, 436th, 437th, 438th, 439th, 440th, 441st, 442nd, 443rd, 444th, 445th, 446th, 447th, 448th, 449th, 450th, 451st, 452nd, 453rd, 454th, 455th, 456th, 457th, 458th, 459th, 460th, 461st, 462nd, 463rd, 464th, 465th, 466th, 467th, 468th, 469th, 470th, 471st, 472nd, 473rd, 474th, 475th, 476th, 477th, 478th, 479th, 480th, 481st, 482nd, 483rd, 484th, 485th, 486th, 487th, 488th, 489th, 490th, 491st, 492nd, 493rd, 494th, 495th, 496th, 497th, 498th, 499th, 500th, 501st, 502nd, 503rd, 504th, 505th, 506th, 507th, 508th, 509th, 510th, 511st, 512nd, 513th, 514th, 515th, 516th, 517th, 518th, 519th, 520th, 521st, 522nd, 523rd, 524th, 525th, 526th, 527th, 528th, 529th, 530th, 531st, 532nd, 533rd, 534th, 535th, 536th, 537th, 538th, 539th, 540th, 541st, 542nd, 543rd, 544th, 545th, 546th, 547th, 548th, 549th, 550th, 551st, 552nd, 553rd, 554th, 555th, 556th, 557th, 558th, 559th, 560th, 561st, 562nd, 563rd, 564th, 565th, 566th, 567th, 568th, 569th, 570th, 571st, 572nd, 573rd, 574th, 575th, 576th, 577th, 578th, 579th, 580th, 581st, 582nd, 583rd, 584th, 585th, 586th, 587th, 588th, 589th, 590th, 591st, 592nd, 593rd, 594th, 595th, 596th, 597th, 598th, 599th, 600th, 601st, 602nd, 603rd, 604th, 605th, 606th, 607th, 608th, 609th, 610th, 611st, 612nd, 613th, 614th, 615th, 616th, 617th, 618th, 619th, 620th, 621st, 622nd, 623rd, 624th, 625th, 626th, 627th, 628th, 629th, 630th, 631st, 632nd, 633rd, 634th, 635th, 636th, 637th, 638th, 639th, 640th, 641st, 642nd, 643rd, 644th, 645th, 646th, 647th, 648th, 649th, 650th, 651st, 652nd, 653rd, 654th, 655th, 656th, 657th, 658th, 659th, 660th, 661st, 662nd, 663rd, 664th, 665th, 666th, 667th, 668th, 669th, 670th, 671st, 672nd, 673rd, 674th, 675th, 676th, 677th, 678th, 679th, 680th, 681st, 682nd, 683rd, 684th, 685th, 686th, 687th, 688th, 689th, 690th, 691st, 692nd, 693rd, 694th, 695th, 696th, 697th, 698th, 699th, 700th, 701st, 702nd, 703rd, 704th, 705th, 706th, 707th, 708th, 709th, 710th, 711st, 712nd, 713th, 714th, 715th, 716th, 717th, 718th, 719th, 720th, 721st, 722nd, 723rd, 724th, 725th, 726th, 727th, 728th, 729th, 730th, 731st, 732nd, 733rd, 734th, 735th, 736th, 737th, 738th, 739th, 740th, 741st, 742nd, 743rd, 744th, 745th, 746th, 747th, 748th, 749th, 750th, 751st, 752nd, 753rd, 754th, 755th, 756th, 757th, 758th, 759th, 760th, 761st, 762nd, 763rd, 764th, 765th, 766th, 767th, 768th, 769th, 770th, 771st, 772nd, 773rd, 774th, 775th, 776th, 777th, 778th, 779th, 780th, 781st, 782nd, 783rd, 784th, 785th, 786th, 787th, 788th, 789th, 790th, 791st, 792nd, 793rd, 794th, 795th, 796th, 797th, 798th, 799th, 800th, 801st, 802nd, 803rd, 804th, 805th, 806th, 807th, 808th, 809th, 810th, 811st, 812nd, 813th, 814th, 815th, 816th, 817th, 818th, 819th, 820th, 821st, 822nd, 823rd, 824th, 825th, 826th, 827th, 828th, 829th, 830th, 831st, 832nd, 833rd, 834th, 835th, 836th, 837th, 838th, 839th, 840th, 841st, 842nd, 843rd, 844th, 845th, 846th, 847th, 848th, 849th, 850th, 851st, 852nd, 853rd, 854th, 855th, 856th, 857th, 858th, 859th, 860th, 861st, 862nd, 863rd, 864th, 865th, 866th, 867th, 868th, 869th, 870th, 871st, 872nd, 873rd, 874th, 875th, 876th, 877th, 878th, 879th, 880th, 881st, 882nd, 883rd, 884th, 885th, 886th, 887th, 888th, 889th, 890th, 891st, 892nd, 893rd, 894th, 895th, 896th, 897th, 898th, 899th, 900th, 901st, 902nd, 903rd, 904th, 905th, 906th, 907th, 908th, 909th, 910th, 911st, 912nd, 913th, 914th, 915th, 916th, 917th, 918th, 919th, 920th, 921st, 922nd, 923rd, 924th, 925th, 926th, 927th, 928th, 929th, 930th, 931st, 932nd, 933rd, 934th, 935th, 936th, 937th, 938th, 939th, 940th, 941st, 942nd, 943rd, 944th, 945th, 946th, 947th, 948th, 949th, 950th, 951st, 952nd, 953rd, 954th, 955th, 956th, 957th, 958th, 959th, 960th, 961st, 962nd, 963rd, 964th, 965th, 966th, 967th, 968th, 969th, 970th, 971st, 972nd, 973rd, 974th, 975th, 976th, 977th, 978th, 979th, 980th, 981st, 982nd, 983rd, 984th, 985th, 986th, 987th, 988th, 989th, 990th, 991st, 992nd, 993rd, 994th, 995th, 996th, 997th, 998th, 999th, 1000th, 1001st, 1002nd, 1003rd, 1004th, 1005th, 1006th, 1007th, 1008th, 1009th, 1010th, 1011st, 1012nd, 1013th, 1014th, 1015th, 1016th, 1017th, 1018th, 1019th, 1020th, 1021st, 1022nd, 1023rd, 1024th, 1025th, 1026th, 1027th, 1028th, 1029th, 1030th, 1031st, 1032nd, 1033rd, 1034th, 1035th, 1036th, 1037th, 1038th, 1039th, 1040th, 1041st, 1042nd, 1043rd, 1044th, 1045th, 1046th, 1047th, 1048th, 1049th, 1050th, 1051st, 1052nd, 1053rd, 1054th, 1055th, 1056th, 1057th, 1058th, 1059th, 1060th, 1061st, 1062nd, 1063rd, 1064th, 1065th, 1066th, 1067th, 1068th, 1069th, 1070th, 1071st, 1072nd, 1073rd, 1074th, 1075th, 1076th, 1077th, 1078th, 1079th, 1080th, 1081st, 1082nd, 1083rd, 1084th, 1085th, 1086th, 1087th, 1088th, 1089th, 1090th, 1091st, 1092nd, 1093rd, 1094th, 1095th, 1096th, 1097th, 1098th, 1099th, 1100th, 1101st, 1102nd, 1103rd, 1104th, 1105th, 1106th, 1107th, 1108th, 1109th, 1110th, 1111st, 1112nd, 1113th, 1114th, 1115th, 1116th, 1117th, 1118th, 1119th, 1120th, 1121st, 1122nd, 1123rd, 1124th, 1125th, 1126th, 1127th, 1128th, 1129th, 1130th, 1131st, 1132nd, 1133rd, 1134th, 1135th, 1136th, 1137th, 1138th, 1139th, 1140th, 1141st, 1142nd, 1143rd, 1144th, 1145th, 1146th, 1147th, 1148th, 1149th, 1150th, 1151st, 1152nd, 1153rd, 1154th, 1155th, 1156th, 1157th, 1158th, 1159th, 1160th, 1161st, 1162nd, 1163rd, 1164th, 1165th, 1166th, 1167th, 1168th, 1169th, 1170th, 1171st, 1172nd, 1173rd, 1174th, 1175th, 1176th, 1177th, 1178th, 1179th, 1180th, 1181st, 1182nd, 1183rd, 1184th, 1185th, 1186th, 1187th, 1188th, 1189th, 1190th, 1191st, 1192nd, 1193rd, 1194th, 1195th, 1196th, 1197th, 1198th, 1199th, 1200th, 1201st, 1202nd, 1203rd, 1204th, 1205th, 1206th, 1207th, 1208th, 1209th, 1210th, 1211st, 1212nd, 1213th, 1214th, 1215th, 1216th, 1217th, 1218th, 1219th, 1220th, 1221st, 1222nd, 1223rd, 1224th, 1225th, 1226th, 1227th, 1228th, 1229th, 1230th, 1231st, 1232nd, 1233rd, 1234th, 1235th, 1236th, 1237th, 1238th, 1239th, 1240th, 1241st, 1242nd, 1243rd, 1244th, 1245th, 1246th, 1247th, 1248th, 1249th, 1250th, 1251st, 1252nd, 1253rd, 1254th, 1255th, 1256th, 1257th, 1258th, 1259th, 1260th, 1261st, 1262nd, 1263rd, 1264th, 1265th, 1266th, 1267th, 1268th, 1269th, 1270th, 1271st, 1272nd, 1273rd, 1274th, 1275th, 1276th, 1277th, 1278th, 1279th, 1280th, 1281st, 1282nd, 1283rd, 1284th, 1285th, 1286th, 1287th, 1288th, 1289th, 1290th, 1291st, 1292nd, 1293rd, 1294th, 1295th, 1296th, 1297th, 1298th, 1299th, 1300th, 1301st, 1302nd, 1303rd, 1304th, 1305th, 1306th, 1307th, 1308th, 1309th, 1310th, 1311st, 1312nd, 1313th, 1314th, 1315th, 1316th, 1317th, 1318th, 1319th, 1320th, 1321st, 1322nd, 1323rd, 1324th, 1325th, 1326th, 1327th, 1328th, 1329th, 1330th, 1331st, 1332nd, 1333rd, 1334th, 1335th, 1336th, 1337th, 1338th, 1339th, 1340th, 1341st, 1342nd, 1343rd, 1344th, 1345th, 1346th, 1347th, 1348th, 1349th, 1350th, 1351st, 1352nd, 1353rd, 1354th, 1355th, 1356th, 1357th, 1358th, 1359th, 1360th, 1361st, 1362nd, 1363rd, 1364th, 1365th, 1366th, 1367th, 1368th, 1369th, 1370th, 1371st, 1372nd, 1373rd, 1374th, 1375th, 1376th, 1377th, 1378th, 1379th, 1380th, 1381st, 1382nd, 1383rd, 1384th, 1385th, 1386th, 1387th, 1388th, 1389th, 1390th, 1391st, 1392nd, 1393rd, 1394th, 1395th, 1396th, 1397th, 1398th, 1399th, 1400th, 1401st, 1402nd, 1403rd, 1404th, 1405th, 1406th, 1407th, 1408th, 1409th, 1410th, 1411st, 1412nd, 1413th, 1414th, 1415th, 1416th, 1417th, 1418th, 1419th, 1420th, 1421st, 1422nd, 1423rd, 1424th, 1425th, 1426th, 1427th, 1428th, 1429th, 1430th, 1431st, 1432nd, 1433rd, 1434th, 1435th, 1436th, 1437th, 1438th, 1439th, 1440th, 1441st, 1442nd, 1443rd, 1444th, 1445th, 1446th, 1447th, 1448th, 1449th, 1450th, 1451st, 1452nd, 1453rd, 1454th, 1455th, 1456th, 1457th, 1458th, 1459th, 1460th, 1461st, 1462nd, 1463rd, 1464th, 1465th, 1466th, 1467th, 1468th, 1469th, 1470th, 1471st, 1472nd, 1473rd, 1474th, 1475th, 1476th, 1477th, 1478th, 1479th, 1480th, 1481st, 1482nd, 1483rd, 1484th, 1485th, 1486th, 1487th, 1488th, 1489th, 1490th, 1491st, 1492nd, 1493rd, 1494th, 1495th, 1496th, 1497th, 1498th, 1499th, 1500th, 1501st, 1502nd, 1503rd, 1504th, 1505th, 1506th, 1507th, 1508th, 1509th, 1510th, 1511st, 1512nd, 1513th, 1514th, 1515th, 1516th, 1517th, 1518th, 1519th, 1520th, 1521st, 1522nd, 1523rd, 1524th, 1525th, 1526th, 1527th, 1528th, 1529th, 1530th, 1531st, 1532nd, 1533rd, 1534th, 1535th, 1536th, 1537th, 1538th, 1539th, 1540th, 1541st, 1542nd, 1543rd, 1544th, 1545th, 1546th, 1547th, 1548th, 1549th, 1550th, 1551st, 1552nd, 1553rd, 1554th, 1555th, 1556th, 1557th, 1558th, 1559th, 1560th, 1561st, 1562nd, 1563rd, 1564th, 1565th, 1566th, 1567th, 1568th, 1569th, 1570th, 1571st, 1572nd, 1573rd, 1574th, 1575th, 1576th, 1577th, 1578th, 1579th, 1580th, 1581st, 1582nd, 1583rd, 1584th, 1585th, 1586th, 1587th, 1588th, 1589th, 1590th, 1591st, 1592nd, 1593rd, 1594th, 1595th, 1596th, 1597th, 1598th, 1599th, 1600th, 1601st, 1602nd, 1603rd, 1604th, 1605th, 1606th, 1607th, 1608th, 1609th, 1610th, 1611st, 1612nd, 1613th, 1614th, 1615th, 1616th, 1617th, 1618th, 1619th, 1620th, 1621st, 1622nd, 1623rd, 1624th, 1625th, 1626th, 1627th, 1628th, 1629th, 1630th, 1631st, 1632nd, 1633rd, 1634th, 1635th, 1636th, 1637th, 1638th, 1639th, 1640th, 1641st, 1642nd, 1643rd, 1644th, 1645th, 1646th, 1647th, 1648th, 1649th, 1650th, 1651st, 1652nd, 1653rd, 1654th, 1655th, 1656th, 1657th, 1658th, 1659th, 1660th, 1661st, 1662nd, 1663rd, 1664th, 1665th, 1666th, 1667th, 1668th, 1669th, 1670th, 1671st, 1672nd, 1673rd, 1674th, 1675th, 1676th, 1677th, 1678th, 1679th, 1680th, 1681st, 1682nd, 1683rd, 1684th, 1685th, 1686th, 1687th, 1688th, 1689th, 1690th, 1691st, 1692nd, 1693rd, 1694th, 1695th, 1696th, 1697th, 1698th, 1699th, 1700th, 1701st, 1702nd, 1703rd, 1704th, 1705th, 1706th, 1707th, 1708th, 1709th, 1710th, 1711st, 1712nd, 1713th, 1714th, 1715th, 1716th, 1717th, 1718th, 1719th, 1720th, 1721st, 1722nd, 1723rd, 1724th, 1725th, 1726th, 1727th, 1728th, 1729th, 1730th, 1731st, 1732nd, 1733rd, 1734th, 1735th, 1736th, 1737th, 1738th, 1739th, 1740th, 1741st, 1742nd, 1743rd, 1744th, 1745th, 1746th, 1747th, 1748th, 1749th, 1750th, 1751st, 1752nd, 1753rd, 1754th, 1755th, 1756th, 1757th, 1758th, 1759th, 1760th, 1761st, 1762nd, 1763rd, 1764th, 1765th, 1766th, 1767th, 1768th, 1769th, 1770th, 1771st, 1772nd, 1773rd, 1774th, 1775th, 1776th, 1777th, 1778th, 1779th, 1780th, 1781st, 1782nd, 1783rd, 1784th, 1785th, 1786th, 1787th, 1788th, 1789th, 1790th, 1791st, 1792nd, 1793rd, 1794th, 1795th, 1796th, 1797th, 1798th, 1799th, 1800th, 1801st, 1802nd, 1803rd, 1804th, 1805th, 1806th, 1807th, 1808th, 1809th, 1810th, 1811st, 1812nd, 1813th, 1814th, 1815th, 1816th, 1817th, 1818th, 1819th, 1820th, 1821st, 1822nd, 1823rd, 1824th, 1825th, 1826th, 1827th, 1828th, 1829th, 1830th, 1831st, 1832nd, 1833rd, 1834th, 1835th, 1836th, 1837th, 1838th, 1839th, 1840th, 1841st, 1842nd, 1843rd, 1844th, 1845th, 1846th, 1847th, 184

priest, the bishop must pronounce a blessing over those thus baptized" to make it valid, though if he fails to do so and those baptized ~~xxx~~ should die, they will

NOT go to hell as if unbaptized! The Bishop should be present at ordinances, Ignatius wrote, so that everything may be done "firmly and securely." Such instance illustrate great vagueness and doubt on matters concerning the authority of the lower priesthood even when functioning in its proper field. This COMPLETE CONFUSION

not only ~~butxxxbutxxx~~ among the various claims and theories tying the offices of Bishop, Priest and Deacon to those of Apostles and Prophets and Seventies, etc. but among the various officers of the local churches as to their office and authority and finally among the bishops for a claim to be general authorities can ONE have

and when come about if THE LOWER BIBLE THING was ALSO LOST TO MEN. After all, James the Just and his mysterious office of presiding Bishop disappeared just as completely and suddenly as did the apostles--and none was left in his place. It is true, thousands of public and religious officials in the city of Jerusalem WANTED him, but that does NOT mean that they WAS him!

Catiffol has stoutly argued the descent from the apostles of a single, unchanging, unique Episcopal authority. He grandly announces that in the ancient Church priests could have no cathedra: "The cathedra (Bishop's chair, seat, "see") is the exclusive institution of the Bishop, the symbol of his authority, the symbol of the unity of the Church. . . . Yet Koch points to Constantine's references to presbyters' thrones in 313. . . . He cites many ancient texts to show that priests as well as bishops ^{do} have chairs and thrones. . . . He discovered that for a long time there was only one Bishop in all of Rome--the other churches were governed by other officers.

one deacon the Jews

~~It has often been claimed that the office of Bishop was of Jewish origin~~

The famous dictum of Ignatius of Antioch, that "the Church grew up in the shadow of the synagogue," is the point of departure for much discussion and investigation.

It is the key to the understanding of conventional Christianity. There is nothing mysterious in the survival and integrity of the local branches after the passing of the apostles: they had been organized around the synagogues from the first. In

the synagogue they had a pattern both for local organization and for "spiritual Israel." The word Church itself, as has often been noted, is the equivalent of the Heb. kahal, the congregation of all Israel, of which the meetings in the synagogue were merely a scale-model reproduction. The synagogues scattered throughout the world were a result of the Diaspora--they did not represent the real assemblies of Israel, which had to take place at the Temple in Jerusalem and had to embrace the entire holy nation--they were merely regarded as temporary expedients. To this idea Lietzmann attributes the sinuual practice of the early Christians of referring to their local Churches as temporary foundations on the earth: "The Church of God, which is temporarily visiting (zu Gaste) in Rome, greets the Church of God which is temporarily visiting in Corinth," which means, explains Lietzmann, "the Church is on this earth only as a temporary guest, it is a stranger and a pilgrim. The Christian Church took over from the Jews two basic ideas, according to Ed. Schwartz, 1) that of the people of God, and 2) that of the Spiritual Gifts. The "People of God" are identical with the Christian idea of the Church: "From the very first beginnings the Gospel is preached and believed NOT by a sum total of individuals, but by an organized community (Gemeinschaft), originally constituted by ~~direct revelation~~ the resurrected One through DIRECT REVELATION, and later by the belief that the Spirit of the Lord continued to operate in its midst." This sort of thing, Schwartz believes, is part of an unbroken tradition carried forth among the Jews. But not by all the Jews: official Jews did not like it, but as we have seen there were at all times authors of ardent Jews who thought in Messianic terms and whose language was that of the New Testament. There has been much discussion as to whether the apostolate was originally a Jewish institution. In every age there have been men sent forth, i.e., apostles, ~~and these twelve were~~ in the literal sense of the word; and by the very nature of their calling they had to be ~~apostles~~. The Twelve certainly came under this category: scholars have been troubled because they were not exactly like other prophets in all respects but were very special witnesses, special witnesses with a special assignment. Should we look for fraud and ~~imagination~~ imitation if they resemble the ancient prophets in no

many things? Of course not. The Lord himself describes the sending of prophets from time to time into the vineyard, and among them he includes himself--another one sent from the presence of the Lord of the Vineyard--but the fact that he places himself in the category along with other workers sent into the vineyard in no wise precludes his describing himself as a unique and special representative. The finding of the Scrolls makes us less and less surprised at the close resemblance between the Church Jesus founded and the sort of thing that was to be found among faithful Jews of the time: the one was the realization of that the others merely anticipated. At all times the churchmen have sought to establish ties between the Church and the prophets, patriarchs, and apostles of old--and always they have had to fall back on sentimental abstractions and allegorical extravagances. This has been annoying and unsatisfying and the fathers have not been able to leave the mysteries of royal priesthood and Melchizedek alone. "The Church receives royal power from Christ in two ways," according to St. Ephraim, who is typical in his speculation: "Through David, who was an eternal divine king. It receives the priestly power through him directly as High Priest." And how does the Church get it? "Through the ordination of James, called the Brother of the Lord, the FIRST BORN and a natural son of Joseph, and consequently a legitimate brother of the Lord...This James was of the line of David, he was a Jewish High Priest, and Jesus tells us much about him." Long out of touch with ancient sources and even traditions, Ephraim is trying to make out a case, and he is hopelessly confused: he is typical.

The once popular "Hellenistic" theory of the indirect origin of the liturgy, organization, and ceremonies of the separate Christian Churches has now been left behind in favor of viewing the organization of the Primitive Church as a ~~continued~~ extension of the pattern of salvation laid down in the OT." The Scrolls and the Papyrus fragment have borne out this viewpoint. In a study of these Ephraim has recently suggested a reconstruction of events: "After the martyrdom of James in 67 and shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E., the leaders of the Hebrew Christians in Jerusalem received by divine revelation a warning of the imminent

28

catastrophe and escaped to Tella. Soon after the fall of the city an electoral assembly, composed of the despasmoi (Jesus' blood relations) and apostles and disciples of Jesus, met in Tella and chose a successor to James, Symeon son of Clopas and cousin of Jesus...Symeon's election was contested and his success in face of the stronger rights of Jesus' closer relative--since it is generally agreed that the rule in the early Church was 'monarchical'--must be regarded as the... sign of victory of the Pauline trend in the Church...The secession of the Hebrew Christians from the Church began after the election of Symeon." These Jewish Christians, Weichert suggests, "organized themselves as a separate Jewish-Christian sect in the Syrian desert, probably adopting as their model...certain Essene institutions." The leaders of this movement were "sons or grandsons of Jude." On the other hand, Stauffer says that Symeon was chosen as "the only living relative of the Lord who had ~~not~~ seen Christ in a special revelation," and thus breaks down Weichert's ~~resort to the~~ threadbare resort of explaining all oddities and discrepancies in the ancient Church by an eagerness to "Pauline Christianity." Stauffer notes that a successor to James was actually ~~that an episcopos was to~~ ordained and that the whole thing was done on the ancient JEWISH pattern. In the Bible discovered at Jericho he finds the title of Bishop as an official Jewish religious office. The word Episkopos is also found to be pre-Christian use with exactly the meaning given it later in the Church as is the word Paroklisis, "isoformis" to describe the temporary nature of the local religious communities. These new words are being added to the already large vocabulary of standard terms, characteristically Christian, yet having their ~~main~~ origin among the local communities of the Jewish diaspora. ~~isoformis~~ Stauffer emphasizes that James was the most important man in Jerusalem in 62 A.D., and that Symeon had that distinction after James's martyrdom: but not a word as to either running any kind of competition to the Apostles, as, by all LATZ calculations they certainly must have had the apostles bestowed their office on James when they made him presiding Bishop. Between Bishop and Apostle there is plainly no overlapping, no confusion. Stauffer notes in all the earliest records of Episcopal Succession the operation of the old Jewish laws and customs--the whole thing was kept as much

(22)

as possible within a family; the Jews, he notes, kept careful genealogies, they followed "the high-priestly ~~rule~~ rule of succession," which meant that all their priesthood should be traced back to AARON. This is the rule for BISHOPS, Stauffer tells us, and it is in marked CONTRAST to the Succession of Apostles—special witnesses chosen by the Lord himself.

This close tie-in of the office of Bishop with the office and blood of Aaron was a permanent heritage in the Church,—vague and confused as all the traditions became, it nevertheless keeps turning up in every age. "Everyone must confine himself to his own office," says the 'Canon 127 Canons of the Apostles,' a ~~very early~~ work discovered in 1901, complaining that the office of High Priest is not being taken seriously in the Church, "Those who make up their own rules are opposing Christ, the Bishop of All Creatures, the Son of God the Great High Priest Jesus. By MOSES were established the High Priests, priests and Levites; by the Saviour were established the 12 Apostles, and by the Apostles we Clement and James were instituted, along with others too numerous to mention. Christ is the first true, only, sovereign priest; AFTER His Ascension HE established the Bishops, priests, and deacons to the number of seven." All the Clementine writings, those closest to Peter, see in the Old Testament the norms and patterns for the offices of Bishop and below. A Bishop should hear charges, judge crimes, and assign penalties, according to the Ap. Const. following the Jewish pattern (II, 16, Num. XII, 14). Those who preside in the Churches should be supported financially by the membership "as the priests, Levites, presidents and officiants of God, as prescribed in Num. 18, 1-6. Formerly, this passage notes, the congregation (laos, laity) were called The People of God and a Holy Nation." They are no longer called that, but none the less "the catholic Church is NOW the people of the Decalogue, the chosen people, etc. The Bishops are your high priests, and your priests are the elders; and your Levites are now deacons, and your readers, ~~singers~~ cantors and door-keepers are your deaconesses and widows and virgins and orphans." This seems rather confusing, but the thing to note is the strict adherence to the imitation of the Aaronic priesthood. Our

guide continues: the OT tabernacle is the Church. "Therefore you who are our bishops today be to your people priests, levites--of the Ark, of the holy catholic Church, standing at the altar and ~~bringing~~ bringing the intellectual and bloodless sacrifices through Jesus the Great High Priest...Be ye INCHURCHES, princes, leaders, kings, mediators between God and the faithful, knowers of the Scriptures, voices of God, witnesses of his will, bezzing the sins of all and answering for all." And to the people: "as the Jews could not offer without Levites, so you may do nothing without the Bishop. Anything done without that office is void, as the doings of Saul were without the approval of Samuel. Christ without the Father cannot glorify himself...It is fitting for the bishop to bring the sacrifice AS the high priest ^{ess} neither by themselves or by the deacons." As to the ordination of a deacon, "let the Bishop anoint her head with oil, in the manner in which the priests and kings of old were anointed." That in view of the fact that the deaconess holds no office and no authority at all! It is all a type and a pattern: "The deacons must refer everything to the Bishop as Christ does to God; but such things as the deacons can manage themselves, having received authority from the Bishop, AS THE LORD HAS GIVEN the POWER: public administration and relief. (II, 44). All rules of marriage and sex life are cited from the Jewish law. The ordination proper for Bishops is significant: After an invocation following the OT pattern: "Give in thy name, O God who is known in the heart, to this thy servant, whom I have chosen for Bishop that he may blamelessly...care for the flock...Give to him, all-ruling Lord, through thy Christ, the participation in the Holy Spirit; that he may have authority to bind and loose...according to the authority which thou gavest to thine apostles." A letter (falsely) attributed to Ambrosius says, "A Bishop must be anointed after the example ~~example~~ of the prophets and kings...the invisible virtue of the Holy Ghost is mixed in the holy chrism. James the brother of the Lord was ordained an apostle by Peter James and John at Jerusalem, (thereby they bestowed upon his successors) with the approval of all others present, THE HOLY SPIRIT...It follows that those who hold the ^{highest} High Priesthood, i.e. Bishops, are to be judged by God and not by men." (II, 602). "If the sons of Aaron represent the presbyters in their

21

office," says this letter, "and Aaron represents that of the High Priest, that is the Bishop, then Moses indubitably stands for the figure of Christ; like Christ he is a direct mediator between God and men, the true leader of the people and the true head of the priesthood, etc." Note here that the Bishop is of Aaron, while Moses, guiding the people as a prophet by direct revelation, is something higher. "Anicletus" here always calls the office of Bishop the highest priesthood, because in his day it truly was. In the Damascus Covenant there is in each camp an "inspector" (shabbaggar) : "He will love them as a father his children...as a shepherd his flock..." Above them there is also "an inspector of all the camps."—the bishop of bishops as it were. The bishops must retire at sixty, the presiding bishop at fifty: "No officers for life!" It has often been noted that the office of Bishop has no life tenure as the higher offices do. Even Origen when the problem was brought up could not point to any such rule for ancient bishops. In the Jewish New Covenant "here and there at the head of each community there is an overseer, the 'bisher.' And the ideal of both Churches (Ntns. and pre-Ntn.) is that of unity, communion in love—even going so far as to share common property."

"At first," wrote Duchesne, "the local ecclesiastical group was constituted and organized on the model offered by the Jewish communities... Whether by imitation of the synagogues, or by simply through the ^{dictates} of essential needs in every community, the first Christians soon found themselves provided with a hierarchy of three degrees. This hierarchy held its powers, direct or indirect, from the apostles themselves, sometimes from the local Bishop and sometimes from the superior ecclesiastical authority, representing the succession of the apostles." Here again is the unwarranted but necessary assumption that any officers having their powers from the apostles MUST represent a line of apostolic succession. Duchesne can tell us absolutely nothing about this "superior authority" thru which the local Churches officers received their powers, save that it disappeared very early and very completely. The Apostolic Fathers all CONFUSE the local hierarchy with that of the main church and with that of Christ, the Father and the apostles—but this is, as we have seen, strictly anology: sometimes an office is treated as the equivalent

to that of the Apostles, another time the holder of the same office is compared with Christ himself, or with the Holy Ghost, or with Moses, or with Abraham, or with the High Priest, or with Aaron, or with God the Father, etc. It is all simply an analogy to illustrate NOT the absolute powers of the relative offices of the priesthood, but their relative powers and the need of subordination one to another. If Christ is subject to the Father, why should not a deacon be subject to the Bishop? A powerful argument for order and proper subordination—but with no thought of making the Deacon the equal to Christ or the Bishop to the Father. Continuing, Luchesne surmises that in the next step "the local ecclesiastical group was at first constituted and organized on the model offered by the Jewish communities." In this Jewish system, "nowhere does one find a local religious center analogous to Jerusalem and to its temple. This last fact, which so sharply marked off the difference between Jews and Christians, was prompt, it is true, to disappear," when the Christians lost their central organization as the Jews had lost theirs. This is a very important fact in understanding the nature and genius of the Christian Church. In a letter to Ignatius, the Pessobolites writes asking for a Bishop to be sent for her community "that she might not be, as Moses says, sleep without a shepherd." For it arises from a question: WHAT REMAINS OF THE OLD RELIGION? What became of the Temple and priesthood? They were taken away. The synagogue is not the Temple, and there are no Levites—the ancient rites and ordinances are not now being practiced. Jewish religion as set forth in the inspired books is today in oblivion. This does not mean that nothing on earth remains of it. Paul told the Christians that the greatest of all gifts, the Gnosis, would be taken away, that prophecy, even to the limited degree then enjoyed, would be silenced, and that the gift of tongues would be found no more. Does NOTHING remain then? In their place, says Paul, will be left behind faith, hope and love. And this is exactly what faithful Jews retain of their old religion: they live in hope, they live in faith, and they live in charity—they keep the memory and the hope alive, and they do not anywhere have the glories of the temple, they never cease to recal-

then, forbidden even to set foot in Jerusalem they swore never to forget that Jerusalem had been. Their synagogues were local Churches led by a council of "Elders": "to every Jewish society belong the Elders; even in the Hellenistic and Roman period they were the core of the Synhedrion; this seems to be the origin of the Christian Presbyteroi." Thus Ed. Schwartz. In the Const. Ap. the prayer of John for the ordination for a presbyter asks God to "fill him with the spirit of grace and counsel even as Moses was ordered to choose assistants..." For the deaconess he prays, "let her be as Miriam, Debora, Anna and Hilda,"—all CE characters. The presence of numerous offices in the Early Church having no specific standing or authority and which were all dropped in various times and places is a heritage of loosely controlled local organization. They synagogues kept alive the Jewish religion. They did NOT preserve the ancient rites and ordinances nor the authority to perform them, they kept warm the memory of other dispensations and above all kept alive the hope of Israel. Thus though deprived of the glories of the temple and the priesthood they none the less performed a valuable service, religious and prophetic. They are not a thing to be held in contempt. So too with these Christian Churches that grew up "in the shadow of the synagogues" they were synagogues too; when the Apostolic authority was withdrawn, when the rites and ordinances were taken away, they kept alive the memory of the Savior and the Apostles. In its own confession the unique function of the Christian Church is to preserve it out increase or diminution a definite "deposit," to hold it and keep it warm while looking forward to the Second Coming. It is precisely the function of the synagogue, and it deserves our honor and respect. The synagogue was admittedly but a feeble reflection of the religion of the Jews; scattered and uprooted communities kept the flame burning. How then should the NEW revelation follow such a sad pattern unless it found itself in a like case? Lechner in the latest authoritative work on the Catholic liturgy finds its origin "before all in Judaism, the liturgy of the synagogue." If the least be said for it, we find two closely parallel institutions. Only if the Christians were so lost and deserted as the Jews would they turn to them for the

rites and practices of their worship. The Mass, of which Lechner is speaking, owes more of its ritual and liturgy to the rites of the SYNAGOGUE than to any other source. But the Synagogue rites are NOT the rites of the temple, but of a people separated from and deprived of all the ordinances and authority that had once been given their fathers from heaven. Now when the ~~Hebrew Christians~~ Christians must go to THIS sad source for the entire substance of their liturgy, we can only assume that they too, as Duchesne points out, lost all official ties with their own divine origins, to carry on ~~like~~ as the Jews in faith hope and charity ~~for~~ through the centuries. The whole ^{religious} life of the Middle Ages, as we shall see later, was a quest and a hope: a search for something lost. The teachings and ordinances of the Apostles appear in the very earliest Christian sources as deep, dark mysteries.

But the ritual and liturgy carried out by the Bishop, priest, and deacon can be examined in every stage of their evolution--and Lechner has done that--and found to be borrowings from human institutions on every side. Lechner not only admits the fact ~~but~~ but goes even further, making the best of an inescapable position by exalting it to a principle: "If the above-named pre- and non-Christian influences have played the most evident role in shaping the cult practice of the Church, they are by no means the only such influences, nor the last, and it is by no means out of the question that in the future still other Cultural- and Ethnic zones shall contribute ~~to~~ elements ~~to~~ our liturgy, displacing older forms, and that the cult of the Church shall adapt itself to still other peoples and concepts as it ^{already} has to those of the west." Since according to Catholic teaching, the raison d'être of the priesthood is the transfer and of cult offices, it must be admitted that priesthood and cult are here seen to be hopelessly adrift in the world--anything like fast Apostolic ties and controls is out of the question in a Church that has borrowed its rituals from the pagans--"displacing older forms" and acquiring new ones as desired. Buttloff rightly says, speaking for his own Church, "Eccelesiology reaches its completion with the dogma of the pontifical primacy." In a Church founded by the Lord there would be no ~~such a process~~ science of "eccelesiology" to study the details out of organizational dogma--for the organization would be complete at the

outset.

From the scrolls we learn that something very close to the office and title of Bishop was had among the Jews in pre-Christian times. The historic background of the episcopal office has never been completely explored. Once its pre-Christian and Jewish background is recognized many doors are opened. The marked dependency of the whole Church order on that of the Synagogue ~~plaxwx~~ makes the dependence of the office of Bishop on the Jewish models unavoidable. We are referring to the conventional office of Bishop, however, NOT to that office as it existed in apostolic times; for like everything else in the Church the lower priesthood was lost as completely as the upper. The Apostles indeed founded Churches, but they "stood in doubt of them," and regretted that they could only handle their affairs properly when an Apostle was at hand to instruct them; they noted that with the withdrawal of Apostolic authority the Churches wilted like flowers cut from a stock. All is confusion and perplexity in the Apostolic fathers. Not only did the churches ^{insanably} begin disputing with each other in the absence of an Apostolic authority to appeal to, but within each church factions arose putting forth rival candidates for Bishop. Such a state of things, the A. Fathers warn again and again, CAN, and if it does not soon cease most certainly WILL destroy the Church. But they also know that without a head to turn to there is no hope of improving things, and they themselves, insisting they have no such general authority, know of no one else to turn to. Only one outcome was possible—the predicted one: the famine for the word of the Lord.

If the office of Bishop in the later Church came directly from the Apostles, ^{and, to} it is very strange, and a fact on which we cannot insist too emphatically, says ^{and these} Leveille, that Irenaeus is entirely unaware of the fact; so is Clement I, ~~whose writings~~ two are the earliest writers after the Apostles and are completely and intimately concerned with the problem of establishing episcopal authority. Neither of them appeal to the Apostolic nature of the episcopal office in pleading its importance and dignity! Plainly in I. III time it did not have that dignity. On the other hand, there is no doubt at all that the Apostles did establish Bishops. This must have been another order entirely. Where then did the Bishops of the 2nd period

come from? Nothing could be simpler: if the churches were modeled after the Synagogue, so naturally would be their officers. The Jews had had apostles, but the early Church had something very special: THE Apostles, the twelve. ~~Traditions~~
Every Jewish community had its council of Elders—the Presbyters; but the early Christians never for a moment confused them with those they called "THE Elders," that is, the elders of the Apostle's time, whose deeds and sayings reach us in Irenaeus, Polycarp, Clement and Eusebius as traditions from a special order of beings the likes of which have completely disappeared from the earth. In the later Christian Church the number of deacons in every church was supposed to be exactly seven, to represent in some way THE Seventy, who had vanished and whose office and calling was one of the mysteries. The office of THE ONE is identified with that of reader: as such it was a part of every Synagogue, but the early fathers knew that a teacher in the primitive Church was something entirely different—just what they could not say. In every synagogue one might find officers bearing the names of bishop, priest, teacher, and deacon. These names were also employed in the Early Church but in a very special sense. It was not this sense but the Jewish one that the later Church preserved/along with rites and ordinances which were not of the earliest times but such later acquisitions taken over from many sources by a Church ~~time~~ that would never have been under the painful necessity of building up its rituals thru the years had the original rites and practices—quite sufficient for all purposes, not been completely lost. The excuse, ^{i.e. the standard explanation} that more practical, and popular and otherwise expedient procedures had to be worked out to suit altered circumstances, is worthless, since ritual is NOT a practical thing anyway: it is NOT adapted to the convenience of a society but rather required of the society—any society—the discipline of conformity to it.

Everything about the EARLY Episcopal office betrays its Jewish and worldly origin. The idea of a religious overseer in a community is very ancient, and very anciently that function is "episcopal." Thus Tiberius assures his fellow-Athenians at the beginning of the 4th century B.C. that God will never destroy the city

EP

as long as it is watched over by Athena, ΠΙΣΚΗΡΟΣ." While the Egyptian god is hidden and secret, says Ed. Meyer, the Greek god is ΠΙΣΚΗΡΟΣ because he oversees the land from his high castle-seat. This is a common Aryan concept--prominent in Norse mythology--of necessarily Asiatic origin: it belongs to the economy of the mountain-palace, the super-lookout from which the ruler surveys all the deeds that are done in his domain and sends out ^{of his wrath} the arrows to destroy those who think to escape his will. The concept is most at home among the Persians, whence the Jews seem to have got it. It deserves mention because strangely enough the Episcopal office is not a distant derivative but is endowed with certain astonishing fixtures which show its direct Asiatic contacts. The oldest Bishops staves were the caduceus and thunder-arrow, and they bore on them such dread inscriptions as "Strike!" "Destroy!" appropriate only to the divine weapon. There was no Persian institution better known to the West in ancient times than that of the "King's Eyes" and the "King's Ears,"--the royal spies who told the divine king all that was going on in the world. Ancient literature is full of references to like institutions. In the same passage in which he describes these officers Xenophon discoursed on the Persian king as the Good Shepherd--one need not, therefore think the terminology is purely accidental or far-fetched. According to a very early Epistle attributed to Irenaeus, "the deacons are the Bishops eyes in every city: there should be seven to ~~take~~ be of the cong. (lit. of his own people!) or duty when the Bishop preaches, lest anyone/speak disrespectfully or make any move against him, or treat lightly the divine word." (PG V, 1047). In turn the Bishop himself is described in a letter attributed to Alexander of Rome as "the eyes of the Lord," and the conclusion from that is very significant, namely that anyone who crosses a Bishop is guilty of the crime of lese majesty! That is, we have here the Bishop holding the power of a temporal king, modeled on the accepted Oriental lines. "Bishops are to be judged by God alone," says a letter supposedly of Pius I, "who has chosen them as his eyes" (V, 1121). After describing the functions of the Bishop in terms of herders, i.e. the OT pattern, the Const. notes: "Since therefore you are ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΙ (lit. "Look-outs," "inspectors," "spies"), you yourselves are under the inspection (σκοπος) of Christ." Inter the same source

announces that "the Deacons are the Bishops eyes, ears, mouth, heart, soul, as

Lethe took the lead from Moses."

H. J. Roetz has surmised that the Gentile Christians adopted the name of Lethe

strong in preference to the old Jewish title, archipresbiter, in precisely the

same way in which they took over episcopos in preference to the usual Jewish gammag-
ue. This would confirm our conviction that the origin of conventional Christian

bishopric is to be found in the same place at the origin of its rites and liturgies,
with the Jews and Deacons, and not with the apostles. Granted that James the brother

of the Lord was "a unique phenomenon without rival," Milton asks, "where

did the local churches get their Bishops and their organization? There are two

answers to this, he explains: 1) the Jewish-Christian theory, which everyone ac-

cepted until in the 1860s when De Rousset and others suggested 2) a pagan models, to

be found in those college--~~xxxxxx~~ clubs and social common-interest groups--which

survived in the world of late antiquity. In neither case was the origin "Apostolic"

very possible form of ancient society, as it is put forward by this or that "school"

to explain the even more of the later Church organization, but no agreement as

passed.

It went on as the apostles themselves set up "schools on 12 models, 2 and 1 from

the language he was he appears to be engaging in a little personal speculation:

certainly he quotes in official language to that effect. Mathew succeeded Judas,

says the apostolic "constitutions, according to the dictates of Psalm 108, 1: 'We

another take 'the epistrophe.' In the text, of the 111 patriarchs the apostle and

Mathew appear in Jewish text: "until the time when the most high shall send out

(apostles) his servants, a new direction (epistrophe) of his only begotten."

The survival of Israel in a form in the site of the Christian Church, including

all the claims to it of the Jew and Christian development in the unfolding of the

plan on earth. The institution of Jewish society in the 1st century was

have been an institution of the "nation, yet we have a theory as a Gentile nation

ized Jewish Church in the form of the "nation, yet we have a theory as a Gentile nation

ted by the Prince of the Captivity to all the Jewish congregations of these different countries to elect rabbis and ministers, all of whom appear before him in order to receive consecration (it was by laying on of hands), and the permission to officiate, upon which occasion presents and valuable gifts are offered to him even from the remotest countries." But who ordains the Prince of the Captivity? The Caliph, successor to Mohammed as head of Islam! Of the Jewish congregations of Europe, he says, they "send letters to one another by which they exhort themselves to hold firm in the Mosaic law." The exact parallel to Christian institutions is here no more striking than that to the usages of Asiatic kingship. The emergence of papal institutions throughout the world ~~incomparably~~ follows hard upon the establishment of the office of religious overseer, or bishop--we find them both wherever we look, with no indication that they began with the Christian church. One is not left here to vague surmise, however; the study of Church vestments quickly reveals the priority of pagan institutions, especially Asiatic, over ^{the} Christian ones which were copied from them. This we have treated below.

There is no dearth of early texts describing the functions of the lower priest hood. Immediately after comparing them with the castles, Irenaeus describes the work of the presbyters: "It is strictly of a local, temporal nature--they are to visit the sick, administer, preserve good order generally in the Church. That is all. . . . for their 'pastoral' calling. The ancient office of deacon was the same--to assist the bishop generally in the performance of the strictly temporal tasks and odd jobs of the Church. Later on the ~~bishops~~ priests and deacons must needs become inspired teachers--a function totally foreign to their original calling--and so that they ill-qualified to change the office of bishop. As his assistants they must be spiritual if he is spiritual, yet nothing is more certain than that in the beginning their office was temporal. Also nothing is more certain than that ~~since~~ ^{their} calling can never be separated from that of the bishop--they are always and everywhere a single team. Therefore in the undoubted nature of their work we have the key to the bishop's own calling; and in the radical theoretical change of orientation that their offices underwent we ~~see~~ see evidence for a like change of orientation

in the episcopal calling.

But we need not confine ourselves to such secondary evidence, however convincing. For the nature and function of no ecclesiastical office is so well, so often and so fully described, both directly and indirectly, as that of Bishop. Out of many studies of the word ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ emerges a consensus: the bishop is an inspec-
tor, sent to examine local conditions by a higher authority. He examines and re-
ports: to do that he must stay on the ground. From the inscriptions "no fixed mean-
ing of the word's content has been found," ~~unlike~~ like the word Apostle "it is ein
inhaltleeres Bezeichnungswort." It was the Christians who gave it a definite con-
tent. For then the Bishop was chief local officer, but it is very significant
that he was NOT elected by the society of which he was in charge—they merely
ELECTED him by a show of hands: it was a higher authority that put him in charge.
~~Report~~ The local-election theory has now been given up. One of the most actively
discussed questions has been that of the plurality of Bishops: is the plurality?
It seems strange that this should have been a question at all—because there was
a multiplicity of places requiring direction and administration. The question
could never have arisen were it not for the determination of churchmen to see in
the Bishops apostolic general authorities, which by their very number ^{they could} ~~they were~~
NOT have been.
The office and function of Ep. is clearly varied from the first: but if
we accept what is shown us, then the later concept of Bishops as rulers of the
^{alone} Church rather than of local churches is completely discredited. And so we
are not allowed to accept the record as it stands but must seek for great and
Pos. reversing the whole Ep. but not allowed on pain of...to leave their
water-gates to explain a glaring contradiction/ The contradiction is NOT in
the record--there is no contradiction there at all--but in the need and determina-
tion of the Churches to make out of the Bishop something that he was not. ^{11/10} ^{11/10}
Pos. taking over the work of Apostles who could not stay in one place more than three
days, while the Bishops then could not leave one place more than three weeks!
While pointing out that the office of Ep. was a spiritual, religious, peculiarly
Christian one, Herrack noted that it was vastly different in its busy practical

41

from the functions of those "prophets, teachers, evangelists, etc. who concern was to teach the church by revelation from heaven. Many texts on the qualifications and training of bishops bear that out fully. The "inspired men" ~~whom Justin~~ ^{early Church} Justin describes as the true teachers and leaders of the ~~Church~~ differed from the great men of the world precisely in having no formal education and relying at ^{this point exploited by Tertullian, Origen, Clem. Alex., Clem, Recog. etc} no time on any skill in Rhetoric or logic. Yet formal education and skill in rhetoric and logic are the very things most consistently prescribed for Bishops. In the pseud Clementine letters to James Clement tries to avoid the office of Bishop with its heavy preoccupation and worldly concern: exactly as many a priest in the 4th century tried to avoid the office, on the significant grounds that it meant ~~giving up~~ ^{giving up} the spiritual life. It is for that reason that Peter was said to have handed over the office to Linus, Clement and Cyprian. Yet the spiritual life was the very essence of apostleship. To return to the Ps. Clementine letters, Peter insists that Clement take over the office: "You are the best qualified of all," he says, "you lead a moral life, you are well instructed in the doctrine, and you have been with me and heard me preach more than anyone else. So the sooner you agree, the quicker you will ~~be free~~ ^{be free} of a great worry." This is NOT the way God calls a man to an office: here is no mention of the will of God, or revelation. Note the interesting principle that the head of the Church chooses his successor, and the strictly practical and worldly ground on which Clement is chosen: he is qualified by character, training and experience. The qualifications for a bishop set forth by the 1st. fathers are the same: they are all the very qualities one would demand of ANY public leader--and no more. Above all, their concern is for "public order." This we shall consider closer when we view the bishop in civil life. As to his strictly religious concerns, a letter attributed to Eusebius says his faith must be in apostolorum traditione fundatum. "A bishop," says the Const. An. "must be trained and experienced in speech (logos); he must NOT be over 50 years old--can one imagine such a limitation on an apostle, prophet, evangelist or any inspired office? He must be especially competent to handle "the blasphemies of

42

certain pseudo-brethren which are being inflicted upon many, and so "must be trained and experienced in the Word, as befits his age." It reminds us, however that there are exceptions, and Solomon and Josiah were chosen when young—as ever, the examples are drawn from OT record and not from Apostolic sources. As the description in the Apost. Const. goes on, it becomes apparent that the OT peculiarly Christian qualification of a bishop is training in Christian doctrine: nothing is said of inspired gifts. "He must be the husband of one wife; he must be sober, reliable (pistos), and neat (kosmios—one thinks of the wonderful un-neatness of certain prophets!). Since the Lord said to Moses, be no respecter of persons, the Bishop should act accordingly: note that the when an identical passage appears in the OT and the NT, no mention is made of the NT—everything indicates the Messianic system as the pattern. Of course the bishop should teach by example, as Christ did: "first do, then teach." His title, according to this source, comes from Ezek. 33,34: the bishop sits as a judge and taxadlers, exactly as the regulamin of ancient Israel. He is a disciplinary officer...He is the leader, NOT the follower. He does not yield to the rebellious layman, but takes his orders from God alone. But these orders he receives, as he does his doctrine, by the Scriptures. He is not an infallible prophet, but a fallible man, and must remember that "everybody makes mistakes." "The Bishop must take thought and consider how to keep the people from getting off the track, since HE is their supervisor." As shepherd, he will be held responsible. How is a Bishop to be judged? Ezek. 34:17 is the key: a bishop to a bishop, layman to layman, prince to prince. (II,19), and the people themselves will be responsible for following a bad one: "As rational amizad beings, the sheep are answerable for their own behavior, and obliged to avoid pernicious pastors." There is much written about the judging of bishops, by whom and how it is to be done. This is in marked contrast to the rule of the Midaché, that an Apostle or prophet, being under the direct working of the Spirit, is NOT to be judged by ANYONE. The Bishop stands in a contractual relationship to a society. Not so the higher officers, who are social officers: "they shall minister to the travelling brethren ^{to} as their superiors, according to the

Didache. Bishops, the Ap. Const. continues, should be gentle, not imperious, shepherds, for they are physicians of the Church of the Lord. The Bishop is an officer of peace: the preservation of peace and order in his community is a prime concern. They must judge as God judges--charitably: the examples cited are David, Jannesek, the case of Nineveh, etc. all from the OT. A Bishop who expels a righteous man from the community is worse than a murderer, for he does not take a proper SMOTOS (view, study) of the situation. Always the play on the work episcopos--inspect, consider, study, examine, etc. The editor of the Patrol. thinks the Ap. Const. is very inept. This doctrine of the episcopal office itself comes from Christ, we are told, "being commensurate with his glorious utterances." This is what is meant here by direction from heaven. (PG 5, 521).

The "spiritual" nature of the Bishop's office is illustrated by the declaration: "If we should honor our physical parents, how much more our spiritual ones? He nurtured us, filled us with the Word, nourished us with the milk of the Logos, baptized us in the didaskalia, confirmed us by admonition, gave us the word of salvation, forgave our sins, etc." And again, "If we honor and support kings and rulers, how much more so the Bishop. How much more should we pay to feed him and his clerics whom God has established: 'Priesthood is greater than kingship in the exact proportion as the spirit is greater than the body.'" Now these are well-known, pay threads, commonplaces of the schools: nothing is more immediate to the mind of allegorizing than that of "spiritualizing" all things, and allegory is not falling in the above passage. Nothing is more natural, easy, inevitable that to "spiritualize" the episcopal calling by these Platonic cliches. In the same beautifully figurative sense, "the Bishop in the judgment hall has the Christ of God to sustain and vote with him." (II, 47). "The Bishop is like the pilot of a great ship: the deacons are the crew, the members the well-behaved cargo full of careful scruples and decent behavior. The Church building must be long and face the East...like a ship. The Bishop's throne must be in the middle with the presbyters' seats on either side, with the deacons standing at attention like

14

sailors lightly clad, etc. Let visiting deacons sit with the deacons, visiting presbyters with the presbyters, and a visiting Bishop with the Bishop." (II, 50). No layman shall perform priestly work: baptism or sacrifice or the laying on of hands, or the eulogia. The Bishop and he alone shall lay on hands. Imitating Solomon, the Bishop shall instruct the people to deal kindly with the poor. The Bishop must be ordained by three bishops, or at the very least by two. A presbyter by one Bishop and the rest of the clergy. A presbyter can teach, baptize, offer sacrifices, and excommunicate the people; a deacon can minister for the Bishop and presbyters but NOT for the people. (III, 20). A BAL ILICIT, we are further told, is not really a Bishop, having been appointed ^{NOT} by God but by men. In support of this, many OT examples are cited of kings and rulers who were punished for going beyond their authority. The interesting remark is made, that though Elias and Agabus ^{NT} were prophets "they did not claim to be equal to the apostles"—showing that apostolic men, even inspired ones, were not thought thereby to have the authority of apostles. The Lector "is to serve the Church as Isdras of old, reading thy laws to the people. Widows are to be ordained "after the time of Judith and Anna." But Virgins as such are not to be ordained, "since the Lord left no instructions" to that effect. But where did he instruct about ordaining widows? One attributes what one wishes to the Lord, and when one does not wish, points to his silence on the subject!

In the 127 Canons, the Lord is represented as instructing the apostles, "determine the order of the Bishops, the setting of the priests, the duties of the deacons, the capacities of the readers, widows without sin, and the activities necessary to the founding of the Church; so they "did it after the pattern of what is in heaven." Here it is possible to attribute to the Lord what was traditionally regarded as strictly the work of apostles. Such a convenient extension of things is seen in the same text, which improves on the scriptures: "it is good that he be NOT married, but if he already IS married, that he be 'the husband of one wife.'" Thus the later clerical office was written into the Decr. by a reworking of I Tim. II, 2-3, Tit. 1, 1-2 which is patently absurd, but which shows how easy it was to "control" the apostles

Such liberties are even more apparent in what follows: John says: "The Bishop should have two priests for assistants," but all the other Apostles object, saying that not 2 but 3 are required, since there are 24 elders: 12 on the right hand and twelve on the left. "That is right," says John, "those on the right hand will take the cup from the chiefs of the angels and carry it to the Lord, and those on the left are over all the angels. The Priests must be of advanced age, beyond the age of marriage and united in the love of their chief." So angels may be drawn in to the system at will. The deacons, says this source, hold no priesthood: "the Bp. only lays his hands upon his head but utters no words, because does not stand among the priests but is simply a helper to the Bishop. His business is to do odd jobs and keep the Bishop informed as to what is going on. The deacon is not supposed to be a teacher, for "he is not allowed to share in the Spirit of Greatness in which the priests have share," but is to try to do everything to please the Bishop--that is, if the Bishop puts his hands upon his head. "The priest," on the other hand, receives the laying on of hands of the Bp. and all the priests that are with him, at which time the Holy Ghost descends upon him." But still the priest though receiving the ANAL. MIIT at the Bp. has no right to give orders as he does; therefore he only ordained priests in cooperation with the Bishop.

Since in the early Church deacons were ordained ~~with~~ not by Bishops but by Apostles along with and at the same time as the bishops, the deacons have now neither lost their authority, or never have had it. But they DID have it. They must have lost it therefore, and with them those that were co-ordained: Bishops and Presbyters. Confessors in recognition of their merits were said to receive honorary disconate ANAL. MIIT without any laying on of hands, such being necessary only if these parties became Bishops. By that right are these concessions made? What general authority has been consulted? If anyone claims the gift of healing, says the 12th Canon, he shall not be established by laying on of hands, but prove his claim by the event. (I, 26). Though tithes go to the support of clerics and others, firstfruits are ANAL. MIIT for priests and ministers, follo-

one true master, and Bishops like everyone else must study and learn before they are ready to teach; Then in this writing entitled "On the Offices of the Ministry," Ambrose makes the surprising statement that his whole essay could be written using nothing but phrases taken "from the schools of philosophy," since they teach the same as the Scripture. In Scripture the 4th century meant a very special and peculiar reading of the scripture--NOT its literal sense. This is the strange twist the Church gave to a premise which the ancient Church understood in a diametrically opposite sense. Since there is only ONE teacher for the Church, they said, the ^{one} ~~max~~ qualification for those who would teach the Church is NOT study and learning but direct dictation from the One who knows. Starting from the same premise, Ambrose now comes to the opposite conclusion: since there is only one Teacher, he says, no one else can speak with his voice, but every Bishop must study and learn to speak as well as he, in the school. "Ecclesiastical men," says Ambrose's great contemporary, Jerome, "who meditate on the law of God do and might NOT be deceived." This is really to Pelagius' claim that revelation was an indispensable prerequisite to infallibility: nonsense! if men only meditate hard enough, they will always be right. This was the bland assurance of the schools--it would have made a primitive Christian smile. In fact it often did. But Jerome also assures us that "not all Bishops are Bishops...ecclesiastical dignity does not make a Christian." In fact in a later discussion Jerome sees through the flimsy argument easily enough: "I know that this question has been variously disputed by the most learned men," he writes of a point in Danl. 11, "and everyone of them decides it, saying what he thinks on the basis of his own cleverness. Since therefore it is dangerous to judge between the opinions of the registers of the Church, and to prefer one to the other, I will say what each one thinks, and leave it to the reader, which opinion he feels he should follow." The early Helogists ALL made much of the fact that there was a unanimity of opinion among the ancient Apostles, precisely because they did NOT judge matters "on the basis of their own cleverness," as "the teachers of the Church do in Jerome's day." Surely this lack of cleverness is what made an all and unanimous.

Copy
S. J. A.
KSL

City

It is a truism that the establishment of Christianity as the big popular Church at the end of the Ancient World was largely due to the influence of city bishops, who emerged during the time of troubles that accompanied the fall of the Empire as the natural leaders of their societies. Their courage, devotion and enterprise are too well known to need a description or encomium at this point. But such men were not a ~~ix~~ new thing in the cities of the Mediterranean. The pious, inspired leader who gives his all for his city and guides it by his wisdom, courage and skill is a stock figure in the Greek tragedy, where he is already designated as "episcopus." Like the kings of the east such an one is called the "shepherd" and the people, the citizens are his flock (Anacreon). The leading man of the town had an influence that went beyond that of his office: "Whom have the people to imitate," Epictetus asks of a friend, "except you their superior, the governor, friend of Caesar, and his Procurator?" a high official in a provincial city when he is rebuking for undignified behavior, "This city teaches the man," said Plutarch--and that in the broadest sense. The world of late antiquity was a city-world: each city was an island universe, completely engrossed in its own affairs and ~~not~~ wholly under the rule and sway of leading personalities. The local kings had sunk to ritual figures but the need and hunger for leadership was as great as ever; the whole society crystallized around its leaders, but by what right did they lead: by popular choice, that was the democratic principle. But that is a rather vague rule of succession. It meant ceaseless unrest and the chronic disease of the antique world--faction, stasis.

Because Rome was the most important city in the ancient world, the nature of its popular government is of particular significance, and is very well documented. The basis of all Roman politics, writes Mommsen, ~~is~~ is of three principles, 1) that an official gives EDICT commands, 2) that the Senate is the highest authority in the state, and 3) that all things must be sanctioned by a sovereign popular assembly. All office was magistracy, and all registrars were priests in Rome (Pontiffs): the political structure was also the state church.

The great significance of priesthood in public life lay, says Missowa, in the fact that "its bearers all held at the same time the highest civil offices and so played the decisive role in the Senate." Certain rights and privileges the common people claimed for themselves at all times: they were spontaneous, direct uncontrolled demonstrations for some outstanding person. They were the antithesis of the orderly subordination which was the ideal of the ruling families and went back to the old days of the Kings. Thus when Publicola died "he was publicly buried and honored by a yearly mourning of the matrons. Menenius was buried by passing the hat among the plebs while the senate, not to be put to shame, contributed land for his sepulchre. It was a rule laid down by the aristocrats, once they had abolished the popular kingship, "that whenever a multitude was, there should be a lawful governor of that multitude present," --appointed by themselves. The spirit of the aristocratic rule, always fighting to hold its own, always moralizing and appealing to fake traditions to inspire loyalty and submission, is shown in the story of the ^{Alban} migration to Rome. All the poorer people went to the King, says, Eic, and clamored "to settle in Rome, and divide up the new land equally, "but the more illustrious and the more important of the people, whether by merit or by chance, resented leaving their holdings and their ancestral hearths. So the senate planned to check the business by a call to arms; there was an up-^{at this} roar in the popular assembly, and the nobles immediately surrounded the meeting with soldiers ~~with their~~ --their own retainers with drawn swords. Then Tullus gave them a speech: "Tomorrow, he said, your city will be destroyed and you must all go to Rome and take what you find there." Expedience and self interest inspired that firm sense of rule and right which the Romans always flattered themselves was an abstract moral principle. Against it there were the ancient folk practices which no declarations of law or philosophy could suppress: when a man was popular with the Roman people, nothing on earth could keep them from demonstrating in his favor and escorting him through the streets. In the end the highest and holiest office in the state, that of the Imperator, rested wholly on one thing alone--spontaneous popular acclaim. An ancient grave inscription from the latter day

is typical of the public spirit of Rome: "Stranger stop and look. Here the city holds the bones of a good merciful man, a lover of the poor. I beseech thee, wayfarer, do no injury to this monument." Cicero praises "That Tuditamus who in pallium and high boots used to throw out coins to the people from the rostrum." Such a generous soul would receive in recognition for his public spirit the title of Father. A man might give such a public donative in memory of his father, "in his father's name." "The Roman people disapproves of private luxury," wrote Cicero, "but admires public magnificence," therefore, he argues, "candidates to public office ought not to be forbidden the exercise of that kindness which is liberality rather than bribery." Naturally the seeds of abuse lay in such a system, which finally destroyed itself. As we have shown elsewhere, in Imperial times CILIC the Emperor was allowed to give popular donatives—the right was jealously forbidden to all others, for to give a public gift was to vie with the Emperor in popularity. The Emperor on his part however was under constant and heavy obligation to keep up a steady outpouring of donatives. "As Ersatz for the political rights of which the Emperors robbed the Roman people," said Gardthausen, "we may consider the duty of providing public sustenance which the Emperors took over, not as their victorious general, but AS THE RICHEST MAN IN THE CITY, following a very ancient tradition." The obligation of the best-fixed citizen to be a leader in the community was supported by ample rewards in a world in which "every municipal government could be summarized in two words: the honor of the city (a second religion with the Romans), and the dignity of the citizen. The first of these mean constant rivalry among the cities to outshine each other, the second among the individuals of any one city."

From this it is easy to see that the ascendancy of a particular man in the city as a bishop would not be a new or sensational thing. Any man holding such an office would naturally be expected to be a model of dignity and deportment, but also of kindness, generosity and popularity. Religious communities within cities—the ubiquitous colleges—followed the same pattern. Thus during a festival

people in the great cities made fun of the Syrian origin of the Emperor Alex. Severus by calling him a "Syrum archisynagogum," and an "archireum." In the time of Belesarius, Procopius tells us, the chief men of African towns were nearly all priests. Sidonius' account to a friend of how "there you stood, with a fine grace...half torn to pieces by the people madly rushing to salute you, but so loyally responsive to this popular devotion that those who took the greatest liberties seemed surest of your most generous acknowledgements," might have been written by Cicero, but it describes the popular acclaim not of a hero of the Republic, but of a local Bishop. When a debtor came to him seeking sanctuary in the church, Augustine took up a public collection and thus paid off his debts. But such a public collection was strictly in the accepted Roman practice, and Augustine as a Bishop is simply fulfilling the office that would normally be expected of the head man of the city. Augustine's own election to his high office like that of his friends, was strictly a popular gesture: the people chanted his name over and over again in front of his house and would have torn him to pieces had he not accepted the honor which it was THEIR right to bestow. For every Bishop had to be elected by the people of the city and their vote took the old form of the popular acclamatio. Ambrose was thus made Bishop of Milan before he was even a Christian. It is no wonder that for him the words populus and fideles are absolutely interchangeable—he makes no distinction between the old city populace and the Christian congregation—they are one and the same, and the man who leads them is no gift of Apostolic insight to the world. Jerome makes layman the equivalent of Plebes, and Leo the Great uses only plebs, never populi—which shows that he recognizes the pagan implications as well as Ambrose did a hundred years before him: but whereas Ambrose admits the fact, (Leo would sooner avoid it.) But Usener has pointed out that "In the Formulare of the papal Chancellery, the 'liber diurnus,' edited at the beginning of the eighth century, it is still customary after mentioning the clergy ~~to~~ expressly to include the nobility and the populace of the city as factors in the choosing of the pope." And exactly as

Bp. of
campaign election
a r. unthinkable
"spr. 11" y.
thrust. 1.12
per. - R

distinguished ancients had competed bitterly for the highest honors of the city by rival largesses and all sorts of political tricks and popular appeals, so rival candidates for the office of bishop continued to play the same game with the same pieces and for identical stakes. Of course, such a thing as a CANDIDATE of an APOSTOLIC office is unthinkable--the Lord alone chooses Apostles, but these men were CANDIDATES in every sense of the word. "The Defensor of the Roman Church has informed us," wrote Cassiodorus, "that lately, when a President was sought for the papal chair, so much were the USUAL largesses to the poor augmented by the promises which had been extorted from the candidate, that, shameful to say, even the sacred vessels were exposed to sale in order to provide the necessary money." The riots in Rome among the pagans concerning the qualities of Clement ^{were} ~~are~~ quickly succeeded by identical disputes within the Christian congregation of the city --identical in nature, but much worse--and the rivalry between Damasus and ^{Victor} ~~Honorius~~ was not settled until the corpses of 137 of the faithful had been removed from the scene of the controversy in St. Peter's.

The Epistle of I Clement deals with these very conditions in Corinth, which the writer finds "loatsome, disgusting, and devilish." The elected Bishop would often make the most of his popularity in the approved pagan manner. Thus Bp. Eusebius had all the fixtures of a Roman noble: he would dictate letters as he walked along in the market-place, followed by a large troop of hangers-on. He erected for himself AS A TRIBUNE, the high throne and "secretum" of a Roman judge, and in speaking slapped his thigh and stamped his foot just like any popular orator." (Euseb. III, 30). This was not the exception but the rule. The priests of God are before all things magistrates, Eusebius reminds us. "Whenever I have a case to try," says his great contemporary, Gregor Naziansus, "I do so, even when the accused is one of my best friends or belongs to the highest nobility; for nothing is superior to the law of God and of his Church." Note the patronizing attitude, expressing as a noble sentiment what anyone in a democratic state would take for granted. The Bishops are plainly aristocrats, as we

shall presently see. "He would win my favor, I the people's and he and I together, yours," writes Sidonius in a Ciceronian vein. The method of favor winning in this case was by shiploads of wheat and honey: "we should have these cargoes ready in no time for the expectant crowds."

"The episcopal ^{epoch} epoch, exactly like the imperial epoch is, before all else an epoch of MUNICIPAL CIVILIZATION: when the imperial machine collapsed, the cities remained standing, solid pieces of the ancient defense structure." Note the exact parallel between the emergence of the city supreme and the local church supreme: in either case, it was the passing of a central authority which left local authority the only and therefore the highest in the oecumene. But just as a city prefect does not have the authority of an emperor because an emperor installed him and then passed away, neither does a local bishop have the authority of an apostle because an apostle installed HIM and then passed away. "The Christian population in each city," according to Duchesne, "one the ubiquitous, travelling general authorities were no more, "raised itself from the position of an imperceptible minority to that of a respectable minority; it finally became the majority, and then the unanimity...The FOURTH CENTURY saw the last acts of this transformation almost everywhere, as least as far as concerns the city masses." Now when these "imperceptible minorities" were bade farewell by the apostles they were, to say the least, in a bad way; in the days of the Ap. Fathers they had become overgrown—utterly corrupt within themselves. Yet from that point they ^{passed} ~~passed~~ to complete domination without the guide of any Apostles or any general authorities. How could they win over the urban masses without being like them? They could not: "They were Christians," writes Duchesne of the newly converted ^{masses} ~~Gaule~~ of the 4th century, "but they were Christians in the only way such people could be—in name ONLY." The early Christians had wanted none of this sort of thing, as the world had wanted none of them: Unam omnium rempublicam agnoscimus, Tertullian declared—mundum. This indeed was the Jewish heritage—Moses taught that all the world was a single state, wrote Philo. It was always

popular for Bishops to deplore the busy preoccupations of the world in which they found themselves, yet the whole nature of their office was just such busy preoccupation. "Following the voice of God," wrote Nicephorus to Leo III, "I turned from all honors and authority and from the restless ambition of the royal court and city affairs..." But he soon found out that actually to leave those things in deed as well as word, could only mean ceasing to be a bishop! After all, such denunciation of the noise and distraction of empty affairs was ever stock with the schools, and the Sophists worked it to death as a means of furthering their public careers.

Every Bishop in Christendom has his office designated by the name of a CITY. None doubts that the office of Bishop is primarily a city office. ¹⁸⁷⁰ The perpetual leadership of the Church, according to the Bill Unam Sanctam, is in the succession of Peter, "which succession is to be found in the bishop of the CITY of ROME." (Denzinger? 468). Early Christianity was a city religion. It had to be if the Apostles were to carry out their great assignment. It spread, says Barnes, "from the capitol to the country-side," so that "the provincial capitol came to be regarded as the mother Church." The last expression is strictly in the heathen tradition. Polycarp wrote that "Faith is the Mother of all of us," and Eusebius says "all men had God for a Father and for a Mother, true piety." The idea of mother Church is something else—it is simply the mother city. A center from which settlements were spread in a colony was always called the Mother City or Metropolis. Cyprian calls the Church of Antioch "our Mother and the Mother of all the Churches. Mother, not only because she is first in age, but because she was ^{built up} ~~established~~ by apostolic hands." Which is he praising, the Church Antioch or the City Antioch? They are inseparable. In the best known of all pagan hymns, Horace prays that the sun ~~may~~ never shine on anything greater than Alma Roma. One of the earliest Bishops of Rome is represented as signing himself "Hyginus in Christ's name episcopus of Amae Urbis Romae," using Horace's own expression. Note, he is not "Bishop of the Mother CHURCH," but

"Bishop of the Mother CITY of Rome." That title having been used long before the Christians. Because he was Bishop of such an important CITY he must have been an important bishop, and his glory derives from his city, NOT from his apostolic calling. As we have seen, the earliest Bishops made no appeal to any apostolic authority. "From the moment when Christianity aspired to embrace the Cribs Romanus in its entirety," writes Duchesne, "it could have no other capital (than Rome). It was besides that consecrated "as it were" by the preaching and death of the two great Apostles....Rome, capital of the Empire, seat of St. Peter, holy place of the Apostles, became without dispute the metropolis--the mother city--of the Church." (Gulte p.14). Now though there is no proof that Peter was ever a Bishop at Rome, and nothing at all to indicate that the Apostles thought of the city as Holy (it was indeed as Duchesne often reminds us in other passages--discreetly distant from this one--^{customary ref. to Babyl.} abominable Babylon for the early Christians) there is one point none will not dispute, and Duchesne wisely puts it in first place, so that the other very dubious points will seem to follow from it as corollaries: that is the point that Rome was the first city of the world; when the importance of a Bishop came to be measured directly by the importance of his city, the Bishop of Rome would of course come first. But Duchesne should never have used such an argument at all. The primacy of the pope is supposed to rest on the claim to a special offices inherited directly from Christ through Peter, and NOT (of all things!) on the highness and importance of a city. Yet it was not Duchesne who first saw in the importance of the city the foundation of its Bishop's claim to primacy. Eusebius honors Julius of Rome (V. t. III, 7) as "the leader of the Imperial (or ruling) CITY," in a discussion of which the whole purpose is to determine the leader of the Church, who Eusebius in this passages says is Constantine. Everyone knew that Rome was the Imperial City, and everyone knew that Julius was its Bishop--but not a word as to his having any primacy in the Church. According to the Byzantine writers, "the governor (eparchos) of Rome ~~xxx~~ is not the Roman Emperor (who had long ceased to

~~OR live in Rome), but the chief man in Rome, the pontifex, "a political figure.~~

The principle that a bishop was exactly as important as his city is certainly not a holy one and certainly was not known to the ancient Church, but by the fourth century it became the guiding principle of general Church organization. "When a traveling apostolate...proved inadequate," writes Baynes, forgetting that, while it existed it proved far more adequate than anything subsequently invented, "we hear during the later half of the second century of the gathering of Bishops in councils." Does the travelling apostolate, inadequate and outdone, raise any objections? Is there any whisper of jealousy, of rivalry or overlapping areas of authority? What does the inadequate Apostolate have to say on the matter? Who consults it before going about ^{setting up} ~~with~~ the new system? What Baynes conveniently overlooks is not that the apostolate was INADEQUATE—it was non-existent. From the first the organization of these meetings of Bishops is very significant: it is always the Bishops of a particular Province that come together, and they always meet in the capital of that province. That is natural enough. The Restored Church has always organized its missions corresponding to geographical and linguistic boundaries—after all, it was the Nations to which the Apostles preached; and they preached to them AS NATIONS, fully recognizing the convenience of established political boundaries and divisions. By about the middle of the third century regular meetings of Bishops were being held in each province once a year. The General Council of Nicea ~~made~~ made this practice compulsory. What was more natural than that the Bishop of the capital city to which all the other bishops had to come for the conference should be the one to make all arrangements for the meeting, housing of the Bishops etc., and be the one to send out the notices, ~~arranging~~ arranging for the exact time and place of the sessions, etc.? And what is more natural than that such functions should bestow upon him a kind of headship over the others? Upon nothing did the early Church insist more emphatically than the absolute equality of Bishops, but here was a strong historic force at work. The more important the city the more im-

portant the Bishop is a principle which was not necessary while the Church enjoyed the guidance of travelling general authorities: the early emergence of the principle is thus another witness to the silence of general authority in the Church. Had ~~there~~ been a head in the Church, that HEAD of course would have determined the importance of office and the divisions of the Church, and not left it to the purely mechanical and secular calculations of the census-taker. Church men have recognized this, and tried to deny anything but a perfect resemblance between the two systems: thus Duchesne insists that in delimiting the areas of ecclesiastical authority, the Provinces of the Church, though having the same name and the same area as the provinces of the Empire did NOT copy those provinces (!), but ~~xx~~ were identical with them by virtue of having the same cause of origin. This argument is as absurd as it is ~~xx~~ dishonest: ^(elsewhere D. says, they simply followed CIVIL boundaries) there had been plenty of historical accidents to influence the final configuration of provincial boundaries, which were by no means the result of purely physical considerations--and these historical accidents were NOT duplicated hundreds of years later in the spreading of the Church. "At the council of Nice," he observes, "the grouping of ^{CIVIL} bishops by provinces and their subordination to the bishop of the metropolis are already an accomplished fact....The provinces to which the Council refers are those of the time, those which Diocletian had formed." Formed by Diocletian, not the Apostles. There is nothing apostolic about this--but is there anything wrong with it? There is. For the inevitable hierarchy among the bishops not only wiped out the basic principle of episcopal equality, but introduced an "order of the priesthood" ~~xx~~ in which rank was assigned purely by the census-taker, and this rank inevitably and quickly was taken as a degree of HOLINESS. The bigger the city the holier its head. God does not work that way. We readily agree with Duchesne that the Bp. of Rome would of course be a top man in the Ch., but it could not be the true Church in which he would owe his primacy, as the Council of 325 made clear he did, to the preeminence of his CIT Y. Originally the ROMA SEEDS was the OLDEST, NOT the biggest, bishopric in a province. By

(55)

all accounts Jerusalem would be THE prima sedes. James the Just being always taken as the type and model of all Bishops, as well as the First Bishop; he was ordained not by two Apostles, as great cities later claimed "double apostolate," but by three—the three highest, and his city was sanctified not by the preaching and death merely of Apostles, but of the Lord Himself. The council of Nicea had to take special recognition of Jerusalem: "Since it is the prevailing custom and the ancient tradition, that the Bishop of Aelia (Jerusalem) be honored, so let his successor be in the future...while the metropolis retains its dignity intact." This is a laborious special concession—on the present principle Jerusalem has no claim, but out of respect ~~for~~ for tradition, etc. etc., Jerusalem is not called by the Scriptural name which alone proclaims its unrivalled primacy as the Holy City, and it is held in respect only by virtue of a special decree to sustain its all but vanished dignity. For Jerusalem as a city was nothing. A few years later at Antioch the principle was laid down that "the Bishop in the Metropolis (Mother City) has charge of the entire province, BECAUSE all those who have any business come together from all directions in the Metropolis; THEREFORE it was decided, that he should accordingly be afforded a superior HONOR, and that the other bishops should undertake nothing further without him." How neatly things have been reversed: once the place was important because of the office, and the office was important because of the prophet who held it. Now the office is important because of the place, and the man is important because of the office. Note that an Archbishop is more holy than others NOT because God has established such an office, but specifically BECAUSE ~~it is~~ ~~convenient~~ he happens to live in the capital where people come to do business. But if the Metropolitan was the highest Bishop in the affairs of a province, what about the relative ranks of Metropolitans? Were not some PROVINCES more important than others, just as some cities were, and should not the holy principle of size and number be consistently applied to them? It should indeed. Constantine remarked once to Eusebius that while bishops within provinces could always appeal

to their Mostropolitan for judgement when there were differences among them, there would have to be one yet higher to appeal to when the Metropolitans disagreed among themselves—and he, Constantine, was that man. But after Constantine died there was trouble in agreeing upon a head of the church, and the council of Cp. in 381 recognized reality by proclaiming FIVE dioceses "as resorts of an ecclesiastical jurisdiction superior to that of the provinces or provincial synods." (Gulte p.23). Needless to say, these were the four World Cities, plus little Jerusalem—the fifth wheel, the uncomfortable reminder of another day and another order. This hierarchy of ~~Metropolitans~~ Bishop, Metropolitan, and Patriarch was no more an invention of the Church than dioceses and provinces were: it was taken over from the civil pattern, as Baynes has shown: The metropolitans, called "patriarch," corresponds to the "vicarius" over the Imperial dioceses. The Patriarch of Alexandria had unusual power over all Egypt BECAUSE the Hellenistic administration of Egypt had always been from a single center—Alexandria—and the system had been preserved by the Romans. "The importance and precedence of a bishopric depended upon the importance and precedence within the Empire of the Bishop's city." That was the rule: the famous 3rd canon of the Council of Cp. in 381 declared that the Bishop of Cp. should stand second in honor to the Bishop of Rome "BECAUSE the city of which he is bishop is New Rome." "The rank of churches," says Baynes, "is determined by the prominence of cities as CIVIL capitals," hence the rank of the Bishop of Rome (JEA 12,147). Letters attributed to the earliest popes, though not genuine, state the principle again and again as at least binding on the Church of the 4th century. Bishops are not to be established in castellis or in smaller cities or villas, according to a decree of "Anacletus,"—such places should be managed by presbyters only, for "the name of bishop should be used as title and denomination only of an HONORABLE city." Here a BIG city is by definition an "honorable" one, and only such an one can have a Bishop. What a significant norm for apostolic holiness! The same letter notes

Baynes

John 1:2

that though "the provinces existed long before the time of Christ's advent," and are therefore of non-Christian origin, "the division was RENEWED by the apostles and by the blessed Clement, our predecessor," so they are Christian after all. Plainly our author feels there is something wrong about ecclesiastical organization following along strictly ^{civil,} heathen lines: the perfect parallel of the two led to the belief held by such respected authorities as John Chrysostom, that the Apostles actually took over and administered the CIVIL government of the whole world in their day! A fantastic picture, but how is one otherwise to account for the fact that a church government that is supposed to have been set up in its perfection by the Apostles copies all its forms from the pagans? Bishops are to appeal to patriarchs or primates, says our text, "though they are called by different names." There was considerable looseness in the nomenclature and the rank. An archbishop, we are told, is the same as a metropolitan, and he gets his title from the fact that he presides in a Metropolis, which is defined as a city in which are located ^{the} lower courts of law. The CIVIL pattern decides all these degrees of glory. Another letter attributed to Anacletus says that primates or patriarchs can only be bishops of a ~~metro~~ city which is both a metropolis and has a church dating from the earliest times. Lacking churches & HISTORIC METROPOLES, all the other big city bishops are only Archbishops or Metropolitans, "BISHOPS OF CITIES ACCORDING TO THE PRINCIPLES LAID DOWN IN THE CIVIL LAW." (PG II, 619). So archbishops are to be called primates, according to a letter attributed to Anicetus, "unless they hold primas civitates," by which is meant not the CIVIL cities to receive the gospel but the Biggest cities: "they are called patriarchs and primates BECAUSE OF THEIR PRESTIGE," this being, our letter brazenly announces "the rule of the Apostles and their successors." ~~Of~~ ~~the~~ Jerusalem was contemptuously pushed aside, it lacked one thing—size, and the holiest sees of Christendom remained the four World Cities of the time: "Evidently the importance of these respective churches due to their size and to the dignity of their cities was the chief factor in winning for them this exception-

J

al recognition." Another letter of "Anicetus" tells how Peter, James, and John the Apostles ordained the most blessed James, who was called the Just, and was even called the brother of the Lord after the manner of the flesh (it is strange that though the R C today explains this as meaning that he was a half-brother or step-brother, being the son of Joseph by an earlier marriage, NONE of the ancient sources uses any word for half-brother or step-brother in describing James, though there ^{was} ~~was~~ no shortage of such words in the ~~very~~ old languages and people were careful and specific in designating family relationships). "If three archbishops were necessary to ordain James, our writer continues, a Bishop should certainly not be ordained by less than three other Bishops, while an archbishop should be [^]ordained by even more. In view of the nature and origin of the office of Archbishop, to call Peter, James and John archbishops is a supreme declaration of bankruptcy: this very letter states that originally there was no difference among bishops, archbishops being a later development.

The principle that made the glory of a bishopric a direct function of the size and importance of its city was scrupulously observed in practice. There was, of course, an important exception to the rule that bigness and importance were the same; the capitol was the exception, as in the modern world. Socrates tells us that "many of the bishops recognized the superiority of the Bishop of Nicomedia BECAUSE Diocletian had set up the Imperial headquarters at that place." This is perfectly consistent with the statement of the Council of Antioch that the bishop of a Metropolis was more important than other bishops because the business of the province was done in his city; and of the Conc. of Ep. defining a Metropolis as a city where the provincial courts of law were located. As early as the year 42 "Antioch had dethroned Jerusalem," according to Dufourcq "Antioch appeared as the metropolis of infant Christianity; it was from there that the Apostles gradually spread the gospel throughout the world." Duchesne has discourse at length on how Milan ruled the Church as long as Milan was the Capital: it was there under the supervision of the B. of Milan that councils were

held to settle questions of priority and subordination. It was to Milan and not to Rome that the churches of the west appealed for advice and instruction in matters of organization and ritual; Milan and not Rome plays the leading role in the story of the ritual and liturgy of the western churches, and to this day celebrates Mass after a rite different from that of Rome. Why this overwhelming preponderance of Milan? "The true reason," writes Duchesne, "is that Milan was the official Imperial Residence, the capital of the Empire of the West.

.. Milan was the great centre of the Western Church only because she was the capital of the Empire." That seems to explain away an embarrassing phenomenon-- the Bp. of Milan was not the real head of the Church: he only acted as such ~~while~~ while Milan was the capital. But that raises as grave a question as it answers. If Rome were the rightful apostolic head of the Church, then the size and importance of Milan would have absolutely nothing to do with the question. Much later Rome was accepted as the head of the church no matter where the capital was or how big it was. But in the fourth century and for long after, and the church would not for a moment have taken orders from Ambrose as it did the capital city always laid claim to being the headquarters of the Church--a claim that was universally respected. Duchesne has another explanation of the embarrassing phenomenon: "many churches appealed to Milan in preference to Rome," he notes, but that was "only because Milan was nearer." A few miles of geographical proximity outweighs all the claims of Rome! What a feeble argument! Later, when everyone believed in Rome's apostolic calling, not established at that time, such a consideration would have been thought ridiculous if not blasphemous. (p. 36).

It is hardly surprising that people should look to Ambrose for leadership when even the Emperor Gratian writes to him begging him to confirm him in his imperial office. When during the Council of Sardica in 347 Julius Bp. of Rome emerges as the most important Bishop it is because Rome is again, temporarily, the capital.

"In basing its claim to precedence on its apostolic foundation," writes Pat

her Bligh, "the Roman see avoided the humiliating position of the Patriarchate of Cp, which frankly admitted that its claim to the Primacy of Honor rested on its connection with the seat of Empire." What else could CP. do? Everybody knew that it had not been founded by the Apostles, though Constantine tried to set up there the common tomb of all the Apostles. But Alexandria and Antioch based their claims to precedence on Apostolic foundation just as much and quite as rightly as Rome. When Alexandria ~~as~~ ^{topped} ~~matched~~ Rome's claim by announcing her foundation by TWO Apostles, Rome countered in 582 with the doctrine of the Double Apostolate--which led to embarrassing complications and was later dropped. But as Badcock observes, there was no mention of Apostolic succession in the orders of 528, which "maintained the customary privileges of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, the sees being in the order of their CIVIC importance, but NOT of apostolic foundation." To evidence this, Jerusalem "remained a suffragan see of Caesarea (a much LARGER City) in spite of its being the mother of all the churches." Later ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{attempts} to build up in retrospect a theoretical apostolic foundation for the Roman claim (discussed by Badcock) do not obscure the eagerness with which the Roman church describes herself as the mistress of the world by virtue of having inherited the glory of ancient Rome--papal Rome gloried in being the successor of Imperial Rome from whom she took what was peculiar and distinctive in dress, ritual and ideas of government. Nancy Lenkeith has [almost recently] treated this much-treated subject. So close were the ties between ^{Rome} Mother Church and Mother City that "if ~~xxxxxx~~ were destroyed, the physical basis of the legitimacy of BOTH popes and emperors would be lost altogether: in its power grew out of control, popes and emperors might lose their claim to the city. Hence the hostility of the populace which found itself thwarted every time it tried to do what Milan, Florence, and the others, were doing." The dependence of Religious priority and authority on the occupation of a particular piece of ^{even if that ground is Jerusalem itself} ground has no place in a ~~univrsal~~ church that is led from heaven. In the case of Rome it becomes a fanatical obsession. Chrysostom, totally at a loss for any sure and reliable principle of authority on which to refute the heretics, finally falls back on the ultimate argument: we must assume and teach, he says, that

whatever church hold possession of the holy PLACES is the true Church. True, some protest that we hold those places by force--with the aid of imperial arms--but it is unthinkable that God should allow the holy places to remain in the hands of heretics," therefore in the end this remains for Chrysostom the ONE AND ONLY sure and simple argument that can convince the world the of truth of the church to which he adheres. *It was not very long before those holy places were to fall into the hands of the Moslems.*

It was only by the authority of civil claims that it was possible to set up as a "Second Rome," holier even than the first. Had the claims of Rome been purely Apostolic, there could have been no thought of duplicating ~~it~~ ^{them} at will simply by establishing another city to resemble old Rome. The City has become the foundation of GENERAL authority in the Church, in recognition of the historic fact that now this city and now that ~~city~~ ^{is} in very truth the queen of the world, the Mother City--Metropolis. The city that ~~was~~ ^{ruled the world} could claim as a matter of course, to be the head of the Church ~~as well as the world~~, and in turn Antioch, Rome, Milan and Cp. put forth the claim and exercised the power in reality. Cp. counted for more than Rome, more than in any of the centers of the ancient Oriental monarchies" writes Jorga, "...Cp. was always a sort of Kremlin..." "By the dedication of Cp on May 17, 330," writes Alföldi, Constantine "gave his Christian organization of the state a centre free from any touch of paganism." The emblems on his coins show ~~that~~ "that the new capital is the ideal centre of Christian world-empire. On Constantine's own confession God appeared to him in a dream and ordered him to found the new residence." Cp ^{Cp mentioned by STOUT VIRA} was to be the Christian Rome, because the old Rome was too pagan! What about its Apostolic claims? If they were being made, they certainly bore no great weight. "When Cp openly became the ideal centre of the Christian Empire, Rome, the old capital, RENOUNCED BY THE EMPEROR, was ipso facto bound to be left the citadel of the old traditions," and these, Miss Leakey has demonstrated, "never died out! But Cp. became "the first city," untainted by paganism, the pure and holy capital not only of the Church but of the world.

To counter the growing power of Milan, the bishops of Rome lent their support to the rival dioceses of Reverna and Arles. In Arles intrigues were set afoot resulting in the expulsion of Hero, an excellent Bishop; in his place pope Zosimus supported one Patroclus who abused his power and lost it. ~~This sordid attempts at power~~ featuring active correspondence politics ~~only came to an end when~~ with the Gallic bishoprics in attempts to weaken their ties with rivals all came to an end with the setting up of new barbarian kingdoms in which "the court of the king became the center of ecclesiastical affairs as of all others." This, as we have seen, is no new system invented by barbarians. Rome was remarkably uninterested in the local rituals and liturgies that sprang up everywhere on the Orinatel-Milnese pattern. Even when asked for instructions, the popes showed little interest in prescribing her own form of the Mass anywhere. Nowhere does the rise of national churches appear as a threat or challenge, let alone insult, to Rome. In dealing with rival CITIES it was, as it had always been, another matter. The city that could not sleep until Carthage and Corinth, Veat, etc. were levelled to the ground was not lightly to be challenged by anyone. But as far as religion was concerned other cities had equal or better claims. Throughout the Middle Ages ^{Rome} ~~the~~ bitterly resented the existence of Jerusalem with its undeniable claim to be THE Holy City, the exact center of the earth, the supreme hierocentric point where the Cross of Redemption stood over the exact spot where Adam's skull lay buried, and where the Holy Sepulchre stood at the pivotal point not only of the earth but of the universe--the one supreme goal of every pilgrim, the place of the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord, the mount of the Lord's House and of the Sacrifice of Isaac, the home of the Apostles, etc. etc. And how Rome hated Constantinople! It is for Claudian the ALTERA Rome, the false copy of the true Rome, which it has basely forced into second place. Why does Claudian take this so to heart? Not for the sake of the Apostles, certainly, but because "he idolizes pagan Romanites and its pietas"--it is not as a Christian but as a proud citizen of the City of Rome that he boils with resentment against the new upstart, and seeks within every fibre of his being that Rome and Rome alone should rule the world--AND the Church.

~~As soon as the rank of churches is determined by the prominence of cities is~~
 When a barbarian king writes to the Ep. of Rome for help, it is not as Peter's

successor that he appeals to him, but simply as the custodian of "the laws of Rome and of Caesar." For shame! cries the pope. "You should have asked for the laws of God instead, for YOU are truly God's vicar in the kingdom by the side of his royal prophet...try to be able to rule with him in eternity, whose vicar you are in the reign that is foretold." (PG V, 1143f). The good King's ignorance of the status of Rome is no more striking than the bishops designation of the king as vicar and co-ruler with God.

As soon as "the rank of churches is determined by the prominence of cities as civil capitals," a clash between the rivals for top place is inevitable. Nothing is less surprising than Lucchesne's observation that "the bishops of the capital did not content themselves for long with being the ecclesiastical heads of a single diocese,"

Could one expect anything else of human nature?

~~There is no~~ When the episcopal seat became the highest office in the city, it became at that moment the goal of the ambitious and the unscrupulous; and when that became but a step to a higher place the rivalry and the bitterness among the top cities knew no bounds. Examples are legion. "It is not the priestly office that is to blame," write Chrysostom commenting on the culmination of the evil in his time, "but those who abuse it, as every intelligent person admits...Yet we go right on electing unqualified men...so that in our day it has reached the point where, unless God very quickly snatches us from the danger and saves us and his Church (all will be lost)...I pray tell me, where do you think all these riots come from that now fill the churches? From nothing in the world but the false teachings of those at the head, and from these haphazard and uncontrolled elections. All this corruption comes from the head: if the head is sick, of course the whole body will suffer...Some are actually filling the churches with murder, leading whole cities to riot and revolt, all because they are fighting to get themselves elected Bishops." A more disastrous lack of central control in the church could hardly be imagined (de Sacred. 215, 224). This passage gives us a

glimpse of an important phenomenon that might be documented at enormous length, that is the mass participation of the city mobs in the affairs of the church, usually centering around the person of the Bishop. Even since the destruction of the old monarchies in the great revolutions of the 8th century B.C. the Mediterranean world had been governed by men whose claims to the right to rule had to rest on trickery, force, and flattery. Tyrants were a necessary evil, democracies another. Authority rests on the will of heaven, but how was that will to be determined where the principle of royal priestly succession had been abolished for the state? The authority of the Pythian Oracle became enormous. The traveling Sophos, a great and disinterested spirit endowed with divine ~~x~~perspicacity and ever seeking knowledge, became the ultimate advisor to the nations, who humbly sought his services. But still there was nothing hard and fast to go by, and so STASIS became the chronic and fatal malady of the ancient world--a knack and tendency for taking sides and slugging it out on all issues filled all the cities of late antiquity with constant riot and disorder--some of it of a ritual nature, some of it recognized as a necessary evil, all of it disquieting to the point of driving men wild with a desire for ATARAXIA, and willing to pay any price to get it. When the Church became the world Church it did not put an end to these disorders: under the direction of church leaders stasis and faction and rioting like public oratory took a new lease on life: hardly had the Christians been in Imperial favor for the first time for more than a WEEK when ~~they were~~ Christian mobs urged on by clergy fell upon each other in the streets of all the great cities with a savagery and abandon which ~~the~~ scandalized and scared the pagans and drove the Emperor to bed with sick headaches. A ^{fierce} partisan spirit has been the breath of life to the clergy ever since.

In the time of the Apostolic Fathers we meet everywhere with "fierce, loathsome, riotous sedition," within the Christian communities. The object of their warfare is the support of rival candidates to the office of bishop. This had in 5th century been the principal cause of trouble in the Christian Church.

This is because the office of Bishop, unlike that of an Apostle or of any general authority, is an elective one. To be a bishop one must gain the support of the multitude and that multitude must shout out the opposition. For the bishops were elected after the old pagan pattern of the acclamation. ~~That~~ If the episcopal office was not originally a political one, it could not be anything else once it became the gift of popular election. One can think of nothing less "apostolic" than such a state of things, and in recent years defenders of the faith have loudly declared the monarchical and undemocratic nature of church office—but to recognize that it SHOULD be such is a far cry from proving that it has been such through the years—it has not. The burning question in the time of the Ap. Fathers was "who is in charge around here,"—and NO ONE, including the Ap. Fathers themselves, knew the answer. In their days the Churches were writing letters to each other to be read and considered and handed on; the Bp. of Smyrna writes to the Church at Philippi; the Bp. of Antioch does the same, also sending letters of advice and council to Churches at Tralles, Ephesus, Rome, Philadelphia and Magnesia—explaining that he has no right to give orders but finds himself unable to keep silence in the face of the way things are going. Irenaeus Bp. of Lyons gives Victor of Rome a severe dressing down in the Easter controversy—and Victor backs down; "the Church sojourning at Rome sends an opinion to "the Church sojourning in Corinth,"—because the latter has asked for it, but boasts that it has received Apostolic instruction by a visit from Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who came to Rome to correct some false ideas of Anacetus, the Bishop there. None of these advisors sets himself up as an authority or a superior and, what is more significant, none of them, though desperately pressed for leadership, knows of any higher authority to which he can recommend those whom he is instructing. The perfect equality of the bishops is evident enough from that; but it is also repeatedly stated as a basic principle.

In all the lively interchange of letters and ideas between the bishops of the 2nd century, Rome "naturally" has a place of prime importance, Koch notes,

but in all this correspondence "there is always expressed the consciousness of
and
the EQUALITY of all churches and bishops/when their opinion differs from that of
Rome they do not change it. It was inevitable that certain B^{is}hops should from
very early times have claimed superior ratings, and Tertullian pours withering
contempt on the one "who calls himself the bishop of bishops," and later C^{on}st^{antine}
says "we recognize no Bishop of Bishops." The Ch. of the 3rd century, says Koch,
believed that Mt.16:18 was the authority of the episcopal office, but not of any
one super-bishop. When a bishop visits another church, according to the A^{post}l.
Const., he must sit beside ~~at~~ the B^{is}hop of that C^hurch, "sharing with him the
same identical honor; and he shall be asked to address the people with words of
instruction. If he modestly refuses HE SHALL BE FORCED. This is to emphasize the
absolute equality of Bishops." The concluding speech of the great Council of
Nice was an appeal by the Emperor to the B^{is}hops to remember a thing which they
had forgotten, that "the decision of which Bishop is really superior to another
must rest with God. You must yield gracefully to each other," says Constantine,
"and so avoid all this terrible dissension." ^{Vit. III, 21} For it was nothing but fighting
among the bishops for places of superior power—a fight in which doctrinal issues
served, as all well knew, only as pretexts—that had brought on the need for the
Emperor's intervention and the calling of the Council in the first place. The
Emperor's word was not enough to stem the tide of human nature and not long after
he wrote in a general epistle words of stinging rebuke, with the refrain: "Accor-
ding to God's law, BISHOPS MUST BE EQUAL!" (Vit. III, 60)

But it was precisely because bishops were equal that the office of Bishop
could not solve the problem of leadership after the passing of the Apostles: when
equals disagree, who is to decide? Ignatius' remarkable silence on the matter of
even local councils has been noted. The idea that if one can only get enough
B^{is}hops to agree on a thing their opinion must be God's opinion became an obsession
after Nicaea: whether 80, or 250 or 381 Bishops signed a document made all the
difference in the world. Number was everything—as it would NOT have been had

the Church enjoyed the leadership of a general authority. Within a Province the archbishop's word was final; but what if provinces disagreed? Who would judge among the Metropolitans? Into this gap stepped the Emperor--reluctantly but perforce, WITH NO ONE DISSENTING. "When there were differences among the various provinces," says Eusebius, "acting as A COMMON BISHOP APPOINTED BY GOD, he (the Emperor) would summon synods of the ministers of God." God had appointed and he had also ~~but the Emperor~~ appointed a common Bishop over them all--where was he now, if the Emperor had to take his place? "He did not disdain to sit in the midst of such assemblies," Eusebius continues, "and share their deliberations being the COMMON ARBITER of their episcopal affairs...He sat in their midst as one of their ~~members~~ their number, entirely without armed retainers."

So at last the Church had a general authority. Of all the men who ever lived, only Constantine was qualified, it is Eusebius' firm conviction, to call the great general Council of Nicea--the first General Conference of the Church to be held in over 250 years--and that during a time when such a general council was desperately needed! "Quite rightly he observed once at a meeting of Bishops that he too was a Bishop. As I remember it, he said: "As you being set over the internal affairs of the Church, so I as having been set by God over its external affairs, may well be called Episcopus. And indeed he was a true Episcopus to all his subjects." Recently RC scholars, aware of the grave implications of such a statement, have attempted to give it a special interpretation, but from the preceding passages the interpretation is only too obvious. (Vit.IV,24) Shortly after, Hilary writing to fellow-bishops in Gaul uses language that completely confirms the obvious meaning of Eusebius' account: Seeing the state of things, Hilary says, like the Ap. Fathers of old, that he "cannot keep silence," "But it is necessary for me and religiously proper I believe to act AS IF I WERE A BISHOP OF BISHOPS sending out letters to all, who have written to me and asking me questions though I am most unlearned and inexperienced." But he knows of no higher head to pass the letters on to, and so like Constantine, RELUCTANTLY

OK
Salvo

tries to fill the place of a general authority that no longer exists. (PL X,479ff)

It is interesting that EC authorities, resting their whole claim on what they loudly describe as an UNBROKEN chain of authority, when confronted with no end of missing links; rotten links, rival links in the chain, blandly and piously announce that it makes no difference how broken the chain or dubious the record, since "the office always remained." Their proof ^{of the divinity of the office is} ~~that the office remained~~ is an ^{ONLY} unbroken chain; their/proof of the unbroken chain is the divinity of the office!

By the closest possible translation, Constantine says to the Bishops: "But you over the internal affairs of the Church, I over the external by God have been installed may be considered a bishop." There is no doubt that the external affairs of the Church are the proper sphere for the General Authorities. ^{App.} Every orthodox writer was fiercely conscious of the need for the unity of all Christians in the Church universal," writes Morris of the 2nd century, "however bitterly he might resist the claims of...any...given center to exercise the authority of that universal Church." All recognized that the Church should have general authorities but nobody knew for sure where to find them.

We need not repeat here the story of the fight between the great city bishops, fights for power and mastery in which nothing was barred. It was this as much as anything that disgusted honest people everywhere and sent hordes of Christians to seek refuge from Christian society in monastic isolation. "Not all Bishops are Bishops," says Jerome in defense of the monks, "Ecclesiastic dignity does NOT make a Christian." "Christ called fishermen and tentmakers and tax-collectors to this supreme authority," wrote John Chrysostom, "But the present clergy spit on those who earn their living by daily toil; whereas if someone is devoted to worldly studies, avoids hard work, etc. they receive him with open arms and admiration. Why is it that they pass right by those who have toiled and sweated all their days for the upbuilding of the church, to give all the highest church offices to somebody who has never raised a finger to do any work but wasted all his time dabbling in useless, ornamental worldly learning?" Certainly

no one can accuse Crisostom, as many have tried to accuse Tertullian, of sour grapes--for no one held a higher office in the Church than he, though it kept the object of him in an official world of constant and dangerous intrigues. The letters in PL

19, 583-8 show that in the West as in the East the Arian controversy was merely an aspect of the great struggle for episcopal priority. It is not a contest between theologians but between Bishops; and the issue is not doctrine but power. It is only proper that in every case it is the Emperor alone who is responsible for the final decision and solution, and that bishop is strongest who has the Emperor's ear. St. Basil was saddened to see the great bishops fighting fiercely among themselves: "without any cause at all the greatest of the Churches have fallen out of their ancient bonds of brotherhood." (PG 32,753). [For all of Basil's

Without cause? It is plain that the cause was not an open and admitted one, such characteristic naivete, it is plain from his remark that there was not open and as differences on points of doctrine--but nevertheless there had to be a cause, obvious cause for the rivalry among the bishops: it was not doctrine, it was a and it is not far to seek--it fairly shrieks at one in almost every episcopal cause which no bishop could afford to admit, yet which all betray in almost every letter--

letter they write: ambition and jealousy. Was the Nature of the Trinity the real issue at Nicaea? Not for a moment! "This is a very trivial ~~technical~~ technical question," the Emperor wrote, "no one understands it and it contributes nothing to the salvation of men. It may be a good thing for the experts to sharpen their wits by discussing such exquisitely refined and impractical things, but they should keep their discussions closely confined to their own company. When they get out into the public they only cause trouble, and what the experts themselves fight about because they cannot understand, can only be a double perplexity to the laymen, who moreover welcome a good pretext for taking sides and stirring up trouble. The philosophers talk on and on about such things in their endless disputations, but they at least quarrel like gentlemen and get along with each other very well for all their technical differences. But you who call yourselves ministers of God and a holy brotherhood act like spiteful and vicious children; these recondite and unsearchable matters are nothing but a pretext for venting your spite against each other." So wrote the Emperor, and the words and

(13)

behavior of the Churchmen support his charge to the fullest. "This Alexander," B. p. Eusebius of Nicodemia wrote to as many bishops as would read and subscribe his letter, "thinks the whole world depends on his nod. The nature of the God-head is for him merely a pretext to gain power—he has been working against us for years. Don't have anything to do with him: if you meet any of his supporters in the street look the other way—don't defile yourselves by wishing them a good day." In reply to such sentiments Alexander spills the beans: "The Eusebius is all ambition. When he saw an opening in Nicodemia he pulled wires until he got himself the job, though he was supposed to be Bishop of Caesarea. We have long suffered his insolent attacks and diplomatic intrigues against us in silence. This is the last straw. We anathematize anyone who has anything to do with him." The opening session of the Nicene Council saw the Emperor presiding at the burning of a mountain of letters which had been submitted to him by the clergy from all over the world during the days during which the Council was being prepared while all were waiting for the late-comers. This huge pile of documents consisted almost entirely of charges by various churchmen against each other.

~~Whereas~~ At Nicea the Emperor assigned all seats and no funny business. The precaution was a necessary one, for when the Bishops came together at later synods ~~every one insisted~~ the more ambitious ones insisted on taking higher places than the others. Basil reports the Oriental Bishops' complaints "because the Roman Bishops took exalted seats in the presence of their legates"—the Master whose example they were following was ^a ~~the~~ cosmocrator whom no one could ever accuse of being meek and lowly!

The growing arrogance of the clergy throughout the early centuries is only too well documented. The 40 years of peace between the Decian and Diocletian persecutions fostered the worst vices in the Church, vices which the brief (2 yr.) Decian persecution had only interrupted. "Not even in particular instances," writes Milman, "can we discover, during the same interval, much of any very lively Christianity." The corruption was general and universal. Again the Diocletian

persecution did not eradicate but only arrested the evil for a short time. On the eve of ~~that persecution~~ ^{that persecution}, when the Church was blossoming under imperial favor Eusebius tells how "some that appeared to be our pastors, deserting the law of piety, were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalry, hostility and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves." (VIII.1). Even during the brief pause in the midst of the Diocletian persecution the clergy showed that they had learned nothing and forgotten nothing: "

But the events that occurred in the intermediate time, besides those already related, I have thought proper to pass by; I mean particularly the circumstances of the different heads of the churches, who from being shepherd of the reasonable flocks of Christ, did not govern in a lawful and becoming manner....(There were) ambitious aspirations of MANY ~~of~~ to office...great schisms and difficulties industriously fomented by the factions among the new members, against the RELIQUANTS of the Church, devising one innovation after another. (Lib. Martyrs, xii)

But it was under the warm sun of Imperial favor that all the worst that envy and ambition could contrive came to the fore. Many a Father has commented on this phenomenon as a truism of Church history: prosperity means ruin for the Church. Less familiar to students than the arrogant claims and charges of the bishops of the 4th and 5th centuries are those OFFICIAL pronouncements of successive synods in which the bishops proclaim themselves to be above ~~the~~ all human laws and from that thesis develop corollary powers whose arrogance knows no bounds.

DIVINE AUTHORITY = Unlimited

We have seen the Apostolic Fathers casting about for a formula to fix the authority and tenure of bishops--and not finding it. They describe a complete breakdown of respect for authority in the churches, brought about by fights between factions and individuals vying for the office of bishop. All they can do is to insist ~~with~~ over and over again that obedience to the bishop and presbyters is the duty of the members, appealing to them in the name of Sophia and Good Sense to forget their squabbles. They did not forget them, and insistence on obedience to the bishop became a familiar refrain capable of many variations. The difference is that whereas the Ap. Fathers emphasized the obligations and

erect encensarius was not content with his hosts of hangers-on in the market place, his
 tribunal throne, his rhetorical affectation--such men, we gather from Cyprian and
 Tertullian were not rare exceptions. When Crigen discoursed before a number of

Bishops met for a conference in Jerusalem, the cry went up "Such a thing has
 never been heard of, that laymen should give a speech in the presence of a Bi-
 shop!" (Eus.b.VI,19). The widening gap between the ideal and the fact is plain

in Crigen's ~~enthusiastic~~ enthusiastic comparison of the Christian with the
 pagan way: "WE do not ~~accept or tolerate~~ ^{accept or tolerate} those ambitious for power, ~~forcing~~ ^{who would force} those who do not
 want to to receive the common opinion of the Church. Our good leaders are under
 the sway of the King who we believe is the Son of God, and everyone willingly does
 his share in the Church for the salvation of mankind. Thus they are ruled by
 the Word of God and thus they achieve perfect unity, wisdom, truth and justice."
 Such was the ideal--by the fourth century the Church was so afflicted by those
 vices of which Crigen declared it to be free in his day, that by the testimony of
 all the Christian writers of the time, her condition was FAR worse than that
 of the pagans! What was missing more than anything else was humility.

Nothing could have been easier or more inevitable than to apply the super-
 natural claims for the source of a bishops authority to every expression of that
 authority. The Western Romans had long drilled the world in the useful equations:
 victory= superior power, superior power= divine power, divine power= divine

authority, divine authority= divine office, divine office= divine officer; or
IR magistrate & monarch: "I & race & kings" & Tarantius ambasc. descrip. Senat
 opposition to such can only be opposition to God, blasphemy, the sum and epitome

of all that is vicious, depraved, and deserving of no other fate than extermina-
 tion. With these convenient formulas constantly before them in the symbolism
 and the standards of the Empire, it would be strange if Christian Romans did
 not extend the divine calling of the Ep! to divine power and authority in all th
 that he did. The ultimate in extravagant drawing out of this super syllogism was
 to become the reasoning, already refuted by Tertullian, that because Christ gave
 a promise to Peter the Bishop ^(an office not mentioned) of a city not mentioned holds all the power in the
 world! This is a triumph of Roman thought--of the Imperial age.

"The Bishop possesses the highest authority on earth," says the Const. Ap., "representing the type of God among men, holding the rule of all men, priests, kings, princes, fathers, sons, teachers and of all subjects alike," the proof? on earth "because to YOU he said 'what you bind ~~in heaven~~ shall be bound in heaven"etc. Who then shall judge a bishop if he does wrong: none but the Bishop himself, let him follow the admonition to "Know thyself." (II,17). What greater sin can there be than to say anything against a bishop, "through whom the Lord has given the holy spirit thru the laying on of hands; through whom you have learned the holy doctrine; through whom you know God; through whom you have believed on Him, by whom you have been sealed with the oil of exaltation and the salve of intelligence; through whom you have become sons of light; through whom you have been baptized and God has adopted you... Cherish the one who is your father next to God and reverence him." The author here lists all the spiritual functions of a bishop that he can think of, generously expanding the list with rhetorical padding. The actual functions of a bishop boil down to baptizing and the laying on of hands. But according to mod. catholic doctrine ANYONE can baptize. What does that leave the bishop? The Christians must turn over their money to the Bishop, says the same source, and NEVER question what he does with it. He is answerable to God alone. "Judge not the Ep. NOR the lay congregation." The injunction to "judge not" is seen to be confined to judgements against clergy—a very convenient specialization. The Const. Ap. makes sharp distinction between crimes deserving of crucifixion, stoning, flogging, whipping, etc., ~~between~~ crimes against kings rulers and equals, and finally the worst of all, crimes against God, priest and Temple. "It is not allowed to oppose either a king or a priest..He who affronts kings is worthy of punishment, ~~indeed it is~~ even though it be a son or a friend; ~~HOW OF HOW MUCH GREATER PUNISHMENT~~ is he deserving who affronts priests?" If sedition in the state is bad, how much worse sedition in the church? This "How-much-more" device is a well-worn and sure-fire rhetorical trick by which any

merit or offense can be magnified or minimized by any desired degree. It is a favorite implement for exalting the priesthood and the teaching profession. If one loves ones physical parents, HOW MUCH MORE should one love one's spiritual parents? If it is a crime to abuse one's father, how much greater a crime to affront one's heavenly father, etc. etc. It is effective even when used in utterly meaningless contexts: If one should be praised for singing, how much more should one be praised for dancing? If bank-robbery is reprehensible, how much more reprehensible should ice-skating be? Declarations attributed to early bishops of Rome to strengthen~~ed~~ the hand of the pope all follow the same pattern. "Bishops are to be judged by God, not by men." They are above all human law. "Laymen are not to be heard if they bring charges against Bishops," The Bishop has the deacons to act as his eyes and ears, spying out any cases of defection or seditious talk against him—they are his personal agents to keep an eye on his personal enemies. "No bishop may be refuted or accused of anything by the people or by vulgar persons." "Anyone who says a word against a bishop, the Eyes of God, is guilty of the crime of lese-majesty...Those who accuse Bishops are slain not by human but by divine agency." "There is no worse crime than to bring a charge against a priest. The priest may be guilty, but even so, he must be left entirely to the judgment of God. For if all crimes are to be punished in this world, there will be nothing left for the exercise of divine judgment!" This shocking bit of sophistry, it will be noted, ~~ix~~ guarantees the immunity of priests ~~CHURCH~~—to others it does not apply. "All charges ~~against~~ against a bishop should be kept secret and referred to the same bishop. No matter what his final decision is, the business should go no further." Even the basic rule, nemo de se ipso iudicet is abrogated in the need for endowing the Ep. with divine authority. "The Bishops who with their own mouths confess the body of the Lord are to be heard, obeyed, and feared by all." "The populace is to be taught and dominated by the Ep., not he by it." "It is equally wicked to speak against a Ep. or to allow another to do so...It is not only against divine laws but a first human, which also prohibit a

master." "The populace shall not reprehend its pastor. Bishops are to be judge only by God, who has chosen them as his eyes." (PG V,1121) At this point the text regrets to report that "the church is full of contentions and aemulationes and that the servants of God who are to judge the world are full of evil. Anyone who kills his wife, a letter of Pious I avers, and does so entirely without reason must do public penance; but if he is disobedient towards a Bishop, let him be anathemized. "The King received his title of Rex not from regno, "rule," says the haughty Eleutherius to one "Lucius King of Britain,"but from regendo--to be ruled," namely by the clergy. "Priesthood is to be more held in awe today than in the days of the Ancient Law," says Chrysostom, "our power and dignity is simply overwhelming," it is a power so great that there is danger in possessing it, it is such a power as can only be exercised by wise men." Wisely John ~~replies~~ pleads for an awakening sense of responsibility among the priesthood, and to ensure its proper exercise he recommends--thorough training in oratory and dialectic! "The ministers of holy things must be just & pure as if he were acting amidst such powers and standing in heaven itself." The ~~boundless~~ claims to possession of boundless power, glory, and sanctity which John puts forth are gladly accepted by the priests of all ages: the accompanying responsibility is rejected out of hand by arguments of simple sophistry.

"I am called a tyrant and worse than a tyrant," says Ambrose, who ruled the church with a power never exercised by any Roman bishop of his century, but he will not tolerate criticism from the Emperor: "When did you ever hear, most gentle emperor, of laymen passing judgment on a Bishop in a causa fidei? ..If a Bishop is to be taught by a layman, what will be the end of it? Let the layman dispute and the bishop listen--a Bishop taught by a LAYMAN!!!" "Who would not deny that in matters of the faith bishops should be judged by emperors, and not emperors by bishops? Your father, an older man than you, said, "It is not for me to judge among bishops," but YOU say: "I must judge." People say "Ambrose wants to have more power than the emperor..." They must have had a reason (PL 16,1046, 1059).

"The Emperor," Ambrose insists, "is IN the church, NOT OVER the Church," who is?

Accordingly, "the monarch was seated below the rails of the sanctuary, and con-
founded with the rest of the faithful multitude," ~~xxx~~ in the Church, while Ambrose^o
sat on the throne. It had been just the opposite under Constantine, where all
the bishops of united Christendom ~~xxxxx~~ were pleased to remain standing until the
Emperor, himself sitting, nodded for them to be seated. This is a personal cam-
paign undertaken by Ambrose—who admits that it has all tongues wagging. [At the
very same time, for example, the African bishops insisted that Macarius, the Em-
peror's military prefect be allowed to sit in church ^{apart} apart from the multitude and
on a level with the bishop.] Speaking of the trial and deposition of Lapsed Bishops
Cyprian writes: "This is a supreme sacrilege. God reserves the right to judge
His own, yet you insist on rushing in everywhere into things that are not your
business, spoiling all pleasure. For what greater ruin of pleasure could there
be for priests of God than to live as less than they were?" Even if it is their
fault, their office should now put them above all examination. It is a priest
speaking. Of the great massacres of Donatists he writes: "We are not responsible
for the way the military broke up the Donatists...urging all to unity...True, it
was " armed with special letters from the bishops that the commander Taurinus
carried out great slaughter, but what do you want against a lot of fanatics?
THEY HAD ACTUALLY MADE THE ROADS WIDE FOR BISHOPS' CARRIAGES." To the Emperor
Lucifer writes: "What power have you, a profane person, over the priestly authori-
ty of the Highest God. (again the convenient identification of the ~~POWER~~ of the
power with its extent—as if a God It., being commission by the Pres. of the US,
could thereby claim all the powers of the president). Now can you dare to say
that you can pass judgment on bishops, by disrobing whom YOU incur the death
penalty as having insulted God himself?" Who are you, cries Lucifer, to usurp
this authority; which God did not give you. And even if he did give it, it was
only on condition that you belong to the right church." (II 13, C21f) In the
rivalry between civil and Eccl. power the priests are the only proper judges--
are they not appointed by GOD? And they award the crown to themselves—are they

Calvin

not appointed by GOD? And any who withhold complete, unquestioning and absolute submission are Antichrist—for are they not appointed by GOD? But who says they are appointed by God? Who else has the right to say it but they themselves—for are they not appointed by GOD? The circular argument is the essence of sectarian authority. "How could any man who writes against the Christians do anything but lie?" says ~~Enoch~~ ^{Enoch}—an argument that had been employed long before by Cicero, an argument to which there is but one answer—"if I bear witness of myself by witness is not true. "Prove that you have been made judge over us, however necessary such a judge may be (FL 13,826)...You cannot prove not only that you have the right to rule bishops, but you cannot prove that bishops are not supposed to rule YOU, MAY, and that if you obey them you are not thereby judged worthy of death!"

As might be expected, the same charges were brought against Lucifer as against Ambrose: "Why do you call me arrogant," he asks, "why do you call me proud, contumelious? Did not the ancient prophets denounce wickedness?" In the end his authority is the OT, but anyone can use that. Lucifer keeps asking: "if the ancient prophets and patriarchs could speak and act thus freely, why should not we?" The answer is easy: THEY were prophets and patriarchs, the kind that God chooses when he will, and they are rare indeed; but priests appear in every age and robes and in order—a totally different type of being, falling back for the justification of all their plans and ambitions on their own private interpretations of the Scr.—and they categorically forbid others to interpret without their aid. Lucifer, for example, loves to compare himself with the Apostles—though he was no more able to pass the test than were the priests of Rome whom Tertullian denounced. Ambrose calls Lucifer the most inspired voice of his time, and Optatus was for the Oxford Movement the most authoritative statement of the claims of the priesthood. Down thru the centuries bishops continued to lecture Emperor on authority. The patriarch, says the pious Constantine Porphyrogenitus to his son, "is an Emperor (basileus), who must provide peace and prosperity just like the emperor himself." When bishops insisted on ordaining clerics to dioceses other

other than their own, as if they were general authorities, they were soundly rebuked: "Who hath enjoined ~~this~~ this upon them, or from what Scripture have they been taught this?" To which they might have rejoined, "from what Scripture do we learn of Metropolitans and Archbishops? Who has enjoined them upon the Church?" Once Raoul, Abp. of Canterbury, having begun mass, and perceiving the king seated on his throne with the crown on his head, quitted the altar and advanced to demand from him who had the crown on his head, which he afterwards MADE him take off; but the barons by their exertions compelled him to replace it." It was a rare archbishop who was satisfied with spiritual supremacy alone

The aspirations of bishops to temporal power can be clearly traced thru the synods they held from time to time. The Council of Carthage in 305 had to decide what should be done about those Bishops who had been traditores during the persecutions. President of the Council was Ep. Secundus of Tigisium "BECAUSE HE WAS THE OLDEST of the 11 Bishops present." All the Bishops confessed to having give up their copies of the Scr. when Diocletian's agents asked for them, each excusing himself on one ground or another. When Ep. Purpurius of Linata ^{pointedly} asked Secundus: "What did YOU do when the curator asked for your books?" the good Bishop turned to the assembly for advice. It was proposed thereupon that "every man judge himself and decide for himself alone whether he was a traditor or not, settling the whole matter privately between himself and God." ~~To~~ this convenient solution ~~agreed upon~~ was passed unanimously with cries of Deo Gratias. In 314 the Conc. of Arles passed a rule that "NO bishop should annoy another bishop," this followed hard upon the Conc. of Ancyra, held in 314 to heal the troubles attendant upon the persecutions—especially the problem of the lapsi—decreed that Episcopoi might not ordain presbyters and deacons nor city presbyters without permission of the Ep. of the metropolitan in writing. Church property ~~held~~ during an episcopal vacancy must be sold back again if the Ep. demands it. Bps. not accepted by the parochias to which they have been ordained will be cut off if they try to push out another Ep. either in their old parochia or in some other

by stirring up trouble, etc.

Neocaesarea 314-325. Can. 14. The Chorepiskopoi are the type of the 70; but in view of the good work they do for the poor, they may have the honor of administering the sacrament.

Nicea 325. Can.4: A Bp. must be installed by all the B's. of his province; if ~~th~~ that is not possible by at least 3 Bps., with written permission from all the others, in every case under the supervision of the Metropolitan of the Eparchy.

Can.5. A person excluded from a church by the personal rancor of the Bp. may appeal his case before a provincial synod to be held in every prov. for this specific purpose twice a yr., at Easter & in Autumn. Can. 15 Because of great disorder and rioting it will be necessary to ABOLISH the old custom of allowing a Bishop, priest or deacon to move from one city to another. If any presumes to do this, he shall be sent back to the city in which he was ordained.

Can.16. Priests, deacons or others living under the canon who frivolously and irresponsibly leave their Churches will be forced to return to them by all possible means. If they refuse to return they shall be deposed. If anyone ~~w~~ steals a cleric against a Bishop's will and ordains him to serve in his own Church, the ordination shall be void.

341: In Encaenias, Can.3: A Fr. or deacon who moves permanently to another place & ignores his Bp's appeals to return, must lose the right to all office; if he goes to work for another Bp. he must be punished to the bargain for breaking Church law.

Can.9. Bp. in every provl must understand that the Bp. in the Metropole has charge of the whole province, BECAUSE all who have business to transact come from all directions to the Metropolis...

Can. 11. Any Bp., priest or any churchman at all who dares to go to the Emperor without a letter from his Metropolitan shall be ejected utterly; not only from his church but from his priesthood...If he must go to the Emperor it must be with the OK of the Metropolitan of the Eparchie or the Bps. of the same, and he must bear letters from them.

Can. 16. When a Bp. seizes a vacant seat without OK of a full synod, he must be deposed, even though the people have elected him.

Can. 18 A Bp. who cannot take over a Ch. because the congregation will not have him must remain in honor & office, but may NOT meddle in the affairs of the Ch. where he is forced to remain.

Can. 21. No matter what happens, a Bp. must remain forever in the Ch. to which God has chosen him.

Sardika 347, Can. 1. Notes that no Bp. ever moves from a larger to a smaller

but only in the other direction, ambition and domination being ~~satisfied~~ measured always and only by the SIZE of a city.

Can. 2. If it can be proven that a man has bribed parties to stir up a clamor for him as Bp., "so as to make ~~him~~ it seem that the people are actually asking him to be their bishop," he shall be excommunicated.

Can. 6. It is not permitted to ordain a Bp. ~~for~~ for a SMALL place. It MUST be Populosa...quae mereatur habere episcopum.

Spain 517, Can. 21. The ordination of Deaconesses shall be abolished throughout the Empire

Lyons 517, Can. 3. If the King acts against us, all Bps. will withdraw to monasteries, & no Bp. shall stir out again until the King has given peace to ea. and all Bps. alike.

~~Lyons~~ Orleans 541, Can. 3. Nobles may not celebrate Easter at their own oratories ~~with their own clergy~~ but MUST come to the episcopal city for the Vr. rites.

Can. 20 NO layman may arrest, question, or punish a cleric without CM of Ch. When a cleric appears in court, it must be with CM of his Bp., and NO sentence may be passed without the presence of his spiritual superior.

Can. 22. Descendants of Church slaves who have found their way back to the original place of their ancestors must be brought back to the Ch. slavery, no matter how long or for how many generations they have been free.

Paris 557, Can. 1. No one may hold Ch. property with changing political dominations. No one can claim that Ch. property ever passes under another ruler, "since the dominion of God knows no geographical boundaries. No one may claim that he holds as a gift from the King property that once belonged to the Ch. All property given by King Clodwig of blessed memory and handed down as inheritance must now be given back to the Church.

Tours 567, Can. 14 All priests and monks must sleep in dormitories. Two or three men must remain constantly awake, spelling each other by turns.

Can. 15. Whoever enters a monastery may never leave it to marry. If he does, any judge who refuses to excommunicate him will be himself excommunicated. Any one who defends a monk guilty of such defilement will be excomm'd until the monk returns to his monastery.

Nacon 565, Can. 15. Whenever a layman meets a higher cleric he must bow to him. If both are mounted, the layman must remove his hat. If the layman alone is mounted, he must dismount to greet the cleric.

Luxerre 575, Can. 44. A layman who disregards the admonition of an Archbishop must be shut out of the church and punished by in accordance with royal decrees. Can. 45. Anyone who is lax in observing this rule, or does not report infraction of it to the Bp., is excluded from Htn. communion for one year.

Toledo 589, Can. 28. Many Bishops burden their clerics with intolerable compulsory services and contributions. Clerics thus cruelly oppressed may complain to the Metropolitan.

Can. 29 Judges and secular officials who assign slaves of the Church and the Clergy to public or private tasks will be excomm'd.

Harbonne 589, Can.1. No cleric may wear purple, which is for princes and not becoming in churchmen.

Can.13. Subdeacons must hold curtains and doors open for superior clergy. If they refuse to do so they must pay a fine; lower clergy who refuse must be beaten.

614 Paris, Can.9. Any state official who touches Ch. property or the property of a Bp. after his death is cut off from communion as an assassin of the poor.

Can.14. Whoever deserts a monastery is excommunicated to the end of his life.

Rheims 624-5, Can. 13. No one, not even a Bp., may ever sell the property or slaves of the Ch. (The Ch. can gain property; it can never lose it.)

Toledo 633, Can.52. Religious persons who are neither clerics nor monks must be taken before the B. of any area in which they are found at large, given correction, and enrolled in the clergy or assigned to a monastery.

Can.67. Bps. may not free slaves of the Ch. unless they reimburse the Ch. out of their private fortunes; and the Bps. successor can reclaim any thus freed.

Can.68. A Bp. who frees a slave of the Ch. without reserving the patronage for the Ch. must give the Ch. 2 slaves in his place. If the person freed makes ANY complaint about the way he was treated while he was a slave he must again become a Church slave.

638 Toledo Can.3. Thank God for the edict of K. Chintila banishing all Jews from Spain, with the order that "only Catholics may live in the land...Resolved that any fut. King bef. mounting the throne should swear an oath "not to tolerate the Jewish Unglauben...If he breaks this oath, let him be Anathema and Marathana bef. God and food for the eternal fire."

646 Toledo, Can. 5. Entirely abolishes the Vagi.

656 " Can.6. Children over 10 may dedicate themselves to the relig. life without consulting their parents. When smaller children are tonsured or given the religious garment, unless their parents lodge IMMEDIATE protest, they are bound to the religious discipline for life.

Merita 666, Can.15. It OFTEN happens that priests who fall sick blame church slaves for their condition and torture them out of revenge. This must cease.

Can.16. Bishops must stop taking more than their THIRD. They must not take from the Church's third for their private use.

Toledo 694, Can.5. Jews must be denied all religious practice. Their children must be taken from them at 7 years and must marry Christians.

Berghempstead 697, Can.26-28. ALL unattached persons are to be treated as thieves. All thieves may be killed (by the King) or sold over the sea.

Rome 743, Can.3. Clerics may never wear worldly clothing.

Boniface, 745, Statute 12. Pasquille (jokes about the authorities) must be severely punished, even with exile.

Faderborn 746, Can. 21. Anyone engaging in pagan rites must pay a heavy fine. If he cannot pay, no matter what his station, he becomes a slave of the Church until he has paid up.

Can.23. Soothsayers and fortune-tellers shall be given to churches and priests as slaves.

Faderborn 748. Can.34. No public assemblies of the Saxon permitted without special royal permission. The Priests shall keep watch that this is carried out.

Aachen 789, Can.77. False writing such as those claimed last year to have fallen from Heaven, must not be read, but must be burnt.

Clermont, 1095, Can.1. Monks, clerics, women & their escorts shall enjoy the peace of God every day. Others may be attacked without breaking the peace Mon. thru Wed. Later full immunity ~~for~~ for farmers and merchants to be effective 3 yrs. "because of the present food shortage."

Lateran V, 1215, Can.3. All condemned heretics MUST be turned over to the secular authorities for punishment...their property must be confiscated by the Ch. Those who have not been able to clear themselves of charges of heresy are excomm'd and must be avoided by all. If they remain a yr. under the ban, they must be condemned as heretics. All civil officers MUST take a public oath to defend the faith and expell from their territories all heretics. Whoever when ordered to do so by the CHURCH does not purify his district or domain of heretics will be put under the ban. If he does not give satisfaction within a year, he must be reported to the ~~Roman~~ Pope, who will absolve his vassals from all duty to him and declare his lands open to legitimate conquest by Catholics; those who participate in the attack will receive the same privileges as regular Crusaders. All who help, protect or believe heretics are excommunicated and if they do not give satisfaction within a year will lose all legal rights (a horrible list follows): all who associate with them will suffer the same. Anyone who preaches without the CH of a Bp. is excommunicated...A Bp. MUST inspect his diocese. His officers are authorized to have all inhabitants swear ~~xxx~~ an oath to expose to the Bp. all sectarians that can be discovered...Any who refuse to take the oath automatically makes himself a traitor. Also any Bishop who is lax in these things is to be deposed.

hand. d. conspiracy on civil liberty, 2, 1 watched; 2, 1 trusted; all 2 join in a union red-hunt; guilt by assn & guilt by silence to R. & d. R clergy, teachers & forbids. In all this the tendency is clear, and in our day familiar. The mission of the Pope is to control

ries in central and Northern Europe appear as the advance guard of an army of occupation. The clergy asserts complete control of civil government, private life and family. The third canon of the conc. of the Lateran is pure McCarthyism

without the crippling 5th amendment that McC. finds so frustrating. There is the guilt by association which makes all non-conformity equally criminal. If

the clergy was increasingly presumptuous and tyrannous, the clergy itself became more and more the victim of its own paralyzing limitations. No one trusts

there is no release in being a clergyman—all are being watched. any one any more. As in the Empire all things were solved by absolute subservi-

ence to one man, so in the Church—with the paradoxical result that that one

man in whom all the power and authority on earth resided was the most pitiful and insecure object imaginable. *figure of all! not fate & R. Emps. in 6 titles pontiff & Def.*

man is owned & ruled by those who mankind 4 or 2 are not trapped - 1 can be a trembling rabbit. the pathological fear of conformity are the fruits of 2 thousand years of Pagan & Xth. R.

rope refusing to be tamed by the civilizing offices of the Church. The Church itself was the mother and teacher of barbarism. The passion to possess and control, the insane jealousy of all that lies beyond its complete domination, is the hallmark of the great Khans of Asia who were the contemporaries of Innoc. III and the very essence of barbarism. One sees what Coudenhove Callergi, the leader of the RC intellectuals of the Continent between the two World Wars, meant in his repeated declaration that "Fascism is Catholicism in action."

Council 3, Civil Power

Against any clergyman if asked where the ultimate authority of the Christian Church resides will say in the universal COUNCILS of the Church. In 782 the Council of Seville condemned Vigetius for the absurd doctrine "that only in Rome is divine power exercised, that only the Roman Church is the Catholic Church, that everything is holy and spotless at Rome and that the words "Thou art Peter, etc." apply only to the Roman Church instead of to the whole Church." To show the ~~low~~ place of the Bp. of Rome, the council recalls that Pope Liberius was condemned for heresy. In calling the first oecumenical council, the Emperor was aware, says Eusebius, that "it is not possible to reach correct decisions in important matters except in synods." "We should not judge each other as individual," says Basil, "but only in general assemblies of large numbers of Bps." A really Catholic church with a single direction "is impossible," Const. writes in his summons to Nicaea, "unless all or at least the greater part of the Bps. meet together." And he states more than once the principle, "Whatever is done in the holy synods of the Bishops has the force of the divine will itself."

"The Church teaches and is infallible," writes the everyconfident Ratiffol, "This teaching office, which belonged to the Apostles, passed to the BISHOPS WHEN IN THEIR TOTALITY OR ASSEMBLED IN UNIVERSAL COUNCIL. Its object is the continuation of the revelation or DEPOSIT of the faith and has to do with things necessary for the conservation of the deposit of the faith." And yet there was no universal meeting of Bishops--the sole expression of apostolic instruction--for almost 300 years after the Aps. when the Emperor, ^{not the} entirely on his own as the

*Seville
Council 3
782*

Cetera

rity commanded ~~wildly~~ wildly disageering bishops to come together in his presence where under his eye and with his constant threats and proddings they brought forth that Credo which is now accepted as the official statement of the Christian faith! And is it not strange that Ignatius knows of no councils of Bps. at all—even local ones. And that as soon as we find the Bishops meeting those meetings are careful imitations NOT of the Apostles but of the Roman Senate. Batiffol himself was one of the first to point ~~out~~ this out, though it is extremely obvious from the minutes of the meetings. Batiffol notes first of all that the name Synod or Concilium as used in Clem. Alex. are NOT religious terms. In the time of Augustine bishops were convoked by ^{whichever} ~~that~~ bishop in the province had held that office for the longest time: HE, regardless of his city, was the PRIMAUS. The expression for calling a synod, cogere concilium was taken from the Roman cogere senatum; to hold a council (concilium habere) from Roman senatum habere. The opening words of the Conc. of Carthage in 256 are "an imitation of the protocol of the proces-verbaux of the sessions of the Roman Senate." Even more significant, the meetings of the Councils remained PUBLIC at all times, though only Bps. were allowed actually to participate. Contrast this with the secrecy of the meetings of the Lord with his Apostles, of the Apostles among themselves and of the earliest Christians, ^{which} is perhaps the best-known aspect of "apostolic" assemblies. Their preliminary reading of a case in the Council was called a RELATIO, exactly as in the Roman Senate; the discussion was VERBA PROFERRE, the final motion the SENTENTIA, exactly as in the Senate. Voting was by DISCESSIO, standing on one side or the other of the hall. "Whether in Carthage in 256 or in 312," Batiffol concludes, "or in Rome in 312, one could not conceive of an assembly deliberating in any other form than that consecrated by the usage of the Senate." "Consecrated" is a good word. Certainly that there was of order and discipline in the meetings was the inherited gravity and dignity of ^{pagan} Rome: as Christians the Bps. screamed and spat at each other, and most of the great councils were scenes of wild disorder.

Hefele's discussion on the nature of Church Councils at the beginning of 11

"standard work" on the subject should suffice to show the qualifications of synods as depositories of Apostolic authority. Having noted that Acts 15 gives us without doubt the origin of councils, Hefele continues, "but the theologians are not in agreement as to whether the Councils were established by divine or human authority." Then and there Hefele settles the question as to whether Councils are Apostolic or not—if they were Apostolic there could be no possible doubt on the head of their divine origin, yet where all the historic Church councils are concerned that is a subject of grave controversy. What was done by Apostles under the influence of the Holy Spirit, Hefele himself observes, must necessarily have been according to earlier instructions of the Lord. Thereby he shows his entire miscomprehension of what Apostolic authority is: why EARLIER instructions? Were not the Apostles in a position to receive instructions from the Lord at ANY time? Not by Bishop Hefele's reckoning. As the strongest proof of the divine nature of Councils Hefele cites Cyprian's description of the Conc. of Carthage in 252: placuit nobis, sancto Spiritu suggerente—"we decided, at the suggestion of the Holy Spirit." But this is the sort of vague and general rhetoric that flowed naturally from the mouths of Bishops and schoolmen; and certainly the "suggestion" of the Holy Spirit is anything but a specific claim to literal guidance by revelation—a claim which cannot well be made while Christian churches all deny continued revelation. Then he cites Constantine's claim that the Council of Arles was a "caeleste iudicium," but the Emperor, desperately hunting for a principle of authority to which to hold his unruly bishops, says that it was a "celestial court," because "the judgement of priests must ALWAYS be considered such," i.e. a Council AS SUCH is divinely inspired only in the sense that any priest is divinely led. Of his own Nicene Council the Emperor says, "what 300 holy bishops accept, is not to be interpreted as anything else but the opinion of the only Son of God." The Emperor here appeals to the argument of numbers: again, it is not the Synod that is holy as such, but the SIZE of the thing that gives it authority. Cicero had used the very same argument to

Ph
Ep. Tertul

V. M. M.

proved the divinity of senatorial decrees. In the third century we read of "councils held by the Greeks in certain places, meetings of all the churches in which were discussed the more important common problems and a representation of the whole Christian society (name) was celebrated with great veneration." Yet as late as 220 councils were still unknown in Africa, and Tertullian in the above passage refers to the Greek custom as a peculiar thing in the church. Later attempts are made to describe councils being held by Bishops in the days of the Apostles. It is not inconceivable that quarterly conferences were held in the primitive as in the restored Church, but nothing is more certain that such conferences were NOT the origin of the episcopal synods of ~~historical times~~ conventional Church history. These are an attempt to fill a gap: "It is not possible to settle controversies on matters of major import except thru Synods." "Whatever is done in the holy synods of the Bys. must be attributed to the divine will." "For whatever such a large NUMBER of Bishops agrees on must be taken as arrived at not automatically but by God's suggestion" (lit. at a nod from God.) The expression "at a nod from God," bears a popular device to "prove" divine authority—it was an old trick of the orators to give superhuman power to the Emperor—a non-committal sort of thing, but full of implications. Thus Leo describes the beating of a rival in a riot: "Flavian though he stirred up a tumult was effected by the churches at a nod from God." The full and vivid minutes of the synod of Carthage in 411 A.D. show it to be just as plainly a copy of the local civil committee as the general Council was of the Senate, Marcellinus, vir clarissimus tribunarius et notarius, presiding. Though the accounts of the Nicene and other great councils are often full and pious, no ritual detail being omitted, it is significant that we never read of any of the councils being either opened or closed with prayer. And it was not until the 12th century that any Oecumenical council was held in a Church! The meeting was always in a palace or other government building. That was strictly in order, since, to quote Duchesne,

It may seem strange that an institution so clearly designated as the highest depository of divine authority in the church should stand from the first completely under the command of the Emperor. That is true not only of the Oecumenical councils until the 12th century, but of important local councils as well. Thus Hefele points out that the Council of Arles 314, was "angeordnet" by Constantine the Great, the Oecumenical Council of Ep. in 381 by Theodosius, the Synod of Orleans by King Gildibert, the Synod of Frankfort by Charlemagne in 794; "and even a number of Oecumenical Synods were held in Rome under the direction of Theoderich the Great, who was an Arian. He is careful not to mention Nicaea, at which the role of the Emperor is fully described--for to admit the unchallenged power of secular rulers in the matter of councils is to rob the Christian Church of its one claim to Apostolic direction. In the letter he sent to all those not present at Nicaea, Constantine gives the official account:

Having by grace of God assumed responsibility for the common peace of the Empire, I considered my foremost duty to be to devise means of guaranteeing peace and love to the most blessed multitudes (plethē) of the universal Church...But since it was not possible to establish a firm and reliable order except by having all or at least the greater part of the Bishops come together at a single place...I myself, having brought you together, and sitting in your midst as one of your number (for I do not deny, but rather rejoice, to have become a fellow-servant with you) I resolved that the whole thing should be discussed until a common agreement was reached, so that not the slightest possible point of disagreement should remain to cause future difficulties.

This was not a case of the Emperor making use of a going concern. Contemporaries all marvel at the originality and ingenuity of his idea: the first general council of the Church since the days of the Apostles! "No mortal man could discover a remedy to the ill," writes Eusebius, "the resources of the contestants being equally matched (III,5). "Almighty God alone could cure this too with ease and in all the world but one man, Constantine alone, appeared fitting to be His agent in this. Who, when He had considered the whole cause...HE GAVE bestirred HIS OWN mind, and concluded that it would be necessary to make war on the adversary who disturbed the peace of the Church." Constantine himself, however, leaves us in no doubt as to where he got the idea: we learn that he had just removed to

last enemies to civil peace by bringing the Senate together at Rome to acclaim his policies and support his one rule of the world. There, but a few weeks before a great and magnificent triumph had been held over the enemy of the human race, enormous canvases had been hoisted in the Capitol showing Constantine treading upon the serpent, the evil one, his bitter political and military rival, the Christian ~~Licinius~~ Licinius. Just as he had triumph over the enemy of peace within the state the Emperor announces in speeches and letters, so now he would triumph over the enemy of peace in the church—that unrest which had thrown the Empire into civil turmoil from end to end. And he would do it the same way: by issuing his orders, calling his solemn assembly, announcing his will, and sealing all with a solemn and magnificent triumph to celebrate the establishment of the heavenly rule upon earth. The Council of Nicea simply repeated a few weeks later the senatorial sessions that had been held in Rome. The identical forms and rituals were observed. The great central room of the palace was the place. Benches were placed in order filling up the space on either side of the hall. All invited were admitted by ticket, and each took an assigned seat. When all the synod was seated and in decent order, the whole body sat in a dead silence, in expectation of the EMPEROR'S entrance. This was dramatically staged: first came one of the Emperor's attendants, then another, and then a third. Still more high officials filed in, not the usual hoplites and spearmen, but only trusted friends of the Emperor. Then at a given signal announcing HIS approach, all arose to their feet, and at length HE appeared, "like unto some heavenly angel of God, wrapped as it were in brilliant light as he cast about him the luster of pearls, clearing in the flash of his brilliant scarlet robe, and adorned with the sparkle and glitter of gold and precious stones." At last a substitute had been found for the glories of Pentecost and the burning bush: Hollywood can do ANYTHING! In his opening speech the Emperor left no one in any doubt as to why he had called the meeting and what he expected of it: an end to Christian rioting—he was out to get a signed agreement that would bring unity into the Church forever

(93)

more. He attended the key discussions with great interest, and one thing only interested him—getting an agreement. ~~This~~ actual doctrinal issues at stake, he said again and again, neither interested him or concerned him, and ⁱⁿ the closing speech of the mighty Council he recommended to all a word which he had been persuaded to adopt in committee as the solution to all problems, the HOMOGENEITY, while frankly ~~xxx~~ admitting that he had not the vaguest idea what it meant. But he did get his universal agreement: only 17 bishops refused to sign the final formula—and he made it so hot for them that all but two ^{quickly} changed their minds: the two were banished. How was it possible to arrive at this marvellous consensus in so short a time? This heavenly unity was forever after put forward as sure proof that the Holy Ghost had ruled the decisions of the first and greatest of the Councils. Yet all our sources describe the workings of a far more tangible persuasion among the holy bishops. As soon as the Emperor saw a majority favoring one side or the other of an issue, he would instantly throw his weight behind that side, "praising those who spoke in its favor or turning with withering frowns or even sharp rebukes towards those who spoke against it, "in this way the most God-beloved Emperor gently prodded the Bishops into this or that decision, until in a marvellously short time there was hardly a dissenting voice in the house. ^{He} Constantine knew his human nature, and declared in the closing oration that "real friends of truth are few and hard to find: what nearly everybody is interested in is a career." So he found no trouble in "prescribing to the Bishops those things which would be of the greatest benefit to their Churches." It was indeed a rare soul who held out for principles, and while Constantine frankly admired the courage and independence of Bishop Acesis who had refused to answer his summons to Nicaea (Soz.I,xvii), and was far easier on him than he was on many a toady who "rushed to the capital eager to see the sights and see the Emperor," he explained the difficulty of his position in a private conversation with Acesis, in which the monarch pointed out that there was no percentage in trying to climb all alone up his own little ladder to heaven. The Emperor was

perfectly sincere in his gospel of bigness and power, but to the true saint as to the true philosopher it has a cynical and despairing undertone. Yet in a frank and revealing study, Father Bligh, S.J. has declared flatly for the Emperor: whatever brings the greatest NUMBER of people under Christian influence is to be regarded as a blessing, no matter how it may corrupt and contaminate that influence. "The title of ICARH OCTOLOC (equal to the Apostles!) given to Constantine by the Eastern Church was not altogether undeserved, if one considers only the extent of his influence upon the expansion of Christianity." What else IS there to consider, if we grant Father Bligh his thesis that the importance of numbers outweighs all other considerations? Constantine actually did "convert" far more people than the Apostles did, for Father Bligh and his Church are quite content with that kind of conversion. There was some protest against the deifying of the Emperor and the glorifying of the Victory of the Pons Milvius at the time, but it was forgotten, and ever since then the Christian Church looked back on the fourth century as the Golden Age which ~~xxx~~ remained the ideal of the Middle Ages and for churchmen the perfect model of the heavenly order on earth. The argument of numbers is actually only the argument of force—and that is where the Emperor comes in. How frank is Pope Liberius when he writes to the Macedonians that since "the opinion of such a LARGE NUMBER of Bishops (as at Nicaea) can ~~not~~ be regarded as anything but God's doing,"...let us reason with them (the Arian opposition) by persuasion, or, to speak bluntly, with worldly force." The bishops have never been able to carry out their leadership for any length of time without the immediate and powerful support of the secular arm. "Except ~~not~~ for thy mighty arm," wrote Leo to ^{St. Leo, Rome} ~~Leo~~ Pepin, "we have no other support save God alone," and plainly God alone is not enough, since ~~Leo~~ is begging for Pepin's ~~support~~ army. But Tertullian was right: where the POWER is, there is the authority. "From the moment the Emperors began to be Christians," writes Socrates, "the affairs of the Church began to be regulated by them, and the greatest synods were, and still are, held according to their mind and will." The mighty Atha-

(95)

nasius, the hero of the Churchmen, repeatedly defied the Emperor--and repeatedly after a battle of wills, knuckled under.

Rome

Up until now, all our discussion has been confined to the Church in general and where the case of ~~Rome~~ has been cited, it has only been by way of illustration. But for reasons that need no explaining it is well to give some special attention to a particular Bishopric whose claims were pushed with ever-increasing insistence. Once there was a man who boasted of being a direct descendant of Abraham Lincoln. To prove his claim he would quote the Gettysburg address with the flaming challenge: "Deny if you can that Lincoln wrote THAT!" ^{No} ~~How~~ one wants to deny it, we would tell such an one, but what has that got to do with your claims? The Roman Catholics quote certain words of the Lord to Peter, indicating that Peter was to become president of the Church, and think thereby that they have demonstrated not only Peter's claim on the Lord, but through some mysterious logic ~~THEIR~~ claim on Peter, though not a word is said about ^{his} successors let alone about the city of Rome. The most undeniable proof that it is raining does not prove that it is Tuesday. What the RCs have to prove is not that the Savior bestowed office on Peter, but that Peter bestowed office on them; to date they have the wit to settle the whole question by endless repetitions of the irrelevant "thou art Peter." Of course intelligent Catholics recognize the true issue. The greatest of all their scholars in modern times devoted his whole life to seeking for some definite tie between Peter and his Church--and failed to find it. Nevertheless, we are assured, if Peter was to be head of a ^{the} Church there surely was to BE a church, and what more likely candidate than ours? Again they make their point by assuring a thing that is not said or even hinted in the Scr: that there would be a PERMANENT Church. When Irenaeus, citing the case of Rome as, he says, one among many, to prove that doctrinal teachings (nothing is said about authority) were handed down from the Apostles, he gives as the first Eps.

Linus, Anacletus, and Clement, upon which the learned editor (Masuetus) comments:

"It is not our business to unravel the difficulties with which the problem of Peter's successors fairly SWARMS, both with regard to succession and chronology." Now we can overlook mountains of swarming difficulties in Catholic doctrine, and liturgy, and priesthood once a fair case has been made for the beginning. But if there is any area in which no difficulty or contradiction may exist, in which in fact the slightest suspicion of a difficulty is enough to throw all final judgements into a state of permanent suspension, it is that crucial moment on which ALL depends--the fatal moment of transmission, NOT from Christ to Peter, but from Peter to HIS successor. And that is precisely the moment that "swarms with difficulties!" No other moment is so big with the future as that moment, no other moment interests us quite so much. The Romans are voluble enough in telling us what happened BEFORE that moment--a promise given to Peter, and in what happened AFTER that moment--a proud line of succession, but on what happened AT that moment they not only preserve silence but forbid investigation. ~~We have said that~~ The investigation of that moment was considered by Msgr. Duchesne to be the special calling of his life, yet his biographer Leclercq assures us that after a certain time of his life that was the one subject on which he would tolerate no investigation and no discussion. In 1952 the N. of C. Foundation for the Preservation of Historical Documents in the Vatican Library invited the world to study all aspects of its magnificent history--EXCEPT the fatal period of the beginning: "The documents which the Church has been collecting for nearly 20 centuries include, of course, the ecclesiastical records from the EARLIEST Christian era. These are housed separately in the Vatican Archives and are NOT to be microfilmed." Why not? What is wrong? If they supported Catholic claims we would have long since have seen these documents spashed on the covers of Life and Time--but they are not even being microfilmed. The official reason given is painfully transparent: "...as they are NOT OF GENERAL INTEREST TO SCIENTISTS." A few minutes spent in the ~~ecclesiastical~~ religious sections of the

card catalogues of any of our great libraries will show that it is precisely "the earliest Christian era," which is of overwhelming interest to scholars and the general public alike--books in that limited area far outnumber those in all the other fields and periods put together. Obviously ~~xxx~~ ^{the disinterest of scholars} is not the true reason for keeping the documents of the early Ch. under cover while all the others are reason, and just as obviously the true reason is quite retrograde to Catholic ~~desires~~ interests.

Msgr. Duchesne was not the first Catholic to recognize that all depends on the great moment of transmission of Peter's power to his successor. The importance of that moment is dramatically pointed up in the significant collection of letters attributed to Clement in which he describes the breathtaking event of the transmission of world-power in detail. The fact that they are obvious forgeries and yet quite old ~~simply shows that~~ and numerous shows that churchmen fully recognized the need for establishing historically the all-important drama of the transmission.

The most serious attempt to explain how the keys got from Peter to the next man--a thing for which no provision is made in the scripture or anywhere else, is ⁱⁿ the famous Liber Pontificalis. The study of this source was the first great work of the celebrated Duchesne, and it was the work he was engaged on when he died. According to Leclercq, when friends asked Duchesne why as the result of his studies he did not renounce the Catholic Church, he explained:

102 yrs old

"I have an ~~aged~~ mother in Brittany/whom I make a retreat for two months every summer. I would not sacrifice the company of her and her friends for the satisfaction of being true to myself." The passage from Duchesne's edition of the Liber Pontificalis reads:

The blessed Peter...first sat on the throne of the bishopric of Antioch for 7 years. This Peter having gone to Rome when Nero was Emperor there sat on the throne of the bishopric for 25 years 2 months and 3 days...He ordained TWO BISHOPS, Linus and Clitus, who in his lifetime performed ALL the tasks of the ministry in the City of Rome...leaving Peter free to pray and preach and teach the people... He consecrated the blessed Clement as Bishop and committed to him the throne or rule of all the Church, saying: "AS THE POWER TO GVERN THE CHURCH IS BY THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, so I commit it to you...do not be ~~governed~~ concerned with the things of this world: seek to devote

all your time to prayer and preaching."

No wonder the good Monsignor had his doubts! One hardly knows where to begin with the contradictions that pop up in the passage. Peter is Bishop of Antioch BEFORE being Bishop of Rome. His call was that of an Apostle—a missionary bearing witness to all the world, yet he must stay put ^{"sitting on the throne"} in ~~exactly~~ ~~one~~ one city bishopric for seven years and in another for over 25. Since the office of a Bp is not like that of an Ap. at all, it is necessary to have Peter transfer ALL his episcopal duties to two other men, who function as Bishops while he goes about the work of an Apostle. With the appointment of Clement we then have no less than FOUR Bishops active in Rome during the lifetime of Peter! We are told that Peter went to Rome "when Nero was Emperor there," yet everyone knows that Peter is supposed to have been put to death under Nero: Nero was only Emperor for 14 years, however, while here we are told that Peter flourished at Rome for 25 year, outliving by eleven years the Nero who presided at his execution. Jesus Christ gives the power of government to Peter, but NOT to Clement—it is Peter who does that. Here we have a principle of ^{horizontal} ~~vertical~~ succession—power being passed from hand to hand: not bestowed directly by God on men, but given by one man to the next. But not only does the PRESENT Pope not choose and ordain his successor, but NO ONE is allowed to so much as even hint at a possible successor as long as a Pope is still alive. Today the transmission of the office is thru the college of Cardinals—but that institution did not exist until the late 12th century.

There are many versions of the spurious letter of Clement "To James the lord and Bishop and Bishop of Bishops, ruler of the Holy Church of Christians in Jerusalem AND of the churches founded by God's foresight and will belonging to Jesus Christ EVERLASTING." All these letters make Clement "the THIRD after Peter to sit on the great throne of Rome." "Peter, feeling the approach of death, called all the Roman brethren together and appointed Clement their head: 'I transmit to him (he says) the power to bind and loose, etc. UNTIL THAT TIME

Peter had reserved these powers to himself." Yet we are told that Cletus and Linus had already "sat on the great throne of Rome," did they not have that authority? If not, the Presidency of the Church is ~~apart~~ something quite apart from the Bishopric of Rome. Where did IT reside? Note that Clement must write to James at Jerusalem without whose approval his ordination is not valid. Note also that it is James who is called "the ruler of the holy Church of Christians in Jerusalem AND of the Churches...everywhere." In every letter Peter makes Clement promise "that when I die you write a letter to James, the Lord's brother telling him how close you have been to me...Let James be assured that after my death the seat will be occupied by a man not uninstructed nor ignorant of the teachings and canons of the Church." Could anything be further from the calling of a Prophet? Clement is a good man with the proper experience—that is all; Peter gives his personal recommendation of a personal friend—and that is all; not a word about ~~the Lord speaking~~ any manifestations or visions. In a like crucial situation Peter got a direct revelation from heaven (Act); but ~~with~~ the launching of the Church is nothing but a personal endorsement with the SPECIFIC statement of all of Clements qualifications, and they are such qualifications as one would ask of any administrator, no more. "Saying these things to the multitude, Peter in the presence of everyone laid his hands upon my head," writes Clement, "and made me sit down in his own chair, saying to me: I charge you AS SOON AS I DIE (!) to send a letter to James, giving him your entire life history and all your experience with me right down to the present moment...He will be very pleased to learn that after me will come a man not untaught nor and ignorant of the life-giving words, especially instructed in the laws of the Church, to assume the teacher's chair." What an amazing transfer of supernatural power—what a Pentecost! "Tell James not to worry, because a well-trained man has taken my place." But why didn't Peter dictate the letter to James on the spot. It is typical of all Roman Catholic claims that Clement HIMSELF is supposed to write the letter after Peter is dead, informing James that HE, as

a close personal friend and apprentice of the Apostle, has now taken over the rule of the entire Church! It is the old Roman failing for self-appointment. Here Peter was alive and vigorous (he died a martyr, not of sickness, those the Clementine letters seem to forget that), and yet rested the whole problem of succession on a letter which not he but the new claimant himself was to write after his death! If Clement were to be made head of the WHOLE CHURCH, why did not Peter personally consult with, or at least inform, James and John, both of whom were still alive? He wants James "to be assured." Why, then, doesn't he write James himself? Why wait until he is dead to notify the other Apostles and make the explanations which he ~~makes publicly~~ does not hesitate to give to the multitude at Rome?

The ordination of Clement as described in the CILY records is to say the least highly irregular. It was always the rule that a Bishop should only be ordained by at least three other bishops, for "We know that the most blessed James, who was called the brother of the Lord, was ordained Bishop of Jerusalem by Peter, James, and John, therefore NO Bishop should claim ordination by less than three." Yet the same Peter who with James and John established this oft-repeated precedent, now ordains his "successor" without even letting his fellow Apostles know what is being done! In one letter Peter says to Clement: "I know I am giving you a hard thing—bad treatment and ingratitude at the hands of the undevoted mob,"—is THAT the way to describe the Roman Church in its purest and beginnings, for THAT the way to describe the highest calling on earth? "I need you," Peter continues, "in the time of crisis and danger." But he admonished the new Bishop to have NOTHING TO DO WITH the TEMPORAL AFFAIRS OF THE CHURCH—that, he explains, is the concern of presbyters and deacons; yet, as he describes them, the qualifications for these offices are exactly identical with those of a Bishop. The invincible ~~gap~~ opposition between the functions of a Bishop and an Apostle still make trouble. "The Bishop must be the hardest-working worker on the ship," Peter continues, forgetting that he has just said

that the whole of Clement's work is to be teaching and prayer, joyful activities to say the least, he adds: "In transmitting to you this office I am doing myself a favor, not you." Here the head of the Church is not merely choosing one to succeed him after his death—he is actually stepping down, shifting his burden to other shoulders. "If most of the brethren hate you because of your justice, their hatred cannot hurt you." The greatest danger to the Church, he continues, comes from WITHIN. What a picture of the primitive Church, in the days of Peter, no less! Of course Clement blushes in the best school manner when Peter orders him to sit on his throne and places his hands upon his head in the presence of all the people and says to him: "I charge you in the presence of all these people that when I die you write a letter to James, the Lord's Brother, telling him how close you have been to me from the very first, observing all my activities everywhere and listening to my sermons. Let JAMES be assured that after my death the seat will be occupied by a man not instructed nor ignorant of the doctrines and the canons of the Church." WHAT an ordination! What language and behavior from one possessing all the keys of heaven and earth! "And may the Lord be with YOU, now and forever, even as he said to US when he was about to be taken to his God and Father 'Behold I am with YOU always until the completion of the time.'"

This is clearly the transmissio of a blessing understood to have been given not to all the world but explicitly to the Apostles only.

But even if these letters were ^{really primitive} ~~readings~~, which they obviously are not, bearing of the style and vocabulary of the 4th century, there is a fact that invalidates any claims they might have to special and unique authority by Clement's successors. For the Clement story duplicates in every detail an earlier and much better authenticated story ~~about~~ written by the same Clement, of how Peter ordained one Zaccheus Bishop of Caesarea. [Carl Schmidt concludes his study of the subject saying; "It is my firm conviction that the Homelist] In this account the Ep. of Caesarea 1) is ordained by Peter, 2) mounts the throne of Peter, 3) is hailed by Peter as vicar of Christ, 4) sits on the throne of Christ, according to Peter, and

receives from Peter power to bind and loose. Schmidt has maintained that the Caesaraea episode was borrowed from the earlier "Letter of Clement to James.", and certainly it is not likely that any Bishop anywhere would be ordained in such a manner by Peter.

"If we ask who were the most important people in the Christian Church in the first generation, the answer ~~undoubtedly~~ is, the Apostles," writes K. Lake, "and Prophets. If we go further, and ask who was the most important person in the church at Rome at the end of the second century, the answer unquestionably is that it was the Bishop. But the difficulty comes when we inquire how this change took place; for that is precisely the problem to which NO UNDOUBTED OR UNQUESTIONABLE ANSWER CAN BE GIVEN." Yet that is "precisely the problem" to which an undoubted and unquestioned answer MUST be given if the Roman claim is to have any validity at all. (Note that Prof. Lake says that the Bishop of Rome enjoys supreme importance at an early date AT ROME, nowhere ~~else~~) But the Roman Bishop lists from that period are in a hopeless condition. The Liber Pontificalis explicitly states that Peter "ordained TWO BISHOPS, Linus and Cletus, who should be present in Rome for the ~~administration~~ carrying out of all sacerdotal ~~and~~ administration for the benefit of the populace or any who should repair thither.

But the blessed Peter himself devoted all his time to prayer, preaching, and teaching the people. Here we have it: the administration of the city Bishopric of Rome is a full-time job for at least two men. Even the mighty Peter cannot fill that office and at the same time perform the spiritual functions of an Apostle. Linus and Cletus are both Bishops with specific instructions to be present IN ROME--for the office of bishop is that of an overseer who must remain present on the spot; that leaves Peter free to go elsewhere, which, as a general authority, he must. Next according to the same source, Peter made Clement the Bishop, though the names of Linus and Cletus appear before his "because they were ~~admitted~~ ordained bishops by the prince of the Apostles himself." Counting Peter, that makes, as we have noted, no less than four Bishops in Rome at once.

But in the Apostolic Constitutions, actually a much earlier text, Peter is represented as saying, "Of the Church of the Romans/^{first} Linos the son of Claudius, was ordained BY PAUL, and then after the death of Linus, Clement was ordained by me Peter, being the second one." Here we have Apostles ordaining Bishops in Rome as they did elsewhere, but themselves not acting as Bishops at all. Certainly no one claims that Paul was Bishop of Rome. Both he and Peter outlived at least one bishop of Rome, and when he was dead they appointed HIS successor. Here we see Clement NOT as the successor of Peter or Paul at all, but of Linus, who was of course no successor to the Apostles who outlived him. Conflicting lists of

Cyprianus has his own list, which omits Cletus, as do also early Roman Bishops are given in the 5th volume of the Lat. Patrologia. The

Ignat., Iren., Euseb., and Augustine. Righi however includes Cletus and the most recent official Roman Catholic list is given by Denzinger: ST Petrus Ap. (?) - omits Anacletus.

67 (?), sub cuius nomine exstant duae epistolae canonicae. S. Linus 67 (?) -

79 (?), S. (Ana)cletus 79 (?) - 90 (?), S. Clemens I 90 (?) - 99 (?). Then the

Eistle to Corinth is quoted. All succeeding Bishops of Rome have question- This is bad, and Righi duly omits the question marks, though marks after their dates until S. Callistus I 217-222. Here Clement succeeds dates differ from Denzinger's.

to the throne about the year 90 (?), while Peter about 13 (?) years before. By that, all our pious letters describing how Peter ordained Clement his successor when he felt the approach of death are worthless. The oldest Roman Bishop-lists according to C. Schmidt, simply follow Irenaeus, who had no original sources to

follow. The reason for the lack of documents was that "in Rome they they bothered themselves very little about the past, and therefore the collection could only be a very scanty one." This unconcern with the past has been noted by

others, including Eusebius, and it could not possibly have been inherited from an Apostolic foundation that looked forward to continued existence. Cardinal Baronius rhapsodizes over the exquisite care with which the Apostolic

Christians preserved such relics as the swaddling-clothes of Christ for the blessing of future ages—that SHOULD have been the mood of the Early Church;

but it was not. The EARLIEST MENTION of Peter as Bishop of Rome is in Epiphanius, Haer. 41,1, who is wildly guessing, like the others, for he calls both

Gelineau

Paul AND JAMES (!) Bishops of Rome. Of course the slip-up is pardonable, for Paul came to Rome before Peter and is said to have been killed on the same day. That means that he was longer in Rome than Peter--how could he live and function ~~there~~ as an Apostle without being Bishop? Plainly there WERE authorities higher than Bishops in the Church, for Paul installed Bishops everywhere. As for James, haven't we seen that he was ~~the Bishop~~ submissively addressed by Clement of Rome as "Bishop of Bishops and...Bishop of All the Churches"?--which would of course make him too Bishop of ^{Rome as well as} Jerusalem. If we accept Epiphanius along with the letter of Clement we have ¹no less than SIX Bishops of Rome operating at once! This is of course the result of the disastrous assumption that the highest officers in the Church MUST be Bishops. To make things more confused, Eusebius, after a thorough search of the records ~~xxx~~ says that "Clement the Third Bishop of Rome was a fellow-worker of PAUL," and became Bishop after Anacletus had been bishop for 12 years, following Linus, who had been Bishop for 12 years also "AFTER THE DEATH OF PETER AND PAUL." It is a relief to read Eusebius' explanation that the legitimate ones, "it is not easy to say who of these were/recognized as worthy in zeal and capable of shepherding the foundations (of the Apostles), except for a few hints in Paul we have nothing to go on. He had countless fellow-workers, whose names are immortalized in the Scripture." For the rest, the records by the fourth century were already silent. From a study of all the lists of Bishops (the lists first appear in the 4th century) Erich Caspar can maintain that "until into the first third of the third century they are typical fabrications of chronographers devoid of the slightest documentary value, and the possibility of laying down certain dates for the Roman Bishops thus appears much later than even critical investigation has hitherto assumed." The first date that is anywhere nearly certain is that of Pontianus, 235 A.D. "If Peter ever came to Rome," writes Soguel, "which cannot be denied in view of the total ignorance of what became of him after his sojourn at Antioch, his presence there left no direct or deep memories." This is a most significant fact, and its significance is only pointed up by

2. Peter

Goguel's amusing effort to explain it: "Whether he was there for too short a time or because the Church was already too strongly organized there to have been strongly influenced by a new arrival, a generation after his death Clement of Rome has nothing precise to say on the subject; and if it was later claimed that he founded the Roman community and was its first Bishop, etc., that was certainly NOT because other documents were discovered in the meantime which were not known to Clement. We must be content with the idea of a the simple operation of popular imagination." The idea of Peter's arrival occasioning no flurry at all in Rome, so well-founded was the Church there, is ~~not~~ amusing, but the complete ^{early} silence of the record ~~xxxx~~ regarding any activity at all of Peter in Rome is a serious thing. After he leaves Antioch the Apostle ^{disappears} drops out of sight. We all know the legends of his martyrdom at Rome, but what about the 25 years during which this mighty, dynamic, towering prophet and high-priest is supposed to have governed the affairs of the Church from Rome? The Patrologia contains ² two stout volumes of the writings and doings of Clement, who was bishop for ⁹ ten years at least and ~~by all accounts~~ who regards Peter as one infinitely above him. Clement depicts a dynamic, wise, simple, honest, world-leader in Peter, a powerful and straightforward speaker, a man of action and immense popular appeal. Compared with him, Clement himself is a midget. But if we turn to the oldest traditions follow, it is all of Clement that we hear, and never of Peter. Where are his sermons, his miracles, his intimate conversations, the delightful stories of his simple personal habits ⁴⁵ which the Clementine writings abound AS LONG AS PETER IS IN ANTIOCH. As soon as he leaves there, Clement too loses sight of him. That has made it possible for a number of contemporary scholars to maintain that Peter never went to Rome at all, though we see no reason for doubting it. If he did go to Rome the silence of the record is even more significant, for it makes it plain enough that he did not govern the Church from there, and he could not have done much in Rome without its being noted and remembered at least as well as were his exploits elsewhere.

The complete absence of any clear principle of succession at Rome is loudly attested by the immense strife and confusion that attended the election of Bishops in that city ~~from the first~~ especially during the 4th century. About 220 the double election of Callixtus and Hippolytus led to a serious schism in the city, and the trouble was not settled until 235. Next came a schism between Cornelius and Novatian. Eusebius regards it as a shocking irregularity that Novatus should insist that there should be only ONE bishop in Rome at a time. In 354 Liberius was ordained 34th Bishop of Rome, but the Emperor wanted one of his own men in the position, and made an issue of doctrine to install his friend Felix. The people had elected Liberius, however, and were so insistent that the Emperor recalled him to preside in Rome as JOINT BISHOP OF ROME WITH FELIX. But popular demonstrations continued, and "the Circus resounded with the shout of thousands who repeatedly exclaimed 'One God, One Christ, One Bishop!'" It was not enough for the Emperor to accept the submission of Liberius and re-install him, "his rival was expelled from the city by the permission of the emperor and the power of the opposite faction; the adherents of Felix were inhumanly murdered in the streets, in the public places, in the baths, and even in the churches; and the face of Rome, upon the return of the Christian bishop, renewed the horrid image of the massacres of Marius and the proscriptions of Sulla." Even worse trouble arose a few years later with the ordination of the next Bp. of Rome, Damasus, whose election was challenged by the Bishops who elected a rival, Ursinus. The partisans of Ursinus entered a church in which "the Damasian part of the populus had assembled, and perpetrated the cruellest killings against those of both sexes." "When Damasus became Bishop," writes Socrates, "instantly rioting broke out all over Rome, because the preceding Bishop had chosen not Damasus but Bishop Ursinus to be his successor." So all the people rose in arms against each other "not because of any doctrine or heresy, but purely and simply over the issue of who was authorized to sit in the episcopal throne." Plainly there was still no definite rule of succession. "From that," Socrates continues, "arose the Stmpezdés--the mighty

220-235

354

49

rushing together of the mobs, so that in the melee many were killed and a great many both clergy and laymen were sentenced by the Eparch Maximus, so that Ursinus finally gave up and his followers quieted down. As in the preceding case, it was the Emperor's favor alone that decided the issue, a civil officer putting an end to the trouble. The next papal election brought on another crisis, reported by a contemporary, Ammianus: "Under Theodoric, Symmachus and Laurentius being both consecrated, fought for the Episcopal throne of Rome. By God's degree, Symmachus, being worthy of the office, was victor." That is a significant principle of succession, for the barbarians who were ruling at that time—and Theodoric and Ammianus were both barbarians—firmly believed in trial by duel: that the winner of a ritual combat was chosen of God. They now apply the principle to the election of the Roman Bishop—but to us it does not seem very Apostolic. Later another Symmachus, a deacon, became Bishop of Rome, being "consecrated by a crowd of deacons," says Theophanes, "from which came rioting, killing, and plundering in the city, WHICH LASTED FOR THREE YEARS." Before that, however, an attempt was made to establish something like a rule to go by in determining the question which had not been answered, namely, not who was Christ's successor, ~~but~~ but who was Peters. There was no sure way of determining. Theodosius the Great nominated Felix IV, he in turn named Boniface II to be his successor, and Boniface chose one Vigilius to follow him. But Boniface was not strong enough to get Vigilius accepted, and the result was a Senatus consulta, i.e. a law passed not by the Apostles but by the Roman Senate governing the election of popes, this was ~~then~~ followed by the Edict of Athalarich, a German prince, "On the Election of Roman Bishops." Another attempt follows in the Liber Pontificalis, from 600 on. So he petitioned the Emperor for help; in reply the Emperor issued the edict (JE 152, in Hist. NOVII, c.1,2): "When 2 Bishops of Rome are elected, NEITHER shall be Bishop, but only that one shall remain on the Apostolic chair, whom the doom (Ordeal) of God and the Will of the Generality have chosen from among the clergy by a NEW ordination." Soon after, however, the Will of the

Generality chose Silverius to be Bishop, the great Belisarius discovered that he has been making treasonable deals with the Gothic enemy and deported him to Greece, setting up Vigilius as Bishop in his stead. Then one Natalius challenged the ruling Bishop and got his assassination. Meanwhile in eastern (1) Rome in 759 "the relatives of the blessed Pope Nadrian stirred up the people; they revolted against Pope Leo, ^{won} the victory, and blinded him."

But it was well in the Middle Ages that the trouble of Popes and counter-Popes became really deadly. We need not retell the story of the Babylonian Captivity. Two less familiar accounts may serve as illustrations of what happened in a Church which had been left strangely unprovided with the means of implementing that injunction which it has come to regard as the very essence of its being. On the eve of the first Crusade, Pope Urban II found his claim challenged "by a certain adversary named Guidbert," who had been elected Pope by the Imperial party in 1061. "^{Goaded on by pride,}" writes Fulcher, a contemporary and secretary to the ^{De Flandris} ~~French king~~, who was supporting Urban against the Emperor and his Normans, "he addressed himself to the confusion of the populace," and got a large following, "though the larger and holier part of the populace followed Urban, rightly elected and consecrated by cardinal Bishops. But Guidberts, with the support of the afore-mentioned Emperor and inspired by the unrighteous backing of the greater part of the citizens of Rome, as long as he could kept Urban ^(sic) away from the monastery of the blessed Peter. But he being thus driven out of the church, went about in the country, holding popular meetings everywhere for God. Guidbert, however, puffed up with pride at having become the Prince of the Church, showed himself a Pope prone to favor those who strayed, condemning the acts of Urban as illegal. So Urban in that same year in which the Franks began to pass thru Rome on their way to Jerusalem, got complete control of the Apostolic power thanks to the aid of the most noble matron Matilda." (This was the step-sister of the Emperor Henry III, who gave all her holdings in Lo raine and Italy as a present to the Roman Church, which she was supporting against Henry IV,

who would have deprived her of the holding anyway). At the time this Matilda enjoyed great power in the Romana Patria. At the time Urban took over with her aid, "Guidbert was in Germany. So now there were two Popes; but a very great number of people did not know which one they should obey, or to whom they should turn for instruction in the matter, or who could cure the disease." Seven centuries before, Eusebius had used the very words to describe the state of the Church when the bishops were at deadlock--the question he found the solution in the Emperor. is still unsolved in the eleventh century. Exactly like Eusebius, Fulcher continues: "Some favored the one man, some the other. As far as human intelligence could judge, Urbanus was the juster, since he was the less given to lust for money. * Then he tells how Guidbert when Abp. of Ravennae had lost his throne through greed. He was especially in the wrong for having seized "the sceptre of God's empire. Which of course is not to be taken by force but should rather be received with fear and devotion. It was no wonder that the whole world was disquieted and stirred up, since if the Roman Church, in which resides the principle for the correction of universal Christianity, is confounded by any disturbance, it instantly affects all the members subject to her, the disease spreading from the head thru the fibres to the whole organism, which becomes sick and weak... And when the head is thus afflicted, then all the members suffer continually." By early fathers we are told that the Apostles had made provision that while the Church lasted the offices would be properly recruited. Plainly this rickety system is so entirely different. "The head having thus been wounded, the members withered from the pain that attacked them, so that IN ALL PARTS OF EUROPE peace, goodness, fides, within the churches and without, among great as well as small, ^{went under} suffered an eclipse. transfer against the pagans that ~~it was necessary...to make war against the~~ war which they were waging against themselves." And THAT according to Fulcher, our best authority, is the reason for the First Crusade: A complete spiritual, economic, moral, and political collapse was the result of Roman rule, ^{for} the main cause of trouble was the lack of any rule of Papal succession.

Now on the way to the Holy Land, the Frankish crusaders were blessed as they passed through Lucca by "apostolic Urban;" then when they got to Rome they naturally went "to the basilica of the Blessed Peter." Fulcher was there: "When we went in," he reports, "there before the altar we found ^{the} ~~Gaidbert~~ men of Gaidbert, the silly (stolidus) Pope, standing with swords in their hands before the oblations on the altar; others crawled up along the rafters and while we were prostrate in prayer threw rocks down at us. For whenever they spotted anyone faithful to Urban they wanted to kill him. But one of the towers of the same monastery was held by men of ~~the~~ Lord Urban, who, faithful to him, had guarded it tenaciously, resisting all attackers to the best of their ability. We had ^{are} share of pains for getting involved in that sort of thing."

Excerpt from Froissart: Ch. cxxxi:

About 4 is period he who signed himself pope Urban VI, came from Rome to Genoa....All England was obedient to him, both church and commonality and now more than ever, because the king of France and that nation were Clementists, Urban (whom the English and several other countries obeyed) during his residence at Genoa, sought how he could obtain succours from England to annoy the king of France; and I will tell you by what means. He was to send his bulls to the archbishops and bishops of the country, to proclaim that he absolved, AND WOULD PARDONE, FROM ALL CRIME OF FAULT, THEM ONE WHO WOULD ASSIST IN THE DESTRUCTION OF THE CLEMENTISTS. He had heard that his adversary CLEMENT had resorted to this means in France, and was daily doing so; and that the French called the Urbanists, as to matters of faith, dogs, which those retorted back on the Clementists, whom Urban was very desirous of condemning to the utmost of his power, and he knew that he had no other means of hurting them but through the English. It was necessary, however, that he should have a considerable sum of ready MONEY, if he wished to put his plans into operation; for it was well known that THE MONKS OF ENGLAND WOULD NOT, FOR ALL THE ABSOLUTIONS IN THE WORLD undertake any expeditions, unless such were predated by offers of MONEY. Men at arms cannot live on pardons, nor do they pay much attention to them except at the point of death.... Urban...sent upwards of thirty bulls to England, where they were received with much joy. The prelates preached up in their dioceses this expedition in the manner of a CRUSADE... and none of either sex thought they should end the year happily, nor have any chance of entering paradise, if they did not give handsomely to the expedition as pious alms. At London, and in that diocese, there was collected a large treasury full of money, and he who gave most, according to the Pope's bull, gained the greatest number of pardons. All who should die at this time, and who had given their money, were absolved from every fault.... A churchman, Henry Spencer, Bishop of Norwich, was chosen to lead the expedition, cozidi, he was "young and eager, and wishing to bear arms" and was all for conquering all of Flanders, but the experienced Sir Hugh Calverly reminded him: "Sir...our expedition had nothing to do with what concerns the wars of kings, but is SOLEMN POINTED AGAINST THE HERETICS."

(111)

tists. We are the soldiers of pope Urban, who has given us absolution from all faults if we destroy the Celementists. Should we march into Flanders ...we shall forfeit our engagement; for I understand, that the earl of Flanders and all the Flemings are as good Urbanists as ourselves." But in a rage the good Bishop overruled him that there should be good pickings in Flanders, for "in the country I have named...they have never been harassed by war." So the expedition went forward and as its first deed of arms "attacked and pillaged a monastery" near Gravelines. A horrible war ensued, but the issue between the two popes was not settled. It continued with their successor, ~~Urban~~ in those days the Turks threatened Europe and took all the Balkans: III,xxiii: "The Turks...only laugh at the two popes, one at Rome and the other at Avignon, saying, 'The two gods of Christendom are waging war against each other, by which their government is weakened and easier to be destroyed.' When the Christian princes asked the King of Armenia why he willingly submitted to the Turk Amurat, the King explained that the Turkish rule ~~xxx~~ over subjects was far more decent, generous and humane than anything one met with in Christian lands.

xxv: "About this period, Otho of Brunswick came to pope Clement at Avignon to receive his pay for the war he had carried on for the pope and church against the Romans and Bartholomew Prignano, who styled himself pope Urban VI. But as he could not obtain a penny...he left them much discontented... About this time, the forces subsidized by pope Clement...had shut up pope Urban in the city of Perugia, where count Conrad, a leader of a large body of Germans defending him, offered to ~~give him up~~ deliver him up to pope Clement for the sum of 20,000 crowns. But Urban could not raise the money so "the diege was slackened on both sides, and Urban escaped to Rome." Froissart here enters a discourse upon the fall of the church and the feudal nobility, whom he describes as utter cynical and corrupt: he tells of a Reforming friar who prophesied true things and was locked up for his pains, and gives an amazingly afield account of the Donation of Constantine, but the burden of his story is that the Church and the Nobility are a single organism: clergy and aristocrats must hang together against the common people, who are of another order of being. John keeps repeating that the nobility alone have broken their part of the contract, while his story is all of how the Clergy men broke theirs.

What determined the Papal succession for a thousand years? In whose hands did the office reside? Depending on circumstances in the hands of a French or English King, an Austrian Emperor, a Milanese Duke, rich ~~xxx~~ banking family, a city mob, an ambitious woman, a successful general, and intriguing Churchmen...Who could tell? The biggest bishops naturally played a leading role. They came to be known as Cardinal Bishops, and as such first-play an important role in public affairs in the 12th century. It was this college of Cardinals which at that time took over the functions of the regular synods, which ceased to be regularly held. "More and more it became the custom," writes Souchon, "for Popes to seek the counsel of this college in matters of faith, the administration of Bishoprics, monasteries and

Church lands, and finally in questions of foreign policy; in this it became increasingly common to call upon the services of individual cardinals. By 1300 the Cardinals had so firmly established their ^{privieleged} position as advisors of the pope, that they began to think of themselves as having OFFICIAL sanction and position."

The present Constitution de Sede Apostolica Vacante ^(24 May 1882) ~~provides~~ states that "IN THE COURSE OF TIME, it has come about that these laws concerning the election of the Roman Pontiff have imperceptibly increased in number and variety...to such an extent that it now appears no small labor to discern which rules are to be observed in electing the Highest Pastor. So we have sought out those rules which venerable age has sanctified, albeit some of them have suffered change." The Constitution contains the interesting provisions that (1) while a seat is vacant, the College of Cardinals shall have absolutely NO POWER OR JURISDICTION AT ALL...but holds all merely in reserve for the future Pontiff." The Cardinals do NOT thus, have Apostolic power delegated to THEM, but it automatically falls on whomever they choose. (2) The College of Cardinals has NO power to dispose of the laws of the Apostolic Chair." (3) No law passed by the popes can be corrected or changed in any way while the Church is without a Pope. (4) But if questions are in doubt the college has power to settle ^{them} ~~it~~ by a majority vote! Number four is a concession to hard reality which completely cancels the beautiful theory of No.3: it IS the Cardinals who have the power after all, though of course there is not the slightest suspicion of anything Apostolic about THEIR calling. (5) In an emergency any matters can also be settled by a majority vote of the Cardinals. (12) The highest Cardinals all keep their offices when a Pope dies. But (22) ALL authority of the Congregations is that granted them before-hand by a living Pope." That is natural enough, since originally they were only his personal friends and advisors. But Christ and the Apostles had the authority to bestow offices akin to those they themselves held upon their fellow-workers. The Cardinals receive no such office. The formula in which a Cardinal casts his vote is significant, in view of the fact that he has NO authority at all, save that of voting: "I testify before Christ the Lord, who has designated me, that I elect one who should by the judgement of God

be elected." A thousand years after Nicaea the Church discovered that a one-man organization could not provide any sure succession, and hit upon the idea of a council of men. This is exactly what the Primitive Church had in the Twelve Apostles, but at that late date the Sacred College could not and did not pretend to be Apostolic in origin. What better indication that the primitive Church had been taken away? For it was plainly NOT because the old travelling apostolate, with prophets, teachers, etc., had been found inadequate that it vanished—it was far more adequate than any other system ever devised. It was not because of changing needs and conditions as the "infant Church outgrew old institutions," NOT a stronger Church behind that they were abolished—for when they ~~were~~ they left only an empty gap which was quickly filled with swarms of impostors, claims and counterclaims, charges and counter-charges, riots and assassination—in a word, darkness and confusion.

The establishment of an episcopal hierarchy was, as we have seen, from the bottom up, not from the top down. It was agreed that the largest cities should be the most important bishoprics and enjoy higher honor and greater glory than the others. It was claimed that the Apostles ~~followed the same~~ in this simply repeated what the state had done before, following as it were a law of nature. This argues the absence of any real ruling head in the Church. The great cities who claimed first place and CONSTANTLY harped upon the theme of priority and precedence would have had to buck the whole Church—not just each other—had they been usurping the claims of an established head. The whole controversy never takes the form it must have taken had such a head existed from the time of the Apostles. The Emperor reiterated the old principle of the perfect equality of Bishops in his closing speech to the Council of Nicaea; then the biggest cities claimed bigger authority than the others, ~~they quarrelled against~~ they watched as a group with the closest jealousy lest any one of their number should think to claim for himself an office superior to the rest: once a hierarchy of Bishops was established, the principle of equality was preserved as strictly as ever, WITHIN the hierarchy. And at the very TOP of the system stood ~~standing~~ the four or five biggest Churches

Silence

--never just one. That was a thing that no Bishop would allow--unless, of course, ~~he~~ were the one. But in that case the others would promptly gangup against him in the name of Christian equality--the ambitions of any one Bishop could always be countered with appeal to a PRINCIPLE was not that of the ruling Bishop but of episcopal equality. It is interesting to see the game that Rome plays in this system. When at the Council of Trent in the mid 16th century, "Lainez, in the name of the whole fraternity, proclaimed...that the government of the faithful had been committed by Christ to the Pope alone, that in the Pope alone all sacerdotal authority was concentrated, and that through the Pope alone priests and bishops derived whatever power they possessed," the French and Spanish bishops were shocked and angered. Throughout all the 19th the absolute ascendancy of one bishop over the rest had never been accepted. The Romanists have attacked the problem from various angles, and their strained logic proclaimed their dearth of evidence. Thus Hefele finds the C1E passage that definitely proves Roman priority, the statement by Socrates referring to the Synod of Antioch: Breaking of Julius of Rome, Socrates says, "nor did he send a representative, though ~~inasmuch as~~ there was an ecclesiastical canon that the Churches should not pass a general order in council without the consulting the opinion approval of the Bishop of Rome." This is a passage in which much rests on translation, so we have followed Hefele's interpretation of MARCELIN: "To pass a general decree through and at Synods." The meaning of the passage is clear: the Churches ^{Support} were passing laws, ^{Soc. reports that the Churches} these laws were of universal and general application must be approved by all--as long as the Bp. of Rome withholds his vote the legislation is stopped. The Roman bishop, like an obstructionist senator on a committee, could hold up legislation indefinitely, and so, IN THE MEANTIME, the whole business waited upon his pleasure. But that does not prove, as Hefele insists, that Rome was running things: it was the meeting that was passing the laws, ^{not Rome} and all that was needed of Rome was to send a TRULIUS--not to preside; so much Socrates states specifically. Rome was the western representative of the Big Four, "governing a very large number of Churches in the West," and some surmises, "without inter-

position of metropolitans."—exactly, Duchesne observes, as Alexandria did in the East. ^{over} Rome's position is thus not unique, but certainly it is very important, and of course if a law was to apply to the WHOLE Church, the Bishop of Rome would have to be consulted. Many a time a single US senator has for a moment held almost dictatorial power, but for one finding himself in such a position to claim that he is therefore the LEGITIMATE ruler of the land—being ~~lawfully~~ ^{de jure} elected, and holding his power ~~in very fact~~ ^{de facto}—would be the height of presumption. The the meeting in question could not pass ^{any} rules without the vote of Rome, neither could it without Alexandria or Antioch. ^{Ep.} ~~But~~ The Roman Bishop in his position of western counter-weight, much farther removed from the other three than they were from each other, enjoyed a position of detachment: when the others were deadlocked, as they often were, it was for Rome to tip the scales—of course in the way that pleased Rome. Accordingly the other three usually played up to Rome, and this enhanced the impression that Rome was really running things. Rome was no more determined nor skillful in pushing claims to priority than the others, but Rome by geographical position held a better hand. The Roman Bishop appears in the West as more imposing, aggressive, magnificent than others, and makes it hard for the student ^{of WESTERN history} to doubt that here we have something really and essentially out of the ordinary. But let that student turn his attention to Asia and the ~~Byzantine~~ and the methods and maneuvers of the Roman bishop immediately appear in another light—everything about him then proclaims him to be not a unique phenomenon in the world, but a typical member of the Big Four. ~~Byzantine~~ It never occurred to Athanasians, Duchesne says, "that an appeal to the Bishop of Rome might strengthen ~~his~~ his fortunes," when he was cast out of his bishopric." Yet it was on the strength of ~~a~~ parresias ^{his} graggasin from Julius of Rome that Athanasius and Paulus resumed their bishoprics. Now "parresistikos" means lit. ~~axixw~~ speaking aside, or outside; irregular order; bold, unauthorized, on one's own authority." The Bishop of Rome was simply taking a chance: as the word shows, his act was entirely irregular, and was in fact not used again in the controversies of the 4th century. This was the ~~last~~ resort for

See Athanasius, not the FIRST resort, as would be the case if it were regular. It was also something of an innovation, since originally the idea had never occurred to Athanasius. In the same aggressive spirit, Liberius of Rome writes to the Macedonian Bishops, that the Arians must be eliminated "either by persuasion or, to put it more plainly: (~~aletheia~~ ~~to blurt out the truth~~) by temporal force."

It is all very well to speak of Christian principles, ~~the~~ But the Ep. of Rome knows that truth is with the big battalions. To support the historic claims of Rome Denzinger quotes at length the claims of the Roman Bishops of the 4th century to have their authority from Peter--as if such proclamations bore any weight at all where the question is NOT ~~whether~~ to show that such claims were made as early as the 4th century but to show that those claims were VALID—another thing entirely.

~~Grill of Alex. bidding for the support of Rome against his powerful rivals if it was the equality of the city Bishops that made it necessary for the Emperor to act as common umpire, and made it possible for him to do so without shocking or~~
 It was the equality of the city Bishops that made it necessary for the Emperor to act as common umpire, and made it possible for him to do so without shocking or annoying anybody, and without a word of protest from any churchmen anywhere. "The Church agreed to this in THEONE," says Duchesne, as well as in fact—not a voice was raised in protest. Grill writes to the Emperor Constantius, "~~May God strengthen~~

~~then thee, and... the common bond of the holy Churches, and the illustrious care of the Roman government, describing that monarch as "the common bond of the holy Churches, the glorious patron of the Roman Government, adorned by his acts of umpireship in major cases concerning the faith." ~~from Gratian's Concordance~~~~
 association
 then thee, and... the common bond of the holy Churches, and the illustrious care of the Roman government, describing that monarch as "the common bond of the holy Churches, the glorious patron of the Roman Government, adorned by his acts of umpireship in major cases concerning the faith." ~~from Gratian's Concordance~~

Tertullian was equally scathing concerning the completely unauthorized claims of the Roman leader to be "the Bishop of Bishops," Cyprian was even more cutting, so much so that Catholic divines have found it convenient to declare the most unflattering letters as forgeries, ~~tho~~ as documents they are as well attested as any of the other letters, "since it is unthinkable that anyone should use such language against the Pope." It is indeed unthinkable, and for that very reason it is clear that Cyprian did not for a moment consider the Ep. of Rome to be the Pope. To use some passages of Cyprian to support Roman claims, it is therefore necessary for Karl Adam to make of Cyprian himself "a complete Winkkopf" (added).

Steghman

Rome was able to capitalize not only on her geographical position, but also Alfoeldi on what ~~Goguel~~ calls "the involuntary reverence ...for the Roman past," which "gave the guardians of the great tradition other opportunities of flying the old flags before the eyes of the peoples of the Empire." "The development of the tradition of Peter at Rome and the importance of the conclusion based on it," writes Goguel, "can so exactly parallel to the development of the role of the Church of Rome and to the increase of its authority, that one is obliged to conclude that there was an organic relation between the two, as the expression AID justification of the claims of Rome developed hand in hand. Prof. Batiffol has labored with characteristic determination to show that the expression ~~EX PRIMA CATHEDRA~~ in Can. 58 of the Council of Elvira refers to the Roman See; while Julicher was able to point to many examples of the use of the expression in reference to other churches. Batiffol would have surman martynii sublimitatem in Cyrilian Ep. 66, 4, mean "the highest peak of martyrdom," but Koch showed its use to refer to martyrdom in general. To prove the primacy of Rome Victor Martin asks the question, "Is there upon the earth, a qualified instance of an accusation against the roman pontif? For answer he cites the fact that "already (!) in 495 St. Gelasius declares that in all cases the See of Rome is qualified to pass on all cases, and that no one has the authority to modify its decisions. This is the earliest instance Martin can find of such a claim--the very end of the fifth century--and it comes from the Roman Bishop himself, which is not the least surprising. The claim of St. Gelasius the fact that it was ~~INSERTED~~ into an Imperial decree of a hundred years earlier illustrates well the methods employed to establish in retrospect the antiquity of claims that could not be proven, a system of sculduggery culminating the int False Isidorian Decretals. "The legal fiction arose," says Ed. Schwartz, "that the Apostles had placed monarchical bishops in all the churches founded by them, and gave them in unbroken line of succession the true Apostolic doctrine. Soon after this ~~was~~ ~~was~~ established, the bishop lists of the large Churches were composed and ~~completed~~ filled out by working backwards to the Apostles." Long before that John Chrysostom had written: ~~the~~

that Antioch, the oldest and greatest of all the Churches, the community to which the name Christian was first applied, was beyond any doubt THE Mother Church. But when he was transferred to be Ep. of Cy. and found New Rome and Old Rome competing for priority of holiness, he wrote: "Cy. is greater than Rome: a city is not to be judged by its buildings. Don't tell me of the enormous SIZE of the city of Rome (this obviously being the common boast), but show me rather an obedient population (Rome had an unenviable reputation of rowdiness in electing its Bishops).

705.
706. 707.
The angels visited Abraham in his hut rather than in the towers of Sodom. Go into the Church at Cy. and see the fine quality of the city—the prayers that never cease, day or night; the vast numbers of the poor at their devotions. Great city, indeed, but also THE METROPOLIS OF THE FUTURE. How many Bishops and teachers came there to be taught!" You cannot judge truth by numbers, cries "Athanasius." The poor, simple, ignorant hostiles were the equal of 10,000 times 10,000. Thus the power ever resides with the truth, even though it is found among but few.

It is the man who cannot give his reasons who flees to the support of numbers, the ~~multitude~~, which is bought by flattery and gifts, easily impressed in its ignorance. Talk to me about numbers... can you overcome falsehood by a multitude of rascals and stupidities, easily tripped up in its timidity and cowardice, which al-

ways prefers the pleasure of the moment to the enjoyment of eternal life; and all these things are well enough: "The strength of falsehood is in a multitude."

It is no wonder that modern Catholic editors want to view these remarks of Athanasius as spurious! The opposite side of this picture is the argument of Bligh:

"Although there is obvious wisdom in delaying the baptism of men whose conduct is likely to bring DISGRACE upon the Christian name, the Church is not the sort of society that can restrict its membership ~~MEMBER~~ in order to be more select."

But Bligh forgets that "Ecclesia" means "select." He would be hesitant to baptize rascals and so that would hurt the REPUTATION of the Church—he shuns public disgrace, but apart from that would have no limitations at all: DIS member-ship is more important than all that the membership stands for. In the end Optatus, Lucifer, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose—all the great ones of the 4th century—direct their final approval on the REPUTATION of their church. Had Rome been an ordi-

city, the claims of the Bishop of Rome would be far more impressive than they are, for then they would stem from his ecclesiastical office and position alone. As it is, the weight of Rome was so overwhelming politically and especially culturally, that, in view of the close identity of a Bishop's importance with that of his city, one is surprised that the Roman see was not rather far more important than it was. There is nothing the Roman Bishops do or claim that one would not normally expect from the Bishop of the most important city in the world. Their claims are not out of proportion to those made by Bishops of other cities; Bishops of the largest cities and of the capital as a matter of course put forth identical claims, which from the 3rd century on bear no weight at all in proving the Apostolic nature of one church or another. Yet the earliest Roman claims date from the 4th century. *and made by R. E. Peters*

When cities started appealing to their Apostolic foundation as proof of superior merit the principle of equality was surmounted by the useful fiction of THE DOU-DE APOSTOLATE," All the earliest churches had been founded by Apostles so on that ground they were equal. But in an age in which numbers was everything a neat and mechanical application of the rule of number to this problem was inevitable: what could be more obvious than that an office bestowed by TWO Apostles is twice as valid as an office bestowed by ONE! At the Council of 381 in Cy. appeared the Doctrine of the Three Thrones of Peter: Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. How then could Rome claim to be superior through Peter? How but by the addition of another Apostle, Paul, to establish the claim of DOUBLE APOSTOLATE? Damasus explains that Alexandria has second place, and Antioch third, because Peter LIVED in those places, but Rome has undoubtedly the first place "because Peter and Paul, dying there on one and the same day EQUALLY consecrated the above said Church of Rome to Christ the Lord." This is speculation unlimited. It destroys the Clementine claims, it introduces principles of authority nowhere mentioned in scripture or in the Fathers, but which undoubtedly would give Jerusalem, with its TRIPLE Apostolate and its consecration by the Lord's own death,

overwhelming priority. "I Paul and I Peter decree..." is the formula in the Apost. Const., giving Paul first place. A letter attributed to Anacletus states: "That is THEREFORE the Prima Sedes which belongs by celestial bounty to the Roman Church, which ~~was chosen~~ the most blessed Peter and Paul consecrated ~~BY~~ THEIR MARTYRIUM." Where does one find a rule that the place in which a hero dies is the place in which the most of his authority resides? Not in ^{II}Christian thinking, certainly: it is rooted in the thinking of the pagan world—where a hero dies, THERE is his shrine and the place of his spiritual survival. It is the foundation theory of those earthbound cults ~~which~~ which are the essence of Mediterranean religion, the cults of shrines and caves which abound in Pausanias dominate the Near East at all times, and flourish as much as ever ~~but even more~~ in the world of the Lady Aetherea who at the end of the 4th century visits the grottoes in which Christ was born, raised, preached, held the Last Supper, was buried, resurrected, and ascended to heaven. The same letter of the dubious "Anacletus" notes that Alexandria comes second "because Mark preached there under Peter's direction, and there received his glorious martyrdom." Antioch comes third because Peter there installed its Bishop Ignatius and the ~~little~~ name "Christian" originated. Note how carefully the letter avoids making Peter himself bishop of either of the other two places, though there is every bit as much evidence that he was bishop there as at Rome. Yet the same letter says that Rome receives its principatus NOT from the apostles at all, but from the Lord Himself. Any church founded by an Apostle could make this claim with equal truth—for all the apostles were commissioned by the Lord: no matter what the Lord said to Peter, the question here is how and to whom Peter's authority was given, and in the absence of any evidence at all, it is assumed that because Peter DIED at Rome more of his authority must reside there than elsewhere: yet this argument is spoiled by giving Peter and Paul equal authority. If it can be proved that a Church has a direct claim on the Lord's promise to Peter, there is no need to bring Paul's office into the picture. Indeed it only confuses the issue where a single head and a monarchical authority is insisted upon. "Peter, Paul AND IGNATIUS died at Rome for the same purpose," says Chrysostom IG 50,593, which was "to extinguish

idolatry with their blood," not to establish a principle of authority. Bringing Ignatius into the picture weakens the double Apostolate as the figure of Paul weakens the Petrine doctrine. "Peter and Paul preached the gospel and founded the church at Rome," writes Irenaeus, "and after they departed, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, himself gave to us in writing the things taught by Peter." If one remembers that Clement was supposed to have been chosen by Peter to head the Church ~~SOLELY~~ because of his experiences and intimacy with Peter and his teachings, it is hard to see how Mark would not have been the better candidate. It was Mark who survived Peter as his closest disciple and personal interpreter, not Clement; it was Mark who as Peter's scribe should have written the letter to James if any was to be written. It was ~~Mark~~ who excelled in the very qualities which are supposed to have given Clement his position: yet absolutely no mention of Mark is found anywhere in the Clementine accounts. Though Krueger expresses his personal conviction that Peter was at Rome, "since without that the history of the early Church cannot be explained," he says that that "cannot be strictly proven by undoubted evidence....I cannot prove it, and neither can anyone else. If Peter was there, he says, it was as we find him in Clement, as one of those modest, unprepossessing and very unimpressive missionaries of the Messiah." For he left no early impressions at all, and "nearly everything in the traditions of Peter is legend." Goguel also believed Peter was in Rome, but finds it strangely obvious that he did NOT play an important role there and certainly did NOT found the Church there, and that is more, he had NO influence in its development. The tradition which makes him the founder of the Roman church and first Ep. of Rome comes from the middle of the 2nd century, according to Goguel, having its rise "in a very vague statement in Clement of Rome."

In the so-called letter of Clement to the Corinthians, "nearly all ^{modern} catholic historians see THE FIRST MANIFESTATION KNOWN TO US OF THE SPECIAL AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME IN THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH." At the end of the first century "Clement of Rome writes already like a pope and intervenes with imposing authority in the

internal conflicts of the Church of Corinth." Does that make him a pope? At the same time Ignatius was ~~exercising~~ intervening with far more "imposing authority" in the internal affairs of half a dozen other churches. There is not the slightest evidence that no OTHER Church intervened in the affair at Corinth, Seiller notes, but what is more important, Rome does not intervene at all—there is nothing in the letter but the expression of a timid opinion, given, it is clearly explain, only because and only when the Corinthians themselves asked for it, and the word used for "asked for," implies a general request made in various quarters for information. There is no mention of the name of Clement in the letter—if he wrote it, it was as a scribe; and he speaks only in the name of "the church temporarily staying at Rome, to the Church temporarily dwelling in Corinth." So much for the Church that was to "remain firm and steadfast until the end of the world!" He gives no orders, though he states that the situation is desperate and ruining the whole church; he never once mentions his office or his authority or his name, though the situation desperately calls for a strong assertion of authority; he appeals to the Corinthians only lamely "in the name of blessed Sophia," quotes very cautiously a passage from the Scriptures and leaves the Corinthians to draw their own conclusions and do as they see fit. What "imposing authority!" Eusebius tells us that Bishop Dionysius of Corinth later wrote a letter to the Romans, in this he patronizingly compliment the Romans on the Roman custom of helping the needy and the mine-workers by special foundations. The letter, however is NOT written to Ep. Soter of Rome, whom it praises, but is specifically addressed to "the Church at Rome," who are always addressed "you" in the plural. "Today is Sunday," says the letter, "and we are reading that letter of yours—the first one, which was WRITTEN DOWN by Clement." How rude of them to forget to mention that this Clement was a Bishop, let alone President of the Church—while all other Bishops are receiving due respect and recognition! What it does mention is that it was he who actually wrote the letter—not dictating it, as a bishop would. If Rome intervenes in Corinth, Ep. Polycarp of Smyrna intervened in Roman internal affairs with ^{far} more imposing

authority, coming in person to the city, so that Irenaeus can boast that the doctrine of the Roman Church is Apostolic—because a man who had actually known an Apostle had taught there! The Catholics see proof of Roman priority in the fact that Ignatius, talking to seven Churches (far more frankly ^{incidentally} than Clement does to Corinth), does not rebuke the Roman church as he does the others. But he was on his way to Rome and had actually seen conditions in the other churches—he had never yet been ^{there} to Rome: when he rebukes the other churches it is always on the basis of personal observation, and as yet he had made no personal observations in Rome. On that head he naturally preserves silence, ~~but~~ Eusebius notes that Ignatius "the Second successor of Peter in Antioch, wrote letters to all the Churches IN WHICH HE HAD SOJOURNED." Then he lists the cities receiving such letters and adds: "Besides these he ALSO wrote to the Church of the Romans." (HE III, 36) Here we see that Rome is indeed in a special category and immune to first-hand criticism—the only kind that Ignatius indulged in—because the saint had not yet visited there, and NOT because he thought of it as particularly pure and holy.

J. Van Cauwelaert

A Dutch Benedictine monk has recently removed the last excuse for arguing that Rome's intervention in the Corinthian trouble is an indication, let alone proof, of her position of leadership in the whole Church. For Rome had always had special and intimate ties with Corinth, which did not extend to the rest of the Church. Already Paul notes close ties between the two ~~churches~~ cities, independent of the churches. American excavations in Corinth have proven beyond a doubt, says Van Cauwelaert, that there were indeed very special ties between/Rome and/Corinth ^{the CITY of} the CITY of. "Is it not perfectly natural to assume that the relations between the two (Christian) communities were of the same nature as those relations which united the two cities?" "The Christians of Rome and Corinth must have conserved their/established ^{previously} social relationships, their civic spirit, their national sentiment, and even the pride in their cities...We may accept it as certain that...the profane rapports ^{secular ties} would furnish the desired foundation for religious ties. Then he reviews the history of events by which, thru a special founding, Corinth became and remained a uniquely

Roman community in an island of resentful Greeks. "The cult at Corinth was actually MORE roman than that of Rome itself, because it was less cosmopolitan!" "In its official life," our researcher concludes, "whether political or religious, Corinth appears before us in the first century (A.D.) as a city entirely and exclusively Roman, with an unequivocal note of puritanical Romanism." The offices, customs, names, dress, manners, and tastes of the city were all aggressively Roman; public arts and private gadgets were all un-Greek, Latin and Roman. Such a state of this could have persisted, our author notes, "only through the persistent influence and continual intervention of Rome itself, and an extreme docility, a veritable spirit of submission (courtisan) on the part of Corinth." "Why then," he asks, "should not the Christians, conscious of forming a single body, remain without such connections? Arguing A FABI from the secular ties between Corinth and Rome, we can admit that the Christians of the two cities were not less united among themselves than their heathen fellow citizens." If anything, they would be more so.

Clement himself refers to the hospitality of the Corinthians, and speaks to them "in the language not of a distant brother but of a recognized member of the CHRISTIAN FAMILY OF CORINTH." Socrates, giving a long list of ~~bishops~~ men who have been bishops of more than one city, notes especially the Rome-Corinth tie-up.

In conclusion Father Cauwelaert writes: "Consequently, the question of ^{WHETHER} ~~determining~~ IF I Clement is presented is an act of the Roman supremacy MUST RECEIVE, IT APPEARS, A NEGATIVE ANSWER. Evidently from that fact that the Church of Rome DID NOT ATTEMPT TO ANNOUNCE SPECIAL RIGHTS, one would not be authorized to conclude that she was NOT conscious of some primacy," but I Clement cannot be taken as proof or even evidence for it, and, says Cauwelaert, "we must underline the modest style of the document as in perfect harmony with the principle which it itself announces for those who wish to instruct others, I Clem. 48:5: "The more meek and humble a man is, the greater he appears, and the proper thing is ever to seek the common advancement--NOT one's own." Certainly the fact that Rome presumes to interfere in Corinthian affairs appears now as anything but an indication that Rome was ruling the Church.

Silence!

It is important to insist on this point not only because the passage in I Clem. is exhibit A in the ~~XX~~ claims to Roman supremacy over the Church, but also because after that single solitary example one must it is the ONLY evidence that actually travel for over three hundred years before coming upon another such useful reference in the literature! H. Vogel's collection of ~~passages~~ "Antenicene Texts referring to the Primacy of Rome," is an extremely instructive lesson in the extent to which human ingenuity will go in trying to make ancient writers say what they have no intention of saying. Not one of the passages Vogel produces even remotely suggests a reference to the primacy of Rome.

The underlying silence of history regarding the primacy of Rome is most significant only when we know just what ~~Rome~~ ^{role} Rome was supposed to have been playing all along. The present claim of the Roman Church is that "the Church is a perfect society and independent, having AN IRREVERSIBLE ORGANIZATION". The Church has...the right and office of ~~custody~~ preserving in custody and of expounding the revealed doctrine, and in that function is infallible...It preserves inviolate the deposit of the faith, and explains it infallibly, being never at any time in error...The Pope is infallible even without the consensus of the Church. A General council acting in concert with the Pope NEVER errs," though national synods are fallible. "The INFANT CHURCH," writes Batiffol, "was a hierarchical society, a Church of Churches, a unity preserved by the unity of the cathedra Petri; and SHE WAS KEPT TRUE BY BEING ALL TRUE." In one of many spurious letters attributed to Innocentius that very early Pope (whose name is missing entirely from many of the lists) says: "The Apostles established the apostolic seat...AS THIS THE MOST IMPORTANT AND PRINCIPAL OF SEES COULD REMAIN IN REFERENCE TO THE APOSTOLIC SEAT." Another very early Pope, Evaristus, is quoted as writing to the Africans: "It is necessary to refer to the apostolic seat...as to the head, whose charge it is TO DECIDE THIS CHARGE (DISPUTE) IN DOUBTful MATTERS, and does not hold its office by usurpation." Evaristus is represented as writing a charge to the whole Church: "If you have anything against your Bishop, refer ALL ON AGES TO THE HOLY SEAT."

Here we have a clear enough conception of the sort of ~~the~~ thing the ~~the~~ head of the Church should be and do. These are functions for which there was a crying need in the Church from the time of the Apostles until the Council of Trent, when the extent of the Pope's authority was still very much a question. ~~Ext~~ They are functions that remained unfulfilled for a thousand years in a Church of chaos. Let us consider the argument of silence in this connection.

If the primacy of Rome had been a fact, it would have solved at a blow all the most burning controversies of the first four centuries. While everyone was casting about desperately for a way out, that way is suggested by no one. ^{It did not, Duch. notes, occur to Athanasius,} How gladly Constantine would have availed himself of it! It was with great reluctance that he himself took over the office of "bishop of bishops" though he himself was and if anyone knew of the Roman claims he should have. a Latin-speaking westerner. A nod from him was enough to sustain the authority without limitation and of any bishop ~~without limitation~~ without opposition, as was proven by experience again and again. He was eagerly seeking some principle of authority, some theory of general rule for the Church; if the theory were not accepted in practice, that was no problem—a word from Constantine and any theory became an ecclesiastic practice. Yet it is never hinted for a moment that in the primacy of Peter he has the obvious solution to his problem. "Christianity was born catholic writes the ecstatic Batiffol, referring to its unified, universal, centralized organization: and he is right. But why did it not remain so? " With the passing of the earliest age all this itinerant, ubiquitous personnel disappeared, and nothing remained but local ecclesiastical organizations." Could they be trusted to follow the right path independently? Their courses promptly diverged in all directions, so that the historian Sozomen can report that in his day no two churches had the same rites or doctrines: a central control was badly needed, but it simply was not there. "It was to the great Babylon, ^{of the West} so cursed by the Jewish prophets, that the role of leadership fell," says Duchesne. Why then does it not lead? It is very strange that "in spite of this, this hierarchical preeminence,

this general direction which had its seat at Rome, WAS EXERCISED WITHOUT ANYONE DREAMING OF THE CREATION OF ANY SPECIAL PERSONNEL." Why not? If Rome was from the first designed by Christ and Peter to be the headquarters of the world Church, why did they not set up there, as they certainly did at Jerusalem, the machinery, offices, and personnel necessary for such a task? Rome was organized exactly like any other city bishopric, with no more and no less official machinery than was necessary to carry on the business of the local city church. Were these offices adequate to supply the central leadership which the Church so badly needed? Just as a bishop and an Apostle cannot, by the nature of their callings, fill each others' offices, so the Episcopal ~~xx~~ organization of Rome was neither designed for the government of the Church nor equal to it. Duchesne says elsewhere that the proof that certain offices must have existed in the Primitive Church lies in the fact that certain functions were carried out: without the ~~function~~ ^{office} the ~~essi~~ function would have been impossible and inconceivable; and so when we find that "NO ONE DREAMS" at Rome of establishing that personal indispensable to ~~certain~~ the functions of Church government, it can only be because those functions were lacking. We can trace the introductions of offices and functionaries from time to time to fill a crying need: but these offices were NOT original to the Roman system. Though Paul is thought to be the real founder of world Christianity, Karl Holl can only marvel at Paul's unconcern for problems of organization: it was the Elders at Jerusalem who worked all that out--Paul as we have seen did not think of himself as establishing either a large or a permanent institution. If we are to believe the Roman claims, both Peter AND Paul spent each of them at the very least 25 years in Rome, engaged in the work of organizing the Church. Now Clement really was something of an organizer, and we have volumes of stories about his activities, albeit legendary. But neither Peter nor Paul has left behind that corpus of stories, legends and true accounts which each of ~~these~~ these dynamic men most assuredly MUST have if the Roman claim is valid. We have noted Ignatius' complete silence on the apostolicity of the Episcopal office, though his purpose

in writing was to build up the prestige of that office; we have noted his distress at the condition in which he finds the Church, how he takes it upon himself to write disciplinary letters "because his love will not be silent," though no one has ordered him to do so. He knows of no general authority to which he can appeal for orders to the Churches, he himself has received no authorization from such. Ignatius refuses to name the trouble-makers, exactly as Clement will not name them at Corinth. Why not? Paul is quite specific in naming the ring-leaders in the same Church. Why doesn't Clement follow his example? As we have seen, in the days of the Apostolic fathers everyone was writing letters to everyone else--these letters were sent directly, copied, and spread among the Churches to provide general edification and instruction. Thus on the death of Polycarp the Church of Smyrna sends out an epistle "to the Church of God in Philomelium AND TO ALL THE CHURCHES THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE WORLD." There are numbers of well-attested instances of this sort of thing (e.g. Ignatius to Polycarp, Iaplas, Polycarp, Barnabas, later Iren. to Rome, etc.) but no central clearing house in action. Remembering that these letters are OFFICIAL and addressed to THE WHOLE CHURCH and that the writers justifying themselves by feelings of love and urgency while admitting that they are not AUTHORIZED to give orders to other churches and one must admit that there is no central authority in the Church. When a serious question arose to whom should it be referred? We have quoted the claim of "Irenaeus" that it was the very purpose of the Roman see to handle just such cases--that is logical and sound, and it shows us thereby that a head of the Church did not exist, for in that case all these questions of doctrine and authority would have been referred to it; bishops would not have attempted to correct widespread troubles in other churches by direct letter, but would have referred matters of rioting and insubordination to the head; and from that head to be copied and quoted everywhere. This is recognized by the Romans themselves in their numerous attempts to forge such letters. But there is neither direct nor indirect evidence that the

the churches were being governed from ~~back~~ Italy, and there is a good deal of evidence that they were not. Indeed Eusebius says that after the persecutions in which Peter and Paul lost their lives, John returned from Patmos "and continued to govern the Churches," as he had authority to do. With the Easter controversy a rash of epistle-writing and exchange of visits broke out again, as the only means of reaching general agreement. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, says that he has written "various letters" combatting a false conception of Easter that has become popular at Rome. "The Elders before us, and those who lived with the Apostles never handed down such teachings to you," he says, rebuking Ep. Victor of Rome. Who ordered Irenaeus to write letters of instruction to Rome, let alone to administer a rebuke? He tells us who: he says it was his own idea, because he felt the Church needed a defender and it should be he. "Let a Bishop be judged by a Bishop, a layman by a layman, and a prince by a prince," says the Ap. Const. and continues: "The sheep are answerable as rational beings for their own behavior. Hence they should flee from pernicious pastors." But where is the head: "A Bishop judges a Bishop,"—not the later rule that THE Bishop of Bishops judges a Bishop. Again, the well-known rule, that a Bishop must be ordained by at least three, or at the very least, by two, other Bishops." What about his being ordained by the pope? Is not Peter supposed single-handed to have ordained his successor? In all the epistles of the earliest "popes", none refers to himself as anything but "Archbishop of the Roman Church." Sixtus I, according to our Catholic editor, is the FIRST one to use the title "universalis apostolicae Ecclesiae episcopus." But if every where was a well-defined title, it is that of Archbishop, a term so specialized that its use here is the equivalent of calling the King of England Lord-Mayor of London—an honorable title, indeed, but one that excludes him from the throne by implication. If the Ep. of Rome were really the president of the Church from the beginning, and recognized as such, he would have had a special and fitting designation, and not always be referred to, as he is, merely as Bishop or Archbishop. This again is recognized by those Catholic divines who faithfully translate the word Episcopus as "Pope" when the Bishop in question happens to be

Bp. of Rome, but simply as Bp. when he is any other Episcopus. One learned Roman-
 ist in his enthusiasm even translates Episcopus as "Pontiff" whenever it applies
 to Rome in Eusebius--though Eusebius died years before anybody but the Romans
 Emperor was allowed to bear that august pagan title of Pontiff. On the other hand
 with admirable consistency and determination, the same scholars when they find
 African bishops such as
 Cyrilian or the Bp. of Alexandria called Pope long before the title is applied to
 anybody at Rome, they mechanically translate the word "Bishop." So "episkopos" is
 to be read "pope" when it applies to the B. of Rome, and "pope" is to be read "epis-
 copos" whenever it applies to anybody else. In such a method it is possible to make
 out in translation a pretty good case for Rome--but only by such methods. Who
 shall judge a Bishop when he does wrong? asks the Const. Ap. Naturally, the Bp.'s
 superior. But the Const. Ap. knows of no such: the Bp. must judge himself; there
 is no higher authority; he must follow the admonition of the Delphic oracle: "Know
 thyself." It is indeed a sore absence of authority that leads Christian Bishops
 to seek their ultimate appeal for truth with in the judgement of holy Apollo!

In the Gontendage of the Apostles we read: "And when I Clement met my master Peter,
 he appointed me to be the protishop of the city of Rome, and he made me chief of
 the congregation, and I remained in the protishop of the city of the city of
 Antioch; and I remained in the protishop of the city of Alexandria,
 etc.

"God has done to me removed all external danger from the Church," writes Cyprian,
 "that I do not believe in security... in this life can last long. Already the trou-
 ble-makers are stirring. I shall strive the multitude of the believers, and I shall
 with the very situation described by ~~the~~ Hegesippus immediately after the passing of
 the Apostles: "as soon as the Apostles and those who knew them first hand had all
 passed, those who had been lurking in dark corners came out openly, then off the
 disguise, and began to preach their false doctrines with utter impunity, there being
 no more Apostles around to put them in their place. They sprang up, says Irenaeus,

like mushrooms overnight. Here we have the abrupt discontinuance of Apostolic authority. Had the Apostles not been "last," but left behind fully authorized successors with as much authority as they themselves had had, ~~xxx~~ and had the nature and ~~xxx~~ location of that authority been clearly declared to all the church, the passing of the Apostles would of course only have been an episode and not the complete disaster it was; those who had been intimidated by the presence of genuine Apostles and Elders would have continued to stand in awe of their genuine successors. But such was not the case. Celsus sneers at the way the Christians, a united body in the Early days, had finally broken up into innumerable wrangling sects--and Origen must admit the charge, justifying that state of things by a feeble comparison with the wholesomeness of differing opinion among philosophers and scientists. ^{2 did Justin} But his answer is beside the point: philosophers and medical men may quarrel no end about their theories, but the revealed word of God should not be the subject of bickering, and we have seen that the Romans claim the Holy See was established from the very beginning to preserve unity and perfect agreement. Why doesn't Origen, the most learned Christian of his time, know about that? Clement of Alexandria observes with sorrow that there are people everywhere who say they cannot join the Christian Church because it is a hotbed of warring sects. His answer is the same as Origen's: the Greeks and Jews are just as bad! Forced himself to choose among the sects, Clement bases his choice wholly on the argument of numbers: the BIGGEST sect MUST be the true one. An argument on which Athanasius pours withering scorn. "The largest consensus-group must be the true preservers of the tradition, and the others must be the strays," Clement concludes. What an argument for divine authority! But that we wish to note here is that the existence of a clearly recognized head in the Church somewhere would immediately solve Clement's problem: the ONLY possible norm would be to follow the teachings of the established head, no matter what sect was biggest, if only such a head existed. But Clement knows of none.

That the idea of No. 1 Church comes from that of Mother City in the 4th century is clear from the earlier Christian concept of a spiritual Mother. When the Judge asked Marcellus, an early Christian martyr, who his parent were, he replied:

"Our father is Christ, and our Mother is belief in him." And Eusebius tells how under

Constantine all the human race was united in a holy family "having one Father, God, and one Mother, true piety." The ~~rapid~~ religious role of Constantine and the instantaneous and ecstatic acclaim he received from the Churchmen would have been out of the question had the Church possessed a single leader anywhere—even as a faintly remembered tradition. But for 300 years there had been no general conference simply, we are told, because there had been no one with the authority to call such a conference—until the appearance of Constantine. "He was common with all men; when the various provinces of the Church differed among themselves, he as a common Bishop established by God, would summon synods of God's ministers. And he would sit in their midst, not ashamed to be one of their number, becoming the ^{for all} COMMON FATHER, acting as umpire/in matters of God's peace." This is the office that Rome should have been performing, yet there was no protest from Rome, whose aged Ep. sent ambassadors, and we are told in no uncertain terms that since the days of the Apostles NO CIVIL MAN had done anything like what Constantine was doing. Yet Constantine did what he did reluctantly: he begged the Eps. for long to settle their affairs among themselves; "since you will fight about trifles," he wrote to all the Eps., "I have been FORCED to write this letter, finding it necessary to come forward as a guardian of the peace, I am FORCED to set myself up as a moderator among you." It is as a peace officer that it is his duty to intervene and bring peace into the Church: and to do that he uses the civil techniques: "Being desirous of bringing this plague to a halt, I could find NO CIVIL MEANS OF CURB or of casting out the common evil, then to send abroad my messengers," etc. At the council, Julius is described as "Leader of the Ruling City,"—that is the most important thing that can be said about him, that his city is Imperial. But this is the time to say that he was the ruling Ep., the head of the Church, the one and only successor to the Apostles, etc. etc., and not just Ep. of what everybody knew was the Imperial city. The priests he sent ^{thence} took orders from him—but no one else did. Since the primary question of "Who was to rule the Church?" (the doctrinal issue, as

was often observed, was merely a pretext for a showdown of power-groups), now was of all times the time for Rome to assert her claims—at the first and holiest of all the general synods, but instead: "Since the beginning of the world only ONE man, the Emperor Constantine, having woven a crown of peace in the bond of Christ, offered to his Savior a godly thanksgiving offering for victory over his public and private enemies, having brought to pass as it were a likeness of the assembly (chorus) of the ancient Apostles in our own time." A miracle and a wonder—the first gen. assembly since the days of the Apostles—and only ONE MAN was able to bring it about! That this is no exaggeration was seen in the bishops that came from all over the world to the meeting, wearing strange dresses, speaking strange languages, teaching strange doctrines, practicing strange rites--Socrates says no two churches had the same liturgy; viewing each other as strangers from other planets--what better demonstration of centuries of isolation during which no single center gave them instruction or ever brought them together? Constantine's opponent, the Christian Licinius, was for the churchmen "a wild beast," and the worst thing he ever did according to them was to forbid the holding of synods, "THE ONLY WAY IN WHICH THE CHURCH COULD BE GOVERNED."

When just after the Nicene council Julius of Rome wrote a triumphant letter to Alexandria on behalf of Athanasius, glorifying the successes of ~~the~~ the West, he made no mention of the primacy of Rome. At the same time we find Hilary of Poitiers writing in his own name letters "to his Brothers and Co-Bishops in Germany, Belgium, Lyons, Aquitaine, Narbonne, Tolo^a, and Britain," i.e., the whole Western Church except Italy, giving ^{doctrinal instructions &} ~~the~~ OFFICIAL report on events in the East. "Though you are firm in the faith," he writes, "still there are some of you who have forwarded to me letters asking for communications ~~for~~ from me: I will therefore, inexperienced and untought as I am, undertake the heavy task of clarifying things." How dare he! Was not the Apostolic seat there for that very purpose? Hilary protests that he is reluctant and ^{poorly} ~~un~~qualified—why then does he not "forward" to the head of the Church the difficult doctrinal questions that have been "forwarded" to him, not from this or that small suffragan church of his own French diocese, but from all

over Europe? "I shall faithfully transmit to you," he writes to the Bishops of the West in another letter, the report of what ^{is decided} ~~was done~~ (at the Council of Sirmium), and you can ^{judge} ~~decide~~ in the light of your faith whether these decisions are catholic or heretic."

This is a double outrage! Are not both these functions, the official reporting of acts and decisions, and the judgement of their orthodoxy the exclusive and proper business of Rome? The Romanists much later claim so, but Hilary knows of no such claim. The terrible rioting, charges and countercharges the resulted from competing parties for the office of Bishop in the Church of the days of the Apostolic Fathers continued unabated. We have read Chrysostomes vivid description of "all these riots that now fill the Churches," and his explanation for them, that "some are actually filling the churches with murder, leading whole cities to riot and revolt, all because they are fighting to be elected bishops." If Clement viewing this very situation 300 years before, intervened "with opposing authority," as the Catholics say, to put an end to it, why did it continue? ^{and grow constantly worse?} Why does not somebody now intervene? Somebody does—and it is always the Emperor. But the point is that a central authority in the church would have long since worked out a way of dealing with these local uprisings IF that central authority had only existed. Later on, when there WAS such a central authority in Rome, the rioting at episcopal elections, the commonest cause of unrest in the Church, ceased. The Apostles knew, wrote Clement, that there would be trouble about this office of Bishop, and so they made an epimone to take care of it. The Apostles also knew writes Socrates, that there would be trouble about doctrine so they also wrote down an official statement of doctrine—"but this letter was held as a thing of naught," and so the problem was not solved. In these cases we are told HOW the Apostles "transmitted their authority," and it is not thru the person of a chosen successor. From the first the sorest spot in the church, the episcopal election, was, then, to have come under special surveillance: yet nothing is more evident than that after the passing of the Apostles there is no such general surveillance over the elections. "I charge you by The Fathers," writes Basil to the people of Neocaesarea, whose Bishop has died, "and by the true faith...each

to use his own judgment in preserving the common good in electing a new bishop." Note who is giving orders—and in whose name! "The more the infirmity of the churches increases," writes the same Bishop to Athanasius, "the more and more we must look to ~~THEY~~ perfection ~~for deliverance~~ to deliver us from this terrible tempest." (winter-time). When a church elects a new Bp. without consulting Basil, he can only wring his hands in protest and cry, "there is no stability in this sort of thing!" How true. ~~xxx~~ Does he not know where there IS stability? Is the man to whom all must turn in the general shipwreck of the Church Athanasius and no other? Where is the imposing authority of Rome?" Grill, Basil's contemporary, always calls the Church SANCTA, but NEVER A⁺postolica. He argues that Mani cannot be the Paraclete, as his followers claim he is, because he came 200 years AFTER the death of the Apostles, while the Paraclete came only in the time of the Apostles. Where has it been in the meantime? "There are three periods in the history of the Church," writes Grill, "that of Christ, that of the Apostles and..." we wait in eager anticipation for the successors in the leadership, but in vain, "...and those times which have passed since the Apostles." What a strange way to designate the Third Period of the Church. It is as disappointing as Clement's announcements—one of the few genuine utterances—that Christ gave the gnosis to Peter James and John, they "passed it on" to the rest of the twelve, and they in turn "passed it on to the seventy." Since the discussion is of the transmission of the key-knowledge of the Gospel, we wait for the next link in the chain—but there is none. Even so the Apostolic Fathers assure us that Christ had his authority to the Son, and that Christ gave the same authority to the Apostles, but refuse to say that that authority was passed on to Bishops, instead we are told that "in the places where they preached the Apostles chose first fruits in the faith and made provision that when these fell asleep others not unworthy should succeed them." Here is definite mention of succession, but it is, pointedly NOT of succession to the Apostles, (Bps. & Bps.) The Fathers scrupulously avoid saying the thing they must say if the Roman claim is true. "When you are visiting a strange city," Grill advises his Alexandrian con-

gregation, "nefer ask simply 'Where is the Church,' for every vile sect calls ITS meeting place by the good name of the Lord; neither ask simply, 'Where is the Eklesia,' but say rather, "where is the catholic church. For this name happens to be peculiar to the holy mother of all of us." This still preserves the old original sense of "catholic," namely the general society as opposed to the individual communities. Thus we have very early letters addressed to individual Churches by name and still others addressed to "the general Church," That is the meaning of the word--it does NOT mean universal. But its very early use in letters shows it to go back to a time when there were actually general authorities. The secondary meaning is given it by Grill: "It is called the catholic church because it is found through all the inhabited world, because it is the COMPLETE preaching of EVERY wholesome doctrine; and because the WHOLE human race is disciplined for piety and because it is a WHOLE cure for EVERY appearance of sin, and because it contains EVERY concept of what is called virtue." This is an obvious rhetorical etymologizing, but note how completely silent Grill is on the subject of a single head. "Your father said," wrote Ambrose to Constantius, "it is not MY business to judge between Bishops," but YOU say, 'I must do the judging.'" What Constantine did say was that it is NONEONE'S business to judge between bishops. As a matter of fact Ambrose has taken that function upon himself, so that people say, he notes, "that Ambrose wants to take more authority than the Emperor." But where does this discussion leave Rome? Who IS to judge among bishops? On that head Eusebius and Ambrose played a rough game against each other. [In 375 some Syrian monks wrote to Epiphanius, who was then a Bishop in Cyprus, begging him to write against all the heresies. "Since not only these but many others as well were constantly appealing to him"] Why does even the devoted Optatus, a Roman by birth and living not far off use such restrained language when he writes: "The line of Popes ends with Siricius, who today is our APOSTLE, along with them and all the rest of us the make a common society of all the world, in the concord of a single society." No mention of subordination but only of agreement. "Should people be baptized again in the name of the Trinity?" he

asks the Donatists. "YOU say yes, WE say no, and the people are torn between us. NO ONE WILL BELIEVE YOU, NO ONE WILL BELIEVE US, we are all contentious men. We must find judges." How to judge in such cases is precisely and specifically the function of Rome, according to the Romans, yet this loyal Italian continues, "But since neither Jew nor Pagan is qualified to judge these things on earth, NO judge is to be found; and so we must look for a judge in heaven. But why ask heaven when we already have heaven's answer, ~~the NT?~~ ^{because} Why indeed, ^{since it was the interpretation} of the NT that they were fighting about in the first place! Optatus finds a poor enough answer—but what a gross insult to Rome, if Rome had anything like the authority she is now assumed to have had! Optatus continues: "But why is even the NT necessary? AS LONG AS THE FATHER IS PRESENT...a TESTAMENT (that is, a witness of him in his ABSENCE) is not necessary. Christ told the Apostles ~~that~~ all that was necessary. The one of whom the Testament bears witness is actually alive in heaven: therefore his will is to be required in the Gospels as if in a will (testamentum). ^(so dead & empty!) The answer to rebaptize is therefore Mt. 28:29, plus John 13:10. In the end Optatus falls back, as do all sectarians, on the Scripture, but he comes very near the answer when he points out that God is STILL ALIVE, and then he quickly reaches the inevitable conclusion: ~~let us ask him for revelation~~ ^{falling back} by falling back on the ~~Scripture~~ ^{Scripture}, the very subject of the dispute! But throughout the whole discourse this loyal Italian preserves a very significant silence regarding the proper function of the Pope—^{total} a few miles away! A few years later a Bishop of Rome writes to the Bishop of Ravenna, within ~~his~~ his own metropolitan district deploring the fact that the ritual and liturgy of that Church is NOT and never has been that practiced at Rome! Where is the Roman control? Rome is supposed to be guiding the Church, and the soul of the Church is the mass, yet in the 9th century liturgy had entirely died out at Rome, and it was necessary for the Frankish church, aided by monks the Clunian reform "to save it for Rome and the world!" "These," says G. Ladner, "compelled the Papacy by main force to return to the path of leadership of the universal church."

The title "Doctor of the Church" is applied officially to show "that the person who bears it is one who has not merely transmitted the teaching of the church to others, BUT HAS TAUGHT THE CHURCH ITSELF, and whose doctrine has consequently been generally followed and authorized by the church." But is this not a usurpation of the ^{the} authority of the Apostolic See? The earliest instance of such teaching would seem to be that of Hermas. "In those days," says a letter attributed to Pius I, ^{his} "Hermes ~~za~~ doctor of the faith and Scripture scintillated among us. An angel of the Lord appeared to the same Hermas dressed as a shepherd and told him that Easter should be on Sunday. HENCE we are able to teach this by Apostolic Authority." This must have been written long after Hermas, for the writer does not even know that it is an allegory. But it is very significant that ~~he~~ ^{Pius I} rests ^{his} ~~the~~ authority in this decision NOT on Peter but ^{that an angel} on the claim of a man who was not a Bishop ~~to have had an~~ angel appear to him. ~~Therefore~~, he says amazingly, we know that this doctrine is apostolic. For the SAME doctrine of Easter as taught at Rome Irenaeus gives a wholly different authority--he had never heard of the angel, ^(see intimate to P. Mouton, R.) a later invention. He says the Roman version is apostolic because Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna actually went to Rome in person and ~~put~~ ^{set} the Bishop of Rome on the right track--and Polycarp, he reminds us, had actually known John. He gives this as the BEST proof he knows that Rome teaches apostolic doctrine. But how insulting to the Petrine claims! Polycarp ~~should~~ and Hermas should be taking instruction from the head of the Church--NOT giving it!

The introduction to Origen's great ~~HEPTA~~ ^{HEPTA} ~~ARXON~~ ^{ARXON} is a most significant document. Next to Augustine Origen was the most important Father in the establishing of Christian Theology; he kept 7 secretaries busy night and day answering the questions on doctrine and authority that poured in to him from all parts of the Church. In the First Principles he announces his intention to deal with just that--not trivial and technical details of doctrine, but the great First Principles ^{on which} ~~of which~~ the whole thing is founded. Christian disagree, he announces at the outset, not only on minor but on major matters, on the very fundamentals. They agree for example

that the Holy Ghost comes Third in honor, "but it is NOT clearly stated whether the HG was begotten or not—that we must find out from the Scr. to the best of our ability by a sagacious inquisition." It is agreed that the devil and his angels exist: "but why or how or what they are has not been clearly enough set forth." It is agreed that the world was created, but what comes before or after is not evident in the teachings of the Church; we know that there are angels, but what, how and when they are is not sufficiently manifest; the word which best describes God is asomaton—bodiless—yet that word is unused and unknown in the Scr. And so on. Origen announces that he must to the best of HIS ability seek a solution to such problems in philosophy, BECAUSE THE CHURCH has not given an answer to them AND HE KNOWS OF NO ONE TO WHOM HE CAN ~~REITERATE~~ TURN FOR INFORMATION. But have we not been told that the very purpose of the Holy See was to answer such questions, and that it alone has the authority to do so? Everyone has his own ideas, all claim to be followers of Christ, Origen announces, and yet they disagree about everything. He says he will follow "the ecclesiastical preaching through order of succession handed down from the apostles and remaining until the present in the Churches, but he knows of no authoritative head to turn to and says that "basic doctrines are NOT manifestly set forth in our preaching." It was time to do something about it—but was it HIS calling, who was not even a Bishop, to become the great authority? How can heretic groups be distinguished for the followers of the true Apostolic teaching, which all pretend to be following? Aside from the lame argument of number, Clement of Alexandria introduces another test: "they can be distinguished by interpreting the law of clean and unclean animals in a mystical sense." But "a mystical sense" covers anything, and Clement is perfectly aware that one group is just as able to turn the Scripture against its enemies as another. Yet he knows of nothing better than this—no general doctrinal head to appeal to. "It is foolish," he says, "to turn down Christianity because it is divided into many sects. We must by demonstration and hard study show from the Scr. how only in the true and Ancient Church^{we} the most

exact Gnosis and the best choice (Literally, HERESI !) of things. There are many who appear wise and who really believe they have found the truth and who are followed by large congregations...but as a matter of fact they only obscure the truth by their clever manipulations." ^{Where are the pure teaching and imposing authority of Rome?} ~~Now~~ [^] Where an infallible authority on doctrine exists, heresy is a sin, yet here Clement recommends his brand of Christianity as the best heresy, i.e. the best choice among many. At the end of every major discussion Origen can only invite the reader to decide for himself. Yet these two men were the greatest theologians of their times.

The situation in the 4th century is neatly stated by Lactantius: "Only the catholic Church therefore, ~~xxx~~ retains the true cult (the word RETAINS is significant, suggesting as it does, the awareness as well as the possibility of LOSS) possibility of such loss). But since, [^] however," he continues, "separate groups of heretics insist that ~~THEY~~ are the true Christians and that they ARE the ^{firmly believe} Catholic Church, we must identify the true church as the one which salubriously cures sins and wounds. To do this we must fight more wholly and devotedly against all the sects of liars." ~~Again, Celestin has no sure test for the true Church~~ ^{Grill} ~~among many: then Christianxxx Epiphanius~~ had advised those of his group to use the word Catholic, since all the sects were calling themselves Christians; but ^{not so Xthine (6} now that is no longer a touchstone, since all the sects now call themselves Catholic! Still nobody thinks of the Dec of Peter! Nobody thought of it when "upon the death of the last Apostle," the heretics, Seeing that there were no longer any Apostles, were free to cast off their long disguises. There was a Bishop Nepos in Egypt, greatly admired for his noble character and his great gift for hymn-writing, who tried to revive the old doctrine of the Millenium, using Revelations as a text. One of his warmest admirers, Ep. Dionysius of Alexandria, protested against this dangerous liberalism but observed: [^] "If Christ and the Apostles were still here we could ASK ~~THEM~~ about such things. As it is, we had best content ourselves with a "spiritual" interpretation of the Scriptures." Here we see that the Scr. are at best a poor substitute for direct revelation; but again we ask the question

"If Christ and the Apostles are no longer here," are not their successors? Are not you as Bishop of Alexandria, ^{sitting on one of the Three Thrones of Peter later} the successor to two ^{with the duty and} apostles, with the duty and authority to teach the whole church? Apparently, E. Dionysius was not impressed by the authority in doctrinal matters of himself or any other man upon the earth, including the Bishop of Rome. "How can we convince ignorant and uneducated people that among all these heresies the catholic Church has the correct faith and does not make mistakes?" asks Athanasius, aware that Scriptural demonstrations, especially of the "spiritual" sort recommended by E. Dionysius, are not too convincing for the masses. Now is the time for Athanasius, one of the very greatest heroes of the Roman Church, to come out with the authority of Peter, but he does nothing of the sort: instead he gives an astonishingly weak norm of orthodoxy: "The best way is through teaching them about the holy TRINITY, where Christ did this and this." The holders of the holy places must be the true sect, says Chrysostom, since we would not allow them to fall into the hands of heretics. What a last-resent comment! In that writing attributed to Athanasius expresses these the teach that ^{that are told} things should be believed outright on authority, without checking whether they are proper or improper. But where is authority when he can talk like that!

In writing his famous report on the Councils to the Western Church in the middle of the 4th century, Hilary justifies the liberty he takes by the great evils that have been made of him and by his inability in a crisis to keep silence: "I think it is ^a necessary and religious act for me to forward these colloquia to you as a Bishop, to Bishops. Next numbers of letters have been written him by Bishops asking for his report and though he is "very unexpert and untaught" he takes hold of the TRINITY to answer them. Hilary uses a neatly rhetorical device for discovering which of the more than two-and-seventy varying sects is the true one: they all fight against each other, he says, accusing each other of being heretics, and so mutually cancel each other out; but in one thing they agree--they all make war to each other against THE Church, which, since their mutual disagreements show them to be false, being the common object of their

base
opposition, can ~~still~~ be the true one. The only weakness of this argument, as a
little reflection will show is that it can be employed with equal validity by
ANY sect! For if the churches are ALL fighting each other, then any one of them
can say with perfect truth that all the others have but one thing in common, ~~namely~~
that they are fighting it, and that therefore it ~~xxx~~ stands alone against them
all and can only be the pure and undefiled one of the lot. Holding to the ur-
ging that comes from Bishops all over Europe, Hilary agrees to send them important
doctrinal reports and interpretations--without dreaming of consulting Rome.
"Fearing lest I be guilty among such and so many bishops of disastrous impiety
or in derel of error,

For as I have frequently signified to ~~these~~ you in most of the cities
of the lower provinces that is being considered by our religious bre-
thren the Bishops of the East...fearing lest either amidst the disastrous
impiety of the larger number of bishops, or in the danger of error,
assuming that your constant activity came from the despair born of the
awariness of pollution and impiety, I decided that I too should pre-
serve silence before you (for I cannot deny that you have often been
denounced to silence.

Now, however, he thinks it "necessary and religious" to transmit the latest
information to the Bishops of the West, "as a Bishop to Bishops." This is surely
most remarkable situation. This man is the real intermediary between the West
and the East: all write to him directly for communi-
cation, and whether he carries the word, and what he says and how he says it
is entirely his own decision. Whatever control there is of this vital intercourse
lies entirely with the Bishop of Antioch--not of Rome, who is not consulted
one way or the other. In exactly the same spirit, in 375 some Syrian monks wrote
to Augustine, Bishop of Hippo in Africa, begging him to write "against all
the heresies, that of course he could not do but a great many others were willing
to do for him, to do for him, to do for him to write." Of course if they could get
a statement that the Bishop of Antioch had called to the head of the church some here, and
he, while not willing to make use of the learned man's services, would commission
him to write. That is the way it would be done if there were a head of the Church
and that is ~~just~~ the way it is done.

When persecutions showed up grave weaknesses in the Church, especially in the matter of mercenary bishops, "Corrodian, though he had no authority to teach in the Church, could not restrain his indignation before such a scandal." He is in exactly the same position as the Apostolic Fathers and their successors--all of whom taught because they could not restrain themselves and not by any special commission. But who gives such a commission? "The aging Bishop Augustine," writes von Campenhausen, "xxx for the Latin world [the] authority--all churches and theologians of the West turn to him for information and advice. The question of freedom and grace was his special interest, but he died before he solved it." Had Augustine been commissioned by God rather than chosen by men to solve the deep and distressing doctrinal questions of the Church he could not possibly have died before he solved them (and Brahmam says he left the four gravest and most burning questions quite unsolved), in fact he would not have "solved" them at all--that, says further is the method of philosophers, but the Church's questions are solved by prophets, who operate in an entirely different manner. Again we return to the claims of the Roman Church, that one see alone was established for the specific purpose that men might appeal to it, and not to the Bishop of Hippo, with "the more important and difficult" problems of doctrine. Why didn't people turn to Rome then? Why didn't Augustine himself? Why did he not refer his questioners to Rome as he did refer them on occasion to the town of St. Felix near Milan. He knew all about Rome--it was his old stamping grounds, but in his mighty wrestling with the great problems of theology to find his ~~own~~ solutions were to remain the authoritative ones for all time, it never occurs to him that there he might find his answer. Then during many years he sought desperately for someone--anyone--who could give him an authoritative and convincing exposition of Christian doctrine--he never thinks of going to what is now put forth as the fountain-head, as he certainly would have found that fountain-head existed in his day. It did not. Augustine's great career ends, there, ended on a question of doctrine: "I pray that the great Council may have decided this question from various sides,

and each one has declared what he has thought correct according to his rights and understanding. Since therefore IT IS A LONG TIME SINCE WE HAVE THE OPINION OF THE ELDER IN THE CHURCH, AND TO FORTH COME TO ANGEL, I will report what each one says, ^{double} AND I AM IN THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH WHICH THE HIGH CHURCH FOLLOWS. Another/insult to Rome, and this time by the author of the ¹gate!! In ALL THE CHURCH there is NO authority whose opinion is to be preferred to another's, and so ²the individual reader is free to decide for himself. Pocrates tells how "the apostles had many differences of doctrine to deal with in their own times, and since they knew these would be the cause of great disturbances among the parties, they all came together and formulated the holy law.

...But the teachings of this latter were distorted and the infatuations of the apostles held as things of naught. As a result there are found two churches in the world that do have the same rites, observances and doctrine." Here the claim that the apostles confided all their doctrinal instructions and authority not to a personal successor but to a letter, and that when that letter failed to sort the problems of the church, completely rules out any awareness on the part of Pocrates, a major historian, that the apostles left any special successor to control such matters. In surviving doctrine, Pocrates notes, the Church tried to follow the apostles' directions. The 5th century scholar can write: "And though many instructions are found in the authority of subtilty,, still since the defect~~ions~~ of our times, in which the very bodies of men are failing, does not allow recourse to a limitation in all things."

The announced intent of discovering definite ties with Peter in the Vatican excavations of recent years ^{exp. 1950-1951} ~~have~~ something of a last-ditch determination about it. This air of finality is matched by the distressing finality of the results. "It appears," writes P. Leventis, surveying the evidence, "that there is no chance of recovering a tomb ~~in which~~ or any authentic relics of Peter. The Vatican excavations...might well have established ~~whether~~ there was a tomb and relics ^{or not} ~~most~~-authentic or not."

foundation of St. Peter
The world is never allowed to forget that the ~~consequence~~ ^{consequence} of the whole Roman
position is that verse of scripture which in convenient mistranslation and in
letters of heroic size adorns the highest circle of the interior of the dome
of St. Peter's. In the 19th century the Protestant attacks on Mt. 16:18 were all
aimed at showing that those words were very probably never spoken by Christ. ^{The} ~~that~~
most powerful argument in favor of that theory
it is precisely because they were spoken is Harnack's observation that until
the middle of the 3rd century no one ever quotes that all-important verse. That is
is precisely because the ^{words} ~~there~~ were spoken that the fatal silence is so thunderous.
The fact that no one thinks to cite Mt. 16:18 ~~xxxix~~ ^{thru} ^{long} three ^{long} centuries of ferocious
controversy on the subject of authority does NOT prove that those ~~xxxix~~ words were
~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ not available to the early Fathers, but it does most emphatically
prove that these fathers did NOT see in those words the organic foundation of an
established church. That high and holy matters are under discussion in the inner-
most conversation of which we have only a few broken fragments in Mt. 16 is apparent
to all: that the three Gospels have no intention of revealing to the world that
these matters were should be equally apparent, if only from the strict injunction
of silence placed upon the disciples at the time. From the Christian point of
view, Protestant as well as Catholic, the important passage is not "thou art
Peter," ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ but "the gates of hell shall not prevail." For while no
one has been able to establish historical connection with Peter, the ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{statement} about
the gates seems ^a ~~xxx~~ general and unequivocal promise that the Church will go forth
invulnerable, from which we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Church is not
only to continue "firm and steadfast till the end of the world," but that it actual-
ly has in the end nothing to fear. "The gates of hell," is quoted so often and so
as by the Catholics themselves, and that
fervidly by Baptists, to prove that their Church, marked by its "Trail of Blood"
must have persisted through the ages from the time of Christ. But does the magni-
ficent assurance of "the gates of hell" hint at anything as poor as an indomitable
trail of "Trail of Blood"? Just what is meant by the peculiar expression, "the
gates of hell shall not prevail against it?" That is the all-important question for
for both Catholics and Protestants—a question which they never solve.

Once the meaning of the phrase, "gates of hell" is clear, it is equally clear why no one in the first centuries of the church ever referred to that verse to prove that the Church would survive or to show where its head would be. It has nothing to do with the future of the Church on earth but refers to a high and secret matter about which the second generation of the Church knew nothing. That explains why it is never referred to in the Bible. It is one of those "teachings of the Elders," which Irenaeus informs us his generation regarded as "rather mysterious" and could not hope to explain. "In the second century," Barnack discovers, "not a single church father or heretic made any reference to this verse (Mt. 16:18), even in those cases in which would and the author of the in view of its context expect such a reference. Tertulian is the first church father to mention Clementine 'writings' and he first to attest it." In this case the Clementine author does not use the word "petra" at all, but instead writes "foundation," but that, in this BIBLE reference, could the foundation of the Church have been anything but the rock? ~~And~~ One of the most distinguished theologians of the fourth century, Hilary and Basil, both say the rock was CHRIST--the others do not mention it. The marginal note in Hilary's ~~only~~ comment on Mt. 16:18, "Ecclesiae fundamētum fides," is fully borne out by Hilary's own text: "The Son of God the heavenly Father refers to revelation. Happy foundation for the construction of the of the new name of the Church!" Elsewhere Hilary writes: "After confessing that Christ is the Son of God. This faith is the foundation of the Church: firm as with the gates of the lower regions are wide open and closed. This faith is the key of the Kingdom of Heaven. This faith will bind in heaven and earth. This faith is the guarantee of REVELATION from the Father... This is the revelation of the Father, this is the eternal security." Not a word about any geographical or political grant of power--no dwelling on the name of Peter. (Mt. 16, 187). "It is this confession of Peter," writes Basil, "which is the true rock of piety (soteria)." Stroud and Millerbach, collecting all the commentaries on Mt. 16:18 in the Vulgate and Syriac, give that scholars consider the best, that is, the most likely rendering of Mt. 16:18 in the original Aramaic

that Jesus would have spoken, and translate the passage: "I also tell thee, even
thee, Peter (purely for emphasis): Upon this rock (upon the fact of my Messianic
calling and my being the Son of God) ^{+ I shall (act) (over)} I will build my society." This interpre-
tation is strengthened, Linton tells us, "by the fact that elsewhere in the primi-
tive Church it is always CHRIST and not Peter who is the foundation of the Church."
very much to the point
"The Tu es Petrus," Jaquet writes, "does not contain any of the ecclesiastical
theorist that have been or sequentially discovered. It does not justify the authority
either of Bishops in general nor of Rome in particular. It expresses only the fact
that the Church rests on faith in the resurrection of Jesus and that Peter is the
one who, when Christ appeared, had the first REVELATION of the resurrection, the
revelation without which the faith in Jesus would not have survived his death."
In his massive work, Tu es Petrus, Jaquet has supplied impressive illustration
of the desperate odds to which defenders of the ^{Roman} ~~extrinsic~~ claim must go to make out
a case: Peter's reply and the Lord's reply are, he says "like a diptych, an inter-
national parallelism, in which on the one hand Peter confesses the greatness of Christ
while on the other Jesus proclaims the future greatness of Peter." But the essence
of Diptych and Parallelism is the DIFFERENCE of the members: there is nothing parallel
about the true love, immeasurable inequality of glory that must be between the
two. If Jaquet is right and the Lord is really matching glory with glory and
power with power, then his glory in heaven can be matched by only one thing--his
glory on earth--his Peter's! "It is true," says Jaquet, "that not a single
verbal edition of the central part of verse 18 exists before Tertullian (ad. 200).
But that is so in the case of a very great number of NT verses." But when the
verse in question happens to be put forward as the foundation of the Church and
the rock on which the Church is built, that silence becomes most significant.
And then that silence covers 200 years of controversy on the particular subject of
authority, and a desperate quest for some central head or authority in the Church,
it becomes fatal. The silence does not mean that the verse is interpolated, as
Linton argued, but it does mean at the very least that the verse was not recorded

in the Early Church as the key to the whole problem of authority. Then Jaegerst comments on the question, "Why ~~does~~ does Mark (and hence Luke) OMIT 'Peter is Petrus,?' " Incidentally, Luke's version is NOT a slavish repetition of Mark's-- he must have his own reasons for not mentioning such an important thing. J's answer: because Peter "out of humility, would have omitted anything that might be to his praise." But LUTER is not writing the Gospel, but Mark is, his greatest admirer--and that after his death! There are plenty of praiseworthy things about Peter in the Gospels. If the Lord's COMMISSION to Peter is what the Gospels say, it is, this is no time to ^{be so anxious to glorify him, (i.e. to glorify the Church)} ~~make his full, modest~~ the whole foundation of the Church depends on ^{his testimony} ~~it~~, to hold back at such a time is nothing short of ~~open~~ betrayal of a trust. Does Celestine, for all his stammering and blushing as Peter seats him on his throne, fail in the letters attributed to him, to declare his own calling? "Mark does not insist on the organization of the Church, and so says nothing about it," says Jaegerst. "To suppose that Mark must have given in detail the origins of the history of the Church...is a pretension devoid of all critical sense." But to suppose that Mark or LUTER have given such a detailed account in an official history of Peter is even more difficult. Does not J's claim hold equally true of LUTER, who tells almost the same story that Mark and Luke do, and (has far less reason for glorifying Peter? (The Mark in his church history should introduce and QUOTE the very conversation which culminated in the promise to Peter without so much as hinting at the purpose of the whole conversation, is a proposition not only "devoid of all critical sense" but devoid of any sense at all.

~~Examinations of the texts~~ The terms in which Eusebius and Hieronymus figure in discussions of authority through the centuries are quite conceivable had there been a widespread tradition in the Church of a central EMPIRICAL authority. ^{ever} ~~never~~ Had there been a pretense of such authority Eusebius would not have had to struggle and strive in vain to show that IN EMERSON at least it is the Pope who summons general synods. The real question, says Hefele, of "who in fact called the general Councils or who participated in the calling of the same?" must be answered: thus: the first eight general synods were summoned by the Papacy,

whereas all later ones were approved and subscribed by the Popes; but even in the former instances there appears a certain participation of the Popes in the convocation, which in separate cases is sometimes more and others less conspicuous." The Roman Catholic Bishop does his best to make a case for Papal convocation but what comfort is there in an "indication" that Popes participated more or less, when other great Bishops were equally active in the convocations? Or what satisfaction in admitting Papal supremacy from the ninth council on? What is a late hour to be asserting a rule that is supposed to date directly "in immutable organization," and full majesty from the days of the Apostles. Hefele then lists the reasons for calling a Universal Synod: 1) In case of a dangerous heresy or schism, 2) When two Popes stand opposed to each other and it is doubtful which of them is the true one; 3) For a common undertaking against the enemies of the Christian name; 4) When the Pope stands in suspicion/heresy or other grave offenses, 5) when the Cardinals cannot or will not proceed with a Papal election, 6) when it is a question of reforming the Church at the head and in its members. In all these situations, as at all councils, the main aim is ever, according to Hefele "To advance the good of the Church through a general consultation with its shepherds." Reflection on each of these points will show that at least five of the six contingencies requiring a General Synod would be IMPOSSIBLE if there were in the Roman Church a divinely established head and a proper order of succession. Hefele further defines an Ecumenical Council as a meeting of the Bishops of all provinces summoned and bound under the Presidency of the Pope or his legates." Which completely rules out the first eight synods. The earliest synod of Rome mentioned in Mansi is described as "A Divine and holy local Synod/in Rome, by the most Blessed Innocentius the pope (papa) of the Holy Church, and by Polycarp the holy martyr and Bishop of Smyrna, and many other bishops." Even though this passage is a forgery, the identical formula is given in Mansi, with different names and Bishops of course, for the Synods of Jerusalem, Caesarea, Lyons, Carthage, etc., so that it not only gives no precedence to the P. of Rome, but by specifically describing him as

"the Bishop OF THE WEST" rules out any idea of the high and mighty "Patriarch" which is now supposed by some to have been his as Bishop of the Whole Church." introduce Nice- presiding in the Council It is as if one were to designate the President of the U.S. ~~as the President~~ as a Patriarch Public. Soon after this we read in Mansi a long epistle from the Patriarchs of the West to the Patriarchs of the East regarding the election of an Archbishop for "all of Ascria, Media and Ierica," yet this document, so vital for the whole Church, East and West, contains no mention of Rome. The absence of any reference of a head in the Church, even as a tradition, comes out in such statements as that of Irenaeus, that "even though the Fathers of both Branches (Western and Eastern) held conflicting opinions regarding the Eucharist, we must not for that reason split up on one side or the other, but rather try to reconcile them. Let these brethren should it be to bring about a reconciliation? Where is the head of the Church? Speaking of the Middle Ages in general, Foulke writes: "The Pope himself was not secure, for he was bound by the decisions of the Fathers and the great councils. He might err; he might be condemned for heresy. His verbal errors, his administrative errors, it is true, were matters for God alone (which I believe did not think so!), but the most appalling specialists were aware that his dogmatic errors were a matter for the Church." If we look back to the only dignified surviving account of the organization of the Primitive Church, the Middle Ages, we find that the prophet was to be tested by his deeds, not by his doctrines. The tables are neatly reversed: the man is to be tested by his deeds, but his doctrines are subject to review.

Michael Smith's "Historical Basis Referring to the Roman Primacy," is feeble and far-fetched in the extreme, but ever less convincing is here Irenaeus' "Response to the Council of Chalcedon." For the excellent evidence of such matters is that of Irenaeus! It would be better not to give him such a high rank as to give him an active apostolic tradition. The case for Irenaeus goes back to the source to prove that Irenaeus' successors: the Council of Chalcedon of 451 is given as the main proof; the Council of Chalcedon of 451

570 and 700 A.D. The fact that the Roman claims are stated so clearly and boldly in these documents makes it all the more significant that they are the first.

Nothing more completely refutes the claim to the existence in post-Apostolic times of a central head in the Church than these descriptions of Church organization and succession in the earliest apologetics which are commonly put forward, in highly "controlled" form, in support of the claim. First there is the significant fact that the earliest fathers when referring to the Church as an organization confine themselves not to speaking about "the Church" at all, but always use the plural, "Churches." "The Apostles," says I Clem., foresaw the difficulties that would arise regarding the office of Bishop everywhere, and so made a special ruling regarding the successions of the Bishops in the Churches which they established." The rule, as Clement's own ~~own~~ experience attests, was not very effective, and he himself can only give the rather lame advice that "it is our opinion that those appointed by them (the Apostles) OR AFTERWARDS by OTHER eminent men, with the consent of the whole Church...and who have for a long time possessed the good opinion of all, cannot justly be dismissed from the ministry." "As the book of Acts shows," writes Socrates, "the Apostles were aware of many differences in their own times already, and since the Apostles knew these would be the cause of great disturbance among the gentiles, they all came together and formulated the holy law, which they wrote down in the form of a letter, by which the Church of their time was freed from such terrible affliction and troubles....But the teachings of this letter were distorted and the injunctions of the Apostles held as a thing of nought," with the result that Socrates can report from personal observation that "it would be hard to find any two Churches with the same Easter, rites, fasting, ordinances, etc." Surely there was a better way of directing the future of the Church, namely through a continuation of its Apostolic head, and we can be perfectly sure that that way would have been followed if the Apostles had ^{believed} expected for a moment that the Church was designed to remain on earth. Imagine confining all their instructions to a letter! Clement here is as vague and helpless as Socrates.

At a time when the Church was swarming with heresies so clever and convincing that only an expert could possibly detect them, Irenaeus took upon himself the task of proving to a perplexed world which of many conflicting sects was the right one. "The true Gnosis," he says, "which is the teaching of the Apostles and the original system common to the Church throughout the world, and the character of the body of Christ after the successions of the Bishops, transmitted to each of them as the Church was set up in his particular place, has come down to us." He goes on to say that this treasure takes the form of "the legitimate interpretation of the Scriptures," which he says, is "more precious than the Gnosis, the gift of more glorious than prophecy, supereminent above all other gifts of the spirit." Which shows, incidentally, how much more highly the Churchmen esteem a dead prophet than a living one, and prefer intellectual exercises to direct revelation. But how does Irenaeus prove the divinity and correctness of the doctrine of his Church? "The Church," he writes, "ALTHOUGH although it is scattered abroad throughout all the inhabited world, still since it received its teachings from the Apostles and from their disciples," teaches the same as we do. "This teaching was accepted by the Church though scattered in all parts of the world, and carefully guarded AS IF dwelling in a single house. And it is believed UNIFORMLY in these matters, as having one soul and one and the same heart, and with perfect harmony (symphonos) it announces these things and teaches them...AS IF speaking with a single mouth. And though various languages prevail throughout the world there is but a single and uniform force to this tradition. Neither the Germans, the Iberians, the Celts (East and West), the Egyptians, the Lybians, nor those in the middle of the world teach otherwise. But like the sun, God's creature, it is everywhere equal and the same." And again: "But of those of the true Church, though they are spread around the entire world all have the same doctrine of the Father, since they have the firm tradition from the Apostles, and this gives us ~~exemplum~~ all a remarkably uniform faith."

This is Irenaeus' one crushing argument against the heretics, his one conclusive proof. And it derives its entire force from the fact that widely-scattered churches preach identical doctrines even when there has been no collusion

among them. If there were a central head to bring the churches into harmony, then the argument would be meaningless. Irenaeus insists that close agreement of doctrine among the churches can only be explained on one ground: that they all go back to the common Apostolic origins; if we want to know what the true old teaching was, he says elsewhere, go to those Churches in out of the way places, at the edges of the world, where the people are illiterate and so have preserved the faith intact in their hearts since the time of the Apostles. This is the argument of diffusion, the very opposite of the argument of centralization. If the Apostles had established a single official source and control for doctrine, that of course, would be the thing to which Irenaeus ~~and~~ would appeal against the heretics setting up their own centers--it was to Rome in fact that much later Fathers did appeal. But Irenaeus rests his whole demonstration on the proposition that the remarkable uniformity of doctrine found among churches scattered in all parts of the world is evidence for the Apostolic origin of the doctrines in question since such widespread agreement can only be explained as going back to the days of the Apostles. Jerome can still argue against the Jews that "the house of prayer is the Church, which is divided (dividitur) in all parts of the world, and not the Temple of the Jews, LIMITED AS IT IS TO A SINGLE NARROW SPOT." Jerome did not know that 400 years later High Mass would be confined to just one spot in the world, and limited to the offices of but a single man--that is the very centralization which he here charges AGAINST the Jews.

Three hundred years after Irenaeus, Optatus tangles with a new brand of heresy and ~~he~~ uses all the arguments of Irenaeus and more. His favorite argument is that the true Church must be found throughout the whole world, while most heretic sects are local phenomena. Over and over he repeats: "Catholic means, ubique diffusa," of course it means nothing of the sort, if he wants to press the meaning of universal, it does NOT mean "everyWHERE" but "everyBODY." But no one knows better than the raging Optatus that his Church does NOT include everybody--that is why he is so perturbed. So he must insist that it means the Church that is everywhere, and use that as his one unanswerable argument against all smaller Churches. But why the icy silence regarding Rome? That would be a far better ar

argument than the test of universal diffusion; but Ontatus never uses it.

"From every valley the catholic population is gathered," writes Jerome, "There are many congregations, but only one congregation, one Church." But while on this theme he never mentions wherein this miraculous unity resides: there is no word of Rome or Peter. "Let us hold a peaceful assembly as in the good old days," says Basil in a heartfelt appeal for leadership, "It was the pride of the Church in those days that from one end of the empire to the other the brethren of each Church could come together with few controls (symbolisms) and of manners and brothers to each other...today letters are sent out in the names of circles, and each society regards its navor with suspicion." This clearly shows that the rise of the great city bishoprics was a phenomenon of the 4th century--a characteristic phenomenon of that power-mad age--and that it was resented by the better men. "Since all who ~~xxxx~~ hoped in Christ make up a single people, and all of Christ's people today make up a single Church, though named for different regions, the patria and the dominion of the Lord rejoice, and will not believe that any ONE man can hold supreme authority, but that all things are managed by one ^{an angel} Church." He recalls the doctrine that ~~xxxx~~ went about visiting the Churches, "the angel of the Churches," and interesting survival of the days of a travelling Apostolate.

Epiphanius repeats the doctrine of diffusion: "The Church received this doctrine and faith and carefully preserved it, though scattered throughout the entire world,† here again the operation of a central controlling head is ruled out, as if living in a single house. Yet she believes these things as having a single soul and a single heart, preaching them harmoniously and transmitting them as if with a single mouth. Though our languages are different, the POWER ~~xxxx~~ of the tradition is one and the same, whether in Germany, Gaul, Iberia, Egypt or Lybia." In his laborious attempts to bolster this argument with all sorts of rhetoric, Epiphanius displays the weakness of his position, yet never once does he use what would be the crushing arguments to all heretic groups were it available: that the Apostolic authority is still visibly operative and clearly located. What we have, says he, is a "firm agreement ~~based~~ on the Law, Prophets, Gospels, Apostles and

safely guarded in the catholic church from the time of the Apostles to our own times." That is as far as he can go. It is Irenaeus' old argument of diffusion.