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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 their church 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 doc. of the 1880'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 the 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 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."

Karl 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 hierarchic but not genuine. A "standard statement" of the case was that of Otto Schel 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 John 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 Church 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 vs. the spirit can and does bring about order, law, discipline.

Today that tendency is no longer to regard the Church 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." "Eklesia," says Sohm, MEANS Gesamtkirche of which the local Churches are only copies. In Mt. 18:17 Harnack, Ratteffel, H. Leclercq, W. Koester believe that Ekkliese refers 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 Gemeindebeschlusses were merely local
Anmerkungshandlung, accepting central decrees. He points to the basic Primitive belief that the Church must act as a Totality, a Unit: a majority vote is not enough—the minority always interacts 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," or Paul, etc.), but it is now recognized that this is NOT the early Christian view, which always traced 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 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 Aufnahmeritus 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 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 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 Luke, 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

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 190). "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 possible end come." John's only conclusion, which he swallows with a very bitter 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 text, many times. Then he goes on to describe how the Christ together and worked at uniting the Church, "no longer going fort
as they had done originally." Many studies have shown the name Apostles when specifically applied to the 12 to mean more than a messenger or missionary—it 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 special witness. There were many "Apostles" as we read in the Didache, but the twelve, "the perfect year of the Lord," were something very special. "At the Present time," says Peter in the Clem. Recog., "do not look for any other prophet or Apostle except us. There is ONE true prophet and 12 Apostles (v. 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 Didache led Holl to the discovery, in which most Prot. scholars now concur, that the Apostolic authority did not come as was once thought merely as a charismatic gift, but that it was an ordained office along with all its spirituality. "From the beginning," wrote Liestamann, "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." (Ieo. 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 44 years Eusebius specifically states that "John the beloved returned from Patmos and continued to govern the Churches." He cites a very old source telling
how as long as an Apostle remained alive the spoilers and dissenters had to content themselves with lurking in dark corners (I I,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. of was that of the Jews and not 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 Harnack and Vogelstein has shown that the general idea of an Apostle as "an authorized representative" was familiar to the Jews, that it was not a "mythical" concept, and that an Apostle could only be one actually send out by Christ himself. Paul, he says, changed all that—mindful 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 mission." This, he concludes, makes the Christian Apostle an office entirely dependent on Christ and NOT a Jewish institution at all. Mk. 3:11, he notes, shows that "the Apostolic office is as original as Jesus himself."

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 (Acts 1:23, I Clem. 14, 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 Patiffol: "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 Mgr. Du Chésne, "there was a perpetual circulation of Apostles, of missionaries, of prophets, of teachers." This is WITHIN the Church, please note, not merely to the Gnostics. "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 (Cul. 11). 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 Apostolic age was gone, other offices remained, and that these offices were not invented to fill the Apostolic vacuum, but had existed along beside the Apostolic offices 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 exert their own and above all to take over the totally different business of governing the General Church is out of the question. Duchesne comments on the remarkable fact that the "great bishopric of Jerusalem 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 believed such a administrative set-up. But no one expected the Diocese of any city to take over the work of an Apostle. This is amusingly shown in the famous forced letters of Constant to James, in which Letter is represented as ensuring the bishopric of the
only to leave the city immediately after having appointed no less than three bishops to sit in his place, since he had to be about the business of an Apostle and could not possibly spend his days in the city.

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 "Presbyterian 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 miopie: no necessary conflict exists between the two which far from being mutually exclusive may well by 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 these 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
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 censors. "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, so 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, feared, 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 prebysterium 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. Ap. explains: the Bishop presides over you as being honored by the esteem of God, by which he rules the clergy and leads 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 of Bishop except through a deaconess. 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 Deacon," says Ignatius, "with them I shall have my share in God."

"The prebysterons are the true successors of the Apostles," he explains... 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
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 in 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 on this, since the claim that the Bishop continues the Apostolic office rests precisely on this argument of equivalence. Thus Bettioll, 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 divine 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. Bettioll assumes that the mere statement of the proposition proves it: there were hierarchies, 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) once 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 (Ep. PG II, 912). Note that "Anacletus" is here trying to explain how Presbytery 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
R.M. - P.M. Grant, "2nd & X St."
- The Woodruff Co.
- J.C. Burch & Co.
- J.W. & J.M. Neff
- W.C. & A.S. Sargent
- No. 11
- Bartlet
Ignatius did say just that. It was long maintained by many that episcopus and presbyterus held one and the same office (Acts 20:20, 17; Tit. 1:7, 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 episcopate and presbyterial offices were identical. Confusion of offices seems to be the rule, and nothing is easier than to reapply any office bestowed by an apostle as "apostolic."

The discovery of the Epistles in 1892 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 three. Harnack pointed out—what has since been universally accepted—the presence in the earliest Church of travel "Bishops." All authorities, and institution of great significance for the study of the existence of an original Church: centralized Church organization. These "traveling bishops," he noted, were not elected but had their office by "a mandate from Heaven," were the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, and they had, Harnack conceived, an administrative of Judicial function. The Bishops and Deacons on the other hand had such functions, but they were exercised only in the local branches. Though determined that administration was important in the early Church, and 2) that several Authorities were also important, Harnack left unanswered the question, "Who could administer the whole Church.?" It was the "Apostles," of course. Harnack retained under the spell of John's thesis that one could not function in a practical or regular way and still exercise spiritual powers. Yet the Church is not directed or controlled does not mean that it cannot itself direct and control—this, we are told, in its specific function: the function of the "Apostles...
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 Ehrlich, "In 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 same 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 early Church, claiming to have "the same organization that existed in the primitive Church," has two priesthod, but one functions locally and the other administrates the Church as a whole, but both are purely spiritual and there has never been any conflict between them. As in Ehrlich's system "the basis of the entire system is the duality of the General Church and the local 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 case with which the office 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. T Clement does not say that a Bishop is elected for life, even on moral behavior, though the matter 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 theological gift. That was the great principle that set the Christians off from other religions. "Neither by nature nor by human intelligence," says Justin, in defense 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 plucked from heaven, and play upon them as upon instruments, making use of righteous men and SENDING 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 totalitas or totalitas summa of religious operation, both are good and necessary, but the higher one has departed from the Church. The Authentic type is apostolic and Prophetic and its genius is power—potestas, against this is the present Church, according to Tertullian can only set up "a succession of Bishops with Disciples, in officium, in the place of potestas. The xx old Church had Imperium—the authority to initiate organization, doct., etc.—while the new one had instar ministerium—a prescribed routine; the temple was the center of the old Church, the synagoge the model of the new; the Spirit was the highest guide in the former, the scripture in the latter; enthusiasm was the guiding principle of inspiration then, all other now; revelation was the source of doctrine then, reason now; the music, tombs, 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 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 Irenæus observed. But could a Bishop succeed an Apostle?
When it came about that the highest office in all the Church was not 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 Battrick's attitude.

"The deacons should remember," wrote Cyril, "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, 100). 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 sometimes called apostles by the ancient Fathers." 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 1st 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, "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 loosing and binding that goes with
it. Though he offers no proof, this is a significant admission of a thing of which the fathers were well aware—that only an Apostle could be the successor of an Apostle, 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 Apostles, Hippolytus lists the names of "the Seventy Apostles."

Bishops were not appointed or prepared to administer the affairs of the whole Church; they were strictly local officers. We have noted Duchesne's perplexity at the absence of any machinery in Rome for the management of anything more than the local Church there; the Bp. of Rome was not set up to be a General Authority. "Follow ye all the Bishop as Jesus Christ," wrote Ignatius, "and follow the Presbyterium as the Apostles. Wherever the Bishop appears THERE IS THE CONGREGATION, just as wherever Jesus Christ appears, THERE IS THE GENERAL (6th.) Church." The Bishop is to the local Church as NO LIVING OFFICER is to the WHOLE Church. No one knows better than Ignatius that there the general authorities have passed away—only Jesus Christ now presides over the whole Church. "Shall I," writes the third Bishop of Antioch after Peter, 'the head of the largest and next to Jerusalem alone the oldest Church in Christendom, "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 Randle, "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 Bishop 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 Churches 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 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 bishops were general authorities in the Church as they had to be if they were successors of the Apostles; 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 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 he’s 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 apostles," he wrote to the Romans, "I am but a man in chains." Furthermore, Reville observes, "if the authority of the bishops 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 end of the first century. Moreover, there is in Ignatius "not yet the slightest trace of those conferences at which the bishops concerted, as in the second half of the second century. The bishop...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, writing to the Churches, must confess that he is in no wise to be considered on a par with the Apostles: "For 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 sense of those who were then alive. And when absent from you, he wrote you a letter...which will build you up in the 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 influential bishop of his day in the entire Church, 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 theirs, such as we find in the holy office of the Apostle. "Christ came from God," writes Clement, "and the Apostle 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." Indeed, he makes a statement later that the Apostles set the Bishops after the old Jewish pattern, and "knowing that there would be trouble about this office of Bishop, they passed an edict, i.e. a by-law or special order, arranging for worthy men to take over and worthy successors to follow—that is all. The Church puts everything on a level far below that of any General Authority. Consider here that all along the Bishops and Apostles existed side by side as contemporaries; we never hear 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 cannot not travel, and an 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 Arche-Shepherd, 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
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 Episkopoii." This is the common and understandable but typically ironic view that anyone ordained to any office by an Apostle could not ordain anyone to any office at all without giving him thereby Apostolic authority! Irenæus 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 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 Irenæus, "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 "successors," he asks: the real Church is "the Spirit working through an inspired (spirituales) man, the Church is not a succession of bishops." Yet so important was it to the Peter school of the office of Bishop that at an early date the attempt was making a rich outpouring of contradictions and absurdities. We have seen the contradictory 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 of the Twelve Apostles simply has CHRIST ordain Peter 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
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 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, Heresius, quoted in Ausbun ii,23 says "The brother of the Lord, James, took over the church along with (mata 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. Yet Jerome translates this passage: suscipit ecclesiam Hierosolymam (mata with AGG) apostolos fraters Domini Jacobus—which in some sense totally changes James' position, making him a successor to the apostles, whom he did not succeed at all—but using violence is necessary if we are to establish a Apostolic successor through bishops. Ausbun, seriously afflicted by doubts and suspicions as a result of his experiences at Lecce, set himself to establish the official link between his own Church and the apostles. He did it, as Irwin says, by tracing a line of bishops. All Lecceans was interested in in his arguments with the Oratorians to establish his proof that certain D. C. CHURCH went back to the apostles, so Ausbun is able to announce at the outset of his study: "I have been not found until now a single writer on ecclesiastical affairs who has considered himself with this question of episcopal succession. Setting 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 any succession to the apostles' office 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 "Investigator,"—Eusebius reviews the Bishops lists of Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch and Alexandria. These are mere CATALOGUES, chosen, he tells us, because of their relative importance, but only a few among many. In 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 an 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 Tolstoy’s equally grave and significant pronouncement: "In Asia the great lights went out."

In the 4th book of Irenaeus’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" are we 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 distinguishing 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 president and acted wittily 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 "equal to each other." How is that possible? Very easily—James was the presiding Bishop of the Church—"not the 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 "piscoped") of the Church at Jerusalem in the beginning, and also presided over ALL THE CHURCHES WITHIN JUDEA. Then 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 Chrysostom cannot claim that 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 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, but 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 at a GENERAL COUNCIL 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 to keep 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—until Peter James and John alive and well, why should they choose yet another chief in the Church? Not to supplant the certainly—the nature of the work for which the Arch 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 TV priesthoods in the ancient Church came as a complete surprise when it was announced in the mid 1800s. The implications of the discovery have not yet been fully realized since it requires a complete revolution of our whole concept of the organization of the early Church, an adjustment which established churches are of course extremal
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 perfect 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: "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 Fr. 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 bishops and helpers (deacons) of those who should later believe." Nothing at all is said about their being apsects 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 (i.e. episcopal, presbyteri) in righteousness and their deacons (novehi) in faith. (Ps. 101:7). This shows the episcopal office as a continuation of a legal institution, and there is much to bear this proposition out. The upstart sects that claimed to preserved 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 is not 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 those
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 identifying 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. Then the historical approach to the problem of the organization of the Early Church supplanted the conventional dogmatic approach in the 1800s, it became apparent, says Mather, "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 centuries, the basic premise remains unshaken. While it is obvious enough that the Apostles WERE "firm, presiding elders, like of service—and who would doubt it?" it is not less clear that the functions of an apostle were different from those of a presiding elder or bishop, and that functionally the apostle is akin to the prophet, NOT to the presiding elder. This is proven, he points out, by the apostle himself. 

Strange! that one of the most celebrated scholars of the day could have asserted as late as 1811 as a matter of fact that the church is for generations, that the functions of bishops and priests are quite different from those of prophets and apostles, and the fact that the former cannot be applied 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 centuries, he 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 Nicaea at the end of the 3rd century (180, observe, in the Christian 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..."
no undoubted or unquestioned answer can be given." The great W. Schuricht designates the theory of the "hierarchical Episcopate as bearer of the Apostolic succession" as a "legal fiction." "In the true nature of which is apparent in many things. In the earliest Church," says W. 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 superior authority of the apostles," wrote the Catholic Duchesne, "founders and spiritual masters...of all the Christian Churches," 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 NOMI organization of Bishop, Priests, Deacon. This is the old Jewish system, he says, which was already in the round and is a natural hierarchy for any such organization to fall into. But these offices do not to take over in place of the General Authorities—they had been their all along doing a full-time job, with no thought of qualifying for Apostolic functions. Can I say they had been there already? Because he can't say it if there are to be any successors to the apostles. But who says there have to be?" Duchesne continued, "If one had been able to write, had the apostles not come, as they themselves announce "last," i.e.: "As these leaders disappear, other such leaders took their place as narrated previously with the election of James." But instead, all he can point to is that up to the most lately past out there were lesser lights still shining—

\[
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...but that has been the case in every dissection of the Gospel. (Cf. p. 4) as we have seen, ever among this lower priesthood there was the greatest confusion when the 'apostles deserted,' as the writings of all the Apostolic Fathers attest. We have noted the inescapable confusion of the office of 'presbyter' with that of 'Deacon' to the degree that many scholars have thought the two offices to be one and the same. In Alexandria, one of the very oldest Christian foundations "all churches were under one Bishop, but each presbyter (priest) had his own church in which to assemble his own people." So late as 267 the Council of Nice declares that "If a deacon who is ruling (superintendent) a congregation baptizes people without a bishop or a
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 never should die, they will not go to hell as if unbaptized! The bishop should be present at ordinations, Justinian wrote, so that everything may be done "simply and securely." Such instances illustrate great vagueness and doubt on matters concerning the authority of the lower priesthood even when functioning in its proper field. This situation of unresolving not only between the various clergy and laymen, but among the offices of bishop, priest and deacon to those of apostles and prophets and seventies, etc., but among the various offices of the local churches as to their office and authority, and finally among the bishops for a claim to be general authority can only have come about if the church was also lost to him. 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 (ANTIOCH) him, but that does not mean that they did not him!

Itself was strictly a demoted from the apostles of a single, unchan-
gained unique hierarchical authority. He proudly announced that in the ancient Jewish
priests could... His attitude: The cathedral (Bishop's chair, seat, "see") is the exclusive exercise of the bishop; the symbol of his authority, the symbol of the unity of the church. Yet Locke points to Constantine's references to presby-
terial texts as well as... He cited many ancient texts to show that priests as well as bishops had claims to power. It seems discovered that for a long time there was only one Bishop of all the others—the other churches were governed by other officers.

The famous figure of Justin Martyr, that "the church grew up in the order of the apostles" 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 successors 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. kehal, 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 dispersion—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 Lietmann attributes the spiritual practice of the early Christians of referring to their local Churches as temporary foundations of the earth: "The Church of God, which is temporarily visiting (zu Gast) in Rome, greets the Church of God which is temporarily visiting in Corinth," which means, explains Lietmann, "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 E. Schürer, 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 acquaintance the resurrected One through personal witnessing, and later by the belief that the Spirit of the Lord continued to operate in its midst." This sort of thing, Schürer believes, is part of an unbroken tradition carried forth among the Jews. But not by all the Jews: official Jewry did not like it, but as we have seen there were all times numbers of disorder Jews who thought in Essenic terms and whose ideas were that of the New Testament. There has been much discussion as to whether the "apostles" of the "New Institution." Is everyone there "apostles" or "apostolate," i.e., apostles, and therefore were they in the literal sense of the word? And in the very nature of their calling they had to be saved. The Twelve certainly come under this category: scholars have been troubled because they were not saved, like other prophets in all respects but very special, viz., they were saved. They were the new Aaron and Moses, the new witnesses with a special assignment, would we look for fraud and immorality in them if they resemble the typical priests in an
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 the other, if not very 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 unsatisfying and unsatisfying and the fathers have not been able to leave the mysteries of real priesthood and Melchizedek alone. "The Church receives royal power from Christ in the wars," 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 act? "Through the ordination of James, called the brother of the Lord, the Father and a natural son of Joseph, and consequently a legitimate brother of the Lord. He was one of the line of David, he was a Jewish high priest, and he tells us much about it." Long out of touch with ancient sources and even traditions, which is only to take out a case, and he is hopelessly confused: he is typical.

The once popular "ellicistic" theory of the indirect origin of the liturgy, organization, and codification of the separate Christian Churches has now been left behind in favor of understanding the organization of the primitive church as a continued extension of the pattern of salvation laid down in the OT. The scrolls and the Joseph fragment have borne out this viewpoint. In a study of these scrolls, no recent reconstructions of events: after the martyrdom of James in 62 and shortly before the fall of Jerusalem in 70... the leaders of the Jews...
catastrophe and escaped to Pella. Soon after the fall of the city an electoral assembly, composed of the despotes (Jesus' blood relations) and apostles and disciples of Jesus, met in Pella and chose a successor to James, Simeon, son of Clopas and cousin of Jesus. Simeon's election was contested and his success in face of the stronger rights of Jesus' closer relative—sire it is generally agreed that the rule in the early Church was 'archiscopal'—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 Simeon. These Jewish Christians, Reicheck suggests, 'organized themselves as a separate Jewish-Christian sect in the Arabian desert, probably adopting as their model... certain Essene institutions.' The leaders of this movement were 'sons or grandsons of Jude.' On the other hand, Struwe states that Simeon was chosen as 'the only living relative of the Lord who had seen Christ in a special revelation,' and thus breaks down Reicheck's version of the threadbare resort of explaining all oddities and discrepancies in the early Church by an appeal to 'Pauline Christianity.' Struwe notes a successor to James was actually ordained and that the whole thing was done on the ancient OT pattern. In the rule discovered at Jericho he finds the title of Diakon as an official Jewish religious office. The word 'Diakonos' is also found to be pre-Christian, used exactly the way given it later in the Church as in the word 'Prophesia,' 'sojourn' to describe the temporary nature of the local religious communities. Two new words are being added to the already huge vocabulary of Rabbinic terms, characteristically Christian, yet having their Hebraic origin even the local communities of the Jewish diaspora. Immanuelstruwe emphasizes that James was the most important man in Jerusalem in A.D. A., and that reason of that distinction after James's martyrdom, but not a word as to either mention any kind of competition to the apostles, as, by all MALA calculations they certainly must have had the apostles bestowed their office on James when they made him presiding bishop. Between Talmud and apostle there is plainly no overlapping, no confusion. Struwe notes in all the earliest records of 'succession the execution of the old Jewish laws and customs—the whole thing as best as such
as possible within a family; the Jews, he notes, kept careful genealogies, they followed "the high-priestly rule of succession," which meant that all their priesthood should be traced back to Aaron. This is the rule for Bishops, Stauder 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,—young 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 2 Clement 1279 Canons of the Apostles, a papyrus work discovered in 1897, 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 Himself He established the High Priests, priests and Levites; by the Saviour were established the 13 Apostles, and by the Apostles were Clement and James were instituted, along with others too numerous to mention. Christ is the first true, only, savior, priest; TETRA is 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 above. Bishops should hear charges, judge crimes, and assign penalties, according to the N.T. and the Jewish pattern (11,14, Rom. 11,11). Those who preside in the Church should be supported financially by the membership "as the priests, Levites, residents and officers of God, as prescribed in Num. 18,1-6." Neurly, the reader notes, the cooper-titans (i.e., loiness) were called the People of God and a holy nation. They are no longer called that, but none the less "the catholic Church is the people of the Nectarion, the Queen people, etc. The Bishops are the your high priests, and your priests are the elders, and your Levites are not fanatics, and your readers, sinners, carters and door-keepers are your deacons 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.
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 immemorially bringing the intellectual and bloodless sacrifices through Jesus the great High Priest...to re-enact, princes, leaders, mediators between God and the faithful, keepers of the scriptures, voices of God, witnesses of his will, bearing the sins of all and answering for all." And to the people: "as the Jews could not offer without Levites, so you can 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 at the high priest and their own persons 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." Just 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, and a received authority from the bishop, etc..." TRADITION FOR THE DEACON: public administration and relief. (27, 44). All rules of marriage and sex life is cited from the Mosaic law. The ordination prayer for Bishops is significant: after an invocation following the Kyrie eleison: "Give in thy name, O God, to be from the heart, to this thy servant, whom I have chosen for Bishop; that he may...unceasingly...care for the flock...love 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 a relative says, "Tito must be anointed after the example of the prophets and kings...the invisible virtue of the Holy Ghost is mixed in the holy anointing." James, the brother of the Lord was ordained apostle by Peter James and John at Jerusalem; hence, they bestowed upon his successors with the approval of all others present, "Henceforward call them priests...It follows that those who hold the Hierarchical, i.e. Bishops, are to be judged by God and not by men." (53, 54). "If the sons of men represent the presbyters in their
office," says this letter, "and Aaron represents that of the High Priest, that is the Bishop, then Moses habitually stands for the figure of Christ; like Christ he is a direct mediator between God and man, 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. "Ardietus" 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 corps an "inspector" (messenger): "He will love them as a father his children...as a shepherd his flock..." (above there is also "an inspector of all the corps."—the Bishop of bishops as it were. The bishop must retire at sixty, the presiding bishop at sixty: "No officers for life!" It has often been noted that the office of Bishop has no life tenure as the higher offices do. Even Josephus notes here, "he must not pass beyond a given period of years..." In the Jewish New Covenant "here and there at the head of each community there is an overseer, the Bishop," i.e. the ideal of both Churches ("tales, and presiding") is that of unity, communion in love—ever going so far as to share common property."

"First," wrote Cephas, "the local ecclesiastical group was constituted and organized on the model offered by the Jewish communities...whether by imitation or imitation of the scribes, or by simply through the means of essential needs in every community, the first Christians soon found themselves provided with a hierarchy of three degrees. This hierarchy held its power, direct or indirect, from the Bishop, 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 Bishop in the representation of the apostles. Such an assumption can tell us absolutely nothing about this "superior authority" to which the local Church's officers received their powers, save that it disappeared very early and very completely. The Apostolic Fathers all recognize the local hierarchy with that of the main church and with that of priest, the Father and the Apostles—but this is, as we have seen, strictly theology; since 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 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? One powerful argument for order and proper subordination—but with no thought of taking the Deacon the equal to Christ or the Bishop to the Father. Continuing, Josephus 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, moreover, one finds a local religious center analogous to Jerusalem and its temple. The last fact, which so simply 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 Justin, Pliny asks what rites are to be performed for her community. Should they not be, as Moses says, to keep without a shepherd, or it not remain intact? As with the Jewish law, so be it. Not the Jews or the priests. They were taken away. The supremacy is not in the whole, but in the Levites—the ancient rites and ordinances are not as being or not. The Jewish religion as set for in the inspired books is today in evidence. It does not mean that nothing or earth remains of it. Paul said the Jews have the greatest of all gifts, the Messiah, would be like one, yet proper, so to the limited degree they enjoyed, would be silenced, and that the gift of tongues could not be found any more. Does NOTICC remain then? In their place, ours will, still be kept 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, if they do not remember the stories of the temple, they never cease to recol-
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 are the core of the community; this seems to be the origin of the Christian "presbyteroi." Thus M. Schachtz. In the Const. Ap. the prays 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 "wants, "let her be as Miriam, Deborah, Anna and Elda,"—all characters. The presence of numerous offices in the Early Church having specific standing or authority and which were all dropped in various times and places is a heritage of basically controlled local organization. The 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 lore 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 were not a thing to be held in contempt. To too with these Christian Churches that were in "the shadow of the synagogues" they were synagogues too; when the apostolic authority was withdrawn, then the rites and ordinances were taken away, they kept alive the memory of the Levite and the Hostile. By its own confession the unique function of the Christian Church is to preserve and not increase or diminish a definite "Messianism." to hold it and keep it warm while looking forward to the second coming. This 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 NT revelation follow such a sad pattern unless it found relief in a like case? Leclercq in the latest authoritative work on the "Christian Liturgy" finds its origin "before all in Judaism, the Liturgy of the Synagogue." If the least be said for it, we find it as 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 Lehner is speaking, is one more of its ritual and liturgy to the rites of the SYNOGE 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. For when the _Christian_ Christian must go to the sad source for the entire substance of their liturgy, we can only assume that they too, as Eichene points out, lost all official ties with their own divine origins, to carry on as the Jews in faith hope and charity through the centuries. The whole life of the Temple 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 Lehner has done this—and found to be borrowings from human institutions on every side. Lehner not only admits the fact, but goes even further, raising the best of an indispensable position by extolling it to a principle: "If the above-mentioned pre- and non-Christian influences have played the most evident role in shaping the ritual 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 the future still other Cultural- and Ethnic zones shall contribute to elements to our liturgy, displacing older forms, and that the cult already of the Church shall refer itself to still other peoples and concepts as it has to those of the west." Since according to Catholic teaching, the raison d'être of the priesthood is the performance of cult offices, it must be admitted that priesthood and cult are here seen to be "adrift in the world—nothing like the fast apostolic ties and controls is out of the question in a Church that has borrowed its rituals from the gospels—displacing older forms" and acquiring new ones as desired. "Priestly ritual," says, speaking for his own Church, "ecclesiologist relates its correlation with the gows of the pontifical privilege." In a Church founded in the Lord there would be no science of "ecclesiology" to study the development of cult ritual forms—for the organization would be a mirror of 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 dependence of the whole Church order on that of the Synagogue 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 rivalry in the Apostolic fathers. Not only did the churches 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 n. Fathers warn again and again, will, and if it does not soon cease must certainly 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 that they have no such general authority, look to no one else to turn to. Only one outcome is 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, it is very strange, and a fact of which we cannot insist too emphatically, says and these jndile, that Irenaeus is entirely unaware of the fact; so is Clement I., Irenaeus, who are the earliest writers after the Apostles and are completely and intuitively concerned with the problem of establishing episcopal authority. Neither of these appeal to the Apostolic nature of the episcopal office in pleading its importance and dignity! Clearly in that time it did not have that dignity. On the other hand, there is no doubt at all that the Apostles did establish Bishops. We must have been under orders entirely. There they 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. 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 Irenaeus 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 seven, who had vanished and whose office and calling was one of the mysteries. The office of deacon is identified with that of reader: as such it was a part of every synagoge, 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 sense of having the names of the early church preserved along with rites and ordinances which were not of the earliest times but were later acquisitions taken over from other sources by the church that would never have been under the painful necessity of building up its rituals, its liturgy out of the original rites and practices—quite sufficient for all purposes, not been completely lost. The scare, not more practical, and popular and otherwise excellent procedures had to be worked out to suit altered circumstances, is very loss, since ritual is not a practical thing any way: it is not adapted to the convenience of society but rather required of the society—of society—the discipline of conformity to it.

Everything first takes its final, eschatological, worldly origin. The idea of a religious community is very ancient, and very anciently that function is "ecclesial." Thus Irenaeus says of his fellow-theorists at the beginning of the 2nd century that "of will never destroy the citi
as long as it is watched over by Athena, ΠΑΘΟΚΟΣ. While the Egyptian god is hidden and secret, says M. Meyer, the Greek god is ΠΑΘΟΚΟΣ because he oversees the land from his 'high castle-seat.' This is a common Trojan concept—president in Norse mythology—of necessarily Asiatic origin: it belongs to the economy of the mountain-palace, the super-watchman who rules the realm over all the news of his realm and sends out the arrows to destroy those who think to escar 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 proecosynal office is not a distant derivative but is endowed with certain astonishing features which show its direct Asiatic contacts. The oldest bishops' titles were the caesars and thunder-arrow, and they bore on their 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 "Vice Kings,"—the royal spies who told the divine king all that was going on in the land. Ancient literature is full of references to such institutions. In the same manner in which he describes these officials Xenophon discoursed on the Persian line of the "Fool" "Leader,"—one need not, therefore think the terminology is merely accidental or for reasons according to a very early passage attributed to Aristeas,

"the demons are the "Eyes" of every city; there should be seven to 100 be of the song. (lit. of his own people) or duty on the "Leader" commander, lest anyone speak disrespectfully or make any move against him, or treat lightly the divine word." (PLV, 1047). In turn the "Leader" 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 "Leader" is guilty of the crime of false majesty! Thus, 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 Paul I, "who has chosen them as his eyes (V, 1121). After describing the functions of the bishop in terms of numbers, i.e. the CT pattern, the Const. writes: "Since therefore you are ΜΑΧΟΣ (lit. "look-outs," "inspectors," "eyes"), you yourselves are under the inspection (shoves) of Christ. Later the same sound
ted by the Prince of the Captivity to all the Jewish congregations of these different countries to elect rabbis and ministers, all of them at an before him in order to receive consecration (it was by laying on of hands), and the permission to officiate, upon which occasion present and valuable gifts are offered to him ever from the remostest 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 expound 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 immemorially follows in 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 argue, however, the study of Church ventures quickly reveals the priority of the religious institutions, especially Asiatic, over Christian ones which were copied from them. This we have treated below.

There is no doubt of early texts describing the functions of the lower priest (e.g., strictly of a local, temporal nature—they are to visit the sick, to baptize, to reserve good order generally in the Church. But in all sense of the word, "priest"—a word that in the first Latin version was "sacerdos"—the same—"a special in the performance of the strictly temporal tasks and odd duties in the Church. Later on the priests and deacons were to become inspired teachers—a function totally foreign to their original calling—and that they did fulfill their charge in the office of bishop. As his assistants they must in spiritual things be spiritual, yet nothing is more certain that in the beginning their office was temporal. Also nothing is more certain than that beside their regular charge, they have become to be separated from the duties of the bishop—they are alone and everywhere a single team. Therefore is the undefined nature of their work: we have the key to the bishop's our calling as in the radical theological charge of priest, they with their office involuntarily gave and continue for a like charge of instruction.
in the episcopal calling.

But we heed not confine ourselves to such secondary evidence, however convincing. For the nature and function of the ecclesiastical office is so well, so often, and so fully described, both directly and indirectly, as that of Bishop. But of many studies of the word archbishop emerges as a consensus: the bishop is an inspector sent to examine local conditions by a higher authority. He examines and reports: to do so he must stay on the ground. From the inscriptions "no fixed meaning of the word's content is clear," unlike the word Apostle "it is either alkaleeres..." J.C. Hase the Christians gave it a definite content. In them 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 summoned him by a show of hands: it was a higher authority that put him in charge.

The local-election theory has now been given up. One of the most actively discussed questions was that of the plurality of Bishops: for the plurality would seem strange that this should have been a question at all—because there was a multiplicity of places requiring direction and administration. The question was never more arisen. It was not for the determination of churches to see in the bishops apostolic general authorities, which by their very number the New Testament had not intended. The office and function of Bishops is clearly worked from the first: "if we accept..." it is shown, then the later concept of Bishops as rulers of the Church..."..." rather than as local churches' is completely discredited. And so we are not allowed to accept the record as it stands but must seek for rest and explanation in the present practice, but not allowed or exact of...to leave their other matters to explain a clear contradiction. The contradiction is not in the record; there is no contradiction there at all—but in the need and determination of the churches to make out of the Bishop something that he was not. We are thus taking over the work of Pauline who could not stay in one place more than three weeks, while those Bishops they could not stay one place more than three weeks! While pointing out that the office of Bishop is a spiritual, religious, peculiarly Christian one, Hase noted that it is vastly different in its basis..."
from the functions of those "prophets, teachers, evangelists, etc. who concern us
to feed the church by revelation from heaven. Any texts on the qualifications
and training of bishops bear that out fully. The "inspired men" whom Justin
describes as the true teachers and leaders of the Church differentiated from the
great men of the world precisely in having no formal education and relying at first
this point exploited by Tertullian, Cyprian, Clem., etc., even on any skill in rhetoric or logic. Yet formal education and skill in rhetoric
and logic are the very things most consistently proscribed for bishops. In the need
Clementine letters to James, Clement tries to avoid the office of bishop with its
heavy preoccupation and worldly concern; exactly as every priest in the 4th centu-
ry tried to avoid the office, on the significant grounds that it meant互動
the spiritual life. It is for that reason that Peter was said to have handed over
the office to Linus, Clem., and Syl. Yet the spiritual life was the very essence
of apostleship. To return to the Pa. 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
us and heard me preach more than anyone else. Go, the sooner you agree, the
quicker you will be free of a great worry." This is NOT the way God calls a
man to an office: there is no mention of the will of God, or revelation. Note
the interstinct 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 "4 fathers are the same: they are all the very qualities we would
demand of all public leaders—and no more. Above all, their concern is for "public
order." This we shall consider closer when we view the bishop in civil life. Is
to his strictly religious concerns, a letter attributed to Celestius says his
faith must be in apostolical tradition and practice. "A bishop," says the letter,
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
certain pseudo-brethren which are being inflicted upon many, and so "must be trained and experienced in the Lord, 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 Gost. 1st. 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. "We must be the husband of one wife; he must be sober, reliable (pistos), and rest (hosios—one thinks of the wonderful meekness of certain prophets!). Since the Lord said to Moses, he no respecter of persons, the bishop should act accordingly: note that the very an identical passage occurs in the OT and the NT, no mention is made of the OT—everything indicates the basic 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. 44:20: the bishop sits as a judge and teacher, exactly as the regal of ancient Israel. He is a disciplinary officer... He is the leader, not the follower. He does not yield to the rebellious Israel, 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 setting off the brink, 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, lambs to lambs, prince to prince. (II, 10), and the people themselves will be responsible for following a bad one: "as rational animal beings, the sheep are responsible for their own behavior, and obliged to avoid pernicious pastors." There is much written about the judging of bishops, in this and how it is to be done. This is in marked contrast to the rule of the Mosaic, that an anointer or prophet, being under the direct working of the Spirit, is NOT to be judged (I Sam. 9:9). The bishop stands in a contractual relationship to a society, not so the bishop of officers, who are social officers: "they shall minister to the travelling entre of their superiors, according to the
Nicene. Bishops, the Ap. 3 nat. continues, should be gentle, not irritable, 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 comity is a prime concern. They must judge as God judges—charitably: the examples cited are David, Samuel, the case of Hiram, etc. all from the OT. A Bishop who expels a righteous man from the comity is worse than a murderer, for he does not take proper means (view, study) of the situation. Always play on the word episcopacy—instruct, consider, study, examine, etc. The editor of the Patrol. thinks the Ap. 3 nat. is very direct. This doctrine of the episcopal office itself comes from Christ, we are told, "being commensurate with his glorious utterances." This is what is meant by direction from heaven. (1947, 1992).

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 realized us, filled us with the Word, nourished us with the milk of the Word, raised us in the Church, 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 the bishop. How much more should we pay to feed him and his clerics whom God has established? "My soul is greater than kinship in the exact proportion as the spirit is greater than the body." How these are well-worn, far-forgotten, commonplace of the schools: nothing is more immediate to the wise of allegorizing than that of "spiritualizing" all things, and allegory was not falling in the above comments. Nothing is more natural, easy, inevitable than to "spiritualize" the episcopal calling by those Hellenistic clichés. In the same sense of "allegorizing" we see, "the Bishop in the judgment hall has the spirit of God to sustain and vote with him." (II, 47). "The Bishop is like the pilot or great ship: the seamen are the crew, the sailors the well-behaved crew can be of several samples and variances. The Church building must be long and face the East...Like a ship. The Bishop's throne must be in the middle with the deacons standing at attention like
sailors li."thely circd , etc. Yet visiting deacons sit with the deacons, visiting
presbyters with the presbyters, and a visiting Bishop with the Bishop." (27,28).
No layman shall perform priestly work: baptism or sacrifice or the laying or of
hands, or the eulogia. The Bishop and be alone shall lay on hands. Initiating So-
men, 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 sacri-
fices, and eulogia the people; a deacon can minister for the Bishop and Bishops
but not for the People. (27,28). Further, we are further told, is not real-
ly a Bishop, having been appointed by God but by men. In support of this, many ex-
amples are cited of kings and rulers who were punished for going beyond their
authority. An interesting remark is made, that though kings and rulers were pro-
vided "they did not claim to be equal to the apostles—showing that apostolic men,
even in their own days, were not thought thereby to have the authority of apostles.

The lesson is to serve the Lord as prince of all, reading thy laws to the people.
Wives are to be ordained "after the time of Judith and Lena." But Virgins as
such are not to be ordained, "since the Lord left no instructions" to that effect.

It seems to instruct about ordaining virgins? One attributes what one wishes
to the Lord, and "the one does not wish" points to his silence on the subject!

In the 1st lesson, the Lord is repre sented as instructing the apostles, "deter-
mine the order of the deacons, the serving of the priests, the duties of the de-
cons, the care of the people, etc., without air, and the activities re-
necessary to the functioning of the church; so they "did it after the pattern of what it
is here." How it is possible to attribute to the Lord what was traditionally
recorded as strictly "a work of the 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."" But the later scriptural office was written into the law, by a reworking
of I Tim. 5,10,12., 20
which is not wholly a new, 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: 16 on the right hand and 12 on the left. "That is right," says John, "those on the right hand will take the cup from the chief 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 into the system at will. The deacons, says this source, hold the priesthood; the only love 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 "fearlessness in the presence of the priests have share," but is to try to do everything to please the Bishop—that is, to do the Bishop's will. "The priest," on the other hand, receives the laying on of hands of the Bishop, and all the priests that are with him; it is time the Holy Ghost descends upon him." But still the priest though receiving the effectual laying on of hands has no right to give orders as he does; therefore he only ordained priests in cooperation with the Bishop.

Once the early church deacons were ordained not by Bishops but by Apostles along with and at the same time as the Bishops, the deacons have now either lost their authority, or never have had it. But they did have it. They must have lost it therefore, and with then those that were co-ordained: Bishops and Presbyters. Professors in recognition of their merits were said to receive honorary discharge II/12 or priesthood without any laying on of hands, such being necessary only if those virtues become Bishops. If that right are these concession, what is general authority has been consulted? If anyone claims the right of laying on hands, he shall not be established by laying on of hands, but prove his claim by the event." (1,21). Though titles go to the support of clergy and others, Christendom are OXYMORON for priests and ministers, follo-
The earliest letter from the 'end of the Christian is that of Irenaeus at
Alexandria (c. 180). In this we find the bishop actively engaged in commercial
affairs—not his own but those of the Church. "Irenaeus provincial Christians em-
ploy the highest ecclesiastic in the country as their confidential agent in money
affairs!" testifies Feissmann with amazement. "The link between the Christian com-
pellers in the fourth and their agent in Rome is...the Tares of Alexandria!" When
one considers that this is the WITNESS description of a bishop's activity, it is
most significant. Euthyn and Tertullian speak of elders (seniores) presiding
or acting as presidents at meetings (c.p. 31)—plainly such an efficient did not
need to be a bishop, as we have seen above. Tertullian in the 3rd century advises
clergymen always to remember that "the Lord chose...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...the...
one true master, and teachers like everyone else must study and learn before they are ready to teach; then in this writing entitled "In the Offices of the Ministry," Athanasius makes the surprising statement that his "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 that the Church gave to a promise which the ancient Church understood in a diametrically opposite sense. Since there is only one teacher for the Church, one, they said, the max qualification for those who would teach the Church is the study and learning but direct citation from the one who knows. Starting from the same premise, Athanasius goes to the opposite conclusion: since there is only one teacher, no one else can speak with his voice, but everyone must study and learn to speak as we must, in the school. "Coelestial" men," said v. 183, "when the spiritual words of Christ..." Then emp. to Pelagius' claim that revelation was an essential "prerequisite to infallibility" nonsensical! If you only "feel the 'spiritual' thing," they will always be right. So was the bland assurance of the schools—it would have made a true Christian smile. In fact it often did. But Jerome also assures us that "not all Bishops are Bishops...coelestial" clarity does not make a Christian." In fact in a later discussion Jerome sees through the thing argument easily enough: "I know that this question has been repeatedly disputed by the most learned men," he writes of a point in hand.,

"for everyone else decides it, saying what he thinks on the basis of his own cleverness. Once therefore it is dangerous to judge between the opinions of the teachers of the Church, and to prefer one to the other, I will say that each one thinks, and leave it to the reader, which opinion he feels he should follow." The early theologians all made much of the fact that there was a uniformity of opinion among the early apostles, precisely because they did not argue "on the basis of their own cleverness," as the teachers of the Church did in Jerome's day. "Apostle, like a reverend man, that made all..."
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 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: "Who 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 who has had real trouble for undisciplined behavior, "The city is in me," said Themistocles—this sort in the broadest sense. The world of late antiquity was a city-world: each city was an island universe, completely expressed in its own affairs and wholly under the rule and sway of leading personalities. The local "friends" of such 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 was a rather vague rule of succession. It meant restless unrest and the chronic disease of the ancient world—faction, anarchy.

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 popular politics, writes Wood, was of three principles, 1) that an official gives orders, 2) that the Senate is the highest authority in the state, and 3) that all things must be sanctioned by a seven popular assembly. All office was hereditary, and all registrants were priests in Rome (Vasco); the political structure was also the state church.
The great significance of priesthood in public life, says Missoura, 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 patrons. 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 migration to Rome. All the poorer people went to the King, says, 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, refused leaving their holdings and their ancestral hearths to the senate planning to check the business by a call to arms; there was an uproar in the popular assembly and the nobles immediately surrounded the meeting with soldiers 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 of 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 Emperor, rested wholly on one thing alone—spontaneous popular acclaim. An ancient grave inscription from the Lateran says
is typical of the public spirit of Rome: "Stranger stop and look. Here the city holds the bones of a good merciful am, a lover of the poor. I beseech thee, wayfarer, do no injur to this monument." Cicero praises "That Tuiditanus 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 donation 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 the Emperor was allowed to give popular donations—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 donations. "As Dracut for the political rights of which the Emperors robbed the Roman people," said Sardthausen, "we may consider the duty of providing public sustenance which the Emperors took over, not as their victorious general, but as the right 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 ascendency 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 "γρομ arxhig-ναγογομ," and "archifunem." In the time
of Belesarius, Procopius tells us, the chief men of African towns were nearly
all priests. Suidonius' account to a friend of how "there you stood, with a spit
trace...Half torn to pieces by the people madly rushing to salute you, but so
lovingly responsive to this popular devotion that those who took the greatest li-
berties 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 popularus and fideles
are absolutely interchangeable—he makes no distinction between the old city popu-
lace 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 th
equivalent of Plebeis, and Leo the Great uses only pletas, never populii—which sho
s how 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 Chanceller, the
'liber diurnus,' edited at the beginning of the eighth century, it is still cus-
tomary after mentioning the clergy in expressly to include the nobility and the
populace of the city as factors in the choosing of the pope." And exactly as
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 for 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, shrewdful 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 the chosen one 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 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 St. Clement deals with these very conditions in Corinth, which the writer finds "lost its sense, disgusting, and devlish." The elected bishop would often make the vest of his popularity in the approved pagan manner. Thus Dr.

Drucearius had all the fixtures of a Roman noble: he would dictate letters as he wished along in the market-place, followed by a large troop of hangers-on. "I erected for myself as a THERMUS, the high throne and "secretum" of a Roman judge, and in speaking slapped his thigh and stamped his foot just like any popular orator." (Iuseb. VII,20). This was not the exception but the rule. The priests of God are before all things magistrates, Ausbium reminds us. "Whenever I have a case to try," says his great contemporary, Gregor Nazianzus, "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, exactly like the imperial epoch is, before all else an epoch of JURISDICTION: 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 occurrence. 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 in stalled him and then passed away. "The Christian population in each city," according to Dchesnes, "one of 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, at least as far as concerns the city masses." How then these "imperceptible minorities" were, bade farewell by the apostles they were, to fate, the least in a bad way; in the days of the Ap. Fathers they had become ever worse—utterly corrupt within themselves. Yet from then on, they turned 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 Dchesnes of the newly converted Greeks 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 omniun rempublicam agnoscimus, Tertullian declared—mundum. This indeed was the Jewish heritage—Moses taught that all the world was a single state, write 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," wroteNicephorus 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. One doubts that the office of Bishop is primarily a city office. The perpetual leadership of the Church, according to the Bull Unam Sanctam, is in the succession of Peter, "which succession is to be found in the bishop of the CITY of ROME." (Denzinger 458). 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 capital to the country-side," so that "the provincial capital came to be regarded as the mother Church." The last expression is strictly in the Hebrew 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. Tertullian 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 has been blessed by apostolic hands." Which is he praising, the Church Antioch or the City Antioch? They are inseparable. In the best strain 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 "Vigirius in Christ's name episcopus of Aem Urbis Romeae," using Horace's own expression. Note, he is not "Bishop of the Mother CITY," 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 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." (Ovide II.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—abominable Babylon for the early Christians) there is one point none will 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 office inherited directly from Christ through Peter, and NOT (of all things!) on the dignity 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.4, 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 passage 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 (eparchus) of Rome XXX is not the Roman Emperor (who had long ceased to
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 Berrux, 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 traveling apostolate, inadequate and outdone, raise any objections? Is there any desire of jealousy, rivalry, or overlapping areas of authority? What does the inadequate apostolate have to say on the matter; who consults it before going about the new system? What Berrux conveniently overlooks is 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 their AS NATIONS, fully recognizing the convenience of established political boundaries and divisions. For 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 this practice compulsory. What was more natural than that the Bishop of the capital city to which all the other Bishops were 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 for the exact time and place of the sessions, etc.? And what is more natural than that such functions should vest 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 would of course 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. Churchmen 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 (1), but were identical with them by virtue of having the same cause of origin. This argument is as absurd as it is dishonest; 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 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" in which rank was assigned purely by the census-taker, and this rank inevitably and quickly was taken as a degree ofORITY.

The bigger the city, the holier its head. God does not work that way. We readily agree with Duchesne that the Bishop of Rome would of course be a top man in the Church, but it could not be the true Church in which he would own his primacy, as the Council of Chalcedon made clear he did, to the preeminence of his CATHOLIC. Originally the PEOPLE were the CLOUDEST, NOT the biggest, bishopric in a province. By
all accounts Jerusalem would be the prime seat. 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 Nicae 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 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." Now 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 is the highest Bishop in the affairs of a province, what about the relative rank of Metropolitans? Were not some PONTIFFS 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 reached once to Greece that while Bishops within provinces could always appeal
to their Metropolitan 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 Op. in 321 recognized reality by proclaiming FIVE dioceses "as ressorts of an ecclesiastical jurisdiction superior to that of the provinces or provincial synods." (Culpe p.22). 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 metropolitan 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 Barnes has shown: The metropolitan, 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 Op. in 321 declared that the Bishop of Op. 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 Barnes, "is determined by the prominence of cities as CIVIL capitals,"hancetiaminimaeunx (I M 12,147). Letters attributed to the earlier 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 "Anacle-tus,"—such places should be managed by presbyters only, for "the name of bishop should be used as title and denomination only of an IMPERIAL city." Here an IMP 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
that though "the provinces existed long before the time of Christ's advent," and are therefore of non-Christian origin, "the division was REMAINED 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 civil, following along strictly heathen lines: the perfect parallel of the two led to the beliefs held by such respected authorities as John Carpocrat, 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're told, is the same as a metropolitan, and he gets his title from the fact that he resides in a metropolis, which is defined as a city in which are located lower courts of law. The CIVIL pattern decides all these degrees of glory. Another letter attributed to Anaelus says that primates or patriarchs can only be bishops of a metropolis and have a church dating from the earliest times. Lacking churches in

In all the other big city bishops are only Archbishops or Metropolitans, "Hence, to be made one of the patriarchs, one must be in the city of Caesarea." (62 II, 11). In real bishops are to be called primates, according to a letter attributed to Anaelus, "Unless they hold primum civitates," by which is meant not the great cities to receive the gospel but the big cities: "they are called patriarchs and primates BECAUSE OF THEIR INTERESTS," this being, our letter brazenly proclaims "the rule of the Apostles and their successors." If Jerusalem was controversially pushed aside, it lacked one thing—size, and the holiest sees of Christianity remained the four world cities of the time: "Instead the importance of these respective churches due to their size and to the dignity of their cities was the chief factor in aiming for them this exception—
al recognition." Another letter of "Apollosus" 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, KKB of the an-
cient sources uses any word for half-brother or step-brother in describing
James, though there was no shortage of such words in the 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 size and importance were
the same; the capital 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 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 Or, de-
fining 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 Eufourcq
"Antioch appeared as the metropolis of infant Christianity; it was from there
that the Apostles gradually spread the gospel throughout the world." Duchesne has
at length on how Milan ruled the Church as long as Milan was the Capita
tal: it was there under the supervision of the Bishop 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 if passing 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 Ep. of Milan was not the real head of the Church: he only acted as such 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! That 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. 35).

It is hardly surprising that people should look to Ambrose for leadership then and 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 Ep. of Rome emerges as the most important Bishop it is because Rome is again, temporarily, the capital.

"In beseeching his claim to precedence on its apostolic foundation," writes Fat
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 hope of all the Apostles. But Alexandria and Antioch based their claims to precedence on Apostolic institution just as much and quite as rightly as Rome. When Alexandria or maintained Rome's claim by announcing her institution by TWO Apostles, Rome countered in the doctrine of the Double Apostolate—which led to embarrassing complications and was later dropped. But as Backcock observes, there was no mention of Apostolic succession in the orders of 325, which maintained the customary privileges of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, the sees being in the order of their civic importance, but NOT of apostolic institution. 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 even to build up in retrospect a theological apostolic institution for the Roman claim (discussed by Backcock) does not obscure the eagerness with which the Roman church describes herself as the mistress of the whole 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 most recently treated this much-treated subject. So close were the ties between Rome mother Church and Mother City that "if were destroyed, the physical basis of the legitimacy of both popes and emperors would be lost altogether; if its power grew out of control, popes and emperors might lose their claim to the city. Hence the hostility of the populace which roused itself towards 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 place of even if that ground is Jerusalem itself ground has no place in a vivant 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 holds possession of the holy PLACES is the true Church. True, some protest that we hold those places by force—with the aim 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 turn 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 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 was in very truth the Queen of the world, ruled the world; the Mother City—Metropolis. The city that was that 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 Jorge, "...Cp. was always a sort of Kremlin..." By the dedication of Cp on May 17, 330," writes Alfeld, "Constantine gave his Christian organization of the state a centre free from any touch of paganism." The emblems on his coins show "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 build the new residence." Cp 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 were 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 or the old traditions," and these, Miss Leake 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 Reims and Arles. In Arles intrigues were set afoot resulting in the expulsion of Hero, an excellent Bishop; in his place pope Zoëmus supported one Petronius who abused his power and lost it. This trepid attempts at power featuring active correspondence politics 
only came to be cautious 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 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 sprung up everywhere on the Ominatinil-wiliness 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 of 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 Corinth and Corinithi, 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 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 Jesus, the home of the Apostles, etc., etc. And how Rome hated Constantinople! It is not 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 the idealizes Romanitas and its plateau—it is not as Christian but as a proud citizen of the City of Rome that he boils with resentment against the new unrest, and looks within every fibre of his being that Rome and Rome alone should rule the world—and the Church.

Eccles-The prominence of cities is determined by the prominence of cities...
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, 1142f). The good King's ignorance of the status of Rome is no more striking that 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 Anesme'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?

THE RIVALRY. When the episcopal seat became the highest office in the city, it became 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," writes Prosperon 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 rushes us from the danger and saves us and His Church (all will be lost)...I say to you, where do you think all these riots come from that now fill the churches? For nothing in the world but the false teachings of those at the NAB, and from these haphazard and uncontrolled elections. All this corruption comes from the NAB: if the 'head' is sick, of course the whole body will suffer...And 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 Sacro.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 6th 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 xperesisacity 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 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 disgusting to the point of driving men wild with a desire for *ataraxia*, and willing to pay any price to get it. Then 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 the Christian mobs urged on by clergy fell upon each other in the streets of all the great cities with a savagery and abandon which scandalized and scared the pagans fierce and drove the Caesar to bed with sick headaches. *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, leathery, sore, 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 3rd 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 out shout the opposition. For the bishops were elected after the old pagan pattern of the acclamation. 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. Father 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 Ap. of Smyrna writes to the Church at Philippi; the Ap. of Antioch does the same, also sending letters of advice and council to Churches at Tralles, Ephesus, Rome, Philadelphia and Harnesia—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. Irakus Ap. 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 letter 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 3rd century, Rome "naturally" was a place of prime importance, Koch notes,
but in all this correspondence "there is always expressed the consciousness of 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 bishops 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 Carrian says "we recognize no Bishop of Bishops." The Ch. of the 3rd century, says Koch, believed that Mt. 16:16 was the authority of the episcopal office, but not of anyone super-bishop. When a bishop visits another church, according to the Apost. Const., he must sit beside of the bishop of that church, "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 Nicaea was an appeal by the Emperor to the bishops 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." 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: "According to God's law, ENTHRONES NOT BE DYNASTY!" (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 bishops to agree on a thing, their opinion must be God's opinion became an obsession after Nicaea; whether 60, or 250 of 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 GEOCH BISHOP APPOINTED BY GOD, he (the Emperor) would summon synods of the ministers of God." God had appointed Bishops, and he had also 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 GEOCH APOSTLE of their episcopal affairs... He sat in their midst as one of their numerique 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 am 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 20 scholars, aware of the grave implications of such a statement, have attempted to give it a special interpretation, but from the preceding passage 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 reading of Eusebius' account: Seeing the state of things, Hilary says, like the S. Fathers of old, that he "cannot keep silence," "But it is necessary for me and religiously proper I believe to act at once. If I merely STAND IN HUMILIATION, 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
tries to fill the place of a general authority that no longer exists. (I I X., 47ff)

It is interesting that no 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, of the divinity of the office is since "the office always remained." Their proof that the office remained is an UNBROKEN chain; their proof of the unbroken chain is the divinity of the office!

In the closest possible translation, Constantine says to the Bishops: "But 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. Every orthodox writer was fiercely conscious of the need for the unity of all Christians in the Church universal," writes Norris of the 2nd century, "however bitterly we 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 strife between the Great City Church, fights for power and vassery in which nothing was barred. It was this as much as anything that disturbed 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 take a Christian." "Christ called fishermen and tentmakers and tax-gatherers to this supreme authority," wrote John Chrysostom, "but the present clergy simply 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 Chrysostom, as many have tried to accuse Tertullian, of sour
made him
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 intrigue. The letters in PL
12, 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." (Ep. 32, 753). For all of Basil's
"without cause? It is plain that the cause was not an open and admitted one, such
characteristic motive, 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, an
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 Nicene? Not for a moment! "This is a very trivial 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 shar-
ner their wits by discussing such exquisitely refined and impractical things, but
they should keep their discussions closely confined to their own company. Then
they get out into the public they only cause trouble, and what the experts them-
selves fright about because they cannot understand, can only be a double perplex-
ty to the laity, who moreover welcome a good pretext for taking sides and stiri
for up trouble. The philosophers talk on and on about such things in their end-
less discussions, but they at least quarrel like gentlemen and get alone with
each other very well for all their technical differences. But you who call your
selves ministers of God and a holy brotherhood act like spiteful and vicious
children: these recordite and unsearchable matters are nothing but a pretext for
venting your spite against each other." He wrote the Emperor, and the words an
behavior of the Churchmen support his charge to the fullest. "This Alexander," Bp. 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 Godhead is for him merely a pretext to gain power—he had 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 anathemize 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.

Nicene At Nicea the Emperor assigned all seats and no funny business. The prosecution was a necessary one, for then the Bishops came together at later synods every one within 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 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 Hilary, "can we discover, during the same interval, much of any very lively Christianity." The corruption was general and universal. Again the Eusebius
persecution did not eradicate but only arrested the evil for a short time. On the eve of the Persecution, 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." (III.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) ambitions aspirations of MANY TO OFFICE...great schisms and difficulties industriously fostered by the faction among the new members, against the AUTHORITY of the Church, devising one innovation after another. (Hist. Martyr., xlii)

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 OTTOMI pronouncements of successive synods in which the bishops proclaim themselves to be above all human laws and from that thesis devolve corollary powers whose arrogance knows no bounds.

Dive Authority Unlimited

We have seen the Apostolic Fathers crying 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 feuds between factions and individuals vying for the office of bishop. All they can do is to insist over and over again that obedience to the bishop and prostyters 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
with his hosts of hangers-on in the market place, his

\[\text{tribunal throne; his rhetorical affectation—such met together from\text{'sion and Tertullian were not rare exceptions. When Origen 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 a man should give a speech in the presence of a Bishop!" (Hist. VI, 19). The widening gap between the ideal and the fact is plain in Origen's enthusiastic comparison of the Christian with the accept or tolerate who would force pagan way: "We do not minimise those ambitious for power, turning 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 Origen 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 supernatural claims for the source of a Bishop's authority to every expression of that authority. The recent Romans had long drilled the world in the useful equation: victory = superior power, superior power = divine power, divine power = divine authority. Divine authority—divine office, divine office = divine office, a position 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 extermination. 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 Deity to divine power and authority in all that he did. The ultimate in extravagant drawing out of this super-sacralism was to become the reasoning, already refuted by Tertullian, that because priest (an office not mentioned) guarantees to Peter the Bishop of a city not mentioned holds all the power in the world! This is a triumph of man 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 'that you bind on earth 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 baptising 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 NO question that he does with it. He is answerable to God alone. "You're not the Di Man the lay congregation." The injunction to "Judge not" is soon to be confined to judgements against clergy—a very convenient specialization. The Const. Ap. makes sharp distinction between crimes deserving of crucifixion, stoning, fines, whipping, etc., against 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, notwithstanding even though it be a son or a friend; XXX (I know much more the punishment is he deserving who affronts priests?) It is sedition in the state is bad, how much worse sedition in the church? This "You-must-more" device is a well-camouflaged sure-fire rhetorical trick by which
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 the bond of the pope all follow the same pattern. "Bishops are to be judged by God, not by men." They are above all human law. "Harmon 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 seditions 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, guarantees the immunity of priests CMN—to others it does not apply. "All charges 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 judicet is abrogated in the need for endorsing 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 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 Pius I avers, and does so entirely without rea-
son 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 Cyprian, "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." "Isel—John 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 as pure as if they were acting amidst such
powers and standing in heaven itself." The 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 gentl
emperor, of laymen passing judgment on a Bishop in a cause fidei? If a Bishop
is to be taught by a layman, what will be the end of it? Let the laymen dispute
and the Bishop listen—a Bishop taught by a LORD!!!" "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 14, 1044, 1050).

"The Emperor," Ambrose insists, "is in the church, NO OTHER the Church," she is not.
Accordingly, "the monarch was seated below the rails of the sanctuary, and con-
ounded with the rest of the faithful multitude," xxx in the Church, while Ambrose
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 th
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. [66]
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 from the multitude and
or a level with the bishop. Speaking of the trial and deposition of MACARIUS BISHOPS
Catastus 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 put them above all examination. It is a priest
speaking. Of the great massacres of Dorotheus he writes: "We are not responsible
for the way the military broke up the Dorotheans... urging all to unity... True, it
was armed with special letters from the bishops that the commander Taurinus
did not carry out great slaughter, but that do you want against a lot of fanatics?

Then we actually have the name "Taurinus, the Dorotheans," To the Emperor
Lucifer writes: "Not power save you, a foreboding person, over the priestly authori-
ty of the Highest God, (with the convenient identification of the INTER of the
power with its exert— as if I had it, being constrained by the Pres. of the US,
could thereby claim all the powers— of the president). How can you dare to say
that you can pass judgment on bishops, by dis obeying whom XCU incurr the death
penalty as having insulted God himself?" So 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." (H 18, 22c) In the
rivalry between civil and God, power the priests are the only proper judges—
are they not appointed by XCU? And they crown the crown to themselves—are they
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 [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 (II 12, 22). . . 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, NO, 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 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 CT, 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 verse: all, or they are rare indeed; but priests appear in every age and roves and in error — totally different type of being, falling back for the justification of all their plans and ambitions on their own private interpretations of the CT — and categorically forbid others to interpret without their aid. Lucifer, for example, loves to compare himself with the Apostles — 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 Cyprian was for the Oxford movement the most authoritative statement of the claims of the priesthood. Dean Thyn the centuries bishops continued to lecture emperor on authority. The patriarch, says the pious Constantine Porphyrogentius to his son, "as an Emperor (basileus), who must provide peace and prosperity just like the emperor himself! When bishops insisted on ordaining clerics to dioceses oth
other than their own, as if they were general authorities, they were soundly rebuked: "Who hath enjoined 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 Saul, Abp. of Canterbury, having begun mass, and perceiving the king seated on his throne with the crown on his head, quieted the altar and advanced to demand from him who had the crown on his head, which he afterwards made him take off; but the bishops 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 years from time to time. The Council of Later 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 Lugdunum "because he was the chief of the 11 Bishops present." All the bishops confessed to having given up their copies of the Scriptures to Diocletian's agents asked for them, each excusing himself on one ground or another. Then Ep. Lurpurius of Limina 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." This convenient solution was passed unanimously with cries of Deo Gratias. In 314 the Conc. of Arles passed a rule that "no bishop should anoint another bishop," this followed hard upon the Conc. of Arles, held in 314 to heal the troubles attendant upon the persecutions—especially the problem of the lapsed—decree that

---

Vermin of the Dr. of the hetera paroiches in writing. Church property sold during an episcopal vacancy must be sold back again if the Dr. demands it. Drs. not accreted by the paroiches to which they have been ordained will be cut off if they try to push out another Dr. either in their old paroiches or in some other
by stirring up trouble, etc.

Neocaesarea 314-325. Can. 14. The Chorapiskopi 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.

Nicaea 325. Can. 4: A Bp. must be installed by all the Bps. of his province; if 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 Diocese.

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 ABEDE 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 aegis of the province, 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 who steals a chalice against a Bishop's will and orders him to serve in his own Church, the ordination shall be void.

241: In Encyrius, 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. 6. Bps. in every prov. must understand that the Bp. in the Metropolis has charge of the whole province, BECAUSE all who have business to transact come from all directions to the Metropolis...

Can. 11. Any Fr., priest or any churchmen 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 CH of the Metropolitan of the Diocese or the Bps. of the same, and he must bear letters from them.

Can. 16. When a Bp. seizes a vacant seat without CH 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.

Cardinal 347, Can. 1. Notes that no Fr. 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 claver for him as Dr., "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 Dr. in a small place. It MUST be Populous... quae nescitur habere episcopum.

Sap. 51, Can. 21. The ordination of Deaconesses shall be abolished throughout the Empire.

Irons 51, Can. 2. If the King acts against us, all Bps. will withdraw to monasteries, and no Dr. shall stir out again until the King has given peace to us and all Bps. alike.

Irons Orleans 511, Can. 2. Nobles may not celebrate Easter at their ownatories but MUST come to the episcopal city for the Dr. rites.

Can. 22. No canon may arrest, question, or punish a cleric without CO of Dr. when a cleric appears in court it must be with CO of his Dr. and on sentence may be passed without the presence of his spiritual superior.

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

Irons 51, Can. 1. No one may hold CO property with changing political dominations. No one can claim that CO property ever passed under another ruler, as since the dominion of CO knows no geographical boundaries. No one may claim that it is held as a gift from the King property that once belonged to the CO. All property given by King Eligius of blessed memory and handed down as inheritance must now be given back to the Church.

Irons 51, Can. 11. All priests and monks must sleep in dormitories. Two or three may 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 defies a monk guilty of such defilement will be excommunicated until the monk returns to his monastery.

Sap. 51, Can. 25. Whoever a cleric meets a higher cleric he must bow to him. If both are priests, the lower must remove his hat. If the lower alone is waited, he must discount to greet the cleric.

Sap. 51, Can. 44. A cleric who disregards the jurisdiction of an 'inquisitor' or is shut out of the church and punished by in accordance with royal decrees. Can. 15. Whoever is lax in observing this rule, or does not report his violation of it to the Dr. is excluded from his communion for one year.

Irons 51, Can. 21. New Bishops burden their clerics with intolerable compulsory services and contributions. Priests thus cruelly oppressed may complain to the metropolitan.

Sap. 51, Can. 21. Judge secular officials who assign slaves of the Church and the Clergy go public or private trains will be excommunicated.
Barbouze 589, Can.1. No cleric may wear purple, which is for princes and not becoming in churchmen.

Can.13. Subdissas 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.5. 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.

Theims 624-5, Can. 12. 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 Bp. 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 T. out of their private fortunes; and the Bp.'s successor can reclaim any thus freed.

Can.68. A Bp. who frees a slave of the Ch. without reserving the patronym 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.

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

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

656 "Can.4. 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 INFINITE protest, they are bound to the religious discipline for life.

Prêtres 656, Can.15. It 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 656, Can.5. Jews must be denied all religious practice. Their children must be taken from them at 7 years and must marry Christians.

Berghampshead 657, 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.

Fontiface, 745, Statute 17. Basquille (jokes about the authorities) must be severely punished, even with exile.

Padroborn 747, Can. 21. Anyone engaging in pagan rites must pay a heavy fine. If he can't pay, no matter what his station, he becomes a slave of the Church until he has paid up.

Can.23. Boothsellers and fortune-tellers shall be given to churches and priests as slaves.
Faderborn 740. Can. 34. No public assemblies of the Saxons permitted without special royal permission. The Priests shall keep watch that this is carried out.

Aachen 799, Can. 77. False writing such as those claimed last year to have fallen from heaven, must not be read, but must be burnt.

Clermont, 1025, Can. 1. Works, 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 farmers and merchants to be effective 3 yrs. "because of the present food shortage."

Lateran V, 1215, Can. 2. All condemned heretics MUST be turned over to the secular authorities for punishment...their property must be confiscated by the Ch.

These who have not been able to clear themselves of charges of heresy are excommunicated 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 expel from their territory all heretics. Whoever does not do so by the 25th 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 Papal Pope, who will absolve his vessels from all duty to him and declares his lands open to legitimate conquest by Catholics; those who participate in this 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 Fr. is excommunicated...A Fr. MUST inspect his diocese. His officers are authorized to have all inhabitants swear an oath to expose to the Fr. all seditious 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.

In all this the tendency is clear, and all our day familiar. The missions...
rope refusing to be taxed 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 Thans of Asia who were the contemporaries of Innoc. III and the very essence of barbarism. One sees what Coudenhove Calviergi, 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."

Apostolic authority, if asked where the ultimate authority of the Christian Church resides will say in the universal COUNCILS of the Church. In 762 the Council of Seville condemned Hesychius 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 "Tu art Peter, etc," apply only to the Roman Church instead of to the whole Church." To show the index place of the BR. of Rome, the council recalls that Pope Liberius was confounded for heresy. In calling the first ecumenical council, the Emperor Constantine, says Hesychius, that "it is not possible to reach correct decisions in important matters except in synods." "We should not judge each other as individuals," says Basil, "but only in general assemblies of large numbers of Bps."

A really Catholic Church with a single direction "is impossible," writes in his summons to Nicea, "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 ever-confident Fulfilon, "This teaching office, which belonged to the Apostles, passed to the BISHOPS THROUGH THEIR EXAMEN OR ASSEMBLY IN UNIVERSAL COUNCIL. Its object is the continuation of the revelation or DICTUM 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 Bps. when the Emperor, entirely on his own, did the
city commanded wildly disagreeing bishops to come together in his presence where under his eye and with his constant threats and proddings they brought forth that Creed 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. But if his own was one of the first to point 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 whichever the time of Augustine bishops were convoked by that bishop in the province held that office for the longest time: HE, regardless of his city, was the PREVIA. The expression for calling a synod, concilium concilium was taken from the Roman concilium senatum to hold a council (concilium habere) from Roman senatum habere. The opening words of the Conc. of Carnage in 256 are "an imitation of the protocol of the proconsuls' courts of the sessions of the Roman Senate." Even more significant, the meetings of the Councils remained PERSONICO at all times, though only Bps. were allowed actually to participate. The secrecy of the meetings of the Lord with his Apostles, of the Apostles among themselves and of the earliest Christians is the best-known aspect of "apostolic" assemblies. Then preliminary reading of a case in the Council was called a DIABOLICO, exactly as in the Roman Senate: "the discussion was VERE VIOLENTIUS, the final motion the SENIENTIA, exactly as in the ente. Voting was by BISAGNA, standing on one side or the other of the bell. 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 in the usage of the Senate." "Consecrated" is a Good word. Certain it is that there was of order and discipline in the meetings was the inherited gravity and dignity of Rome: as Christians the Bps. screamed and spat at each other, and most of the great councils were scenes of wild disorder.

Nefele's discussion on the nature of Church Councils at the beginning of 15
"standard work" on the subject should suffice to show the qualifications of synods as depositaries of Apostolic authority. Having noted that Acts 15 gives us without doubt the origin of councils, Kefele continues, "but the theologians are not in agreement as to whether the Councils were established by divine or human authority." Then and there Kefele 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, Kefele 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 HUMLER instructions? Were not the Apostles in a position to receive instructions from the Lord at ALL time? Not by Bishop Kefele's reckoning. As the strongest proof of the divine nature of Councils Kefele cites Cyrrian's description of the Conc. of Carthage in 252: placit nobis, sancto Spiritu suggestente—"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 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 "celeste judicium," 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 Licene Council the Emperor says, "what 300 holy bishops assent, 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
prove 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 (naye) 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 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 2-nods." "Patsoever is done in the holy synods of the Ea. must be attributed to the divine will."

"For whatever such a large body 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," became a popular devise to "prove" divine authority—it was an old trick of the emperors to give superhuman power to the emperor—a non-contradict sort of thing, but full of implications. Thus Leo describes the seating of a rival in a riot: "Thevian though he stirred up a tumult was elected 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 a plainly a copy of the local civil commit on the general Council of the Senate, "ecclesius, vir ob missiarum tribunardis et notorius, presiding. Though the accounts of the "mores and of all great councils are often full and pious, no ritual detail before 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 10th century that the Geographical council was held in a Church! The meeting was always in a palace or other government building. The was strictly in order, since, to quote Eusebius,
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 Ecumenical councils until the 12th century, but of important local councils as well. Thus Hefele points out that the Council of Arles (314) was "beneath the" by Constantine the Great, the Ecumenical Council of Sp., in 311, by Theodosius, the Council of Orleans by King Childbert, the Council of Frankfort by Charlemagne in 796; "and every 6 cent.
even a number of synods were held in Rome under the direction of Theodo- 
ric, the Great, who was an Ariam. 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 in grace of God assumed responsibility for the common peace of the entire, I considered it foreordained duty to be to devise means of guaranteeing peace and love to the most blessed multitudes (plebe) 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 the 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 slaying concern. Contemporaries ascribe all of 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 Hefeleus, "the resources of the contestants being equally matched (311)." "Mighty God alone could cure this too with ease and in all the world but one man, Constantine alone, a peered fitting to be His agent in this. So, when He had considered the whole cause...He did not stir up the 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: he learn that he had just removed th
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. 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 Nicaea 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 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: and end to Christian rioting—he was out to get a signed agreement that would bring unity into the Church forever.
more. He attended the key discussions with great interest, and one thing only interested him—getting an agreement. The actual doctrinal issues at stake, he said again and again, neither interested him or concerned him, and 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 KONSTANTIOS, while frankly 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 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, "pursuing those who spoke in its favor or turning with withering froms or even sharp rebukes towards those who spoke against it, "in this way the most God-beloved Emperor gently prodded the sho s into this or that decision, until in a marvellously short time there was hardly a dissenting voice in the house. 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 Acadius who had refused to answer his summons to Nicea (Cod.1, xii), 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 Acadius, 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 Eligh, 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 ICAI OTOCLOC (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 Eligh his thesis that the importance of numbers outweighs all other considerations? Constantine actually did "convert" far more people than the Apostles did, for Father Eligh 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 Ions 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 remained the ideal of the Middle Ages and for churchmen the perfect model of the heavenly order or earth. The argument of numbers is actually only the argument of force—and that is where the Emperor comes in. For Frank is more liberious when he writes to the Macedonians that since "the opinion of such a LORDLY NUMBER of Bishops (as at Nicaea) can never 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 for the mighty arm," wrote Leo to Constantine, "we have no other support save God alone," and plainly God alone is not enough, since he is begging for Ferrin's army. But Tertullian was right: where the Pope is, there is the authority. "From the moment the Emperors began to be Christians," writes Lactantius, "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-
naxius, 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!" One wants to deny it, we would tell such an one, but what has that got to do with your claims? The Roman Catholics quoted 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 his claim on Peter, though not a word is said about 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 tried to settle the whole question by endless repetitions of the irrelevant. "this art Peter." If some intelligent Catholics recognize the true issue, the protest 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 Church there surely was to be a Church, and what more likely candidate than ours? Again they make their point by assuming a thing that is not said or even hinted in the Gospels that there would be a ROME Church. When Irenaeus, citing the case of Rome, 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 Eqs.
Linus, Anacletus, and Clement, upon which the learned editor (Pasquius) comments:

"It is not our business to unravel the difficulties with which the problem of Peter's successors fairly SWIRLS, 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 event interests us quite so much. The Romans are voluble enough in telling us that happen ENUMERATE them moment—a promise given to Peter, and in what happened AT the that moment—a proud line of succession, but on what happened AT THAT moment they not only preserve silence but forbid investigation.

The investigation of that moments was considered by Le Roy. Duchesne to be the special calling of his life, yet his biographer Lescault 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 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 EVIDENT 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 sparsely 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 RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS."

A few minutes spent in the 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 is not the true for keeping the documents of the early O. under cover while all the others are reason, and just as obviously the true reason is quite retrograde to Catholic interests.

Mgr. 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 wold-power in detail. The fact that they are obvious forgeries and yet quite old and numerous shows that churchmen fully recognized the need for 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 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:

"I have at present a 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 TIBERIUS, LINUS and CLETUS, 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: "IN THE NAME OF CLEMENT I CONFIRM YOU, MY BROTHER, SO I COMMIT IT TO YOU...DO NOT BE 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—EXACTLY being Bishop of Rome. His call was that of an Apostle—a missionary bearing witness to all the world, yet he must stay put in one city—bishopric for seven years and in another for over 25. Since the office of a bishop 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 years, 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 succession—power being passed from hand to hand: not bestowed directly by God or 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 11th century.

There are many versions of the spurious letter of Clement "To James the lord and Bishop and Bishop of Jerusalem, ruler of the Holy Church of Christians in Jerusalem MIX of the churches founded by God's foresight and still belonging to Jesus Christ SAVED." All these letters make Clement "the Thirteenth after Peter to sit on or 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. With this
title..."
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 something quite apart from the Dioces 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 fulfillment of any manifestations or visions. In a like crucial situation Peter got a direct revelation from heaven (Acts ); but without the launching of the Church is nothing but a personal endorsement with the similarity of all of Clement's 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 ECCLESIA STUPA (I) to send a letter to James, giving him your entire life history and all your experience with me right down to the present moment...We will be very pleased to learn that after me will come a man not untaught nor ignorant of the life-giving words, especially instructed in the laws of the Church, to assume the teacher's chair." But an amazing transfer of supernatural power—that is 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 V (1305) 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 to James himself? Why wait until he is dead to notify the other Apostles
and make the explanations which he makes in his written note does not hesitate to give
to the multitude at Rome?

The ordination of Clement as described in the CHURCH 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 that it is being done! In one letter Peter says to Clement: "I know
I am giving you a hard thing—and treatment and ingratitude at the hands of the
uninstructed mob,"—is THAT the way to describe the Roman Church in its purest
and beginning, is 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 insubordinate 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. There is no opposition between the functions of a
Bishop and an Apostle still make trouble. "The Bishop must be the hardest-
working marksman on the ship," Peter continues, forgetting that he has (as said
that the whole of Clement's work is to be teaching and prayer, joyful activities
to say the least, he says: "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 blusters 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 orders of the Church." THIS is ordination! That language and behavior from
are possessing all the keys of heaven and earth! "And may the Lord be with you,
and forever, even as he said to US then he was about to be taken to his
Father and Lord! Behold I am with you all ages until the completion of the time."

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

But even if these letters were written, which they obviously are not, be-
ing of the style and vocabulary of the 4th century, there is a fact that invalid-
dates any claim they might have to special and unique authority by Clement's suc-
cessors. For the Clement story duplicates in every detail an earlier and much
better authenticated story written by the same Clement, of how Peter ordained
one Zacchaeus Bishop of Chressos. [Cf, Schmids concludes his study of the subject
saying: "It is my firm conviction that the Homelists In this account the Ep. of
Chressos 1) is ordained by Peter, 2) early the throne of Peter, 3) is presided over
Peter as vicar of Christ, 4) sits on the throne of Christ, according to Peter, an.
receives from Peter power to bind and loose. Schmidt has maintained that the Caesarea 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 indubitably is, the Apostles," writes H. 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 unuttered or unuttered, MH, AND {
NI.} 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 above.) But the Roman lists from that period are, in a hopeless condition. The Liber Pontificalis explicitly states that Peter "ordained to teach, Linus and Cletus, who should be present in Rome for the administration carrying out of all sacerdotal service 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. From according to the same source, Peter made Clement the Bishop, though the names of Linus and Cletus appear before his "because they were executed ordained Bishops by the prince of the Apostles himself." Counting Peter, that makes, as we have noted, no less that 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/Linus 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 but Paul at all, but of Linus, who was of course no successor to the Apostles who outlived him. Conflicting lists of early Roman Bishops are given in the fifth volume of the Lat. Patrologiae. The Ignat., Iren., Eus., and Augustine. Fighi however includes Cletus and two most recent official Roman Catholic list is given by Denzinger: Cletus Ap. (?), omits Anacletus.

67 (?), sub cuius nomine existant duae epistolae canonicae. S. Linus 67 (?)-79 (?), S. (Ana)cletus 79 (?)-90 (?), S. Clemens I 90(?)-98 (?). Then the Bristle to Corinth is quoted. All succeeding Bishops of Rome have questioned this is bad, and Fighi duly omits the question marks, the marks after the dates until S. Callistus I 217-222. Here Clement succeeds 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, "or 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 Borromini 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 Irenaeus, Haer. IV, 1, who is wildly guessing, like the others, for he calls both...
Paul and James (1) 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 summarily addressed by Clement of Rome as "Bishop of Bishops and... Bishop of All the Churches"—which would of course make him too Bishop of Jerusalem. If we accept Epiphanius along with the letter of Clement we have no 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 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. We had countless fellow-workers, whose names are immortalized in the Scripture." For the rest, the records by the fourth century are already silent. From a study of all the lists of Bishops (the lists first appear in the 4th century) Irish 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 Fortianus, 225 A.D. "If Peter ever came to Rome," writes Bögel, "which cannot be denied in view of the total ignorance of that 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
 Joguel'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 simple expansion
 of popular imagination." The idea of Peter's arrival occasioning no flurry at all
 in Rome, so well-founded was the Church there, is quite amusing, but the complete
 early silence of the record regarding any activity at all of Peter in Rome is a
 serious thing. After he leaves Antioch the Apostle 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 two stout
 volumes of the writings and doings of Clement, who was bishop for ten years at
 first and ἅπαξ ἀποστόλος who regards Peter as one infinitely above him. Clement
 depicts a dynamic, wise, saintly, 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 wretched. But if we turn to the oldest traditions
 before, it is all of Clement that we hear, and never of Peter. There are his
 sermons, his miracles, his intimate conversations, the delightful stories of his
 simple personal habits; of which the Clementine writings abound as ICCH AS
 "ΠΑΠΑ ΠΑΠΑΝΟΙΚΟ." As soon as he leaves there, Clement too loses sight of
 him. That has made it possible for a number of contemporary scholars to main-
 tain 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 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 225. Next came a schism between Cornelius and Novatus. 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 shouts 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 reinstall 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 *Carius* and the proscriptions of *Sulla*."

Even worse trouble arose a few years later with the election of the next Bishop of Rome, *Damian*, whose election was challenged by the Bishops who elected a rival, *Ursinus*. The partisans of *Ursinus* entered a church in which "the Donatists part of the populace had assembled, and perpetrated the cruellest killings against those of both sexes." When *Damian* became Bishop," writesocrates, "instantly rioting broke out all over Rome, because the preceding Bishop had chosen not Damianus but Bishop Ursinus to be his successor." To all the people rose in arms against each other "not because of any doctrine or 'creed', 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,"ocrates continues, "arose the *Impegezdes—the mighty
rushing together of the mobs, so that in the melee many were killed and a great many both clerks and laymen were sentenced by the Bishop 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, Arnianus: "Under Theodoric, Symmachus and Laurentius, being both consecrated, fought for the Episcopal throne of Rome. By God's decree, 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 Arnianus were both barbarians—finally 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: who was Christ's successor, but the Venerable. 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 another Hilarius to follow him. But Boniface was not strong enough to get Hilarius accepted, and the result was a Senatus consultum, i.e. a law passed not by the Apostles but by the Roman Senate governing the election of popes, this was followed by the Edict of Athalaric, a German prince, "on the Election of Roman Bishops." Another attempt follows in the Liber Pontificio, from 529 on. To be petitioned the Emperor for help; in reply the Emperor issued the edict (fif, 532, in Dict. V-XIII, c.1,2): "When 2 Bishops of Rome are elected, THE ONE SHALL BE BISHOP, but only that one shall remain on the Apostolic chair, with the doom (Oredek) of God and the Will of the Generality have chosen from among the clergy by a valid ordination." Soon after, however, the Will of the
Generality chose Silvester 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 719 "the relatives of the blessed Pope Hadrian 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 1031. "Guided as on by pride," writes Dulcher, a contemporary and secretary to the Rhenish pope, who was supporting Urban against the Emperor and his nominee, "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 Guidbert, with the approval of the ever-maligned Emperor and inspired by the unrighteous backing of the greater part of the citizens of Rome, as long as he could kept Urban away from the holy city, 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 shared, condemning the acts of Urban as illegal. So Urban in that same year in which the Franks began to go to 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 Loirain and Italy as a present to the Roman Church, which she was supporting against Henry III,
who would have deprived her of the holding anyway). At the time this Matidia enjoyed great power in the Roman Patria. At the time Urban took over with her aid, "Gudbert 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 deadlock—the question
Church, he found the solution in the Emperor, is still unsolved in the eleventh
century. Exactly like Eusebius, Pulcher continues: "Some favored the one man,
some the other. As far as human intelligence could judge, Urbanus was the juster,
since he was the lesser given to lust for money. Then he tells how Gudbert when
Abp. of Rheims 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
nations subject to her, the disease spreading from the head thru the fibres to
the whole organism, and becomes sick and weak...and then the head is thus af-
flicted, then all the members suffer continually." By early fathers we are told
that the apostolic order of provision that while the Church lasted the offices
would be properly repeated. Plainly this haphazard system is something entirely
different. "The body being thus been wounded, the members withered from the
pain that attacked them, so that [in all states of life] peace, goodness, fides,
year under
within the churches and without, in both great and small; suffered an eclipse.
transfer against the pagans that
in all it was necessary...to wage war against themselves." And THAT according to Pulcher, 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 Guaimarix men of Guidbert, 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. He had seen a share of pains for getting involved in that sort of thing."

Excerpt from Proissart: C. ccxxi:

About 4 is period he who signed himself pope Urban III, 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 (from the English and several other countries obeyed) during his residence at Genoa,vaugh he could obtain succours from England to arm the king of France, and I will tell you by what means. He used to send his bulls to the archbishops and bishops of the country, to proclaim that he is absolved, "IN VINCULIS, TANDEM CVNEUM, THE PUNISHMENT OF THE CIVIL WAR." He heard that his adversary Clement had resorted to this means in France, and was daily doing so; and that the French called the Clementists, as to matters of faith, dogs, which those retorted back on the Clementists, whom Urban was very desirous of conforming 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 cash to be wished to put his plans into operation, for it was well known that his means of wealth increased, and that he absolutely must undertake any expeditions, unless such were preceded by offers of money. Yet at arms cannot live at peace, nor do they pay much attention to their escort at the point of death... Urban...sent upwards of thirty bulls to England, where they were received with such joy. The prelates were glad to their dioceses this expedition in the manner of a war...and none of either sex thought the, should not the very family, and the family of extending arms, if they did not give hard service to the expedition on more than, at London, and in that diocese, there was collected a large congregation full of men, and he gave rest, according to the Pope's will, given the greatest number of preachers. All the should die at this time, and who had given their money, were absolved from every fault...A church was, Henry, bishop of Werden, was chosen to lead the expedition, cccxi, he was "young and eager, and visiting to arms and was all for conquering all of Flanders, but the experienced Sir Roger was relieved him. "Sir...our expedition had nothing to do with it, it concerns the wars of kings, but is in favor of this to the mission.
tists. We are the soldiers of pope Urban, who has given us absolution from all faults if we destroy the Clementists. Should we march into Flanders...we shall forfeit our engagement; for I understand, that the Earl of Flanders and all the Menings 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 pressed 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 peoples was not settled. It continued with their successor, Urban III, in whose days the Turks threatened Europe and took all the Balkans: "The Turks...only laugh at the two popes, one at Rome and the other at Avignon, saying, 'The two gods of Christendom are fighting 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 unwillingly submitted to the Turk Amurat, the king explained that the Turks' rule over subjects was far more decent, generous and humane than anything one met with in Christian lands.

About this period, Otto of Brunswick came to Pope Clement at Avignon to receive his pen for the war he had carried on for the pope and church against the Romans and Bartholomew Prinzen, who styled himself pope Urban III. But as he could not obtain a pension...he left them much discontented...About this time, the forces subsidized by pope Clement...had stirred up pope Urban in the city of Narva, where Count Conrad, a leader of a large body of Germans defending him, offered to deliver him up to pope Clement for the sum of 20,000 crowns. But Urban could not raise the money, and Urban escaped to Rome."

Thus art 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 bankers, a city mob, an ambitious woman, a successful general, and intriguing Churchmen...Who could tell? The bishopric naturally played a leading role. They came to be known as Cardinal Bishops, and as such first played 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 monks, 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 position as advisors of the pope, that they began to think of themselves as having "CORONAL sanction and position." The present Constitution de Baevd Apeotolicz Vacante (Papal) states that "IN THE CONJECTURE, 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 then college has power to settle it by a majority vote. Number four is a concession to "real" 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 even a Pope dies. But (2) ALL authority of the Congregations is transferred them beforehand 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 alike 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 judgment 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 ICT because the old travelling apostolite, with prophets, teachers, etc., had been found inadequate that it vanished—it was for more adequate than any other system ever devised. It was not because of charging needs and conditions as the "infant Church outgrew old institutions," ICT a stronger Church behind that they were abolished—for then they would have been 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 would help the in this simply repeated that 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 ICT solely upon the theme of priority and preeminence 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 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, IN TEN the hierarchy.

And at the very TCF of the system stood the four or five biggest Churches
—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 gang up against him in the name of Christian equality—the ambitions of any one Bishop could always be countered with appeal to a primitive wish was not that of the ruling Bishop but of episcopal equality. It is interesting to see the game that some play 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 ecclesiastical 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 16th century, 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 Jefele finds the CH passage that definitely proves Roman priority, the statement he quotes referring to the Bishop of Antioch: speaking of Julius of Rome, "he says, "or did he send a representative, though immemorially there was an ecclesiastical custom that the Bishops of Superior order in council without the approval of the Bishop of Rome." This is a passage in which rests on translation, so we have followed Jefele's interpretation of UNANIMUS: "To pass a general decree through and at Rome." The spelling of the passage is clear: the Churches of the West are passing laws under laws are of universal and general application must be approved by all—ius to the Pope. The Latin text has his vote; the legislation is stopped. The Pope, like an obstructionist mentor on a committee, could not say "Legislation indefinitely, and so, "IN TERTIUM non, the whole business rested upon his pleasure. If that does not prove, as Jefele insists, that Rome

...f is the voting that any passing laws, and all that was needed of Rome was to send a PROPERLY-QUALIFIED to preside; so much more the case specifically. "We are the western representative of the Big Four, "servant of a very large number of Church in the West," I cleanse ourselves, "without inter-


position of metropolitans. — exactly, Duchesne observes, as Alexandria did in the East. Rome's position is thus not unique, but certainly it is very important, and of course if a law was to apply to the 'Old 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 in fact elected and holding his power in fact—would be the height of presumption. The meeting in question could not pass rules without the vote of Rome, neither could it without Alexandria or Antioch. But the Roman Bishop in his position of western counter-weight, much further 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. One 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 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 Eastern and the methods and reasons of the Roman Bishop, and immediately appear in another light—everything about him proclaims him to be not a unique phenomenon in the world, but a typical member of the Big Four. 

It never occurred to Athanasius, Duchesne says, "that an appeal to the Bishop of Rome might strengthen his fortunes," yet this was not out of his bishopric. Yet is was on the strength of a res gestae, or res gestae, from Julius of Rome that Athanasius and Paulus restored their bishoprics. 'Ox and 'arrestisikois' means lit. 'outside speaking aside, or outside; irregular order; illicit, unauthorized, or outside our authority.' The Bishop of Rome was simply taking a chance: as the word shows, his acts were entirely irregular, and was in fact not used again in the controversies of the 4th century. This was the 1ST resort for
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 (alēthesizeon—to blurt out the truth) by temporal force."

It is all very well to speak of Christian principles, but the prelates of Rome knows that truth is with the big battalions. To support the historic claims of Rome Zinzinger 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 MADE—another thing entirely."

Still another thing, writes for the support of more orthodox views 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 TIMID," says Zinzinger, as well as in fact—not a voice was raised in protest. Still writes to the Emperor Constantius, "I beseech you..." the Bishop of the Holy Church, and the illustrious see of..."

Tertullian was even more scathing concerning the completely unauthorized claims of the Roman Bishops as "the Bishop of Bishops." Zinzinger was even more cutting, so much so that Catholic divines have found it convenient to declare the most unflattering letters or forgery, thomox as documents they are so well attested as any of the other letters, "since it is unthinkably that anyone should use such ignorance against the Pope." It is indeed unthinkably, and for that very reason it is clear that Zinzinger did not for a moment consider the Pope of Rome to be the Pope. To use some passages of Zinzinger to support Roman claims, it is therefore necessary for Karl Adam to make of Zinzinger himself "a complete Mirrorkopf" (ad lib).
Rome was able to capitalize not only on her geographical position, but also 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 the development of the role of the Church of Rome and to the impress of its authority, that one is obliged to conclude that there was an organic relation between the two; and the expression AID justification of the claims of Rome developed hand in hand. Prof. Retifolle has labored with characteristic determination to show that the expression ne PLAMA CATHOLICA 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. Retifolle would have susanamartyrii substitutêtre in Gyr. 37, 3, mean "the highest peak of martyrdom," but both 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" (1) in 495 St. Pelagius 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 decision. 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 fact that it was IPSTUS 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 scolulcny cultivating the int False Apostolic Secretals. "The legal fiction arose," says W. Toutart, "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 established, the bishop lists of the large Churches were composed and unbroken filled out by working backwards to the apostles."

Long before that John Chrysostom had written:...
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 then he was transferred to be Ep. of Sp. and found New Rome and Old Rome competing for priority of holiness, he wrote: "Sp. 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 rowdism in electing its Bishops).

The angels visited Abraham in his hut rather than in the towers of Sodom. Go into the Church at Sp. 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, I see, but also THE MOTHER OF THE BISHOPS. How many Bishops and teachers come there to be taught? You cannot judge truth by numbers, cries "Atanasius." the poor, simple, innocent priests are the equal of 10,000 times 10,000. Thus the poor ever receives 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, "if" is bought by flattery and gifts, easily impressed in its ignorance, talk to me about numbers... can you overcome falsehood by a multitude? Because of its credulity and simplicity, easily tripped up in its timidity and cowardice, which always prefers the pleasure of the moment to the enjoyment of eternal life; all of which things are well enough: "The strength of falsehood is in a multitude."

It is no wonder the modern Catholic editors want to view these remarks of Atanasius as quibbles! The opposite side of this picture is the argument of Ralph:

"Although there is obvious vision in delaying the baptism of men whose conduct is liable to bring sin upon the Christian name, the Church is not the sort of society that one might call "select." Ralph Bigh. Forgets that "society" means "select." He would be hesitant to "purify" a society to which all who would hurt the reputation of the Church—he shows to public disgrace, but a sort from that would have no limitations at all: "the membership is more important", and the membership stands for. In the end (Polybot, Lucifer, Inigo, Louis, etc.)—all the great men of the 4th century—went their full course, or the 4th year 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.

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 BODY APOTCALYTE." 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 rest 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 3rd in Ch. 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 APOTCALYTE?

Vossus explains that Alexandria has second place, and Antioch third, because Peter LEFT 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 unwarranted. It destroys the Cenentious claims, it introduces principles of authority nowhere mentioned in scripture or in the Fathers, but which undoubtedly would give Jerusalem, with its THIRD 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 THEOGENY, the Prima Sedes which belongs by celestial bounty to the Roman Church, which consecrated the most blessed Peter and Paul consecrated in their martyrdom." 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 Christ’s 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 are the essence of Mediterranean religion, the cults of tress and caves which abound in Iusenius dominate the Near East at all times, and flourish as much as ever in the world of the Lady Hester 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 his Bishop Ignatius and the name "Trinity" 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 principatum 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 confused the issue were a single head and a monarchical authority is insisted upon. "Peter, Paul AND DOMINUS died at Rome for the same purpose," says Chrysostom 1350,593, which was "to entice ish..."
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 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 SCULPTO 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, unassuming 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." Jougel also believes 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 bp. of Rome comes from the middle of the 2nd century, according to Jougel, having its rise "in a very vague statement in Clement of Rome."

In the so-called letter of Clement to the Corinthians, "early all Catholic historians see the thrust on episcopate given to us by the Clementine authority as the touch 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, pretending to intervene 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 affairs of Corinth, Secker 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 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 private; 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. "By the word 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. Not "imposing authority!" Tertullian tells us that Bishop Hermas 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. This letter, however, is not written to Ep. Coter 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 TO" Clement." You were of them to forget to mention that this Clement was a Bishop, let alone President of the Church—while all other Bishops are receiving the respect and recognition! Yet it does mention in that letter to the Romans actually wrote the letter—not dictating it, as a Bishop would. If Rome intervened in Corinth, Tertullian of Lyons intervened in Rome; internal affairs with the 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 incidentally Ignatius, talking to seven Churches (far more frankly 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 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; 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." (Euse, 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 at particularly pure and holy.

Van Cauller a Dutch Benedictine 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 communities, independent of the churches. American excavations in Corinth have proven beyond a doubt, says Van the CITY of the CITY of Cauller, that there were indeed very special ties between Rome and Corinth.

"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 previous cities?" "The Christians of Rome and Corinth must have conserved their established social relationships, their civic spirit, their national sentiment, and even the secular ties pride in their cities...He may accept it as certain that...the profane reports 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'Greeks', Latin and Roman. Such a state of things 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 PRIORI 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 betther fellow citizens." If anything, they would be more so. In conclusion, Father Causselaert prefers: "Consequently, the question of determining if I Clement is presented as 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 add 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 Causselaert, "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 is ruling the Church."
It is important to insist on this point not only because the passage in I Clem. is exhibit A in the R2 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! K. Vogels collection of *Anticene 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 Vogels produces even remotely suggests a reference to the primacy of Rome.

The thundering silence of history regarding the primacy of Rome is most significant only when we know just what *summa* 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 no hierarchical constitution." The Church has...the right and office of *ministeri* 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 voting in favor with the Pope NEVER errs," though national synods are fallible.

"The Eucharistic Society," writes Deissel, "is a hierarchical society, a Church of Churches, a unity preserved by the unity of the cathedral Petra; and such we must understand in Methodus." In one of very sporadic letters attributed to Jesus that very early Pope (whose name is missing entirely from many of the lists) says:

"The apostles established the apostolic seat...the Church exists not because it is the church, but because it was called to the apostolic seat...as to the head, whose charge it is to illumine the world through Jesus Christ and make it the Church." Another very early Pope, Eusebius, 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 illumine the world through Jesus Christ and make it the Church." Eusebius is represented as writing a charge to the whole Church: "If you have anything against your bishop, refer it to me, and I will settle."
Here we have a clear enough conception of the sort of thing 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. 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 else did not, Duchi, hotes, occur to Athanasius, casting about desperately for a ray out, that ray is suggested by no one. 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 not, and if anyone else of the Roman claims he should have been a Latin-speaking westerner. A nod from him was enough to sustain the authority of any bishop without limitation and 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 enthusiastic 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 and ecumenistic; it was the ecumenistic Ecumenical, 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 Bozen 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, so cursed by the Jewish prophets, that the role of leadership fell," says Duchesne. Why then does it not fall? It is very strange that "in spite of this, this hierarchical predominance,
this general direction which had its seat at Rome, WAS EXERCISED WITHOUT 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 organization of Rome was neither designed for the government of the Church nor equal to it. Lachsen 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 the office would have been impossible and inconceivable; and so when we find that "IN CIVI DRES" 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 Doll 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 Barrov 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 with which each of these dynamic men must 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 dis-
Great 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 sent out an epistle "to the Church of God in Philomelium and to all the
Churches throughout the empire world." There are numbers of well-attested instan-
ces of this sort of thing (e.g., Ignatius to Polycarp, Phileas, Polycarp, Hermas,
Peter, Herm. to Herm., 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 who—should it be referred? We've
quoted the claim of "inscrito" that it was the very purpose of the Book 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 thesene issues of doctrina
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 ever-
we would have a stream of letters and directives, exactly such as these letters foretell.
This is recognized by the Greeks 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 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 contin-
ued to govern the Churches," as he had authority to do. With the Easter contro-
versy 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" creating 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 the eucharist. 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. Justin,
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 Bis-

chop 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
two, or at the very least, by two, other Bishops." What about his being ordaine
by the pope? Is it 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." St. Isidore, according to our Catholic editor,
is the first one to use the title "universalis apostolicae Ecclesiae episcopus." But if every there was a well-defined title, it is that of Archbishop, a term so
specialized that it use here is the equivalent of calling the King of England
Lord-Lord of Lords—an honorable title, indeed, but one that excludes him from
the "pope" by implication. If the Fr. 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 fully
translate the word episcopus as "pope" when the Bishop in question happens to be
like mushrooms overnight. Here we have the abrupt discontinuation of Apostolic authority. Had the Apostles not been "last," but left behind fully authorized successors with as much authority as they themselves had had, and had the nature and 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 it in a state of things by a feeble comparison with the vileness of differing opinion among philosophers and scientists. But his answer is beside the point: philosophers and scientists 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 wrangling 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 biggest 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 what we wish to note here is that the existence of a clearly recognized lead in the Church somewhere would immediately solve Clement's problem: the only possible norm would be to follow the teachings of the established lead, no matter what sect was biggest, if only such a lead existed. But Clement knew of none.

That the idea of the 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 March, an early Christian martyr, who his parent was, 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 paramount 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. "We were 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 GREAT PEACER, 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 Pr. sent ambassadors, and we are told in no uncertain terms that since the days of the Apostles in Christ 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 OTHER WAY OF CURE or of casting out the common evil, than 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 Pr., the head of the Church, the one and only successor to the Apostles, etc., etc., and not just Pr. of that everybody knew was the Imperial city. The priests he sent took orders from him—but no one else did. Since the primary question of "What one, who was to rule the Church? (the doctrinal issue, as
was often observed, was merely a pretext for a showdown of power-groups), how 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 won 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
an. assembly since the days of the Apostles—and only Constantine 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, teach-
ing strange doctrines, practicing strange rites—Plato says so too churches
and the same liturgy; viewing each other as strangers from other planets—but
better demonstration of centuries of isolation during which no single center gave
their 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 ac-
cording to them was to forbid the holding of synods, "THE ONLY WAY IN WHICH THE CHURCH
was to be advanced."

Then, just after the Nicene council Julius of Rome wrote a triumphant letter
to Alexandria on behalf of Athanasius, glorifying the successes of 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,
Irons, Aquitaine, Harbonne, T lois, and Britain, i.e., the whole Western Church ex-
cet Italy, giving an 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 from me: I will therefore, inexperienced and
untrained 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
poorly
is reluctant and unqualified—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
is decided
West in another letter, the report of what was done (at the Council of Sirmium), and
judge in the light of your faith
you can decide for yourselves, 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, the days of the Apostolic Fathers
continued unabated. We have read Chrysostome 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, interceded "with opposing authority," as the Catholics
and grow constantly worse,
soever, to put an end to it, why did it continue? Why does not somebody now intercede?
obody does—and it is always the Emperor. But the point is that a central au-
tority in the church would have long since worked out a way of dealing with these
local uprisings if such central authority had only existed. Later on, when there
was such a central authority in Rome, the rioting at episcopal elections, the common-
cause of unrest in the Church, ceased. The Apostles knew, wrote Cenaret, that there
would be trouble about this office of Bishop, and so they made an epimeme 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—this
letter was held as a thing of naught," and so the problem was not solved. In these
cases we are told HCT the Apostles "transferred their authority," and it is not
through 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
central surveillance over the elections. "I charge you by The Fathers," writes Basil
to the people of Seleucia, 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 the perfection for calumny to deliver us from this terrible tempest." (Witter-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. 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?" Cyril, Basil's contemporary, always calls the Church SANTA, but NEVER Apostolica. He argues that Mani cannot be the Peraclete, as his followers claim he is, because he came 200 years AFTER the death of the Apostles, while the Peraclete 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 Cyril, "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." That a strange way to designate the Third Period of the Church. It is as disappointing as Clement's announcements—one of his few genuine utterances—that Christ gave the gnosia to Peter James and John, handed them "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 this 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, but of succession to the apostolic office.

The Fathers scrupulously avoid saying the thing they must say if the Roman claim is true. "When you are visiting a strange city," Cyril advises his Alexandrian cong-
correction, "never 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 Ecclesia,' but say rather, 'Where is the catholic church.' For this name happens to be common everywhere to 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 Cyril: "It is called the catholic church because it is found throughout all the inhabited world, because it is the common preaching of sound doctrine; and because the whole human race is disciplined for piety and because it is a remedy for human appearance of sin, and because it contains the concept of that is called virtue." This is an obvious rhetorical etymologizing, but note how completely alien Cyril is on the subject of a single head. "Your father said," wrote Chrosc to Origenius, "it is not the business to judge between bishops," but Cyril says, "I must do the judging." That Constantine did say was that it is WISE to judge between bishops. As a matter of fact Chrosc has taken that function upon himself, so that people say, he notes, "that Chrosc wants to have more authority than the Emperor." But where does this discussion leave us? The Em to judge among bishops? On that head Arne and Chrosc played a rough game against each other. [In 379 some Bari monks wrote to Epiphanius, who was then a bishop in Cyprus, urging him to write against all the heresies. "Since not only these but many others as well are constantly appealing to him] Why does even the devoted Cato, a lover by birth and living not for off use such restrained language when he writes: "We live for to ends with Stractus, who today is our Auctor, along with you and all the rest of us we make a common society of all the world, in the co ord of a single society." No mention of subordination but a, of agreement. "Could people be baptized again in the name of the Father," 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 then we already have heaven's answer, the NT?" Why indeed, since it was the interpretation of the NT that they were fighting about in the first place! Cyprian 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! Cyprian continues: "But why is even the NT necessary? AS OUGHT AS THE FATHER IS PERFECT...A TESTAMENT (that is, a witness of Him in His ABSENCE) is not necessary. Christ told the Apostles 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). The answer to rebaptize is therefore Mt. 28:20, plus John 12:10. In the end Cyprian falls back, as do all sectorians, on the Scripture, but he falls very far into the inexcusable error: he points out that God is still ALIVE, and then he quietly adds: "We were not a part of the question, therefore we can't answer it. But he does add, "Let us ask Him for revelation, by falling back on the war, on the very subject of the dispute. But throughout the whole debate course this loyal fellow reserves a very significant silence regarding the proper function of the NT. -- few miles away! A few years later a Bishop of the Church writes to the Bishop of Rubbia, within his own metropolitan district depicting the fact that the Ritual and Liturgy of that Church is NOT ever ‘as been that practice’ at Rome! ‘Here 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, sided by monks, the Scholastics reform ‘to save it for Rome and the world!’ ‘These,’ says J. A. Alexander, 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 authority of the Apostolic See? The earliest instance of such teaching would seem to be that of Hermes. "In those days," says a letter attributed to Pius I, "Hermes was doctor of the faith and Scripture scintillated among us. An angel of the Lord appeared to the same Hermes 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 Hermes, for the writer does not even know that it is an allegory. But it is very significant that it rests the authority in this decision on Peter. But by the claim of a man who was not a Bishop to whom an angel appeared to him.

The decision on Peter must be the claim of a man who was not a Bishop. But by the claim of a man who was not a Bishop to whom an angel appeared to him. Hermes, he says, "were the head of the church," and Hermes and Hermes should be taking instruction from the head of the church—NOT giving it!

The introduction to Origen's _Contra Autolycum_ is a most significant document. Next to Augustine Origen was the most important Father in the establishment of Christian Theology; he kept seven 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—which trivial and technical details of doctrine, but the great First Principles upon which the whole thing is founded. Christians 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 Holy Ghost was begotten or not—that we must find out from the Scripture, 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, both what comes before or after
is not evident in the teachings of the Church; we know that there are angels,
but that, how and when they are is not sufficiently manifest; the word which best
describes God is atomos—bodiless—yet that word is unused and unknown in the
Scripture. And so on. Origen announces that he must to the best of his ability seek a
solution to such problems in philosophy, FOR THE SCRIPTURE has not given an
answer to them and it now even on structures on which we can enter into. If not.
But have we not been told that the very purpose of the Holy Scripture 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 bond 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 have 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 line argument of number, Clement of Alexandria introduced
another test: "how 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 sure 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 bond to appeal to. "It is foolish," he says, "to turn down
Christianity because it is divided into many sects. We must by demonstration and
very study show from the Scripture how only in the true and ancient Church the most
exact Gnosis and the best choice (literally, HERESY) 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 an infallible authority
on doctrine exists, heresy is a sin, yet here Irenaeus 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 Irenaeus: "Only the
ancient Church therefore, retains the true cult (the word RITUAL is signific-
antly the only one that has it but CULT, it thus admitting the
possibility of such loss). But since, however, he continues, "separate groups
firmly believe of heretics insist that they are the true Christians and that they ARE the
Orthodox Church, we must identify the true church as the one which salubriously
substitutes sins and faults. To do this we must fight more skilfully and devotedly against
all the sects of liars." Again, Irenaeus has no sure test for that true Church.

All the sects were calling themselves Christians; but now
that is no longer a touchstone, since all the sects now call themselves "Christian!"
Still no one thinks of the Lord 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 Nicator in Egypt,
greatly admired for his noble character and his great gift for hymn-writing,
who tried to revive the old doctrine of the Millennium, using Revelations as a
text. One of his warmest admirers, Bishop Dionisius 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 Sir.
appeal is 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 the successor to the Apostles with the duty and authority to teach the whole church? In reality, John Chrysostom was not impressed by the authority in doctrinal matters of himself or any other man upon the earth, including the Bishop of Rome. "You can be convinced ignorant and uneducated people that among all the heresies the catholic Church has the correct faith and does not make mistakes," asks Athanasius, after that scriptural demonstrations, especially of the "spiritual" sort reintroduced by St. Gregory, are not the convincing for the proofs. "You in the time for Athanasius, one of the very greatest heroes of the later Church, to come out with "Tithi opt Peter," but he does nothing of the sort; instead he gives an astonishingly weak form of orthodoxy: "The best men are through teaching them about the holy Eucharist, where Christ did this and this."

The letter of Alexandria places must be the true seat, says "Cyprian," since we cannot but hold him all to the "teaches of the fathers." It is a last-minute argument! In the public-relations to it concurs oranges those the "teal." that "Cyprian held Chichester's actual oversight or authority, without checking whether they are sound or soundless!" But there is authority then he can talk like that?

In the "Late report of the bishops to the Western Church as the middle of the 4th century," Athanasius justifies the Bishop of Rome by the past events. "The sleep of Chrysostom by his insensitivity in a crisis to keep silence: "I think it is," necessary and religious act for me to forward these collablients to you, and to others," write numbers of Letter have been written by Chrysostom about for the situation: "I am in a very unpleasant place..." he tried hold "..."; I did not know to answer them. "Chrysostom uses a scholarly religious device for discovering the "true" form of the very fact that the-early-very early training came to the true one; they all first against each other, he says, accusing each other of being "froth," but so mutually cancel each other out, but in one thing the agree--they all make the same against the Church, which, since their
opposition, can only be the true one. The only weakness of this argument, as far as the reflection will show is that it can be employed with equal validity by any sect! For if the divines are all fighting each other, then any one of them can, with perfect truth, say that all the others have but one thing in common, viz., that they are fighting it, and that therefore it must stand alone against all, and can only be the pure and unfallen one of the lot. Yielding to the ur-ging that comes from bishops all over Europe, Flamel agrees to send them annual doctrinal reports and interpretations—without dreaming of consulting Rome.

"Letting first, I be guilty enough and so many bishops of disastrous influence or in denial of error,

I have frequently signified to you in most of the cities of the land, my resolves that is being considered for our religious protection to the bishops of the land... Letting first either amongst the disasters or the cause of the new form of religion and society, I decided that I too should preserve silence before you (for I cannot deny that you have often been reminded to silence).

Now, however, it seems high time and relogious to transmit the latest...

"Letting first, I be guilty enough and relogious to transmit the latest..."
Men persecution showed grave weaknesses in the Church, especially in
the matter of the one Church of Christ, "Corroded, though he had no wish to teach
in the Church, could not restrain his indignation before such a scandal." He is
in exactly the same position as the Apostolic Church and their successors—all
of whom fought because they could not restrain themselves and not by any special
commission. But the gives such a commission? "The aging Bishop Aquila,"
writes von Bonorden, "for the Latin world"—authority—all authority
and conclusions of the best turn to him for information and advice. The question
of freedom and grace was his special interest, "while he died before he solved it."
And Augustine been commissioned by God rather than chosen by men to solve the
very and disturbing doctrinal and practical questions, of the Church, he could not possibly have
died before he solved them (not "prematurely") left the four greatest and most
vexing questions quite unsolved), so that he could not have "solved" them at
all—"the one in the matter of Hilary's case, but the Aquila's questions "to
solve" by world's, i.e., operate in an entirely different manner. Again we re-
the claim of the open Church, that one see solved was established for the
question of the fact that men might appeal to MT, and not to the Bishop of Rome, it's
"the personal and direct" problem of doctrine. "We didn't people love
them. and Her. Didn't Augustine himself?" Did he not refer his question to
love, nor to a doctor who, as an example to the rest of it. Felix near Hilary, "he
in all the love and the life of the Church, and not in the Church itself
least of the Church of Christianity to the side" his "only" solutions were to re-
and the authoritative ones. For all time, it never occurs to him that there is
right and his nature. Therefore we need he sought desperately for someone—
prove—the case of the Rome authoritative and convincing exposition of Christ's
rectitude—he never thinks of people to "die in the right faith", as the papal Will.
be central. He will not let a fact be, and existed in the true. It will
not. It will abide of a person,教会, called it a question of doctrine;
so this, with the end of the new. But the question of doctrine,

had ever declared that he was 'not thought correct' according to the
writers and masters of our art, since therefore it is an instruction to all who
were to treat as they treated in his day, as he treated in his youth. All, I
believe, that did so were, I may say, in the first instance largely
undoubtedly erroneous; another, 'except to Rome, and this time by the author of
the Epistle.' In all this Bithynia there is a authority—these opinions are to be pre-
ferred to another's, and so the individual reader is free to decide for himself.

Heretofore the 'problem' of many differences of doctrine to deal with in
their own time, and since they knew these could be the cause of great distur-
bances among the parties, they still kept together and formed one holy line.

...But the teaching of the letter was distorted in the handling of the
preachers' texts or copies of writings. As a result there are now two churches in
the world into which are the same rites, observances, and doctrine. Here the
claim that the 'churches of Christ' were 'false' and 'false' all their doctrinal instructions are set
forth in a special letter but in a letter, and that only the letter failed to
be understood, are, therefore, rules and any awareness on the part of
Bithynians... That the 'churches' left no special successor to control
and watch over them... That the 'churches' left no special successor to control
and watch over them. In every church, whether large... The Church tried to fol-
low the examples of the early fathers... was the only one to write: "And though many instruct
us in various ways of subtlety, still since the defect of our
this, in this..." The words... the very bodies of men are failing, does
not allow one to say in matters of all things.

The summary is that of discovering definite ties with later in the 'I knew
and was' and the very body of men... The execution of rules made
sacrificing of last-ditch determination that it,
the plea of mankind, met at once by the distressing failing of the results. "It
there," is not. Instead, coming up the evidence, "that there is no chance
of possessing a real foundation or any authentic radical of letter. The 'I know
and was'... does not call for established neither there was a real foundation
true-authentic or not."
The world is never allowed to forget that the cornerstone of the whole foundation is the verse of scripture which in convenient mistranslation and letters of heroic size adorns the highest circle of the interior of the dome of St. Peter's. In the 16th century the Protestant attacks on Mt. 16:17 were all aimed at showing that these words were very probably never spoken by Christ. Yet the most powerful argument in favor of that theory is precisely because they were spoken. AsURNACE's observation that until the middle of the 3rd century, no one ever quotes that all-important verse. Yet if words are purely because they were spoken that the fatal silence is so thunderous, you're long.

The fact that no one thinks to cite Mt. 16:17 in three centuries of ferocious controversy on the subject of authority does NOT prove that these words were unavailable to the early Fathers, but it does most emphatically prove that these Fathers did NOT see in these words the organic framework of an "ecclesial church." That high and holy matter is under discussion in this important controversy of which we have only a few broken fragments in Mt. 17:10. In current scholarly circles the three Gospels have no intention of revealing to the world that these matters were of equal interest, if only from the strict inference of silence alone between the 'witnesses' at the time. From the Christian point of view, Protestant as well as Catholic, the important passage is not "thou art Peter," but rather "the gates of hell shall not prevail." For while no one is "able to establish historical connection" with Peter, the promise about a "heaven's ever open and unequivocal promise that the Church will go forth in_the_power_and_name_of_Christ, from 'dies' 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 actually did in the end nothing to fear. "The gates of Hell," he quoted so often and as by the Father-themselves, "shall prevail against him."

The Church, marked by its "Trail of Blood" must have persisted through the ages from the time of Christ. Yet does the magnificent assurance of "the gates of hell shall not prevail" not at any time so poor as to imbalance the "Trail of Blood"? Just as it is correct the regular expression, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against him." That is the all-important question to ask. But what causes this all-important question to fail? Our answer is always in our last question itself. No one ever questions...
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 higher, secret matter about which the second generation of the Church knew nothing. That explains why it is never referred to in all of those "teachings of the elders," from which Eusebius informs us his generation regarded as "rather mysterious" and could not hope to explain. "In the second century," Eusebius observes, "not a single church father or heretic made any reference to this verse (Mt. 16:18), even in those cases in which, if the head and the author of the Church were to be compared to the "living stones," the author of the Church was not mentioned. The popular name of Peter's ordination or Mt. 16:16, "Koeneisai" meaning "eyes," if that came out by Peter's own words: "This is the foundation of the Church, the Church refers to revelation. I have foretold this for the apostles and the Church of the world!" How are "living stones" different? They are not just any stones. They are the foundation of the Church: they are the stones of the lower foundations made up by that faith. This faith is the "true rock" in Peter's words: "This is the revelation of the Father... This is the revelation of the Father, this is the Church's security." Not a word about any geographical location; not a part of the earth to dwell upon the seat of Peter (Mt. 16:18). It is "the foundation of the author of the Bible, who is the true rock of Christ's safety." In other words, collecting all the commentaries ever made in the thousands of volumes, give that nothing can ever be said to be lost, they led the way to dwell on the seat of the Church's security.
that Jesus would have spoken, and translate the passage: "I also tell thee, even thee, Peter (pœthi: for my sake): upon this rock [viz. the fact of my Eucharistic institution and my saying the Sacrament of God] I will build my Church." This interpretation is strengthened, Betteleus tells us, by the fact that elsewhere in the primitive Church it is always Peter and not any other who is the foundation of the Church." Very much to the point is Peter, Peter," Faguet writes, "does not contain any of the ecclesiastical expressions that have been subsequently discovered. It does not "stipulate" the authority of either of the elders in general nor of Peter in particular. It expresses only the fact that the Church rests on faith, the resurrection of Jesus and that Peter is the one who, when Christ ascended, "is the first foundation of the resurrection, the resurrection without which the faith in Jesus would not have survived His death." In his "active part," in as Peter, Faguet tells us, supplied impressive illogic with a Roman of the desperate order to "die" of the defenders of the literalism claim until one quote from Peter's reply and the Lord's reply are: "like a child, an inter- nautical parallelism, in which the one and Peter confesses the greatness of Christ, "Oh, the Lord, I proclaim the future greatness of Peter." But the essence of Peter's and a parallelism to the "admirers" of the verbs: there is nothing parallel this time, a measurable inequality of glory, that must be between the Lord's reply and the "I am, I will build" with glory and not with shame, then His glory in Heaven can be matched by only one thing—His Lord's reply—"Peter's: "It is true," says Faguet, "that not a single verse of this part of verse 17 exists before Tertullian (c. 200). By that is said the only one verse, the whole number of 11 verses." But if there were six questions to be put forward as the foundation of the Church and the most important verse in all the Bible, that silence becomes most significant. And then the site of all the scars of controversy: or 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, so "inserted" as it was, and is the very least that the verse was not inserted.
in the Early Church as the key to the whole problem of authority. Then Ignatius comments on the question, "Who wrote the Gospels?" He answers, "I don't know; but they are all right.

Incidentally, Luke's version is not a slavish repetition of Mark he must have his own reasons for not mentioning such an important thing. It's answer because Peter's "out of humility, would have omitted anything that might be to his praise." But Luke 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 one as to it is to the one as to the other, the Church's foundation of the Church depends on Peter, "to hold back at such a time is nothing short of betraying a trust.

Does Clement, for all his shimmering and blushing at Peter's faults in his tropes, dare in the letter attributed to him, to declare why hecalled Mark's work "not insincere or the reproduction of the pure, and so says nothing False it," giving an account, "The absence of Mark must have given its detail the fullness of the history of the Church... is a pretender devoid of all critical sense..." Does not the claim hold equally true of Peter, who talks about the same story, that Mark and Luke do, and "so insinuating for many other reasons..." The whole in the first volume could introduce and yet the very conversation which attributed in the prize to Peter without so much as hinting at the name of the "intercessor" is a "repetition of only "devoted to all critical sense" but devoid of any sense at all.

The name is of Maximus, a term in which St. Paul and Ignatius figure in discussions of authority. Possible authorities are quite incoherent and have been a widespread tradition in the Church and were even used as " cruel of a central Roman authority. Ever EXEM. Had there been a person of such authority, Bellarmin would not have had to struggle and struggle in vain, to show that in 1492 at least he is the one to summon general councils. The real question was whether, of "who is to be called the very great one" who participated in the calling of the same. Just as Emperor, thus; the First Council general Synods were summoned by the

whereas all later ones were approved and subscribed by the \textit{Episcopos}; but even in
the former instances there appears a certain participation of the \textit{Episcopos} in the
convocation, which in separate cases is sometimes more and others less conscious.
" The Roman Catholic Ebskoh: does this best to make a case for episcopal convocation
but that comfort is therein in an "indication" that \textit{Episcopos} participate more or
less," when other great bishops were equally active in the convocations? For what
satisfaction in admitting episcopal supremacy from the ninth council on? That is a
late hour to be asserting a rule that is supposed to date directly "in imitable
organization," yet still vestry from the days of the Apostles. Besides, then lists
the reasons for calling a Universal Council: 1) In case of a dangerous heresy or
siren, 2) When the \textit{Episcopos} 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 \textit{Episcopos} stand in suspicion, heresy or other proofs of-
errors; 5) When the Cardinals cannot or will not proceed with a legal election,
1) 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
Celsius, "To save the soul of the Church through a general consultation with its
clerics." In effect, each of these points will show that at least five of
the six conditions requiring a General Council would be met if there were
in the Roman Church a "catholic episcopacy" and a proper order of succession.
Besides, further defines an "ecumenical Council as a meeting of the \textit{Episcopos} of all
"autonomous and boundless," which completely
rules out the first six cards. The oldest form of the ecumenical in "sacred
assembled" is described as "V. \textit{Vitus the Holy} 12th Council." Here, in the most literal sense:
the pope (\textit{papa}) of the \textit{Meta}, and byolecule, the holy father and bishop of
the \textit{Meta}, and \textit{meta} are "beyond limits." Under this, the presence is a stranger, the
\textit{episcopal Council is joined in "sacred" with different voices of bishops of course,
from the lands of Jerusalem, Rome, Thrace, etc., so that it is not only
given no power as in the case of Rome, but by a solemnly declaring him as
"The history of this time" rules out any idea of the "Law" and "king of the world", which is now supposed to have been "the elevation of the Name". To introduce "mystery", the "natural" idea of truth was to "command the Name of the Lord" to remain in the Church. Only after this we read in, "Nu. 20:5", a long episode from the

负责人 of the Law to the负责人 of the Law regarding the election of an

in parenthesis for "all of America, Mexico, and Peru", yet this document, so vital for

the whole Church. In fact the Church contains an mention of love. The absence of any

mention of other in the Church, even in a man of the Church, is a sign of something to

words as that of "monstrous", and "even though the Fathers of both Orders" (Hieros

and Latin) held conflicting opinions regarding the "proceedings", we must not

for that reason split up one side or the other, but rather try to reconcile the.

The Church should it be to be shown that reconciliation? Here is the

test of the Church. Speaking of the Middle Ages in general, Foucault writes: "The

love itself was not as such, but was the medium by which the decisions of the Fathers

and the great councils. To reject a thing, he might be condemned for heresy. We

must consider, if it were a live error, it is true, were matters for God alone

that it was, if it was that, the Church may have been more pre-

ly than that the Church, was a matter for the Church." If we look back to

the Church, the most surviving amount of the organization of the "Provincial Councils"

the Church, to this day, is not, to be changed by the Holy Father, by the Church, to be

changed by the Church. But its titles are slowly restored: we read

"the title" in the record of one, but the decisions are subject to review.

We are left with the idea that referring to the "Provincial Council." In "The

and so-called in the Church, but even less understood in terms of what before the Council of "Reformation." For the evident

idea of such an action to be done of its essence! To be able to "set up" the idea of the Church, all can be to prove an active and visible in truth, the

consequences of the Church, as the answer to that idea of "Reformation" can make us

understand that in 696 as given on the individual, the true will of a majority is

The fact that the Roman claims are stated so clearly and logically 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 constitution and succession in the earliest ecumenics which are compiled not forward, a 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., forewarn the difficulties that would arise regarding the office of Bishop everywhere, and so made a special ruling regarding the succession of the Bishops in the Churches which they established." The rule, as C. Clement's 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, roditions, 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 believed would have been followed if the Apostles had expected for a moment that the Church was designed to remain on earth. Imagine confining all their instructions to a letter! Clement here is a 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 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 same tradition from the Apostles, and this gives us 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 1000 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 brands of heresy and 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 Optatus 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 within this miraculous unity resides: there is no word of none or Peter. "Let us hold a peaceful assembly as in the good old days," says Basil in a heartwarming 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 (symuclois) and of brothers and sisters to each other...Today letters are sent out in the names of cities, and each society regards its master with suspicion." This clearly shows how the rise of the great city bishops was a phenomenon of the 4th century—a characteristic phenomenon of that powerful age—and that it was resisted by the better men. "Since all who xxx worship in Christ make up a single people, and all of Christ's people today make up a single Church, though named in different regions, the patria and the ekklesia of the Lord rejoice, and will not believe that any one man can hold apostolic authority, but that all things are managed by one angel Church." He recalls the doctrine that xxx said about visiting the Churches, "the angel of the Churches," and an interesting survival of his days of a travelling Apostolate.

Epiphanios repeats the doctrine of diffusion: "The Church received this doctrine and faith and carefully preserved it, though scattered throughout the entire world, there again the operation of a central controlling head is found out as it lived 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 xxx 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, Epiphanios 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 "final 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.