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PREFACE

It is the purpose of the writer in the following pages to seek the origin of the conception of the Christian Church, and to trace this conception through its development up to and including Luther. It need not be said that in a work so short as this it is impossible to go into an exhaustive study of the subject, but it has been the author's aim to state as briefly as is at all consistent with clearness the more important steps in the development. First the teachings and purpose of Christ relative to a Church are examined in an endeavour to discover how He conceived the Church. Next the Primitive Christian Community at Jerusalem is examined in order to learn, if may be, the view of the Church held by the members of the same. Paul and the Apostolic Age is then studied with the same end in view. Passing on from this study, the significance of the death of the Primitive Apostles is noted and the development of the Catholic Church is traced from its roots in the Apostolic Age, through the later books of the New Testament Canon, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, and others of the Early Fathers to its practical maturity in Augustine. Lastly Luther's conception of the Church is examined. With Luther the study closes; for with him a cycle is completed, and we find ourselves back to the familiar conceptions of the Apostolic Age. A concluding chapter is appended in which an attempt is made to sum up in as small compass as possible the main results of the study.
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The historian who essays to enter into the early years of the Primitive Age of Christianity finds a hard way before him. It is customary to think that we know a great deal about the historical Christ, but a very slight acquaintance with the actual subject convinces one of the contrary. We actually know very little about the historical Christ. Prof. D. A. Hayes, in his splendid little book, "The Synoptic Problem," says that the Synoptic writers give us incidents out of only forty days of that wonderful and intensely active life of the Man of Galilee. Many other days, doubtless, were just as crowded with activities as were those the Synoptics saw fit to report, but all is lost to us. The same author tells us that all the recorded sayings of Jesus could be spoken in six hours. "Six hours of golden speech, and over all the rest of the life a pall of perfect silence." Not only are we confronted with the problem of the meagerness of materials out of the life and teachings of Jesus, but it is exceedingly hard for one to think himself out of one civilization through the span of nearly twenty centuries into another civilization about as different from his own as possible. To orient oneself is under the most favorable circumstances difficult, in fact can never be done perfectly, but it becomes exceedingly difficult when the sources are so meager, and the lapse of time so great.

Another very embarrassing difficulty which confronts the historical student of Jesus is the fact that the literature which contains the "words of Jesus" was not cast into its present form until long after his death, and consequently was modified by conceptions
of the author's mind, and of the age in which the author lived and wrote. It is inevitable that such should be the case; and peculiarly is this true of teachings, if there were any, concerning the Church. By the time the Synoptic Gospels were written, the most casual student of the Church can not avoid seeing that a considerable change had taken place in the general conception of the Church. This is so very evident all through the book of Acts as compared with the earlier writings of Paul; for Paul is the earliest and consequently the best authority for the study we have in hand, used as a corrective on the Words of Jesus as reported in the Synoptics.

There are difficulties many and great in the task proposed, yet in spite of all these, the Words of Jesus as found in the Synoptics, together with Paul's earlier writings coming, as they do, nearest of all our sources to Jesus, give us reliable sources so far as they go. From these it is possible to arrive at something like an accurate conclusion as to Jesus' conception of the Church, if He had such a conception: that is to say, the Synoptic Gospels must be corrected constantly by Paul's letters.

Our question then is whether or no Jesus had it in mind to found a Church; that is to ask, Did Jesus have, so far as we can determine by a study of our sources, any clearly defined idea of a Church, and any fixed purpose to found and perpetuate any such institution apart from Judaism, that an independent institution?

The idea seems to be quite prevalent outside of the circle of the more careful scholarship that Jesus came for the express purpose of founding a church-- an organization upon which He placed His approval. A careful analysis of the facts does not, however, warrant any such conclusion. In actual fact, there is no evidence for the
thesis that Jesus had any clearly defined conception of an independent ecclesiastical organization. It is highly improbable that he ever thought of any kind of an organization apart from Judaism. This appears from the following facts.

The whole spirit and teaching of Jesus was a powerful protest against externalism in any form. Jesus stood always most emphatically against the letter that killeth, and for the spirit that maketh alive. He condemned the externalism and legalism of His day as expressed in the Judaism of the Scribes and Pharisees in such powerful words that no legalism or externalism in religion can endure in their presence. No intelligent person can read the fifth Chapter of Matthew, or Mt. 6:1-6; 12:33-35; 15:7-20; 16:6-12; 21:28-46; 22:37-40; Mk. 7:1-23; 8:15; 9:33ff.; 10:35f.; 12:1-12, and many others that might be mentioned, and for a moment thereafter entertain the idea that Jesus had any idea or purpose of founding an ecclesiasticism. It is unthinkable that He who condemned in such scathing language the legalism and ecclesiasticism of His day could even entertain for a moment the purpose to found another Himself.

Jesus dealt only with great ideas—great principles. There is not the least thing in all His teaching that is petty or artificial. His aim was to rouse the mind and conscience of men by leading them to gaze into eternity by making bare the Father's heart. He desired that men should think the thoughts of God over after Him; yes, more and finer still, He would that men should seek with intelligent, loving, unwavering effort and unflagging zeal the high and holy purposes of God. The aim of Jesus was to help men to live the life of holy love in the here and now in the light of the eternal years. He made no detailed laws or rules. Men in all their relations to God
and to each other are to be governed wholly by the heavenly law of love. Jesus knew and gave but one law, that law in the hearts of men that compels them to fall on their knees before their Father-God and in childlike confidence look up into His face and cry, "Abba! Father! My Lord and my God!" In all Jesus' words we find but one place where it can with any show of propriety be claimed that Jesus gave a law or rule, and that is the statement relative to divorce in Mt. 19. In this case, however, it is not a law He is laying down, but an ideal He is setting up. So far as is known, this is the sole bit of legislation by Jesus partaking of a specific character and this is not in any true sense of the nature of enactment, but the placing of a moral ideal to be realized.

It has already been affirmed that Jesus had no clearly defined conception of a Churchly organization. Certainly He had no such a conception of the Church as the Fathers of the second and third centuries, or of the papists and their apists of the present time. This statement, however, is denied, while on the other hand it is affirmed with dogmatic assurance that Jesus founded not only an ecclesiastical, but also a sacerdotal Church: that is to say, Jesus founded the papal hierarchy and priesthood, making the priesthood the Church. It was He who shut God's grace up within the Church, and gave to Peter and his successors absolute authority to bind or loose, to forgive or retain sins; Jesus it was who made the bishop of Rome, as Peter's successor, God's vicar on earth, Jesus having made him His Proxy, and gave him a power of attorney to act in His stead. Outside of this hierarchy of priests there is no Christian Church, no access to God's grace and Christ's merits—no salvation. The authority for this claim is based on Matthew 16:18-19: "And I also say
The text is not legible due to the quality of the image.
unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it. I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." This claim makes an examination of Mt. 16:18-19 necessary. How are these verses to be treated and understood?

In all the Words of Jesus, the word Χριστός occurs but twice, Mt. 16:18 and Mt. 18:17. Mt. 18:17 reads as follows: "And if he refuse to hear them, tell it unto the Church, and if he refuse to hear the Church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican." Here the meaning of Church (ἐκκλησία) is simply the local congregation or community; it is the assembly of believers without regard to any officials or persons in authority: in fact all authority clearly rested not in any official or officials, but in the community as a whole. In Mt. 16:18, however, the case is quite otherwise. Here the meaning seems to be clear enough—nothing short of a general or universal Church can be meant. Not only so, but the following verses can be so construed as to make this universal Church an ecclesiastical and sacerdotal Church. Thus in one place, and in one place only, Jesus is made to found a Church.

Mark and Luke both record the same confession which Peter makes in Mt. 16:16, but have not a word to say concerning the founding of a Church on Peter, in fact have not a single word of any kind relative to a church of any sort. (Mk. 8:29,30; Lk. 9:20) It is held by many of the best authorities that Peter was the inspiration of Mark's Gospel, and was such to so great an extent that the Gospel according to Mark may in a very true sense be called the Gospel ac-
cording to Peter. If this be true, it becomes doubly significant that Mark says never a word about a Church, much less the founding of a Church on Peter. In Mt. 16:18 the founding of the Church on Peter, and the giving to him of the keys of heaven and hell, is the direct outcome of his confessing Christ as the Messiah of God. Peter makes this same confession in Mk. 8:29 and Lk. 9:20, but Jesus says not a word about founding a Church on any man or company of men, or even on Himself: in fact, He says nothing about a Church, much less the founding of one.

Moreover, the two passages in which the word Church occurs contradict each other. In Mt. 16:19 the power of the keys is granted exclusively to Peter with no mention of the other disciples, but in Mt. 18:18 he is speaking of the company of believers, and says that "whatsoever things they shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, etc." Peter, however, is not mentioned. In one case Peter binds and looses, in the other the company of believers—a significant contradiction indeed.

Not only so, but Mt. 16:18,19 is directly contrary to the whole spirit and teaching of Jesus throughout the New Testament. Jesus came not to found a Church, but the Kingdom of God: and Church and Kingdom of God are not one and the same. If any one may chance to think they are equivalent terms just let him try writing Church in every place where kingdom now stands—say in the Lord's Prayer, and he will soon be convinced that they are not synonymous. Jesus was in no sense a Church founder, but the prophet of the Kingdom of God. He had much, very much, to say about the kingdom, but nothing to say about a church, not to mention my Church. Deissmann says that Jesus can not be called a Church founder or builder, neither can he be
said to have regarded himself as such. He was the great Sower who went forth to sow the seed, the prophet of the kingdom of heaven."

He adds that in the light of this fact it is very suspicious to hear in Mt. 16:18, not only of Church, but of my Church. The very heart and essence of Jesus' teaching is diametrically opposed to such externalism. Jesus taught that the one essential thing was the filial relation to God the Father. There is abundant theology in the parable of the Prodigal Son to save the world. Men do not need ecclesiastics and priests, but they do need a home and a Father. The one requisite in the mind of Jesus was, and is, simply, Child, come home! The sinner is a child wandering in a foreign land far from Father and from home; the message of Jesus is, Come home to the Father's house and be a true son. He sought to make men feel their personal responsibility. In His thought, every individual stood directly responsible, not to an organization, to any individual or company of individuals, but to God the Father, and this relation is comprehended wholly in this, that it is the relation of a son—the relation expressed in the cry, Abba, Father! The child comes to the Father, not through Peter or any other person or persons, but directly, and any organization, be it Church or what not, that in any measure attempts to relieve men of this direct personal responsibility, and most sweet and blessed of privileges, has just in that same measure done what it may, not to save men, but to damn them. Jesus taught men to say, "Our Father," and made every man his own priest.

The two great fundamental conceptions in the mind of Jesus are sonship and brotherhood. These are basic and all else in his teaching must harmonize with them. He who said, "Not so shall it be among you; but whosoever would become great among you shall be your minis-
ter; and whosoever would be first among you shall be your bondserv-
ant, even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Mt. 20:26f.), could not create a primate, a hierarchy, or a priesthood--it is un-
thinkable.

Furthermore, Mt. 16:23 does not go well with Mt. 16:18-19. "But He turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me Satan, thou art a stumbling block unto me, for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men." It seems exceedingly strange that the glowing words of Mt. 16:18,19 should be so immediately followed by such stern ones of denunciation. One is to be pardoned if he finds it difficult to think of Christ's founding his Church on Peter, and giving him divine powers, then in the very next breath calling him the devil, for certainly the Son of God would not place much power in the hands of Satan, nor confer such a dignity upon the devil.

Not only are all the Words of Jesus against Jesus' ever having founded a Church on Peter, or founding any Church for that matter, but all the sources of the Apostolic Age are likewise against any such doctrine. Paul, who is the earliest writer of the Age--much earlier than the writers of the Synoptic Gospels--knows absolutely nothing about any primacy given to Peter by Christ. The second Chapter of Galatians certainly does not support the claim of Petrine primacy. When Paul went up to Jerusalem to defend his work among the Gentiles, he did not go before Peter, fall on his face and be-
seech him to own his work. In the first place he tells us that he not did go up by command of Christ's vicar or of any person or body of persons, but by revelation, and as an equal among equals. What Paul went to Jerusalem for was to arrive at an understanding with the
Jerusalem Church, and Paul got what he wanted; that is to say, he got all he demanded. It is to be noted, however that Paul says that those who were of reputation didn't teach him anything, and that be gave way to them not at all. Paul assures the Galatians that he did not care if they were "pillars" and reputed to be somewhat, God does not care about a man's reputation, He has a better way of knowing him. Paul wants it clearly understood that he is taking no orders from Peter, the Apostles at Jerusalem, or the Jerusalem Church; but that he takes orders now, and has always taken orders, from his Master alone. He says, "And when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship that we should go unto the Gentiles and they unto the circumcision." (Gal. 2:9) Peter is not at the head of the Church at this time, nor is any other man or set of men. James, Peter and John are leaders in the Church, but they do not dare to act without the sanction of the company of believers. They are "pillars," not "rooks," and James, who was not even one of the Twelve, is mentioned first. Furthermore, not long after the conference at Jerusalem, Peter proceeded to violate the terms of the conference, and came to Antioch where Paul was working. He laid aside his Jewish customs and began to live as the Gentiles. Soon, however, certain came down from Jerusalem and took Peter to task as a renegade Jew, whereupon he at once withdrew himself. But Paul had somewhat to say to Peter, and he said it. Paul felt that he was to be blamed, in fact had acted the hypocrite. Called a renegade by the emissaries of James, and a hypocrite by Paul, Peter was certainly in a bad way. What a predicament for the first pope! What a situation for the vicar of Christ! If Peter was primate, and Christ's vicar on earth, he made a sorry spectacle as
he escaped from the hands of Paul.

The Book of Revelation which is certainly out of the latter years of the Apostolic Age, does not recognize Peter as the possessor of the keys of heaven and of hell. Paul and the author of Revelation knew nothing of any such appointment; Mark, the companion of Peter, has not a word to say about a primacy or a Church, and Luke knows nothing about either. The Acts knows nothing of a primacy of Peter. While the author of the Acts seems to think that the Apostles from the first formed a sort of governing college, having their headquarters at Jerusalem, and that the first years after the death of Christ Peter was the leading spirit among them, nowhere does he even hint that he ever heard of any such a thing as a primacy given to Peter by Jesus, or the founding of the Church on him: on the contrary, when Paul and Barnabas go up to Jerusalem from Antioch, James is the leader, and soon thereafter Peter drops out of sight altogether.

In view of the above, the conclusion seems inevitable: Mt. 16:18 is not a genuine Jesus Word, but came into the record at some later date. This means that Jesus, so far as our authentic records go, never founded a Church on Peter and gave to him the power of the keys. Not only so, but with this passage out of the record, there is no evidence that Jesus ever had it in mind to found an independent Church, on Peter, Himself, or any other person or persons. So far as it can now be determined, Jesus never used the word Church in its general sense, and it is seriously doubted whether he ever used it in any sense. So far as the record goes, then, Jesus never had a word to say about founding a Church, much less my
Church. Furthermore, there is no evidence that He had any conception of an independent Church, certainly not in the sense in which the term is generally used, to say nothing about an ecclesiastical and sacerdotal sense.

So far nearly all we have said is negative—what Jesus did not have in mind: now we must seek what was in his kind relative to a Church or society. Just what was his purpose? It has already been hinted that it was the purpose of Jesus to found the Kingdom of God, not a church in the sense in which this term is generally used. Attention has already been called to the fact that Church and Kingdom of God (or Heaven) are not interchangeable terms. If you ever thought so, try substituting Church for Kingdom throughout the Words of Jesus, e.g. "Thy Church come," instead of "Thy Kingdom—. Jesus spake constantly about the Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven, or simply my kingdom, but in all probability never once spake of my Church, or a church. In the Gospels the term Kingdom is used 112 times, and the word Church, twice, and only once in the general sense, and that, in Mt. 16:18,19, has just been rejected. This is to say, then, that Christ's true conception of his Society is to be found in his conception of the Kingdom. The Kingdom is the larger, broader, more comprehensive idea. It includes all true children of God past and present, in heaven and in earth, in the Church and without the Church. At most the Church can be but a means to an end; merely a means or agency for bringing men and women into the Kingdom of God. The idea of the Kingdom is first and primary, and the idea of Church is later and secondary. Jesus comes to found the Kingdom, not an ecclesiastical corporation. In this founding of the Kingdom, his instrument is preaching, not millinery, petti-
coats,—and so many pages of ceremonies chanted in an unknown tongue. (Mt. 4:17,23) His message was the good news of the Kingdom of God—Repent and become the Good Father's child. He, Himself, was the Sower of Good seed (Mt. 13:3,19,25; 24:7). The Kingdom is defined or likened in several ways (Mt. 13:31,32,44). It is a present Kingdom (Mt. 5:3; 12:28; Mk. 10:14; Lk. 17:21). Men may enter it, are even within it (Mt. 21:31; 11:11; Lk. 7:28). The terms of entrance are obedience to the Word of God (Mt. 12:19,52), or the childlike spirit (Mt. 19:14; 23:3). It comes without observation (Lk. 17:20), spreads quietly like leaven (Mt. 13:33); grows like seed (Mt. 13:31,32); it is ethical in character, and to seek it is to seek the righteousness of God (Mt. 6:33); to ask for its coming is to ask that the will of God be done on earth as it is done in heaven (Mt. 6:10). The men it honors are those who humble themselves as a little child, those who seek the Kingdom of God and his righteousness (Mt. 18:3; 19:12; 5:3,10; 7:21; 25:1,34); the signs of the Kingdom are all ethical and spiritual relating to gracious helpfulness and service, and never to officers or acts of ceremonial (Mt. 11:2-12; Lk. 4:18,19). It is a universal Kingdom, open wide to whosoever will (Mt. 8:11).

In all the times Jesus speaks of the Kingdom he never once speaks of officials or sacramental acts. Nowhere does Jesus give any directions relative to an external organization. He does not even exhort the disciples to foster the growth of any organization. All his specifications relative to the Kingdom are concerning entrance to the same. This is a complete change of mind, a taking up the cross, denying self, a readiness to give up all for God and the brethren. It is individual love to God and the brethren. The com-
ditions of entrance are wholly internal and spiritual, not an iota of legalism or externalism appearing anywhere.

The conception then filling the mind of Jesus was not a universal organic Church, but the Kingdom of God, a concept quite different in content. The Kingdom, spiritual and personal was that for which Jesus lived, for which he died, and for which he lives and works today.

With Jesus, however, the greater emphasis was on the future Kingdom - the coming of the Son of man in his Kingdom. While it was a present reality, it was emphatically a future consummation—in fact in a large measure eschatological. He would come in the clouds of heaven in great power, glory, and majesty to judge the nations, quick and dead. This would mark the real beginning of the Kingdom. It seems that Jesus must have expected that he would return quickly, and his followers of the first century certainly expected his speedy return. In Matt. 16:28 he clearly teaches, if correctly reported, that he would return before the generation then living had passed away. It is not our province or purpose to enter into any discussion of the contradictions at this point, but merely to call attention to the undeniable fact that according to the words of Jesus as reported to us, Jesus teaches that He will quickly return to enter into his inheritance, His Kingdom. If then Jesus expected soon to return to consummate his Kingdom, what occasion would there be for founding a Church, or any formal organization? None so far as we can see. This fact alone renders it highly improbable, to say the least, that Christ had any external organism or organisation in mind. That is to say, this fact alone renders it improbable in the extreme that Christ ever had any conception of an organic universal Church of which He was really the head, but had given Peter his proxy. "It is certain," says Bacon
(The Founding of The Church), "that Jesus had no idea of founding what we mean by the Church. He expected the 'little flock' that he had gathered around him to endure as such, but only until the Father's purpose to give them the Kingdom was fulfilled: and this He expected before the passing of that generation."

Paul and the early Christians generally expected the early coming of Jesus in His Kingdom. Paul believed that the time was "at hand," and it is quite evident that others generally agreed with him. (I Thess. 4:13-18; II Thess. 2:1ff.; Phil. 4:4). It had been the hope, yes, the expectation of Paul that Jesus would return during his lifetime, and only as he approached his end, and Jesus delayed, did he give up this fond hope.

If Jesus had any purpose of founding a Church apart from the Jewish, the disciples, Peter included, did not so understand Him. After his death they continued to worship in the temple and observe carefully the Jewish law; in fact they were to be the best possible Jews. They were a sort of holy remnant—the real, true, elect Israel. In the thought of the disciples, Jesus was the true head of the children of Israel. They believed that their righteousness must exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, so they became most devotedly and zealously attached to the law, as yet not even dreaming that ultimately the teachings of Jesus must entirely overthrow the law. This question must be taken up later, but is mentioned here merely for its bearing on the idea of the Church, in the mind of Jesus. While it does not necessarily prove anything, it renders quite improbable the view that Jesus had any idea of an organic universal Church, or any purpose to found one. It seems unthinkable that if he had any such idea and purpose, and had expressly founded this
Church, on Peter and had given into his hands the power of the keys, the disciples, Peter included, should for so long a time be such zealous members of the old Jewish Church.

In the Words of Jesus as found in the Synoptic Gospels, it is very significant that there is no mention of external organization, and not a single word that would lead to even a suspicion that Jesus might have had an ecclesiastical organization in mind. In all the many times Jesus speaks of the Kingdom, there is absolutely no reference to officials or sacramental acts. He has, indeed, much to say about persons, their qualities, conduct, character, duties, obligations, opportunities, privileges as sons of God; he calls men and sends them out commissioned as Apostles (The Sent). They have their places, not as officers, but because fitted peculiarly by the Spirit to do just that thing. Place and influence in the Kingdom depends not at all on office, but wholly on spiritual qualities and powers. Service is the great word; the only distinctions in the Kingdom are personal and spiritual, not official or priestly. In fact, according to Jesus, official priests are superfluous. Priests are no more needed since Jesus' time than a man is in need of two appendices—They are of no value, and are a constant menace to the health of the spiritual man. That is to say that the priest as such, - i. e. in his sacerdotal or mediating capacity—has no place where there is no God to propitiate, and where all His children may come boldly to His throne of Grace. In the parable of the Prodigal Son, there is no go-between, but father and son meet directly, the father rushing to meet the son the moment he sees him coming. Jesus taught us the infinite nearness and love of God our Father—that men are children of God and need only turn their faces homeward to meet our Father—God face to face and
know the all-embracing power of his almighty love. Fundamentally, the teachings of Jesus are profoundly antagonistic to any sacerdotal conception or idea: not only is there no place for it, but the whole teaching and spirit of Jesus is fundamentally antagonistic to it.

The fact that Jesus, himself, never claimed priestly functions is quite worthy of note. He is the teacher, preacher, prophet—the Sower of the good seed—but never does he make a sacerdotal claim, nor do a single sacerdotal act. By no word, act, or implication did he institute any official sacerdotal class, or institute any sacerdotal observance or law. He does not found sacraments so far as we can determine, at least in the true sense of that term. That he meant the evening meal with His disciples the day before His death to be such is far from certain. When they met together in this family meal, they were to remember him, but a memorial and a sacrament in the true sense are widely different things. Baptism was not of the nature of an initiatory rite during Jesus' ministry. John says that Jesus baptized not, but His disciples (3:22; 4:1,2), but so far as undoubted Jesus' words are concerned, there is nothing to show that even the disciples baptized during His ministry. Paul, our earliest authority, says that Jesus did not send him to baptize, but to preach the Gospel. That Paul received no command to baptize is very significant. Had baptism been a sacrament in the churchly sense, or as even an outward sign of membership in a church or any organization, required of all who entered as a necessity, it seems very strange that the great missionary to the Gentiles received no command from Jesus to perform the rite. Jesus sent His disciples out to preach the coming of the Kingdom, but nowhere does he exhort them to foster any organization at the head of
which stands Peter, or any one else. No, Jesus was not an organizer in any such sense. He had no doctrine of the Church to preach—there never was in his mind, so far as it now can be determined, any conception corresponding to the later conception of the Church. To find anything of the kind in His undoubted words is to read back into them conceptions of a much later time, and do terrible violence to his teachings. Jesus was a prophet, not a theologian— an elder brother, not a priest; He came to call men to repentance and loving friendship to Himself, and sonship with God; not to join an organization, to say nothing of a hierarchical sacerdotal organization. His purpose was to bring in the Kingdom of God, and the only qualification and requirement for entrance into the Kingdom was (and, thank God, is) the spirit of sonship with God. This is the only condition Jesus makes—certainly nothing of ecclesiasticism or sacerdotalism here.

So far as we can see, then, Jesus had no intention to found a new religious organization, but rather to renovate the old. The Church and all doctrines of the same spring from a later date, and wholly after the death of Jesus. The Church as we know it and all doctrines concerning it, had their beginnings in the reaction of the disciples to the rejection and crucifixion of Jesus, and the persistent refusal of the Jews to accept Him as their expected Messiah after His resurrection. Of the Church in a good sense, Peter was the founder, but it was years before there was any doctrine of the same. The ideal of Jesus was the Kingdom, and His Kingdom is a spiritual Kingdom, a realm in which love is the only law, and in which men are great only in proportion to their loving service. (Mt. 10:43,44). The loving, trustful, teachable child is the type, not the lordly official sticking out his ugly foot to be kissed. Jesus, Himself, set the example.
He was the world's greatest Servant and Lover. What a contrast between Him and the so-called successor of Peter! The one, "God making Himself man on earth, the other man making himself God!" When Jesus worshipped He did not feel the need of priests, but went straight to His Father, and so those who worship the Father truly from that day to this, worship Him spiritually, and only so. His ministry was wholly self-giving, never self-seeking, and He sent his disciples out to do as He had done - to teach, preach, love, serve, suffer, - and casting their all upon the Father, be prophets of God, doing the work of prophets - but there is never a word about priestly or official functions. Paul had truly caught the spirit of the Master when he said, "The Kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. 14:17).
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Chapter II

THE PRIMITIVE COMMUNITY

AT JERUSALEM

1. ITS CONCEPTION OF ITSELF

It seems true that the followers of Jesus were scattered at his death, and since all or nearly all were Galileans, fled to their old homes about the shore of the lake of Galilee. Here the risen Lord appeared to Peter, and Peter's being convinced of the reality of the resurrection was able to convince his companions. The older accounts as found in Mark (16:7,8) and in the yet older account of Paul (I Cor. 15:5) bears out the view that such was the case. This probably accounts for the leadership of Peter so soon after his denial of his Master. But, however these things may be, we find soon after the death of Jesus a body of men and women in Jerusalem convinced that Jesus was not dead, but risen and living, and that he had gone into the heavens, soon to return in his Messianic capacity to judge the world, and that they were to be His messengers until He came.

But that which concerns us most in our inquiry, is not how the community began, but rather what was it, and how did it conceive of itself once it had begun?

In the days when Jesus was with them in the flesh, there was a brotherhood--a fraternity--as we saw above. The fraternity formed the nucleus of the Primitive Community at Jerusalem. It was comprised of His immediate disciples who formed the inner circle, the women who were devoted to Him, and at first a small company of followers
(Acts would say about 100, Acts 1:15) soon to have a large company added, bringing the number of adherents up to a few thousands, perhaps. Since the author of Acts deals in round numbers, it is impossible to say how many, but evidently the community grew rapidly at first. Of this number, all were Jews or proselytes, and the door of entrance was open only to Jews, or to those who would first become Jews. But how did they think of themselves? How did they conceive their functions and mission? Did they feel that they were a new and peculiar people apart from the main current of Judaism, and no part of it? Did they possess an independent organization, with officers, priests, and all the machinery implied by the view of the Romanists? Let us have a look at the facts in so far as the facts are accessible.

They were profoundly conscious that their Master still lived, that He was the long expected Messiah who had been received for a short time out of their sight, but who would return on the clouds of heaven to judge the world and bring in His Kingdom, and that they were commissioned by Him to complete the work He began and prepare their countrymen for His return. They looked upon themselves as the Messengers of Jesus, prepared by their close fellowship with Him, and by what they had seen of His death, resurrection, and departure, together with his directions to them personally, to testify to the Jews of the Messiaiship of Jesus. But according to Acts 2:46, 3:1, 5:12,25, 10:9ff., 11:1f., 15:1-35, 21:17f., this little brotherhood formed at Jerusalem after the departure of Jesus was content to remain Jews. They did not think of themselves as no longer Jews, but rather as the elect and genuine Israel, and that instead of being free from the law their righteousness must exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees. They represent, it might be said, a reform movement, a
reformation among the Jews, within the Jewish Church: for this little brotherhood was composed entirely of Jews. They were the most zealous of the zealous for the law. For the first five years of the existence of the brotherhood, its members were in good and regular standing with the Pharisees, and zealous legalists of the day. It is a striking fact that all their troubles during these early years were made by the high-priestly party, the Sadducees, the political party among the Jews (Acts 4:1ff.): this is to say that it was for political reasons that the disciples were arrested and imprisoned, not for heresy. Many of the priests (not the aristocratic high-priestly party) believed (Acts 6:7), and the little flock was probably actually in favor among the more devout (Acts 2:47). There was, during this time, no break with Judaism, and no thought of such a thing being possible. The only thing that marked them, so far as surface indications went, was that they were more zealous about righteousness than even the Scribes and Pharisees, and that they believed that Jesus was still living, that He was the Messiah of the Jews, and would come quite soon to begin His messianic rule in Jerusalem, and from his throne in the Holy City would rule a conquered world. Neither the Judaists nor the members of the "little flock" had yet seen the innate, fundamental differences of the two views of life and worship; but it was inevitable that these fundamental antagonisms should, sooner or later, be discovered, and so it was. In all probability (Account of Stephen in Acts 6:8; 8:1) the Hellenistic Jews were the first to see them, and it may be that the keen, powerful mind of Paul was the first to make these antagonisms clear to his fellow Judaists. However that may be, this is certain, that from the trial and murder of Stephen, the Judaists were awake to the fact that
this sect of Jews who were preaching Jesus as the Christ were dangerous, and fundamentally so, as their positions might ultimately overthrow the law. The scales fell from the eyes of the Jews at this time and they saw the revolutionary implications of the teachings of Jesus, and, doubtless, before this fact had become at all clear to the disciples themselves. The disciples were revolutionists, but knew it not, for Christianity and Judaism can not have much fellowship together.

But even after the death of Stephen and the persecution that followed the disciples still held to the law, were still faithful sons of Abraham. This is made quite evident by the account in Acts (10:9ff. and 11:1ff.), when Peter preaches to Cornelius and eats with him. When he returns to Jerusalem, he is required to give an account of his violation of the law; and it is significant that while Peter justifies his visit and preaching to Cornelius (Acts 11:1f.), he does not once attempt to justify his eating with him.

Still later then this, after Paul had been a missionary for fourteen years (Gal. 2:1f.), men came down to Antioch from Judea saying that the Christians there must be circumcised and keep the law of Moses or they could not be saved. This gave rise to Paul's journey to Jerusalem, and the Council there, over this matter; the outcome of which was that Jews should keep the law, but the Gentiles were not to be required to do so.

Furthermore, according to Acts (21:17ff.), on Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, James and the Jewish Christians insisted that Paul show by a public act in the temple that he was a Jew, and by the act to allay, if possible, the prejudice of the Jewish Christians against him. Thus it would appear from Acts that James remained to his death
a true Jew and taught the primitive communities to do the same.

What bearing, then, has the foregoing on our thesis? Much, every way. The early Apostles, companions of Jesus, did not conceive that they were apart from the law, and no part of the stream of Judaism, but on the other hand, they looked upon themselves as the true Israel, and the real stream of the true religion of Israel. They were the true sons of the law, and the Scribes and Pharisees, not themselves, perverted the law. The bearing, then, of this upon their conception of the Church is evident. There could be no separate organization looked upon as of divine ordering apart from the law. They were true, thorough-going Jews who never thought of departing from the customs of their fathers, and setting up a new hierarchy or a new sacerdotalism. To talk of such a possibility is ridiculous in the light of their belief in the speedy coming of Christ in his Kingdom. It was thought that the kingdom was at hand, and that any day might mark the end of the present age, and the beginning of the Messianic reign. They lived in constant expectation that Christ's coming was imminent. So, to contend for a moment, in the face of the above facts, that the primitive Jewish disciples ever thought of the Church in a hierarchical or sacerdotal sense, is to contend without ammunition or weapons. There is absolutely no valid ground on which such a view can stand. They expected the Kingdom very soon, but in the meantime their conception of their relations to each other was expressed in the idea of the family. This conception was universal at this time among the disciples of Christ. It is in the light of this conception that the communism of the early Church at Jerusalem is to be understood (Acts 2:44,45; 4:32,34ff.). They were one great household, and their mission in the world was to bring others into the
family circle, and this family circle was the true elect of God who should enjoy the rich benefits promised to the true Israel when Messiah came in His Kingdom.

But what of the Apostles; did they not form a college, and rule this family? Acts seems clearly to imply that the Twelve Apostles constituted an Apostolic College, which from the very beginning had the government of the Church in its hands; and that the members of this College remained in Jerusalem, not only as head of the Church there, but as head of the whole Church, and that this continued for a number of years. (Acts 6:1; 8:1,14; 11:1). But there is nothing to be found to warrant any such a conclusion, or to support any such a contention. While we cannot get back into the life of the Primitive Community and say just what position the Twelve held and what was their meaning for the Church, in all probability they held no official positions in the Church, and that they were not entrusted with the government of the Church nor given absolute authority in the same. This is shown by:(1) It was not as an officer that Matthias was elected, but as a witness to the resurrection (Acts 1:22). Moreover, he was not appointed by the Apostles, but by casting lots; (2) It is also to be noted that the term Apostle was not confined to the "Twelve," but was given to travelling missionaries who had absolutely nothing whatever to do with the government of the Church or Churches; (3) These men had no official status at all. The Apostles were not officers or officials, but primarily by their appointment by Jesus, according to Acts 1:4,8, they were missionaries, preachers, men who were to carry the Gospel to the uttermost parts. Since this was their primary function, as implied even by the author of Acts, it is hardly conceivable that they were ever looked upon in any sense as
officials and authoritative rulers of the Congregation in Jerusalem, or the Church in general. The Apostolate, then as founded by Jesus was not an ecclesiastical office, but a preaching ministry. (Acts 1:8) That the "Twelve" were leaders is quite another matter. This they were, of course, but a leader is quite different from an official, and especially an ecclesiastical official. Their leadership was based wholly on the instruction they had to give due to the fact of their former close fellowship with Jesus. It was through their instruction that the Primitive Community was founded and held together, but it was their instruction as the taught of Jesus, not as officials appointed by Jesus that they worked and taught. They were simply members of the family, members to be sure, who were more influential than many others, but still only of the brethren. (4) It is to be observed again, that the "Twelve" do not come before us anywhere as a standing and compacted corporation or body. They appear as individuals. It was not a corporation that Paul visited at Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18,19), but Peter, and incidently, James. Acts 11:1, it is true, mentions the "Twelve" as a body, but the incidents given all through Acts, and all the references of Paul to the subject (Acts 15; Gal. 1:18,19; 2:1-10) clearly indicate that quite the contrary view is the true one. Acts deals almost from the first with definite individuals, and only two of the original "Twelve" have any part in it, and of these two, Peter alone has much to do. James who certainly became the leader later at Jerusalem, was not one of the "Twelve," but a relative of Jesus, probably a brother. Paul, as we saw above, went to Jerusalem, not to see a hierarchy, but an individual as an individual, not as a prelate or primate, (Gal. 2:1-14) nor does he so conceive them on his second visit over the matters at Antioch (Gal.
2:1-14), but far otherwise. He does not even call them Apostles, nor does he feel the need of consulting with more than three, Peter, James and John; moreover these "pillars" do not settle the matter, but the whole church passes on it. In other words, Paul accentuates the personality and moral influence of these men, but says nothing that permits an inference to be drawn that they were officials, or that the "Twelve" formed a corporation governing the Church.

Not only so, but the "Twelve" soon scattered widely and we lose sight of nearly all of them. For a time we hear of Peter and John remaining in Jerusalem, but what later became of them no one certainly knows. Anyway, James, who was not a member of the "Twelve", is soon found to be the leader at Jerusalem, and remains such until his death.

Furthermore, the result of the Conference at Jerusalem (Acts 15; Gal. 2) was to take the control of the Gentile churches once for all away from Jerusalem and the Apostolic College, if such an institution had ever existed.

Thus again we come back to our claim that the Apostles were not officials, much less ecclesiastics, in the congregation at Jerusalem, or in the Church at large, but that their position was that of brothers in the family, that they held their positions because of the instruction they had to give, and the gifts and personality possessed by each. They were not officials appointed to administer, but ministers sent to preach the Gospel even unto the uttermost parts. The Primitive Community conceived of itself, then, not as a new and distinct organization, ecclesiastical and sacerdotal, or either, but as a family, brethren who, instead of being separated from Israel and as not bound by the law, looked upon themselves as the elect Israel, the
true Israel, and their mission was to call the Jews into this family circle of the true Israel before the return of Jesus the Messiah, who would quickly come to judge the unbelieving Israel and appoint them their portion with the lost.

2. POSITION OF JAMES IN THE CHURCH AT JERUSALEM

The question of the position of James in the Jerusalem Church and his relation to the Gentile Churches demands attention at this point. It has been the tradition since the time of Clement of Alexandria, who lived and wrote in the latter part of the Second Century, that James was the first bishop of Jerusalem. Eusebius, on the authority of Clement of Alexandria, says, "This James, therefore, whom the Ancients, on account of the excellence of his virtue, surnamed the Just, was the first to receive the episcopate of the Church at Jerusalem." But Clement, in the sixth book of his Constitutions, represents it thus: "Peter, and James, and John, after the ascension of our Saviour, though they had been preferred by our Lord, did not contend for the honor, but chose James the Just as bishop of Jerusalem." Eusebius again makes reference to James as bishop in Book ii., Chapter 20, where he gives an account of his death.

This account, however, is much weakened by the fact that similar accounts were abroad at the close of the Second Century, relative to about all the great churches. This being true of all the great churches would in any case lead to such a claim for James in Jerusalem. Since very little dependence can be placed upon any of the traditional accounts of first bishops of the great churches, not much credence can be given this account of Clement of Alexandria. Anyway, when Clement of Alexandria wrote the bishop was not what he later be-
came, a sacerdotal official, and the term was naturally used in a loose sense by Clement.

But what historical warrant have we for the tradition? Here we are dependent on Acts and the writings of Paul.

In the first place, there can be no doubt about the fact that James exerted a great, a commanding, influence in the Jewish Church to the time of his death, and so far as our sources go, could with more propriety be called a bishop than any of the ancient worthies of the New Testament times. But an honest examination of the sources does not warrant any such conclusion that he was a "bishop." This is seen, first, from the book of Acts. While the author of Acts is quite disposed to read the conceptions and institutions of his own day back into the Primitive Church at Jerusalem, nowhere does he call James a bishop, nor yet ascribe to him episcopal functions. This is also true of Paul. In view of the numerous references to James in Acts and by Paul, this is significant.

Furthermore, the episcopate had its origin, not in Jerusalem, but in the Greek Churches, and the causes giving rise to the episcopate were entirely different from those that gave rise to the elevation of James.

Just what relation to the Church was James' is very difficult to determine. In this, as in all this early part of the First Century, the actually known is but a small island in the midst of a great ocean of the unknown; but making the most unbiased use of our materials possible to us, it seems that we are not even warranted in concluding that James held any official position as such, but that his influence which was unquestionably great was due to other causes. That he controlled the Jerusalem Church can not be doubted, but that
he controlled because of his official position is most seriously doubted, in fact is not true. In order to control, official position is not at all necessary. We see in our own time that some of the most powerful leaders are not officials at all, but even dictate to the officials, and this is true in both state and Church. No deeper significance need be attached to Acts 12:17 than the foregoing.

In none of the references to James is it necessary to attribute any official position to him. As has just been said, there is no occasion of interpreting Acts 12:17 in any other way than that James was a leader, not because of official relation, but because of his relation to Jesus and his own personality. This is true also of the fifteenth Chapter of Acts, which contains the account of Paul's visit to Jerusalem, and the Council relative to the relation to be recognized between the Jewish and Gentile Christians. Here there is suggestion by James, 15:19-22, but action is taken by the Apostles, Elders, and the whole Church, in selecting men to carry the findings of the conference. Certainly no hint of episcopal government there. James is not mentioned either by name or implication. In 15:23 some would find comfort for the high church doctrine, but when we read it carefully, it has quite another bearing. It is the Apostles and elder brethren who write unto the brethren of the Church at Antioch. The elder brethren were no doubt the senior members, not perhaps, or probably, in age, but seniors in membership, so elders were not officials yet, but simply because of seniority of service in the Kingdom (Church) had positions (not offices) of influence. From such a condition later grew the eldership by slow historical development. But even were we to admit official elders, which we do not, no not for a moment, the bearing on our present problem of Acts 15:23 would not
be different. In any case, James as official representative of the Church did not select the representatives, nor did he write to the brethren at Antioch. There is not the least evidence that James was the bishop of Jerusalem at this or any other time, but all the evidence is against it. Furthermore, and more significant still, there is no evidence that he held any official position, and this from Acts, the author of which would be most likely to mention such a fact had it existed.

Paul's writings also have a bearing here. When Paul first visited Jerusalem, it was not his purpose to visit James, but Peter. He saw James, but evidently it was merely incidental (Gal. 1:18-19). In his account of the visit fourteen years later, he conferred with "them who were of repute" (2:2)- with individuals, not officers, it will be observed. Then in 2:6 we infer that Paul did not recognize any of them as being appointed of God to rule over him at least. In fact, he says, "whatevsoever they were maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person." Furthermore, when he mentions James, it is as one of the reputed "pillars" of the Church. To say the least, not a convincing argument for the episcopacy of James. Paul gives more recognition to Peter as a prominent personage in the Church at Jerusalem to James. He went up to see Peter on his first visit and on his second he tells us in Galatians that Peter had been entrusted with the "Gospel of the circumcision," as he, Paul, had been with that of the uncircumcision. (Gal. 2:8) It remains true, however, that James' name stands first, but that has no direct bearing on our problem, more than that James was, perhaps, the most influential man, and especially was he the leader of the circumcision party, for by this time Peter had weakened in the faith somewhat, and besides was no doubt absent from Jerusalem much of the time preaching, as was
probably John, also.

But if James was not bishop, not even an officer in the Church in the proper sense of the term officer, just what was he? This question we have said cannot be answered in accurate detail, because our sources are too meager to warrant it, but we have warrant for a safe general statement. James, as Paul tells us (Gal. 1:19), was a brother of Jesus. (See also Mk. 6:3; Mt. 13:55). During the active ministry of Jesus he, like the balance of Jesus' relatives, thought Jesus was demented. But Paul says that after the crucifixion of Jesus he appeared to James (I Cor. 15:7), and this evidently convinced James, and at the same time gave him a pre-eminence as not alone the brother of Jesus who had known him from early boyhood, but who had been favored by an appearance of the risen Lord to him especially. Either of these two facts would have made him a marked man among the early disciples, but when the two appear together they would give him a tremendous prestige, other things being anything like equal. Furthermore, when we bring the above facts into relation to two or three others already mentioned, it is still easier to understand how he came to his prominence. James was always a stand-patter, and this fact alone would make him the natural leader of the larger part of the Jewish Christians. Add to this, that Peter and the other Apostles were no doubt much of the time absent from Jerusalem, it is not at all difficult to see why James occupied the place of influence he did; for it seems probable that practically he was ruler of the Jerusalem Church at the time of his death. Moreover, James was a very zealous disciple, and evidently an able man. These facts taken together easily account for the influence and power of James in the Jerusalem community, and we are warranted in concluding that he was not
leader of the Church, because of any official function, capacity or appointment, but that his position was due to historical, moral, and personal reasons, and to these alone. This, however, does not mean that his influence did not amount to great power,—in fact he undoubtedly did occupy the first place for a long time in the Primitive Community at Jerusalem, and was followed by another relative of Jesus. This was tending towards a caliphate, and was contrary to the Gospel.

According to Eusebius (Bk. iv., Ch. 22), giving Hegesippus as Simon, son of Cleophas, a cousin of Jesus, was elected head of the Church and it seems for the reason that he was the "Cousin of our Lord." He was elected according to the tradition (Euseb. 4:22) to be head of the Primitive Community, and it seems quite well established by tradition that from this time until the reign of Hadrian the relatives of Jesus executed a very great influence in the Jewish Christian Church, (Harnak, Küchenverfassung und Kirchenrecht, pp. 24ff.) and that beginning even with James himself, the powers of these leaders were of a monarchical nature, and were looked upon probably as in the line of David and therefore legitimate successors until Christ come again. In short, a sort of Caliphate (caliphate) was established in the Jewish Christian Church, which fortunately was broken up at the destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian.

But does this not seem to favor the contention that James was a bishop, and that monarchical conception of the Church goes back to the first generation? Not at all. The episcopacy of the later early Church and of the Middle Ages was the child of quite a different mother. This development was confined to Jewish Christian Church and ceased with the Church. It is significant that Eusebius in 4:22
says that a revelation was received by the Church warning them to flee Jerusalem, but he does not say that the revelation was received by certain approved men, and that in his account of the warning and flight no bishop or ruler is mentioned. But how did the Jewish Christians then under James, and even later, conceive of the Church? They evidently before 135 A. D. never saw clearly, it they saw at all, that Christianity must be a development apart from Judaism. James and his followers clung tenaciously to Judaism, and so did his successors. It was the hope of James, and the New Testament and tradition support each other here (Euseb. 2:23), that Judaism as it stood should become Christian. This being true, we can easily see what the conception of the Church in this time was. While James had almost monarchical power in the Church, not because of office, but as we have already seen, because of historical, moral, and personal reasons, the view of the Church was still the old Judaistic, with the addition that the Messiah was known, that Christ was and is the Messiah, and that he had gone for a short time into the heavens, but would quickly come in his kingdom. Their conception was saturated then with Jewish ideas, yes it was more than saturated, it was Jewish to the core. No comfort can be found here for any High Church doctrines of the Church, for whatever may have been the position of James, the circle of ideas was wholly within Judaism, and whatever the influence of James may have been we know, as we shall see below, that the episcopate had quite another origin and development.
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Chapter III.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE APOSTLES

We have already seen that the author of Acts gives the Apostles a very prominent place in his early chapters, and that not only did he give them a prominent place, but he seems at least to hold that they formed an Apostolic College at Jerusalem and ruled the Church as such, and because of their official position. It becomes our task now to examine the New Testament writings to see if he is warranted in such teachings or implications. If we compare Acts 6:1, 8:14 and 11:1, it becomes apparent that the author of Acts thought of the Twelve Apostles as constituting a College, and that they remained at Jerusalem even when others fled, as the head of the Church there; and not only in Jerusalem, but also as head of the Church at large. We saw in Chapter ii. that such a conception does not agree with the facts as given in the book of Acts itself: and Paul's writings are diametrically opposed to any such view. This also appears in our discussion above. Since we cannot accept the existence at any time of an Apostolic College in an official sense, it remains for us to inquire concerning the authority of the Apostles, define it and seek its basis.

To go back to the origin of the Apostolate (The Twelve), it is evident that it was founded by Christ not as a governing, but as a preaching body, or rather, let it be said, as preaching ministry, (Acts 1:4,8). The authority then of the Apostles was the authority of the founders of a brotherhood, a fraternity where things were very much in common. In short they being first among brothers, had the
authority, if authority it may be called, of elder brothers, but no
authority officially delegated by the fraternity, nor yet of dele-
gated authority as ecclesiastics received from Christ. Their author-
ity was due to the instruction they had to give. This is to say that
their authority was personal, moral, historical, and rested on actual
relationship, personal and historical. The Church received its faith
from the Apostles and continued to receive its most important instruc-
tion from the same source. Scripture and the words of Jesus were the
true authority in the Church, yet the Apostles were in the position
of interpreters, and in this position were of course very influential.
There was, however, one other qualification which must be added to
the above, and that is, an Apostle must be equipped with the Holy
Spirit. This claim was made by the Apostles and conceded to them.
Paul claimed it (I Cor. 7:40) along with the other Apostles.

Nowhere is it taught in the New Testament that an Apostle has
supreme power, or that he holds a position analogous to the Episcopal
office of the third and succeeding centuries. Even when they inter-
fered in the affairs of a local community, no ecclesiastical author-
ity is anywhere seen or claimed. Even Acts does not so represent the
times when the Apostles were yet in Jerusalem, for here the Apostles
advise the Church, and all together take action. This does not savor
much of monarchical ecclesiasticism! Turning now for the moment to
Paul, we find his attitude towards the "Twelve" expressed in Gal.
1:1, 2:4, and 2:6. These references make it very clear that no one
at Jerusalem held any office which in their eyes of Paul gave them
any right to command him, or to curb in the slightest degree "the
liberty" which we have in Christ Jesus. Furthermore, whoever wrote
Ephesians 4, whether Paul or some one else, the ministry of the word
then does not depend in any sense on office or official position, but
on a gift. It was Christ who gave the gift of apostleship (Eph. 4:11) RNQQX. It came not by election or appointment of men,—it is from above. This seems to indicate the pragmatic test of fruits for an Apostle in addition to those mentioned above.

The conclusion relative to the authority of the "Twelve" that their authority was moral and based upon an actual relationship, personal and historical, as well as the possession of the Holy Spirit, and proved by the bringing faith of fruits, applied to all who were called Apostles. It certainly was true of Paul. Paul always demanded the recognition of his Apostolic authority. His work and his call being his credentials,—his labors being in the deepest sense the proof and seal of his Apostleship (1 Thess. 2:7ff, I Cor. 9:2, II Cor. 12:12). Because of these, he had a right to their gratitude and devotion (Gal. 4:13ff.). He tells the Corinthians (I Cor. 4:14ff.) that he has the claims of a father upon them, and claims the right to call the Galatians to account. (Gal. 1:6ff., so also Corinthians (I Cor. 4:18-21, 14:38; II Cor. 13:2ff.). Weizsäcker calls attention, however, to the fact that Paul takes a quite different attitude towards Romans (Rom. 1:11ff. and 15:15) in his letter to them, the reason of course being evident. While Paul speaks with all the sureness of absolute authority when he writes to his own churches relative to doctrines and rules, when particular cases of discipline come up, he can only propose, and no matter how deeply he may be interested in the case he can do no more (I Cor. 5:1ff.). (Weizsäcker: 'Apostel' of Christian Church., vol. ii., p. 298-299.) "If then a name be sought for the regular ministry of the Apostle after the work of founding a Church was over, we can only say that, apart from the moral effect of his advice and exhortation, it consisted in legislation. This is on-
Long after classical or Byzantine times, some had thought the Temple to be the earthly home of God. This idea was strengthened by the fact that the Temple was the center of religious life. It was believed that the Temple housed the Ark of the Covenant, which contained the Law and offered a direct line of communication with God.

Despite this, the Temple was not inviolable. It was attacked and destroyed several times, including by the Romans in 70 CE. The fall of the Temple marked a significant moment in Jewish history, as it signaled the end of the Temple period and the beginning of the Diaspora.

In the centuries following the fall of the Temple, there was a renewed interest in the past. This led to the installation of an elaborate structure in the Temple area, which was known as the Second Temple. This temple was built in 64 BCE and was considered to be the most important religious site in the Jewish world.

The Second Temple was destroyed during the Roman Jewish War in 70 CE. This destruction marked the end of the Second Temple period and the beginning of the Talmudic period. The period of the Talmud is characterized by a renewed interest in Jewish law and culture, and by a heightened sense of national identity.

The fall of the Temple and the rise of the Second Temple were momentous events in Jewish history. They marked the end of an era and the beginning of a new one. The Second Temple was a symbol of the Jewish people's faith and their commitment to the Jewish faith. It was a place of worship, a center of learning, and a symbol of national identity.
ly true, however, in a definite and limited sense. An Apostle only
gave a charge of a compulsory nature when he imparted a saying of the
Lord Himself" (I Cor. 7:10, cf. also 25 and 6). Scripture and the
Sayings of Jesus were the authority of the Primitive Churches, and
the Apostles had their authority in the right to interpret them. So
their authority was in no true sense ecclesiastical or monarchical,
for the Church in all its internal affairs outside doctrine was self-
governing, and in the Primitive Community at Jerusalem, and in Paul's
Churches, the Apostles could only suggest and exhort.

Any claim that the Apostles (the "Twelve", or Twelve and Paul
and successors) or their successors looked upon themselves as the
Church, and that they as a closed corporation were appointed of Jesus
to rule the Church as ecclesiastical officers with sacerdotal func-
tions is fully exploded. There is no evidence for the same, and it
is clear that the conception of the Church at that time was that of a
fraternity, and that whenever two or three of the brethren were gath-
ered together, there was the Church, and that the Apostle had au-
thority only because of his character, and what he had to give in the
way of instruction and legislation, his credential being the fruits
brought forth. He was not a local ruler or monarch in any sense,
but a wandering teacher, a sower of the seed, like his Master before
him.
1. FROM THE HISTORICAL STANDPOINT

In the preceding section we saw that the individual Church owed its existence, not to the authority of an Apostle or of the Apostles, but to the ministry of the Word, possession of the Scriptures, and the words of Jesus. The bond that held them together was faith in Jesus Christ. Weigäcker says that this warranted that the Church and believers, united spontaneously on this foundation, be represented as the body and members of Christ. (Apost. Age of Christianity, Vol. II, p. 309) Then he adds, "This explains the indisputable fact that each community governed itself, and in all important affairs formed its own decrees, and that accordingly the decrees were passed by the exercise of an equal right on the part of all the members." (Apost. Office in Church, Vol. II, p. 309).

That the above is true of the Primitive Jewish Church is evident from Acts 1:23, the election of Matthias to the place left vacant by the fall and death of Judas, Acts. 6:5, where the "whole multitude" chose the Seven. It is to be noted that it was the "whole multitude," not an official one or few who appoint, constitute or ordain. Acts 11:1-4 "the Apostles and brethren that were in Judea" took Peter the leading Apostle to task for his going in unto Cornelius and eating with him. Peter did not make any haughty reply, but made a proper apology, as we might call it, for his going to Cornelius, preaching to him, and baptizing him, but at the same time did not defend his
action in eating. Peter, according to this account, does not have any of the marks of a Romanist primate. Again, in 11:22, "the Church" heard of the work being done in Antioch, and "the Church" sent Barnabas to inquire into the matter. When Paul and Barnabas come up to Jerusalem bringing Titus with them to determine the status of Gentile Christianity, it is "the Church and the Apostles and elders" that receive them, and the Apostles, elders and "the whole church" pass judgment upon Paul's principles. (Acts 15:4,12,22). Again, when Paul, for the last time came to Jerusalem (Acts 21:17ff.) he was gladly received by "the brethren," and 21:20-22 indicates that the multitude, i. e., the membership of the Church at Jerusalem, had the whip, and this, too, was in the days of James. All this is supported by Paul in Gal. 2:1ff. So even Acts, the most ceremonials of all our New Testament writings, shows clearly that the Churches, i. e., the individuals composing the communities--of Palestine--were in fact the ruling power. That a similar condition prevailed in the Pauline communities is self evident to even the careless reader of the Epistles of Paul to his communities. Here there can be no doubt. "The self-administration of each community is so obvious that any government by representatives wholly set apart for the office, and especially by a teaching primacy, is put entirely out of the question, while the latter is also at once precluded by the fact that there was no teaching at all in the Church except what rested on the talents and the voluntary coming forward of the members. The assumption of an administrative office contradicts everything to be observed in our authorities." (Weizsäcker, Apost. Age of Christian Church, Vol. II, p. 310.)

In the discussion to follow we shall first confine ourselves to the most generally accepted epistles of Paul, leaving Colossians,
Ephesians and the Pastorals for an independent inquiry.

In Acts 14:23 the author makes Paul and Barnabas "appoint for them elders in every church." Now Acts would evidently have his readers infer that this was Paul's regular custom; but Paul's letters do not support any such inference. It is probable that the author of Acts was reading conditions of his own time into Paul's activities, as he did into the Primitive Jewish Christian Church in an attempt to secure a basis for the organization existing in his time. But no support can be found in Paul's letters until we reach Phil. 1:1, which we shall discuss later. In I Cor. 12:28, Paul speaks of "helps and governments," but no such title as "elder" is used in connexion with the same. "Helps and governments" would certainly suggest the eldership if it existed at this time. It seems quite clear that the work afterwards done by the elders was being performed in the community, and in all probability regularly by certain individuals. This at least would be the most natural supposition, and such a view is certainly supported by I Cor. 12:28. It is not our contention that certain services, the performance of which was necessary, did not exist at this time, or that these certain necessary services did not lead ultimately to fixed ecclesiastical offices. It is our view that these services were being performed in the community by certain selected individuals, and that they were in all probability performed regularly by the same individuals for the most part. Such duties as the making of provisions for baptism or the Lord's Supper, taking care of the Sacred Writings, public meetings made a presiding officer necessary, etc., etc. Here, however, we do not find a fully developed and wrought out ecclesiastical and sacerdotal system, but the germs of a historical development. That is to say, we find the
germs not necessarily of a hard and fast ecclesiastical sacerdotalism, but we do find duties that must be performed, and in these duties the germs of a historical development are found; what the outcome may be, history alone can answer. But in the time of Paul's activities this development had made little headway. That there was need for the services of individuals there can be no doubt, and furthermore, there can be no doubt but that some were better fitted both by nature and training for a certain particular service than others, besides, others were more willing, than as now, to make the sacrifice to do the things that brought them into prominence. As said above, it is easy to see how, with such a simple beginning of men volunteering to perform certain duties, their performance of the same becoming regular; for the need was constant. It requires no stretch of the historical imagination to see such a condition rapidly pass into another where the volunteer has become a fixture, then the performance of a certain duty has become an ecclesiastical office, and the performer of the duties of the same has become an officer, an ecclesiastic. But it does not need to be shown that this sort of an historical development is quite a different matter from the arbitrary creation of offices, and the appointment of officers to fill the same by an ecclesiastical primate or functionary with sacerdotal powers.

From a study of Paul's letters, what conclusions may we draw relative to his own relation to his churches, what authority he had, and the nature of the same. If we can discover this, we may find ourselves helped towards Paul's conception, and the general conception in his age, of the Church. We shall concern ourselves not alone with claims Paul makes, nor chiefly with these, but shall rather at
first seek to discover the prevailing view by the actual practice as revealed in Paul's letters to his communities.

First, it is to be observed that Paul always wrote to the community, not to the officials of a community. Phil. 1:1 at first blush seems to be a contradiction, but only of this one verse can this be said, as all through the letter he is addressing the body of the believers, and not the believers through officials. Anyway, the salutation in 1:1 is not alone to bishops and deacons, but first "to all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Thus the statement that Paul always addressed his letters to the great body of believers in the Church, or composing the Church rather, is warranted by the facts, Phil. 1:1 not being an exception in the sense that the body of believers is not the Church. He merely mentions the "bishops and deacons" here along with the other saints, and for the first and only time does he use the titles. Paul never in any situation, however serious it might be, appealed to an official, as an official, in any of his communities, i.e. he never called an individual to account as an official, nor claimed any allegiance or fidelity to himself from any individual because he was an official and thus responsible to himself. Paul never appealed to ecclesiastics, but he constantly appealed to the temper and will of all the members of the communities. Absolutely in no sense can his letters be looked upon as official communications from a higher to a lower ecclesiastic. To even suggest such a possibility is preposterous. His letters are all of a popular nature and calculated to stir assemblies to action, and to bring the multitudes to decision. If any doubt this, let him read Galations, or any other of his genuine letters. They are not only addressed to the whole body, but are pop-
ular appeals to action and decision on the part of the whole membership of the communities addressed.

Now let us examine I Cor. 7:1ff. in the light of the above. First read his salutation in 1:1-3, then turn to 7:1, "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote." Here, if anywhere, we should expect officials to appear, if there were any, but they do not. There is not a single iota of proof that ecclesiastical rulers of the Church at Corinth had asked Paul questions, and that he was answering the questions for their benefit and guidance. On the contrary, everything points to the fact that Paul has been asked these questions by the Church, and that he is addressing the Church in his answer there can not be the slightest doubt.

Again in II Cor. where cliques and factions have sprung up in the Church and Paul's rights, and even his motives have been questioned, he does not appeal to officials ecclesiastical or other. Furthermore, cliques and factions do not argue a very strong central authority. So whatever may be the need, or whatever the situation, Paul never writes to officials or even leaders of the Churches, but in all cases and under all circumstances his appeal is direct and popular.

Paul's fundamental principles made ecclesiasticism impossible while his influence was dominant. The equality of all believers, because they were the Sons of God, was fundamental in Paul's teaching. I Cor. 12:12, 13:13, certainly is fatal to any Romanist theory of ecclesiasticism. The more excellent way certainly is not official position, and superiority over the brethren. Rom. 2:11 is quite decisive on this point as is also Gal. 3:26,28. In fact, the whole spirit of Paul is against any such practice as truly as was that of
the Master Himself. Gal. 2:4 and 2:6 have bearing at this point also. Paul here, be it remembered, was speaking of James and the Twelve, and makes the unqualified statement that not even this body had any right over "the liberty which we have in Christ Jesus." In short, ecclesiasticism in any form is antagonistic to Paul's fundamental doctrines of equality before God as sons, and liberty in Christ Jesus our Lord. There was no place for ecclesiasticism in his thinking.

There are many instances given in the Letters of Paul that show conclusively that his communities governed themselves. That discipline was meted by "the many," i. e., by the whole body, becomes clear from II Cor. 2:6. "Sufficient to such a one is this punishment which was inflicted by the many." Paul then in the next verse (II Cor. 2:7) pleads for mercy for the punished man, lest he become discouraged and be lost. That it was the Church that exercised discipline and not officials is seen also in Gal. 6:1, where Paul again pleads for mercy, or recommends it. I Cor. 5:1 following shows Paul taking the Corinthians to task because they would not punish a scandalous liver. He does not have power evidently to settle the matter himself, but appeals to them, being gathered together, to deliver the offender to Satan. Perhaps II Cor. 2:6 refers to the same affair. There "the many" have dealt with the offender. It is evident that the Corinthians proceeded to examine Paul himself (I Cor. 4:3). The proverbial factional spirit among the Greeks had broken out in strife at Corinth, and Paul had not escaped in the fray. He had been examined and compared, not to his entire advantage, it would appear from the early chapters of I Cor. Paul does not here speak as an official; he is merely "a minister" through whom the Corinthians had believed.
He and Apollas had merely taken the place of servants, and God gave the results. He refuses to be examined, however, by the Corinthians judging not so much as himself, for he is judged of God only. II Cor. 7:12 has a bearing also at this point.

Now, taking all the above into consideration, two things at least appear clear enough. In the first place, Paul himself is in no sense possessed of absolute power in his own communities, but far from it. He can recommend, but is himself certainly conscious that his recommendation need not, and may not be heeded. The position of the Apostle here appears as rather adversary in matters of discipline, and the Church even went so far as to examine him, and not wholly to his advantage in the judgment of a large faction of the Church who turned to Apollas. Paul seeks to have his judgment executed, not independently of the Church, but through it. (I Cor. 5:3-7). The Apostle Paul certainly did not transmit any monarchical power to bishops of a later day in the field of discipline; for he did not possess such power himself. This however will be discussed in connection with the more serious troubles in Corinth recorded in II Cor. The second fact that comes out here is that the Church as a body, and not certain officials hold the power to discipline its members. In other words, there is no ecclesiasticism to be found from this point of approach, and, if it were present at all, certainly it would manifest itself in discipline, but neither Paul nor leaders have any official authority, and Paul himself recognizes that this matter is in the hands of the community. He can recommend, but they are the authority in the matter.

It should be noted in this connexion that II Cor. 2:6 proves that a majority vote was binding on the whole Church, and so accepted
by the Church. "The many"= "the more," i. e., to say the majority. So it was the majority that disciplined the offender, and the Church had so accepted it as done. A strong proof of the democratic organization of the early Pauline Communities.

From Rom. 15:26, I Cor. 16:1ff., and II Cor. 8:18,19, it is evident that the churches assessed themselves, and appointed representatives by their own free election. Paul (I Cor. 16:3) says, "Whomsoever you shall approve, etc." Paul does not take the whole matter into his own hands, nor do officers of the Church, but the Church elects men for that particular function. In fact, all men who acted in the capacity of ministers, whatever their activities might be, received their appointment from the Church, but in the days of Paul this appointment was nothing more than the recognition by the Church of a Charisma already conferred by God upon the person, hence it might be said that the appointment was made by God Himself, and the appointment simply ratified or recognized by the Church. The right, then, to perform and to continue to perform certain functions in the Church, was dependent on a gift, and the recognition by the Church of this gift as of God, and hence a divine call to the particular activity. In fact, there were no legal rights possessed by any from Apostles down to the humblest member of the community. (See I Cor. 12:28 and Rom. 12:6-8) For the present, however, we must pass on, but shall come back to the further discussion of this subject from a different view point.

In I Cor. 6:1f., Paul complains that the Christians of Corinth have been bickering, and going to law, and going into the heathen law courts at that. But here it is to be observed that it is the community that is criticised, and exhorted. They are to find wise men
among themselves who are able to decide such matters, and who shall act as judges between disputing brethren. Evidently there were no officials in the Church in the legal sense, or Paul would not have advised as he did, but would rather have made them the judges, or at least suggested the same which would have been the most natural thing to do.

The conditions existing in the Corinthian Church as reflected in II Cor. leads to the same conclusion relative to the self government of the communities. Paul in his encounter with this Church came out second best, and was finally obliged to send Titus as peace-maker to Corinth, before the trouble was overcome. The numerous factions existing in that Church is sufficient evidence that nothing of the nature of an ecclesiastical organization existed there. There could be no central legal authority, for it could not exist under such circumstances. It seems also quite probable that Paul in an unrecorded visit to Corinth was badly worsted, and was compelled to return to Ephesus, humiliated by his enemies in the Corinthian Church. Timothy was probably sent in an attempt to quell the storm, but was made short work of—Titus alone was able to quiet the disturbance. In other words, authority in that day whether possessed by Apostles, prophets, teachers, or what not was moral and personal, and in no sense legal, and the real authority lay ultimately in the Church itself. The ideal being, as was brought out above, that the Church recognized and retified the will of God in all its affairs.

Again, it is highly improbable that Paul would take the trouble to work out and put into practice any ecclesiastical scheme when it was his deep conviction, at least until nearly the end of his life, that the Paroasisa was near. It is not the way of men who expect the
end any day, and at farthest in their generation to plan for future ages. It is preposterous to think of such a thing as an elaborate ecclesiasticism being worked out by Paul, in any case, knowing his temper and view of authority, but especially it is so when we combine the temper of Paul with this deep-rooted belief of his in the nearness of the Parousia. And not only Paul, but the whole Apostolic Church accepted this view of the Parousia. Certainly such doctrine is not a stimulating atmosphere in which to cultivate ecclesiasticism and legalism. "An organization of the church in the sense of an ecclesiastical constitution, was not merely not given by Paul, but not even contemplated by him, for the simple reason that he expected the Parousia of Christ in the near future." (Pfleiderer - Prim. Xy Vol.I., page 427.) (See I. Thess.)

It was the custom in the time of Paul for the church to grant "letters of commendation" to bretheren who set out to travel. From II Corinthians 3:1, these letters were not granted by any official, but by the church. That Paul means the whole society, or community, is evident from the fact that he is dealing with the whole church in the entire letter. And he tells them he does not need a letter to them or from them, for they, the individuals composing the community are his letter of recommendation. It is quite probable that some had demanded that Paul bring proper credentials to show to the church who he was, and by what right he was exercising his function of an apostle.

In the above examination it has certainly been conclusively proved that the pauline communities had control of their affairs in their own hands. Even Paul does not go further than to recommend. True, he seems to almost demand at times, but his demands even had no great
terrors for the Corinthians. The final authority was in the community, the ideal being the entire community in the unity of the Holy Spirit recognized and affirmed the Divine will. Those who had, by certain evidences, been called to the work of the community were given the seal of the community approval, and in this sense elected, but on the other hand if they lost these distinctive marks, by the same token they lost their positions in the church. In this same study certain corellaries result. No leader from the Apostles down held his position through any legal standing or power, but solely because of a divine call recognized by certain marks, or we may say the will of God was recognized in his gift, and fruits. Furthermore, in a sense, the church was a democracy, yet in another it was not, but rather a theocracy, Christ alone being the sovereign. Individuals counted only in so far as they were recognized by the community as being the organs of the Spirit declaring the divine will. Rule there was, but it was purely spiritual, and was dependent, not on any human appointment or organization, not upon any official or legal relation, but entirely upon the belief of the individual that he was the agent of the divine, and the recognition by his brethren that such was the case, being thus commissioned of God to speak for Him.

But before going further into this conception of the Church in the Epistles of Paul as an absolute monarchy, whose king is Christ, it may be well to inquire if it was ever suggested in Paul's writings that officialism was necessary for the unity of the church. On the contrary, any careful reading of the letters of Paul must convince a candid reader that just the contrary is true: unity is found in quite a different way. It is found not in legalism and the letter, but
in the spirit. According to the ideals of the time, there was no need for officers or ecclesiastical constitutions to secure unity. We saw that the conception of unity partook of the nature of the family, or a fraternity, governed by the spirit, not the apostolate or officials of any sort. It had its unity in a unity of faith, or we might say in Jesus Christ as its head, and king. Brothers do not need to appoint one of their number a monarch in order to be at one: in fact there is no real unity to be secured by external forms and laws. A semblance may be secured in this way, but unless there be actual internal unity, there is no real unity secured. The Roman Catholic Church with its boasted unity has, to-day, no real unity, and has not had for centuries. The unity sought in the Apostolic Church was the unity of spirit and belief secured through the revealed will of Christ who was the absolute sovereign of all the churches. Here we find unity in the separate churches, and the unity of which all were conscious from the first of all the church; for from the beginning this conception of unity was present in the concept of the Kingdom of God. Christians everywhere were conscious of belonging to the one great family, and being sons of God, they were brothers under all circumstances, and however wide might be their social positions, or however widely separated might be their homes. Such a unity was Paul's aim all through his life, but he did not try to accomplish it by organization, but rather through the brotherly spirit he attempted to foster everywhere, not only among his own societies, but especially between his own societies and the Jewish Christians. (Romans 11:13 f., Gal. 2:3, Rom. 15:27, IICor. 9:12 ff.). But during the Apostolic Age, and for a long time afterwards, there was no real attempt to realize this ideal unity of the church in any form of or-
ganisation; furthermore, it was centuries after the attempt was made before unity in the ecclesiastical constitutional sense was fully realized. Legalism is in no sense necessary to unity, in fact may be detrimental to it, and usually is. True unity then as now must be found in oneness of spirit, purpose, belief, and hope. The Primitive Christian Church needed no superficial help, and had none, to secure this end.

Before coming to the more positive statement and summing up Paul's conception of the church, it becomes necessary to examine the so-called prison epistles. The Pastors we cannot accept as genuine Pauline letters, but rather as containing a Pauline element, but well worked over by a redactor. This is the most that can be conceded to them as Pauline. They will be discussed, however, in the appropriate place.

As to the remaining letters the so-called twin epistles, Colossians and Ephesians, have been much discussed and some of our best modern authorities cannot accept them as Pauline. The majority of the modern critics reject Pauline authorship of Ephesians, or at least question it without definitely taking sides. (Jülicher). Yet many accept Ephesians as genuinely Pauline. Among the former, may be named Holtzmann, Moffatt. But on the other hand, Sheldon, Harnack, McGiffert, Hart, Moule, Abbott, Lightfoot, Hayes and others have convinced the writer that probably Paul himself actually wrote both Colossians and Ephesians. Yet there still exists a doubt that he did, but the evidence for his authorship is so strong that it is thought best to accept them as probably genuine in this discussion. Thus accepting as genuine Philippians, Colossians and Ephesians, cer-
tain practical problems for our inquiry thrust, or seem to thrust, themselves forward for investigation and solution, if solvable.

At the very outset it may be well to again call attention to the fact that Paul is no formalist or legalist, nor yet is he a systematic theologian who uses his terms with scientific nicety, exactness and precision. He is a letter-writer, and a letter writer who plunges tumultuously forward, intent on the idea to be expressed, but not too careful of how it is expressed. He is a letter writer who addressed simple unlearned folk who would not have appreciated any nice discriminations had they been made. It never entered the mind of Paul that he was writing to the ages when he dictated those letters to his various communities. They are truly letters, and were written to meet particular circumstances, and accomplish immediate, particular ends. The significance of this is that we have no warrant in treating his letters in any other way than that in which he intended them to be treated in writing to his communities, i.e. to say we have no right to hold Paul to rigid theological conceptions expressed in a scientific terminology, but we must approach Ephesians and Colossians in the free spirit, as nearly as may be, in which they were written.

The two leading objections to Ephesians and Colossians are based on the advance in Christology and the conception of the church found there. It is also objected that Paul does not seem to expect the return of Jesus in the near future, but seems to make room for a long period before the Parousia. This, however, is but a natural development, and as Hart says in his Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians, page 142, "Nothing was more natural than that a change like this should come over St. Paul's mind, when year after year passed
away, and still there was no sign of the Lord's coming, and when the spread of the faith through the Roman Empire, and the results which it was producing, would give force to all such ways of thinking as represented by the image of leavening the whole lump." But enough for this. We will turn to the main question.

Allowing that Ephesians and Corinthians are probably genuine writings of Paul, the problem confronting us in this study is the doctrine of the church appearing in the same. It has been claimed that Paul could not have written Ephesians because of the doctrine of the church held in 1:23. This passage since the time of Ignatius has been made the basis of ecclesiastical claims, and it is impossible to conceive that Paul could be a conscious father of anything so inimical to freedom as ecclesiasticism. In short it would contradict all his other writings. But does Paul mean anything of this kind? Just how much did Paul mean by 1:23, i.e. how much did he include in his conception of the church expressed in 1:23? How much are we justified in reading into it? To begin with, it must be taken in connection with the context and the spirit of the whole letter, and on the background of his admittedly genuine letters, and Colossians. When viewed in this way we must say the author, whether Paul or not, was no ecclesiastic. When 1:23 is read in connection with 1:4, 1:18, 2:22, 3:19, and 4:1-16, where we find the spirit of Paul as manifested in his admittedly genuine letters, all that can legitimately be read into 1:23 is the spiritual headship of Christ, and the oneness of those professing allegiance to Him, in the fact that they are all animated by the same Holy Spirit. Furthermore, although here is an advance over the earlier letters concerning his view of the church
it is an increased emphasis, not something new. In Romans 12:4 ff. we find this doctrine by implication at least, much more clearly in I Corinthians 12:12 ff., and in Colossians 1:18-24 it is stated as clearly as here in Ephesians. Moreover, it is in keeping with Paul's advance in his Christology as seen in Colossians that he should keep pace with his doctrine of the church. The two would go hand in hand. That Paul here in Ephesians, which seems in any case to have been a general circular letter, should concern himself exclusively with the universal church ought to be no surprise. What rather should we expect in a letter of such a general character, not addressed to any particular community than that Christian unity and Christian peace through all the churches should be dwelt upon. So, we accept Colossians and Ephesians as genuine, but it makes little or no difference to our study in either case, for the most that can be proved is an increased emphasis on the part of the author of Ephesians and Colossians over the author of Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, on the doctrine of the church and Christology, but that nothing new really has been brought in. Sheldon (System of Christian Doctrine, page 482) says, "It (the Christian Church) is the body of Christ as confessing his headship, obeying his sovereignty, receiving and being animated by the Holy Spirit in fulfillment of his promise and gracious will." Fairburn (Place of Christianity in Modern Theology, page 524) says, "The essential idea is that Christ is so in all, so needs all, so works through all, that he is the life of the body, and the body the realisation of his life. Each is necessary to Him, but He to all." While the teaching concerning the church found in 1:23, 3:10 ff., 5:23 ff., is quite
an advance over Romans 12:4-10, I Cor. 12:12, it is an advance, a natural development of the idea or conception there present in germ. Colossians 1:18-24 expresses practically the same conception as 1:23. It is true that the church has been personalized and universalized in Colossians and Ephesians to a degree unknown earlier. The universal, however, was present from the very first in the Kingdom of God as expressed by Christ. All were members of this kingdom. In the case of the church the universal really preceded the particular. In spite of this fact, however, there is a difference here from Paul's earlier putting of his concept of the church. Jacobus (A Problem in New Testament Criticism, pages 274-5) says, "There is a difference between Paul's idea in Romans and Paul's idea here. The difference lies in the advance of the idea - an advance in the magnificence of its proportions, and consequently in the profoundness of its character. The epistle's theme is, not simply the unity of the church, but the unity of the church in Christ supreme." Complete, perfect unity is found in the absolute supremacy of Christ - Christ "all in all". When Christians in common have Christ supreme, there must be the completest communion and oneness (unity) prevail among them.

We said above that Paul had the idea of the unity of the church from the first, and such was the case, but, the troubles in Colossae, i.e. heresies there, made it necessary for him to sharply define and clearly state his Christological views and his conceptions of the church. This necessity led him to bring these two more sharply defined doctrines together in 1:23 and find the true unity of the church in the absolute supremacy of Christ. That is the unity of the brotherhood is found in the fact that all have Christ as Supreme Head of the
spiritual community. Here, as so often in history, heresy has worked to the clarifying of theological conceptions. The Colossian heresy stimulated Paul to the very climax of his conception of the unity of the church.

If we examine Ephesians we find in the body of the letter no comfort for any doctrine of ecclesiasticism. In Ephesians 4: 4-12, ministries in the church come not by appointment, but come as gifts. they are not offices, but the same condition obtains here as in the earlier epistles. All had their places and influence in the church just in so far as the church recognized that the particular person had a divine call to that particular ministry. The whole emphasis was on the spirit and none on the man. In short the communities were yet under the control and guidance of the spirit. Men inspired of God are the leaders not officers or officials.

(1) Philippians, like all others, is addressed to the church as a whole save this fact precludes the existence of any ecclesiastical constitution. Philippians is scarcely even doubted any longer even by the most radical critics. This gives us one problem and that not a difficult one, in short the question of Paul's one mention of deacons and bishops. We are not, however, nearly so much concerned about names as things, and as we examine the entire letter we find that there are no deacons or bishops in Philippi in any such sense as the third and later centuries conceived them. The same conditions prevailed here as in all Paul's communities. The most to be said is that the development of the church had reached the point where certain men (not officials) who performed certain functions through the gift of the spirit, i.e. by divine call, were called deacons, or
bishops respectively. The names were present, but the thing connoted by that name to moderns was absent.

2. FROM THE STANDPOINT OF ST. PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF GOD AND SALVATION.

In Paul, as everywhere, the conception of God is profoundly determinative of all other conceptions and doctrines. So we would expect to find Paul's doctrine of God determining his doctrine of salvation, and the two views then becoming dominant factors in his conception of the church, and this we find to be true. Paul was very certain that God's heart was the heart of a father. Paul was very deeply conscious of God's purpose in his and in every life, of His nearness, love, and helpfulness: in short God is seen in Jesus Christ. Paul's view of salvation, then, is evolved out of this view of God and his own personal experience. There is nothing of the formal, legalistic, or external or sacerdotal entering into his teaching at this point. It is a matter of personal experience and peculiar to Paul, drawn in part, however, from the teaching of Jesus. But just what is his doctrine of salvation? Does Christ save a man because this man has kept a doctrine or string of doctrines? Is it because the man is righteous, and by being righteous has a claim on Christ which an honest person must acknowledge and hence pay? Or is salvation secured through sacrifices of animals, or through ascetic practices, or through the mediation of the priests, etc.? No, to all. While Paul was interested in forgiveness of sin, and says considerable about it, his great cry was for deliverance. And here, as usually, Paul struck bottom, his desire was for deliverance, not merely from the penalty
of sin, for that was a minor matter, but from the source of sin. He would not be quit of the whole thing - for sin was death. But how should he get quit of the sources of sin? This was the vital question with Paul. In answer to this question Paul shows himself the greatest religious genius since Jesus. He does not copy from others, but out of his own experience tells the world how it came about in his own case, and how the same experience may be for all. Paul says a man is saved by Christ's entering into him, and taking up his abode in him, by the becoming one with Christ. It is a binding of the individual so intimately to Christ that not the individual lives, but Christ lives in the individual. That is to say that what the individual does, Christ does, and whatever Christ does, the individual does. (Gal. 1:16, 2:20, 3:27, 4:6, 4:19, Rom. 8:10, II Cor. 4:6f.)

This oneness is something more than a moral unity according to Paul; it is a oneness of nature. The Christian becomes a new creature (II Cor. 5:17, See also I Cor. 15:47-49 and II Cor. 6:17.) Here we all that Christ, which is but another name (personal) for the divine spirit, in Paul's usage. (See Rom. 8:10, II Cor. 5:17) takes up his abode in man, and in so doing imparts a new nature to the man, i.e. a new spiritual nature, the exact opposite of the old fleshly nature. The man is dead to the flesh and alive to the spirit. The personality has received a new content, and in receiving this new content the old strife between flesh and the true self has been done away, and a new harmony between the real man and the spirit installed. He is now a spiritual man, and as spiritual has passed from death unto life. (Rom. 5:5, I Cor. 2:12, 3:16,22, 6:11,19, 12:13, 14:25, II Cor. 1:22, 4:16, 5:16,17, Gal. 4:6, 5:16f.). Paul expressed this idea as again dying with Christ to the flesh, and rising with Him in the spirit.
The consequence of this is eternal life, for this new life is eternal. Yet so long as the man is in the flesh he has a connection with the present world, and is liable to fall again into sin, and so lose the divine nature. Salvation then is not completed until death releases him from this fleshly body. Death allows him, because he is set free from the earth, to rise into the heavenly places where he properly belongs because of his divine nature.

But the law is because of sin, but since Paul has died to sin in the death of the flesh, he is no longer bound by law, for he is risen in newness of life in the freedom of the spirit. Christ is in him now and what he does Christ does, and what Christ does he does. He is now spiritual, hence law has no more dominion over him, law has no dominion here.

How may this happy state be achieved? What is the process? What are the conditions laid down? To begin with not a single condition is even hinted at that in the least partakes of the formal, legal or external. The letter that killeth is entirely absent, and the spirit that maketh alive is everywhere present and under emphasis. Faith is the absolutely necessary, and all-sufficient condition of salvation. Paul does not by any means have in mind a mere intellectual assent to certain propositions or doctrines, when he says faith; for Paul as truly as John Wesley knew that there is not any more religion in a string of dogmas than there is in a string of beads; but Paul means by the term faith to express the act of a man in becoming one with Christ, i.e. partakes of the divine nature. It is the throwing of the being wide open to Christ and a complete giving up to Him. It is the response of the whole man to Christ in which the old man
stands absolutely receptive before him. (Rom. 11:20, 21.)

Man can be saved in no other way, "for by grace are ye saved, through faith" (Eph. 2:8.). Then where is there any place for officialism, legalism, externalism, sacerdotalism? All such are excluded. The individual becomes one with Jesus Christ by an act of faith, and this entirely apart from any priestly mediation, or any organization. It is a condition immediately consummated between Christ and the individual, and is purely a concern only of the individual and Christ. Fundamentally, Paul in all of his theology is in violent antagonism to anything that smacks of ecclesiasticism or sacerdotalism. True he gave some practical advice that were made later to support such systems, but as we shall see soon these were merely attempts to clear up particular practical situations with no thought of ever fastening legalism and the letter that killeth on the church. In all the fundamentals of his teachings, Paul must forever stand as the great enemy of ecclesiasticism and sacerdotalism, and as the champion of freedom, and the priesthood are believers - Christ, or the divine spirit, in the life primary through faith. This great principle of Paul's teachings, more or less clearly apprehended, has been at the basis of all great religious reform movements. And when the little monk of Wittenberg stirred all western Christendom and called millions of the best heart and brain of Europe to his banner, it was by his mighty cry, "The just shall live by faith."

3. A PROBLEM OR TWO.

History is full of paradoxes. This is not anywhere more clearly illustrated than in the teaching and influence of Paul. It seems ex-
ceedingly strange and paradoxical that the greatest advocate of freedom from rites, ceremonies and officialism should by his teachings more than anyone else be responsible for the rigid, lifeless, ecclesiasticism of later centuries. In fact it was making itself manifest within Paul’s own century as Clement’s Epistle to the Corinthians proves. (Chs. 40-42, 44, 59.) We do not for a moment think that Paul laid down certain principles with the express purpose of bringing about such conditions as ultimately obtained, and were supported by citing him as authority. Far from it. Paul was face to face with embarrassing practical problems, as he usually was and he had to advise something. At Corinth the custom of celebrating the Lord’s Supper had prevailed as in the primitive community. It was a common meal partaken of by all in commemoration of Jesus, in short it was a religious commemorative feast. But instead of its being a holy meal conducted decently, reverently and orderly, it had degenerated into a disgraceful scene of strife and debauchery, each looking out for himself, in fact it had lost its true significance and degenerated into a disgraceful scramble, and gluttony descending into debauchery. Now something must be done, but what? Paul solves the problem by telling them to eat their fill at home, then come to the celebration of this religious commemorative feast, and in this way religious significance would be paramount. In short, the old common meal is by the act of Paul made wholly commemorative of Christ. And by the same token made it a specific, and more or less formal, chiefly formal, service in which eating and drinking were purely symbolic acts. "Thus a ceremonial rite takes the place of a real meal, and a line is drawn between the sacred and the secular." (McGiffert, Apostolic Age, p538.) Instead of the permeation of every ordinary meal, with a sacred char-
acter, there is the distinct setting apart of a particular feast, or rather the institution of a special symbolic feast, to which attaches a purely religious meaning, so that the secular character of all other meals is tacitly recognized." (McGiffert, Apostolic Age, P 538.) Of course the results of this principle enunciated by Paul did not appear at once. In fact it required a long period for them to make themselves fully manifest, but the fact remains that the outcome of this principle was just the thing that Paul fought during all his Christian life, i.e. ceremonies, rites, stereotyped formalism, law.

Furthermore, Paul laid down two other principles equally far-reaching in their effects. According to I Cor. 14th chapter, there was much confusion in the Corinthian church, caused largely or wholly in this case by the prevailing view of the spirit. Paul had been consulted as to the best means of treating the conditions and he responded by laying down, first that all that is done in the church must be done for the edification of the whole number (14:26f). This involves distinctions, for some member or some body of members must decide whether a person taking part in the meeting of the community is edifying the whole church or not. This principle places the emphasis, not on the source of the gift, but on the usefulness or value of the message. Men now may participate only for the good of the brethren, not to exercise a gift alone. This of course served to throw such gifts as speaking with tongues practically out of the public meetings, and to establish a governing body whose duty it was to see that all things were done decently and in order. (Anyone can see that this was a departure from the former free character of the community where each spake what the spirit gave regardless of whether it blessed others or not.) Carrying on this discussion, and showing how a man may refuse to utter what the spirit gives him, he lays down the principle
that the recipient of the revelation must decide whether or not he shall give it to the church. (14:32f.) When God gives the revelation he also gives the recipient wisdom to make use of the same. Paul seems to have been somewhat of a pragmatist, for he says God is not going to hurt his church through any gift bestowed. This is not far from saying, if it does not actually say, that a gift which does not help the church is not a true gift. So Paul here in I Cor. 14 makes the spirit subject to the will of the individual. At the same time he gives to those who have the gift of discerning the spirit the power to decide whether or not the person speaking is speaking the words of the spirit. This fact is one of the far-reaching consequences. These two principles taken in connection with his action in the case of the abuse of the Lord's Supper laid foundations for future developments that ultimately ran into just the thing that the great apostle of freedom and liberty most of all hated and fought to destroy. A paradox indeed.

But such was not Paul's intention or purpose. Far from it! Working from his hypothesis that God is a God of peace and not of confusion (I Cor. 14:33 ) Paul seeks order in his societies, not the order of legalism in any sense but the order of the spirit. If there is confusion it is not of God (or the spirit). In fact the real purpose of Paul here is to preserve the liberties and rights of the individual members of the community. Order is not incompatible with liberty. It is, of course, with license, but that is another matter altogether. This latter seems to have been about the condition existing at Corinth, so Paul would preserve the liberties of all the members of the community, not allowing certain forward, long-winded, egotists to monopo-
lize all the time, but to give all an opportunity if they had anything to edify the church, or any useful gift, to see that they had the opportunity to exercise it on occasion. In I Cor. 14:29, he says that after the prophets have spoken "let the others discriminate". But this power to discriminate is as truly a "gift" as that of the prophet or teacher, (I Cor. 12:10.). It is not an arbitrary matter, but a matter of the spirit. Furthermore, Paul does not command certain officers, or even the community but makes appeal to the individuals who caused the disturbance. He exhorts them to self-control, and calls upon them to have respect unto the rights of others. In abusing their liberty they are robbing others of their rights. What Paul actually seeks is not the order of legalism, for this he abhorred, but the order that comes from the conformity to the will of God: a divinely appointed and bestowed order. This order was, according to Paul, to be attained through love to God and fellow-man. Paul then seeks to preserve unity and order in the church by securing true liberty to the individuals of the community, barring out legalism of any sort, and securing a unity and order that comes from the fact that one spirit (the mind of Christ) animates and controls all members of Christ's body, the church. The mind of Christ "brings order and this is what Paul seeks (See I Cor. 13, II Cor. 10:1, I Cor. 4:21, Col. 3: 12-16, Eph. 4:1-16, Phil. 2:1-11.) Love is the real pledge of order and unity in the excelsaia, for "love never faileth", and the "more excellent way", meekness, gentleness, kindness, looking not upon our own things but having regard for another's good, these and many more Paul invokes in the members of his communities. The freedom and liberty of such love then is what Paul desired when he was writing to the
Corinthians, never even suspecting that the time would come when his words would be used to support legal order and unity in the church.

4. CONCLUSION.

It becomes our duty now to sum up our short, and very incomplete study of Paul's conception of the church. Just what his conception is no one can say absolutely in so many words, but within certain limits it is safe to draw certain conclusions.

To begin with Paul found the idea of the unity of the church present. Whether the word church in any universal sense was ever used before Paul's use of it in this sense, we do not know, but probably it was not so used until taken up by him. But that makes us no concern, for the conception of the Kingdom of God was familiar to every Jew before Christ came, and since Jesus took up this concept and read a new and fuller content into the same, the universal concept was already at hand, and each community was nothing more than the local manifestation of the Kingdom of God. Hence the universal was, in a sense, first, and the particular later. Of course both were present at one and the same time, but when Paul came on the scene the universal conception of the Kingdom of God was present in every Christian mind, and each local church was simply the local manifestation of the Kingdom of God. The mission was for the Kingdom of God, and out of this mission grew the local communities.

As in the Primitive Community at Jerusalem, so the Pauline conception of the great family, or perhaps more properly a brotherhood. These communities were, viewed from one standpoint, democracies. That is to say all who acted in the capacity of ministers received their
appointments from the church, and held them only so long as the church willed it; but according to Paul, and the conception then dominant, the church on the other hand was a monarchy, in fact it was an absolute theocracy, with Christ as king. He alone had authority, and the church’s election or appointment of its ministers was nothing more nor less than the ratification or recognition of a charisma already conferred by God upon the person. No one possessed any legal right, in fact there were no legal rights possessed by anyone from apostles down to the humblest member. The only right anyone had to a part in the service of the church was a right conferred by the spirit, and in that case it was not the person who received recognition but what the spirit spake by him (See I Cor. 12-14.) Harnack says, (Kirchenverfassung and Kirchenrecht S.40) "Ander erseits and unbeschadet dessen setzt er voraus, dass der Geist die Gemeinden leitet. In dieser Hinsicht ist I Kor. 12-14 der deutlichen Zustände. Die Charismen bestimmen alles". Individuals counted only as they were recognized by the community as being the organs of the Holy Spirit, or spirit of Christ, declaring the divine will. There was rule, but all rule was purely spiritual, and was in no sense dependent upon any human appointment.

We have said that Paul conceived the church as a unity, as universal. But this unity was in his mind purely ideal, i.e. there was no empirical unity in any sense, but unity here as in the Primitive Community consisted in oneness of faith, purpose, allegiance, hope, that is it was unity of spirit, the only real unity there is or can be. The unity that comes of legalism and the letter was not present. Paul labored to secure unity among his own communities and be-
tween Gentile and Jewish communities, it is true; but always by means of the spirit, never by legal or by formal means. In fact it was, All are children of the one God, and hence members of the one great family—brothers. A fraternity governed by the Holy Spirit, or the spirit of Christ,—this was Paul's conception of the church. Ecclesiasticism was wholly absent as of course was sacerdotalism. Both are wholly excluded, as we saw, by Paul's conception of God and salvation. All true reforms in the church have been based upon a clearer understanding of Paul at this point. A grasping of Paul's conception of justification ushered in the Protestant Reformation.

It might be said that the church in the view of Paul was, to quote Oman (Church and Divine Order, p 60.)"the church then is a society of those who are individually directed by the spirit and need no other assurance of truth or bond of unity." The risen, exalted Jesus is the head of the church, and we would be true to Paul were we to say that where two or three are gathered together in the faith and name of Christ, there is the church. In Ephesians (and Colossians 8:18,24) we find Paul coming to the climax. We saw that there is nothing new here save an advance of another stage on the same way that Paul was travelling. In short the difference in Ephesians is the difference of an advance due to increased emphasis. The church as universal was no new concept, but was present from the first. Here Paul, in keeping with the advance in Christology in Colossians made necessary by the presence of heresy, makes a corresponding and natural advance in his conception of the church, and complete perfect unity of the church is found in the absolute universal supremacy of Christ in His church. Here, as we said above, Paul for the first time in his writings has brought the two sharply defined doctrines of Christ and of the church together, and placed them in the proper relations to
each other. The spiritual, risen, glorified, exalted Christ is the supreme absolute head of the spiritual brotherhood. The risen, exalted, glorified, spiritual Christ is not only head of the community, but is present in the individual of the community. Thus we have the conception of the church universal reaching its climax in the risen, exalted, glorified, ever-present Son of God, its Head, dwelling in the hearts of believers, and thus ruling their lives, and by His presence giving all the same spirit - the climax of unity and universality found in the one mind of Christ in all - Christ 'all in all':

The church, however, cannot be legally organized. Such is impossible. God's word, we have seen, alone rules in the church, giving any individual or set of individuals legal authority over the body of believers. So legal rule in the church is impossible. There is organization, and there is order, as we saw above, but there was no legal organization, and there was no legal legislative authority in the church. Not only was there none, there was no room for any such, for Christ was all in all. In short then the conception of the church in Paul, and which remained the conception through the first century, is the conception expressed so simply and so clearly in Matthew 18:20, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."
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Chapter V.

THE RISE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

1. THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION FROM THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The death of the Apostles in the latter half, as the death of Christ in the first half of the first century, marked a period of transition, resulting in great changes in the Christian Church. After the death of Paul changes in certain directions were very rapid. These changes however were not so much the bringing in of entirely new ideals and ideas, as the development of ideas already present at least in germ, or the carrying out to unsuspected results certain forms and conditions. This period from the death of Paul to the close of the century, and even into the second century, is a dark one, and we are not always able to walk by sight, in fact we walk much by faith; yet there is some material to guide us, and to warrant certain conclusions.

In the first place, certain tendencies in this period of transition from Primitive Christianity to the Catholic Church are to be found in germ at least in the writings of Paul. In many cases, of course, the meaning of Paul came in time to be terribly distorted, yet, nevertheless, as we have already seen, Paul was in a great measure responsible for the development in the direction of Catholicism. Not only did he emphasize universality and unity, but certain teachings of his became the foundation (Scriptural) for certain practices and dogmas of the Catholic Church. Sacramentalism is present in Paul in germ at least. This has been in part discussed above, but a few words should be added to what is there said. Practices such as the Lord's
Supper, baptism, laying on of hands, use of bread and wine in the Lord’s Supper, and of water in baptism were general in Paul’s time. These practices soon lost their symbolism, and in an age when men craved "mysteries," became media for the conveying of spiritual benefits to the one to whom applied, and this entirely apart from any mental act of the recipient. The recipient was in fact passive. This was not true of Paul’s time, nor of the first century either, but was the other end of the beginning we see in Paul. I Cor. 10:18f., he teaches that the bread and wine are not merely symbols, but truly a communion with Christ. Again in I Cor. 11:30, where he gives ground for looking up the Lord’s Supper as a "mystery," the partaking of which unworthily causes sickness and death. In Rom. 6:3f., baptism is baptism into His death, and faired again to life with Him. His reference to baptism for the dead (I Cor. 15:29) has also a bearing at this point, whatever Paul himself may have meant by it. We are not to think that sacramentarianism ever had any prominent place in the first century. Here all such was subordinated to true and free religion. Even John, near the last of the century, says that eternal life is to know God and Jesus Christ, whom He has sent (John 17:3). It is not contended that these sayings and teachings of Paul were in this century bent in the direction of sacramentarianism, but attention is called to the fact that they are capable of being so bent, and that they later actually were so used. In short, the thing was present in germ, although none saw its possibilities— or suspected the dead formalism into which it ultimately ran.

Another tendency present in germ in Paul and quite as significant for later developments, was the exclusive Church and divine election to membership in the same. While it is a far cry from Paul’s concep-
[Content not legible due to quality or resolution]
tion of the Church to that of the Catholic Church, it has already ap-
peared that his conception of the Church expressed in the metaphor of
head and the body, and husband and wife, (Eph. 1:23, 5:22-33), helped
along the development that eventuated in the conception of the Church
as a real existence outside of which there was no salvation. In fact,
connexion with the Church became in a sense a sort of sacrament, a
duty. Salvation not mediated by faith and the Spirit as Paul, but by
union with a Church outside of which there can be no salvation.

A third tendency towards the Catholic Church is present in Paul,
also, the tendency towards ecclesiastical order. There is, it is
true, nothing of ecclesiasticism in Paul, yet there was government and
organization in the Churches from the very beginning. It has already
been sufficiently shown that the leaders in the Church up to
this time were in no sense officers, i.e., they had no legal claim to
their places, but that they were spiritually endowed functionaries
called of God to this particular thing. They were leaders because the
Church recognized that the Spirit had given them the gift of ruling;
in other words the Spirit ruled through them. The Pastorals, perhaps
written in their present form near the end of the century, or even the
first of the second, show at marked advance in organization over Paul.
In I and II Tim. and Titus the rulers of the Church are fast losing
their earlier character, and becoming officers in the Church. (I Tim.
3:1f., 8f., 4:11, 6:2; II Tim. 1:6; Titus 1:5. See also I Peter 5:1f.).

It is, however, but a natural process here, due in large measure to the
passing away of the Apostles, i.e., Paul and the Twelve, and the
cooling of the first great enthusiasm. As we shall see, the Church
at the end of the century and for a considerable time thereafter, was
defined as Christ defined it in Mt. 18:20. This, it is true, contin-
used for a considerable time after it had ceased actually to be the fact, for theory is never abreast of fact in such matters—that is to say, historical processes come to certain stages of development usually before they are recognized, and men go on thinking in the old forms until a Cyprian or an Augustine arises and brings the theory down to date and makes it square with fact as nearly as can be done. But more of this later.

Not only has organization advanced towards officialism in the Pastorals, but they are much more formal and legal than any of the earlier writings,—they are filled with rules and the regulations for leaders and others. In addition to references given above, I Tim. 2:6f; II Tim. 1:13; Tit. 2:1-9, 2:11-3:7, (See also I Peter 2:13-3:12), clearly show the above to be true. This increased emphasis is, however, only a natural accompaniment of the developing organization, and is due to the same causes.

Besides, the fundamental view of what Christianity is, was changing through this period, and instead of being the Christ life in men, it becomes a law, or rather obedience to law, the observance of God's law. Thus Christianity is not the Christian's filial relation to God as Jesus taught, nor yet the individual's oneness with Christ, because of the presence of Christ himself in the believer, as Paul taught, but observance of God's law. This is characteristic of all the writings of the last part of the first century; and from this time on Christianity was so regarded, the conceptions of both Christ and Paul being practically lost sight of finally.

What has been said above is born out by the following: Jas. 1:21,25, 2:6f, 4:7-11, 1:6f., 4:15; Rev. 2-3, 12:17, 14:12, 19:8, 20:12f., 21:7, 22:12; I Tim. 2:15, 4:8, 4:18ff.; II Pet. 1:10, 2:9f.,
This conception of Christianity as a law, is however, no new thing under the sun, for so it was conceived by the Primitive Community at Jerusalem, and continued to be conceived by many of the missionaries who went out from this community. Paul's view of Christianity was too profound for the men of his own company and succeeding centuries for that matter. Besides it was an age of revival of moral law, an age that understood law easily, but could not grasp Paul's teaching. It is no surprise then that Christianity as a law, or as obedience to God's law, became the prevailing view so early. With the conditions already mentioned must be coupled the fact of the passing away of Paul and all the Twelve. This hastened very much the process of moralizing Christianity, and the drawing of hard and fast lines in belief and practice. It was most natural that the passing of the original Apostles should lead to great changes in the Church, and to changed views concerning the Church. The traditions and teachings of these men were now held as almost precious treasure, and this Apostolic deposit must inevitably become authoritative. This is what actually took place, and had much to do in the development of the Catholic Church. It is not, however, our task to trace it to its outcome.

Faith is no longer the giving of the life up to God as Paul, but it "Has become a doctrine to guard which is a duty." (Werzeäcker, Apost. Age of Christian Church, Vol. II, p. 394.) In Heb. 11, faith has become obedience and is the foundation of all Christian virtues (v. 1). In 6:12, faith and patience inherit the promises. Paul said "faith," and meant an act of the soul, men came to say "the faith" and to mean
a body of doctrine." The intellectual element comes more and more to the front. In some of the later writings of this age we have almost a dogmatic atmosphere. This is especially true of Hebrews, and the Gospel according to John is the development of a theological thesis. To the author of this Gospel, although much influenced by Paul, Christianity is new knowledge: in other words in the Gospel according to John intellectualism is dominant. In these writings (John, Pastorals, Hebrews, etc.), we have, not the end of the old, but the beginning of the new age, the age of rapid development towards the Catholic Church with all that means in the way of legalism, and religious stagnation.

With the passing away of the original Apostles, the tendency was for the local officers, bishops, elders, deacons, to come into more and ever more authority. The travelling preachers, Apostles, prophets, and teachers on the other hand gradually lost their authority which was all but supreme in the earlier period. III John reflects the beginning of the time when the power of the local leaders had become so great that they resented interference in the part of the travelling preachers (III Jno. 9). Moreover as enthusiasm somewhat cooled, as it did, those who could speak directly the mind of the spirit grew fewer, and often, no doubt, none were present in the local Church. This gave the preeminence to the local leaders who were not slow to avail themselves of the opportunities thus offered. The eucharist was the heart of the matter in this development from the Primitive Church to the Catholic Church. The bishop was the president of the Eucharist and, since the eucharist is at the heart of the whole, their position, to begin with, was one of great honor; but when their power was augmented by their performing the services of the prophets and teachers in matters of admonition and discipline, they tended to become the
most powerful individuals of the community. He is, however, no prophet and cannot speak with a prophet's authority, but his judgment in the first century at least, was subject to the ultimate assent of the Congregation. He must also take council with the elders. The organization of the Church was determined by the Eucharistic assembly, and, since the organization of the Church was one of the primary factors giving rise to the ultimate conception of the Church as a legal organism outside of which there was no salvation, we must glance at it, even though we may seem to pass by on the other side. As we have already hinted, when the passing years brought the Eucharistic president of the Primitive Church to the position of monarch in the local Church, a theory was formed to account for the already existing situation, and this theory was as far removed from the Primitive conception of the Church as two conceptions could well be. In the Primitive Church, where Christ and two or three of his followers are there is the Church, but later where the bishop is there is the Church, and apart from the Church there is no salvation. In the early community the bond of unity was love, in the later the bond was law—a legal constitution. How vast the difference! Yet, in the Primitive Church the germs of all the future developments are to be found. There is no great difference between the Primitive and Catholic organization: in fact in outward form there were no alterations, yet the spirit of the one was as far removed from the spirit of the other as well could be—in the one love ruled, in the other law: in the first the leaders had no legal rights to their positions, their only right being the call of God, but in the last, they had a legal right in a legal organization; in the first there were no legal ordinances, in the last, all moved in accordance with legal ordinances. The subjection of the Christian
community to the terms of a legal constitution is, according to Sohë, the essence of Catholicism, and this is the fact. When this legalistic subjection was complete, the conception of the Church was altered to tally with it, and thus we reach the Catholic Conception, where the bishop is there is the Church, there is the Spirit of Christ, and all the benefits of Christ, and it must be added these benefits are here and nowhere else. (Lowrie, "The Church and Its Organization," p. 11.)

It remains now for us to trace the development of this Catholic conception of the Church to its acceptance by the Church generally. Very early, evidently, two forms of Church government was present, and contending—that is to say, the government of the Church by Apostles, and self-government. That an Apostolic founder of a Church would have large influence in government goes without further proof, yet even Paul was often far from having his will done, especially in Corinth, at all times. After the passing away of the Original Apostles, apostles and prophets remained, and continued for a considerable time as the Didache clearly shows. So the contest continued between these travelling spirit-bearers and the local leaders with the bishop at their head. The Didache, Ch. 11, gives them a very exalted place, yet it must be that at this time they had lost much to the bishop. That this contest was hot when III John was written is apparent from vv. 9,10. When Clement of Rome, in the name of the Church at Rome wrote to the Corinthians (c. 96) these two ideals were in conflict there, and the letter was written to champion the cause of the bishops as against those who advocated the primate method of government and organization. While the conception of the Church held by the Primitive Communities was in general still accepted, and was nominally accepted a considerable time after the beginning of the second century there is a strong
drift in practice towards the monarchical episcopate. It was not a conscious drift, yet nevertheless Clement's view is different from Paul's. Clement is interested in the episcopacy, not from a sacerdotal or ecclesiastical point of view, but rather from the view point of unity and order; furthermore he is laboring to secure for bishops an authority that was not generally accepted— the Corinthians at least strenuously objected to such authority; and undoubtedly preferred the old method. It is quite possible, however, that at Rome this form of government had advanced further than elsewhere. The Didache (Ch. 11) says "Let every Apostle that cometh to you be received as the Lord," but immediately following this provision occurs, "But he shall not remain longer than one day; and if need be another day also; but if he remain three days he is a false prophet." Prophets, however, could settle and become as "high priests" (Ch. 13:3); they were also worthy of their food. Bishops and Deacons were to be elected (Ch. 15) by the local community, men "worthy of the Lord:"— "for they, too, minister to you of the ministry of the Prophets and Teachers" (15:1). The Apostles and Prophets were passing away, and their functions were being assumed by the Bishops (Didache Ch. 15:1), and as time went on, this process proceeded more and more rapidly until we find in Cyprian's time Apostolic authority from the very first is claimed for the Bishop, and and Apostles, Prophets, etc., as classes have entirely disappeared. As yet, however, there is no expressed change in the conception of the Church (c. 110. Harnack, however, places it later than this, i. e., somewhere from 120-165), although there is advance in organization and ritual, and towards officialism and the monarchical episcopate and all that implies.

Ignatius makes a long stride towards the monarchical episcopate,
although we must be careful not to read too much into his statements. Some of his statements are startlingly strong. (Smyrnaeans, Ch. 2, 3, 8, 9; to Ephesians, Chs. 4, 5, 6, 20; to Magnesians, Chs. 3, 4, 6, 13; to Trallians, Chs. 2, 3, 7; to Philadelphians, Salutation, Chs. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8; to Polycarp, Chs. 4, 5, 6). He can not conceive of a community existing at all without a bishop. And the epistles of Ignatius would lead naturally to the conclusion that already in Syria and perhaps Asia, the practice was for every Christian Community to have a Bishop. Ignatius voices a tendency in the Church in general, rather than a generally prevailing practice. That Bishops were generally regarded at this time as Ignatius regards them, is not at all probable; for he is evidently struggling to secure for bishops a position and authority which they do not possess. He is, however, in no sense sacerdotal, although his ideal is a monarchic episcopate; but his ideal does not extend this system beyond the local communities and seek a unity of all churches with a monarchic Bishop as the head. Order and unity seems to have been his main object, and the episcopacy was to his mind the best means of achieving this end.

But how did Ignatius conceive the Church? From several statements, notably Trallians Ch. 3, "In like manner, let all reverence the deacons as an appointment of Jesus Christ, and the bishop as Jesus Christ, who is the Son of the Father, and the presbyters as the Sanhedrin of God, and assembly of the Apostles. Apart from these there is no Church." (Italics are mine). It might be inferred that the later Catholic doctrine of the episcopate was already present, but that Ignatius still held the Primitive view is suggested by his letter to the Smyrnaeans Ch. 8, where he says "Wherever the bishop shall appear, there let the multitude (of the people) also be; even as whenever
Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." (See Philadelphians, Ch. 2: "But where the Shepherd is, there do ye as sheep follow." So he speaks of the bishop here.) So we conclude that while Ignatius desires to exalt the bishop placing great power in his hands and demanding the highest regard for him, even to reverencing him "as Jesus Christ," his object is not sacerdotal, nor yet ecclesiastical in a later sense, but to avoid schism, and secure unity and order in the communities. At the same time he has greatly accelerated the tendency towards the monarchic episcopate, and the Catholic Church. This is proved by at least two significant teachings. In the first place, Ignatius can not conceive of a Church existing without a bishop.

"Apart from these," he says, "there is no Church." Again and again he reiterates, "Let nothing be done without the bishop." He says, "He who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop does (in reality) serve the devil" (Smyrnaeans, Ch. 9). Again he tells us that men who do anything apart from the bishops, presbyters, and deacons are not pure in their consciences (Trallians 7). These are only samples of many statements to the same end. While such a bishop is yet quite far removed from sacerdotal authority, a long stride, certainly, has been taken in that direction. Furthermore, he teaches also that the bishops are appointed of God, in the Epistle to the Philadelphians (Salutation) he says, "I salute in the blood of Jesus Christ, who is our eternal and enduring joy, especially if (men) are in unity with the bishop, the presbyters, and the deacons, who have been appointed according to the mind of Jesus Christ, whom He has established in security, after His own will, and by His Holy Spirit." In Ch. I of the same letter he says, speaking of the bishop's elevation, that he "obtained the ministry which pertains to the common (weal), not of himself,
neither by men, nor through Vainglory, but by the love of God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ." There is no need to multiply references, for his teaching is clearly that the bishop is really appointed of God. This, of course, is no new or strange doctrine, but emphasis on it is significant for the development of Catholicism with its hard and fast monarchical legalism. It is inevitable that such government founded on such a theory, in that age, should lead to a monarchical constitution for the Church. From the beginning the Church was ruled, not by itself, but by the Spirit of Christ, as we have already seen. This is to say that the Church was an absolute theocracy. In the election of rulers and others, the most the Primitive Church had to do was to give assent or approval to those elected of the Spirit of Christ. This is to say that the officers of the Church are the representatives of Christ, and not of the Church. These men were called of Christ to speak and act in his stead. It requires no genius to see that this doctrine can easily and naturally run into Catholicism, as we know it did. Ignatius shows a rapidly moving tendency in this direction, and himself did much to accelerate it. The bishop is rapidly absorbing other functions than originally belonged to him. Certain functions originally belonging to the Apostles and prophets are now his, at least when the apostles and prophets are not present (Didache), and he is in a fine way to absorb all such functions,—a feat accomplished before the close of the third century. The long contest with heresy was just beginning when Ignatius wrote. With him all conditions are present and ripe for rapid development into the Catholic doctrines.

Yet it must not be thought that Ignatius had any conception of an empirical union of all Churches. In his thought every individual Church was to be an image of the heavenly Church. Harnack says, "This
notion lies at the basis of the exhortations of Ignatius. He knows nothing of an empirical union of the different communities into one Church guaranteed by any law or office. The bishop is of importance only for the individual community, and has nothing to do with the essence of the Church; nor does Ignatius view the separate communities as united in any other way than by faith, charity, and hope." (History of Dogma. Eng. Trans. II, 73).

That these letters of Ignatius represent the common practice or belief of the Churches of his day is not at all probable, but it is quite probable that in certain regions such practices and beliefs were springing up. It is quite patent to any one that the Church as a whole did not agree with him, for the Corinthian trouble that called out the letter of Clement of Rome was quite too recent. The fact of the great emphasis placed on the bishop by Ignatius in itself clearly implies that his view was not generally accepted, and this, together with the Corinthian rebellion clearly show that the old idea of the Church as an assembly of two or three in the name and spirit of Christ was still vital, and that there were yet many Christians who stood firm the primitive conditions prevailing in the early part of the Apostolic Age. The revolt at Corinth clearly was a protest against the developing Catholicism and an attempt to return to the primitive order. But the current had set strong in the other direction. When Clement wrote to the Corinthian Christians there were several bishops in the Corinthian Church, and it is just possible that we would be warranted in inferring that this was true of Rome and the other Churches at this time. Clement says (1:1) that it is sin to revolt against the bishops, in fact it is little short, if short at all, of blasphemy against God (47:6,7). It is a serious sin to remove them if they have
properly performed their functions (44:3,4). He holds that the bishops are a divine order, because appointed by the Apostles, and that what the bishops do is from Christ. In Ignatius, however, there is but one bishop, and none but he can administer the Eucharist (Smyrn. 8:1). Without a bishop there can be no proper assembly, for where the bishop is, and there alone, is the church (Magn. 7:1, Trall. 7:2, Smyrn. 8:2). Thus with Ignatius it is the presence of the bishop and not the fellowship in faith of the two or three that guarantees the presence of Christ. The germ of the whole Catholic development is bound up in this change of view—where the bishop is there is the Church; but again it must be urged that this view was as yet far from being the generally accepted view.

2. THE CATHOLIC THEOLOGIANS

The rise of heresy in the form of Gnosticism made it imperative that the Church should define herself with respect to her teachings. The needful thing at this point was to define what was "apostolic," and that is just what the Church did. With the passing of the old guarantees of the Spirit and the keeping of the commandments of Christ, the continued existence of the Church depended upon such a definition. The Church had become in the second century more a teaching institution than anything else, and had the Gnostics not risen, it would sooner or later been necessary to formulate her teachings. The Gnostics, however, were the immediate cause of the beginning of dogma in the rule of faith, and Apostolic tradition. With the coming of the Gnostics and the birth of dogma it of course became imperative that the "rule of faith" must be proved to be 'apostolic.'
But the heretics made the claim that these "rules of faith" were also apostolic. This had to be met and refuted. The earliest of the old Catholic Fathers attempted to show that the Catholic Church had the true apostolic rule of faith by a historical demonstration. They contended that the churches of whose apostolic origin there could be no doubt must have preserved the true Apostolic Christianity; and that the Church must measure her Christianity by these Churches, and if need be, correct their rule of faith by the same. But a very disconcerting question might be asked concerning the preservation through the years of the pure tradition. This of course was asked, and proof demanded. Irenaeus first attempted to supply this proof, and following him, Tertullian made a like attempt. Irenaeus holds that the bishops, standing in the succession from the Apostles possess "A sure gift of the truth," hence, those who separate themselves from the Church are to be repudiated. (IV.33:7,8; IV. 26:2; III.11:9;III.24:1). This means that the bishop is no longer a local functionary, but has relations to the whole Church as the conservor of the true and pure apostolic teaching. The Church guards the truth, then, and she alone has it. This is guaranteed by the presence of the Spirit, giving to the bishop the gift of keeping pure the Apostolic tradition. This Spirit (H. S.) is confined to the Catholic Church, for "Where the Church is there the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God, there is the Church." (Ire. III.24:1). Thus in the time of Irenaeus the power of the bishop had become great, in fact he was now a monarch. The tendency is more and more to add to him Apostolic functions. Irenaeus, while not breaking away from the primitive conception of the Church, in order to establish the Apostolicity of the Catholic Church, sets forth the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, and the claim that by virtue of
his office the bishop has conferred upon him "the Apostolic heritate of truth." It is to be observed, however, that neither Irenaeus nor Tertullian gave up entirely the old historical theory that the Churches founded by the Apostles preserved the true tradition, nor did Irenaeus hold that the transmission of the "Gift of truth" to the bishops invests them with the Apostolic office in the full sense. Tertullian in his earlier writings stood with Irenaeus on this doctrine. (Hck. Hist. of Doct., Vol. ii. p. 70, Eng. Trans). Tertullian's later writings, however, show that the bishop of Rome claimed full Apostolic powers, and it is probable that others were making similar high claims. "Both Calistus and his rival Hippolytus describe themselves as successors of the Apostles in the full sense of the word, and claimed for themselves in that capacity much more than a mere guaranteeing of the purity of Christianity. Even Tertullian did not question this last mentioned attribute of the bishops. Cyprian found the theory already in existence, but was the first to develop it definitely and to eradicate every remnant of the historical argument in its favor." (Hck. Hist. of Dog., Vol. II, p. 70, Eng. Trans). A natural outcome of this teaching of Irenaeus and Tertullian was the doctrine that, since the Catholic Church alone has the Spirit and the true law that God gave to Christ and Christ gave to his Apostles, and they to their successors, there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. The in the measure that doctrine of faith took the place of faith, the Church came between the individual and God. The Church then, was necessary to salvation. This in turn influenced very greatly the conception of the Church. Formerly the Church was the company of the saved, the saints, but now (c. 220) Calistus very consistently set forth the theory that the Church is like the ark of Noah, filled by the clean and unclean. He
held that there must be wheat and tares in the Catholic Church. Yet along with this statement which appears to be a complete departure from the primitive conception of the Church, it is to be observed that very much of the old is still retained by Irenaeus who died less than two decades before 220, and Tertullian who lived to 220. In fact at this time the old theory of the Church was to a great extent preserved, yet the hierarchical theory was already present and in considerable force. The fact seems to have been more evidently present than the theory, as is generally true in ecclesiastical developments. To the old he adds the Apostolic succession in the line of bishops, and the transmission to them of the Apostolic power to rule, and the gift of preserving the "truth" pure. In fact he was guilty of putting together things that did not belong together, and which can not exist together. (Bearing on this see Irenaeus II.31:3; III.24:1; III.1148,9; IV.8:1,3; IV.33:7, 9; IV.26:1,2; IV.36:2; V.20:1; V.32; V.34:3).

Tertullian was far from being consistent with himself. We saw that he held that bishops transmit the rule of faith, and keep it pure, and that episcopacy is an apostolic institution, and necessary to the Church, but on the other hand he combatted the hierarchical theory which had reached a fully developed state before his death, and took positions that made the above doctrine impossible. In his discussion of baptism (ch. 6) he says, "inasmuch as, wherever there are three (that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit,) there is the Church, which is the body of three." Again in Ch. 15 he quotes, though very inexactly, Eph. 4:4f. In Ch. 8 of the same discussion he says, using the figure of the deer and the Ark, "So by the selfsame law of heavenly effect, to earth— that is, to our flesh—as it emerges from the fort, after its old sins, flies the doves of the Holy Spirit, bringing us the
peace of God, sent out from the heavens, where is the Church, the typ-
ified Ark." On Prayer, Ch. 28, Tertullian says, "We are the true
adorers and the true priests, who, praying in spirit, sacrifice, in
spirit, prayers—a victim proper and acceptable to God, which assured-
ly He has required, which He has looked forward to for Himself." (The
italics are mine) (The following bear on the same: On Repentance,
Ch. 10; Apology Ch. 39; On Baptism Ch. 17; On Exhortation to Chastity
Ch. 7.)

One more quotation from Tertullian's works may be given as show-
ing how large a place the primitive conception still had in his thought.
It occurs in "On Exhortation to Chastity," Ch. 7: "Are not even we la-
ics priests? It is written 'A Kingdom also, and priests to this God
and Father, hath He made us." It is the authority of the Church, and
the honor which has acquired sanctity through the joint session of the
Order, which has established the difference between the Order and the
laity. Accordingly, where there is no joint session of the ecclesiastic-
tal Order, you offer, and baptize, and are priests, alone for your-
selves. But where they are, a Church is, albeit they be laics. For
each individual lives by his own faith, nor is there exception of per-
sons with God." (See also Concerning Baptism, Ch. 17; On Repentance,
Ch. 20; Apology, Ch. 39; On Monogamy, Ch. 7; On Modesty, Ch. 21; de
Amina, Chs. 11 and 12.)

From the above it is too evident to need comment that Tertullian's
position was self-contradictory. On the one hand he was a Catholic
occupying about the same position on the doctrine of the Church as
Irenaeus, while on the other hand he was a Montanist and stoutly con-
tended against the hierarchical tendency which was so strong during
his life, and which reached a fully developed state before his death.
In the great Alexandrians Clement and Origen the primitive conception of the Church as the "heavenly communion of the elect and believing" was very pronounced. There can be no doubt, however, that he gave a new interpretation to these old ideas due to his neo-Platonism, yet the old forms are very evident in his writings, even more so than in the writings of Tertullian. His doctrine of the "gnosis" made necessary an ideal conception of the Church; neither could he consistently allow a hierarchy, holding the views he did; for according to his doctrine the true Gnostic may attain the same place held by the Apostles. One holding such a doctrine could not have any sympathy with a Catholic hierarchy. Harnack says that in the Paedagogus and up to the 15 chapter of the 7th Books of his Stromata, Clement always speaks of the Church in the sense of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and the Shepherd of Hermas. "She is a heavenly formation, continued in that which appears on earth as her image. Instead of distinguishing two churches, Clement sees one, the product of God's will aiming at the salvation of man—a Church which is to be on earth as it is in heaven, and of which faith forms the subjective and the Logas the objective bond of union." (Hck. Hist. of Dogma, Vol. II, p. 80. Eng. Trans). But Clement, too, was influenced by his controversy with the heretics, and was thus led to an inconsistency. In his Stromata, beginning with the 15th Chapter of the Seventh Book, he identifies the ideal Church with the empirical Catholic Church. This is especially true of Strom. VII, 17. But first a few references bearing on the old conception of the Church. "For what is yet wanting to him who knows God?" (Paed. I, 6.) Further release from evils is the beginning of salvation. We then alone, who first have touched the confines of life, are already perfect; and we already live who are separated from death. Salvation, accordingly, is
is the following of Christ. 'For that which is in Him is life.' 'Ver-
ily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my words, and believeth
on Him that sent, me, hath eternal life, and cometh not into condem-
nation, but hath passed from death to life.' Thus believing alone, and
regeneration, is perfection in life; for God is never weak. For as
His will is work, and this (viz the result of his will) is named the
world; so also His counsel is the salvation of men, and this has been
called the Church. He knows, therefore, whom He has called, and whom
He has saved; and at one and the same time He called and saved them
(Paed. I, 6). Quoting Gal. 3:26-28, Clement adds, "There are not, then
in the same Word some "illuminated (gnostics); and some animal (nat-
ural) men;" but all who have abandoned the desires of the flesh are
equal and spiritual before the Lord" (Paed. I, 6). He also supports
this by I Cor. 12:13: "The virtue then, that encloses the Church in
its grasp," 'as the Shepherd says,' "Is Faith, by which the elect of
God are saved.'" (Strom. II. 12.)

See also Strom. IV, 8, 21, 26; VI, 13 and 14; VII, 5, 6, 11, for
further evidence of the old conception of the Church in Clement. From
the above it is very evident that there can be no real ecclesiasticism
in Clement's conception, and sacerdotalism would be intolerable. But,
as said above, beginning with Strom. VII, a new note is heard. Here
he identifies the Old Catholic Church with his conception of the
Church as the company of God's elect. Among other statements in VII,
17, he makes the following: "From what has been said, then, it is my
opinion that the true Church, that which is really ancient, is one,
and that in it those who, according to God's purpose are just, are en-
rolled. For from the very reason that God is one, and the Lord one,
that which is in the highest degree honorable is lauded in consequence
of its singleness, being an initiation of the one first principle. In the nature of the One, then, is associated in a joint heritage the one Church, which they strive to cut asunder into many sects. Therefore, in substance and idea, in origin, in preeminence, we say that the ancient and universal Church is alone, collecting as it does into the unity of the one faith—which results from the peculiar Testaments, or rather the one Testament in different times by the will of the One God through our Lord—those already ordained, whom God predestinated, knowing before the foundation of the world that they would be righteous."

So in Clement we have these two irreconcilable conceptions side by side, yet it seems that it never occurred to him that they needed reconciliation, for he never attempted it. Above we see that he adopted the Catholic conception of the Church as an institution in possession of the truth, and at the same time held the conception of the Church as the company of God's elect. We also see by the quotations above that his doctrine of the Gnostic also is antagonistic to the old Catholic idea. But it must be remembered that Clement identifies the two conceptions only when under the stress of polemic writing, and that he does not do so in his writings which are free from polemic purpose. His doctrine of the Gnosis, however, is in itself sufficient proof that he was not a good Catholic in the sense that he accepted unconditionally the Catholic idea then present; for this doctrine of the Gnosis makes it imperative that the true Gnostic be free from such bonds as an empirical Church, outside of which there is no salvation, imposes upon men. Harnack (Hist. of Dog., Vol. II, p. 81. Eng. Trans.) concludes his discussion of Clement's conception of the Church with the following, "The hierarchy has still no significance as far as
Clement's idea of the Church is concerned."

Origen in the main holds the same views as Clement. The Church is a heavenly and holy communion of believers, but like Clement under stress of heresy, he is led to identify the empirical Catholic Church with this Church. But Origen sets forth two ideas not present in Clement, or if present, are very obscure. In the first place, he makes a distinction between the spiritual and fleshly members of the Church. The fleshly members do not truly belong to the Church, but only in an outward manner. In short one might belong to the Church and still not be a Christian. On the other hand, a person unjustly ex-communicated remains in fact a member of the Church, i. e., as God sees him. (Hom. XIV, in Levit. C3). Notorious sinners are to be expelled, but the Church can not be made so holy that the saved alone shall remain within it. So Origen's statement that outside the Church there is no salvation (Hom. III, 5) must be viewed in the light of the above. It is significant that Origen nowhere acknowledges any hierarchy, and held a spiritual view of the sacraments. Taken all in all, the writings of Origen preclude any possibility that he made eternal salvation depend upon connection with any organization. (See Hck. Hist. of Doct., Vol. II, pp. 81f., and 116f.; Sheldon, Hist. of Christian Doct., p. 135; Seeberg, Hist. of Doctrines, Vol. I, p. 159).

This same distinction is also antagonistic to any identification of the empirical Catholic Church with the Holy Church.

Origen gave expression (Against Celsus I:68-75) to another idea of the Church not found in earlier writers, but which Augustine worked out later. According to Origen the Church is the earthly Kingdom of God, which will ultimately absorb all rule and include all mankind, that is to say, the Church will take the place of not only the Roman.
Empire, but all secular states and rule. At this point Origen broke away entirely from the old eschatological conception of the Church, although he always insisted on a holy Church. Harnack sums up his discussion by saying, "Hence, as he also distinguishes the various degrees of connexion with the Church, we find already in his theory a combination of all the features that became essential parts of the conception of the Church in subsequent times, with the exception of the clerical element." (Hck. Hist. of Dog., Vol. II, p. 83, Eng. Trans.)

It may seem very strange that such contradictions as appear above in Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria, and to a greater extent in Tertullian and Origen should be possible in the writings of men of such ability; yet the fact remains that the contradictions are there, and most serious ones at that. But a little reflection will simplify the problem. In the first place, it must be borne in mind that not a single one of these men "made the Church the subject of theological theory." Origen who from set purpose was a systematic theologian, does not discuss as an independent theme the theory or doctrine of the Church. Again, these men lived in an age when the doctrine of the Church was in process of formation, and as the formulated doctrine did not keep pace with the actual growth and practice of the Church, it is easy to see that the old still remained in theory, or at least writers would still continue to express themselves in the old forms, while much that was new and antagonistic was present. Ecclesiasticism was present in fact—an actual realization—before any clear-cut ecclesiastical doctrine was formulated. Under the stress of controversy, and then only, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen identified the old conception of the Holy Church with the empirical Catholic Church. To a very great extent a practical necessity
led to the ecclesiastical practice, and the practice demanded of course the theory. Through the second and third centuries the question of organization was a vital one to the Church. Her contests with the Gnostics, Montanists, and last, but by no means least, in the third century, the problem of what should be done with the world within her pale, seemed to make organization according to fixed law imperative if the Church was to live. Out of these practical necessities grew up through the centuries the ecclesiastical and sacerdotal doctrine of the Church.

Our studies now bring us to the man who more than any other is responsible for the practical completion of the ecclesiastical theory of the Church. And the beginning of the sacerdotal doctrine. Cyprian was the great ecclesiastic of his age, as Origen, his contemporary, was its great theologian. It remained for Cyprian to bring to completion the doctrine that there is not only one flock, but also but one fold, and that fold is the Empirical Catholic Church. But before we consider his contribution to the doctrine of the Church, we shall take stock and see as nearly as we may what materials were present to Cyprian with which to work.

It had long been accepted that the teachings of the Apostles (Rule 7, faith) was the exclusive standard and norm of Christian truth. Acceptance of this standard was faith; that is to say, faith was no longer Pauline, but assent to a doctrine. In the second place, the power to determine what was apostolic was confined to the bishops. As has already appeared from Irenæus, the doctrine of Apostolic succession in some form was held; not in its completed form, by any means, to be sure, yet it was present in no mistaken form, and along with this Irenæus taught that the bishops were given a special gift to keep the
traditions pure. Irenaeus based his arguments largely on a historical basis, however, and did not teach that in the full sense of the word the bishops were the successors of the Apostles, but held the place of government formerly held by the Apostles, and were especially gifted of God with the spirit of truth in order that they might keep the teachings pure. From the time of Ignatius it was taught (whether the teaching was always everywhere accepted is quite another question, as we have seen) that each community must have a bishop. Ignatius cannot conceive of the existence of a Community apart from a bishop. Each individual Church was regarded as a copy of the ideal Church in heaven, and the bishop was God's representative in this earthly Church. Later we shall see that Cyprian's conception of the Church was largely a generalization of this idea. Callistus of Rome (217-222) came forward with a new view of the Church. Because of persecution, many had recanted, while many others had fallen into sins of the flesh. The question was hot as to whether mortal sins (homicide, idolatry, blasphemy, adultery, fornication, denial, and such like) could be repented of, and the repentant one again received into the Church. This gave rise at once to two parties, those who denied repentance, or at least denied persons guilty of mortal sins readmission to the Church, and those who believed that at least a second repentance ought to be allowed for sins of the flesh, and later other mortal sins as well. This, of course, means that two conceptions of the Church were present at that time: those who still held to the old idea of a Holy Church composed of saints, and a legalistic conception of the Church as made up of not alone the holy, but of all kinds. Callistus compared the Church to the Ark of Noah, which contained both clean and unclean. He said that Christ taught that the tares should be let grow among the grain (Hipp.
9:7, Tertullian, of Idolatry, 24). In this statement it would seem that the new conception of the Church was about complete, yet such was not the case as seen above. The bishop, according to Callistus, has the power as a divine right to forgive sins, even mortal ones, and if the bishop sin, even a mortal sin, he may not be removed, and if the bishop tolerates sin in the Church, that is the end of the matter, nothing can be done about it. (Hipp. 9:7). Cyprian, however, did not accept this view. Callistus was the more consistent of the two. While Hippolytus condemns (9:7) Callistus in bitter terms, the innovations of Callistus were in harmony with the age. Seeberg (Hist. of Doctrines, Vol. I, p. 177, Eng. Trans), calls him the "first conscious hierarch." Seeberg continues, "Henceforth the Church is no longer the holy people of God, holding in common the faith of the Apostles, i.e., the faith of the bishops; but it is an association of men, subject to the control of the bishop, whom he tolerates in the Church, and this by virtue of the divine authority which has been given him to pardon or retain sins. He whom the bishop recognizes belongs to the church. The bishop is lord over the faith and life of the Christian world by virtue of an absolute supremacy divinely bestowed upon him. Callistus was the author of the Roman Catholic conception of the Church." This doctrine as we shall see, was also completed by Cyprian. In the third place, from the time of Ignatius, some form of the doctrine that outside of the Catholic Church there is no salvation was present. We are not justified in saying, however, that such men as Irenaeus, or any of the leading lights before Cyprian, would, if the case had been put specifically before them, have affirmed that there was absolutely no possibility of salvation outside the Catholic Church. The thing in the minds of Irenaeus and his contemporaries, and down to Cyprian, was not so much the being outside, as the fact that these men put themselves
outside by a free act, and by this act broke the unity and harmony of the Church. Their emphasis was on this latter; the above would probably even apply to Cyprian to a degree at least. Ignatius (Eph. 5) says, "If any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God." Irenaeus taught this doctrine also (3:24). "Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church, and every kind of grace; but the Spirit is truth. Those, therefore, who do not partake of Him, are neither nourished into life from the mother's breast, nor do they enjoy that most limpid fountain which issues from the body of Christ; but they dig for themselves broken cisterns." It must be remembered, however, that these men represented the extreme hierarchical views of the age. Clement of Alexandria and Origen, contemporaries, did not allow any hierarchy. Yet the Church was no longer the company of the holy believers, whose unity was in faith, hope, and love, but a legal organism composed of both good and bad, whose unity was legal and dogmatic. In actual practise we could say that the bishop was the Church; but the practice had not yet been generalized into a theory of the hierarchy, altho it was present in fact. As yet, however, there was not an empirical union of the different communities with bishops at their heads into one Church, whose unity was guaranteed by any law or office. Here Cyprian carried the hierarchical view to its logical conclusion.

Cyprian, as Irenaeus, was driven to his hierarchical views of the Church by the controversies of his time. With Irenaeus it was heresy, but with Cyprian it was schism, where the schismatics were orthodox Christians, the differences being over the matter of discipline. This accounts in part at least for his great advance in his doctrine of the Church. It now becomes our task to state the doctrine of the
It
Church as held by the greatest ecclesiastic of his day, Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258).

The Episcopacy is a divine institution, and the bishops are chosen not by men, but have their office by divine appointment. "God the Judge, who makes priests," (Ep. 68:1). Whoso, therefore, does not believe Christ, who maketh the priest, shall hereafter begin to believe Him who avengeth the priest." (Ep. 68:10). "That we, with the rest of our colleagues, may steadily and firmly administer this office, and keep it in the concordant unanimity of the Catholic Church, the divine condescension will accomplish; so that the Lord who condescends to elect and appoint for Himself priests in His Church, may protect them also where elected and appointed by His good will and help, inspiring them to govern, and supplying both vigor for restraining the contumacy of the wicked, and gentleness for cherishing the penitence of the lapsed" (Ep. 44:4). "We," they say, "know that Cornelius is bishop of the most holy Catholic Church, elected by Almighty God, and by Jesus Christ." (45:2). "When he had undertaken the episcopate, not obtained by solicitation nor by extortion, but by the will of God who makes priests" (Ep. 51:9). "So that, for the confusion and beating down of heretics, the Lord might show which is the Church—which is the one bishop chosen by divine appointment." (Ep. 57:3). But deacons ought to remember that the Lord chose Apostles, that is, bishops—and overseers; while Apostles appointed for themselves deacons after the ascent of the Lord into heaven, as ministers of their episcopacy and of the Church" (Ep. 64:3). (See also Eps. 32:1, 33:1, 54:4,5, 73:6, on Unity of Church, Chap. 10).

God also instructs and inspires his bishops. Cyprian says, "for you must know that I have been admonished and instructed by divine con-
condescension" (Ep. 34:1). Again, "For whatever, in that moment of confession, the confessor bishop speaks, he speaks in the mouth of all, by inspiration of God" (Ep. 82:1).

The bishops are the successors of the Apostles, in fact in one place Cyprian identifies apostles and bishops. "The Lord chose Apostles, that is, bishops and overseers" (Ep. 64:3). "For this, my brother, we especially both labor after, and ought to labor after, to be careful to maintain as much as we can the unity delivered by the Lord, and through His Apostles to us their successors" (41:3). "Christ, who says to the Apostles, and thereby to all Chief rulers, who by vicarious ordination succeed to the Apostles; 'He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that heareth me, heareth Him who sent me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me, and Him that sent me.'" (Ep. 68:4). "But if the flock is one, how can he be numbered among the flock who is not of the number of the flock? Or how can he be esteemed a pastor, who, while the true Shepherd remains and presides over the Church of God by successive ordination,--succeeding to no one, and beginning from himself, becomes a stranger and a profane person, an enemy of the Lord's peace, and of the divine unity" (75:5). In short, the bishop is the representative of Christ. In defending himself against his enemies, Cyprian says that if Florentinus is right in his charges, "behold now for six years the brotherhood has neither had a bishop, nor the people a prelate, nor the flock a pastor, nor the Church a governor, nor Christ a representative, nor God a priest" (Ep. 68:5). Thus the bishop according to Cyprian, is not only the historical successor of the Apostles, who keeps the Apostolic tradition pure, as Irenaeus taught, but he is more than this, since he is an inspired man, having taken the place of the Spirit endowed men of the primitive communities. The
bishop is the real successor of the apostles, and is endowed with all the power of the apostles. The church is founded on the bishops, and its government is wholly in the hands of the bishops. For this doctrine Cyprian finds his warrant in Matthew 16:18,19. He says, "Our Lord, whose precepts and admonitions we ought to observe, describing the honor of a bishop and the order of His church, speaks in the Gospel and says to Peter, 'I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' Thence through the changes of times and successions, the ordering of the bishops and the plan of the church flows onwards; so that the church is founded upon the bishops and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers. Since this, then, is founded on the divine law, I marvel that some, with daring timidity, have chosen to write to me as if they wrote in the name of the church; when the church is established in the bishops and the clergy, and all who stand (fast in the faith) - (Ep. 26:1). Thus the bishop is both priest and judge, and is both of these in the room of Christ. The bishop admits to and excludes from the church. (See 54:13, 54:11, but especially his treatise "On the Lapsed"). Furthermore, to separate from the bishop is to separate from the church, and since not to be in communion with the church is to be lost, men are saved only by being in peace and concord with the bishop. Cyprian says, "You wrote moreover for me to transmit a copy of those same letters to Cornelius our colleague, so that he might lay aside all anxiety, and know at once that you held communion with him, that is, with the Catholic Church." (Ep. 51:1, See also 48:2,4.). Again he says, "Does he think he has Christ who acts in opposition to Christ's priests, who
separates himself from the company of His clergy and people? He bears arms against the church, he contends against God's appointment." (On Unity of Church, Chapt. 17.). Thus the Episcopate is the church; and to separate from the bishop is to separate from Christ and the church.

To rebel against the Bishop is Rebellion against God (Eps 64:1,3, 75:9; On the Unity of the Church, Chapters 17-18). This is a significant step in advance of the previous view. Heretofore heresy was the basis of exclusion from the church; but with the Novatian Schism a new problem confronted the bishops. These schismatics were orthodox so far as the Rule of Faith went, differing only on matters of discipline. Cyprian's dictum is that the schismatic is also a heretic. If one does not submit absolutely to the bishop, whatever may be his faith otherwise, he is a heretic, having thereby forfeited his membership in the church and with it his salvation; for there is no salvation outside the church. On Unity Chapter 6, Cyprian says "Whoever an is separated from the church and is joined to an adulteress, is separated from the promises of the church; nor can he who forsakes the church of Christ attain the rewards of Christ. He is a stranger; he is profane; he is an enemy. He can no longer have God for his father who has not the church for his mother." (See also Chapters 4, 10, 18, 19, and Ep 75:7,8,9). That schismatics remaining in all points orthodox should be classed as heretics is something new and and exceedingly significant for the conception of the church. It means that if one is not in the church, that is in entire accord with the bishop, and submitting absolutely to his authority, he is not a Christian, and can have no hope of salvation; for there is no salvation outside the church, i.e. apart from the bishop. Speaking of schismatics he
says, "Although he should afterwards be put to death on account of the name, still, being placed outside the Church, and divided from unity and from charity, he could not in his death be crowned." (Ep. 51:17) "Whoever he may be, and whatever he may be, he who is not in the Church of Christ is not a Christian." (Ep. 51:24) "But apostates and deserters, or adversaries and enemies, and those who lay waste the Church of Christ, cannot, even if outside the Church they have been slain for His name, according to the apostle, be admitted to the peace of the Church, since they have neither kept the unity of the Spirit nor of the Church." (Ep. 51:29). "They are the Church who are a people united to the priest, and the flock which adheres to its pastor. Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop; and if anyone be not with the bishop, that he is not in the Church, and that those flatter themselves in vain who creep in, not having peace with God's priests, and think that they communicate secretly with some; while the Church, which is catholic and one, is not cut nor divided, but is indeed connected and bound together by the cement of priests who cohere with one another." (Ep. 68:8) Again, he says, "He can not be a martyr who is not in the Church; he cannot attain unto the kingdom who forsakes that which shall reign there." (On Unity of Church, Chap. 14.) Further on in the same chapter he says, "They cannot dwell with God who would not be of one mind in God's Church... Such an one may be slain; crowned he cannot be. He professes himself to be a Christian in such a way as the devil often feigns himself to be Christ, as the Lord himself forewarns." (See also, especially on this subject, Eps. 61:4; 67:9; 72:21; 74:7; 75:2,3,4; On Unity of Church, Chaps. 4, 6, 7, 8, 12). That is to say that the unity of the Church is just as
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essential an element in the faith, or creed, of a Christian, as the acknowledgement of the Apostolic traditions. In fact, much more emphasis is placed upon it. In Cyprian the insistence upon the rule of faith is not at all conspicuous, except by its infrequency, but everywhere we meet the most emphatic insistence upon the acceptance of the dogma of the unity of the Church, as absolutely necessary to membership in the Church and salvation through such connection, and the impossibility of salvation outside the Church. Faith as insisted on by Cyprian is wholly foreign to Paul's view, and is little else than submission to the Authority of the bishop who is in reality the Catholic Church.

There is according to Cyprian, a college of bishops, which is called the episcopate. This conception, as all others, developed through practice, and practical necessity. The custom early sprang up of the bishops of a given area meeting to consult together, and out of these councils grew the idea of a college of bishops on which the Church is founded, and who have the absolute power to bind and loose. The unity of the Church is found in the unity of the episcopacy. "The episcopate is one, each part of which is held by each one for the whole. The Church also is one, which is spread abroad far and wide into a multitude by an increase of fruitfulness" (On Unity of Church, Chap. 5). (See also Eps. 54:5, 9; 64:1; 71:1; 72:1, 2, 6; 51:24; On Unity of Church, Chaps 4 & 23.) That is to say, Church unity depends upon episcopal unity; and this episcopal unity rests upon the divine election, and endowment of the bishops, in common with the Apostles, with all the powers and privileges of Mt. 16:16, 19. In short, this episcopal unity has existed from the first and by divine ordering. Bishops = Apostles, Ep. 64:3. He says, after quoting Mt.
16:18,19, "And, although to all the Apostles, after His resurrection, He gives an equal power, and says, 'As the Father has sent me, even so send I you: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted unto him, and whosoever sins ye retain, they shall be retained' (Jn. 20:21); yet, that He might set forth unity, He arranged by His authority, the origin of that unity as beginning from one. Assuredly the rest of the Apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honor and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity; which one Church, also, the Holy Spirit in the Song of Songs designated in the person of our Lord, and says, 'My dove, my spotless one, is but one" (On the Unity of the Church, Chap. 4). Thus the unity of the Church rests upon the divinely ordered unity of the episcopacy, and has been so from the first.

As appears in the above quotation (On the Unity of the Church, Chap. 4), Cyprian taught the equality of bishops. The very fact that a man was a bishop placed him on the same common level with all bishops. Attempts have been made to pervert Cyprian into an acknowledgement of the primacy of Rome; even Chap. 4 as quoted above has been interpolated and falsified in the interests of the Roman bishop, but Cyprian never acknowledged the Roman bishop as superior except in the sense that as head of the Great Church at Rome where Peter and Paul were martyred, and because they were the founders, the Church must have the pure tradition; but any recognition of the superiority of the Roman bishop by Cyprian was based on this historical fact, and not because any special prerogative was conferred upon the bishop of Rome creating him in any sense a bishop of bishops. The following will show clearly Cyprian's position in regard to the relation of
bishops to each other, and to the Roman bishop from the dogmatic point of view. "But we know that some will not lay aside what they have once imbibed, and do not easily change their purpose; but, keeping fast the bond of peace and concord among their colleagues, retain certain things peculiar to themselves, which have once been adopted among them. In which behalf we neither do violence to nor impose a law upon any one, since each prelate has in the administration of the Church the exercise of his free will, as he shall give an account of his conduct to the Lord" (Ep. 71:3). "And now also, when we had met together, bishops as well of the province of Africa as of Numidia, the number of seventy-one, we established this same matter once more by our judgment" (Ep. 72:1). Writing to Stephen, bishop of Rome, he says, "For, although we are many shepherds, yet we feed one flock." (Ep. 66:4). The entire seventy-third letter, addressed to Stephen, bishop of Rome, is a strong argument for the equality of bishops, and against any recognition of the primacy of the Roman bishop, save as we said above, an historical primacy. The following, however, is especially pertinent. "Why has the bitter obstinacy of our brother Stephen broken forth to such an extent, as to contend that sons are born to God from the baptism of Marcion; moreover, of Valentinus and Apelles, and of others who blaspheme against God the Father; and to say that remission of sins is granted in the name of Jesus Christ where blasphemy is uttered against the Father and against Christ the Lord God? In which place, dearest brother, we must consider, for the sake of the faith and the religion of the sacerdotal office which we discharge, whether the account can be satisfactory in the day of judgment for a priest of God, who maintains, and approves, and acquiesces in the baptism of blasphemers, when the Lord threatens, and
says, 'and now, O ye priests, this commandment is for you: if ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart to give glory to my name, saith the Lord Almighty, I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings' (Mal. 2:1,2). Does he give glory to God, who communicates with the baptism of Marcion? . . . Does he give glory to God, who, a friend of heretics and an enemy to Christians, thinks that the priests of God, who support the truth of Christ and the unity of the Church, are to be excommunicated" (Ep. 73:7,8).

This does not sound in the least as if Cyprian had the fear of a Pope before his eyes. While Cyprian's writings have furnished much material for the defence of the Roman primacy, and much that he wrote is capable of being so used, he very emphatically denied that Stephen possessed any peculiar rights because of the Petrine succession. From Firmilian's letter (Ep. 74) we know that Stephen was making what was regarded in Africa as the presumptuous claims of a proud and arrogant man. There was not the least disposition to grant his contentions, in fact they were emphatically rejected by Cyprian and his co-bishops. Thus we are warranted in concluding that there was a college of bishops, and these bishops were on an equal footing, at least theoretically. Cyprian's statements in "On the Unity of the Church" (Chap. 4) are very convincing in this connection. Harnack says, "Each of these prelates, however, provided he keeps within the association of the bishops, preserves the independent right of regulating the circumstances of his own diocese. But it also follows that the bishops of those communities founded by the Apostles themselves can raise no claim to any special dignity, since the unity of the episcopate as a continuation of the apostolic office involves the equality of all bishops. However, a special importance attaches to the Roman
See, because it is the seat of the Apostle to whom Christ first granted Apostolic authority in order to show with unmistakable plainness the unity of these powers and the corresponding unity of the Church that rests on them; and further because, from her historical origin, the Church of this see had become the mother and root of the Catholic Church spread over the earth" (Hist. of Dogma, Vol. II, pp. 87-88, Eng. Trans).

Cyprian did not formulate any doctrine concerning the bishop’s being guided by the Holy Spirit. He probably saw no necessity for such a formulation, for he everywhere assumes that they are so guided. The bishops were divinely elected and appointed; they were instructed by God; but what is of greater significance still, they were the divinely appointed successors of the Apostles and possessed of all the powers with which Christ had endowed the Apostles. Apostles and bishops being one and the same of course the bishops were directed by the Holy Spirit. The bishop alone can confer the Holy Ghost, and only those who have the Spirit can baptize (Ep. 75:10). The Church is still guided by the Spirit, but in a way quite different from the primitive communities; for now he guides exclusively through the clergy, which has become an official and privileged class.

In Cyprian the ministry appears for the first time as a priesthood. They offer the sacrifice, and on this offering Cyprian bases his claim. While he has no well wrought out doctrine of the actual priesthood of the clergy, he views the clergy as a sacerdotal order with the bishops as the crown of the order. The sacrifice offered by the priest is a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ. "For if Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is Himself the Chief Priest of God the Father, and has first offered Himself a sacrifice to the Father, and
has ordered this to be done in commemoration of Himself, certainly that priest truly discharges the office of Christ, who imitates that which Christ did; and he then offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, when he proceeds to offer it according to what he sees Christ Himself to have offered" (Ep. 62:14). "For the Lord's passion is the sacrifice which we offer" (Ep. 63:17). The Lord's Supper becomes the sacrifice offered by the priest, and thus the priest stands between God and men. It is only through the priest that men can enter the Church, and he alone can administer the Grace of God. It is only through the priest and his sacrifice that any merit accrues to the sinner, i.e., the merits of Christ. The priesthood, with the bishops at the head, has a monopoly upon grace. Not only so, but the power to bind and loose is now wholly in their hands; as we saw above they are also judges. The priests, and especially the bishops, loose or bind as heirs of all the Apostolic gifts and powers. They can forgive sin, or retain it. (12:1; 13:1; 49; 51:4; 51:13,18,20,21,23,28; 54:13,16,19; 65:2; 70:3; 72:2; 75:7).

Cyprian's appeal is constantly to the Levitical priesthood in support of his sacerdotalism. Among others the following may be noted: 67:1; 65:1; 68:3; 73:8; 75:8,9; On Unity of Church, 18. Thus the ministry is something quite different in Cyprian from that appearing in Paul's time. Now the ministers are not merely functionaries, called of God by His Spirit, but they are officials with a valid legal claim, they are sacrificing priests, standing between God and men; they are the judges and absolute rulers of the laity in all spiritual and moral affairs; they stand in the room of the Apostles, and act in Christ's stead. The priesthood is ordained and instructed of God, and represents Christ. The priesthood has become the Church,
and now we may say, not "where two or three are gathered together in
the name of Christ, there is the Church, but rather where the bishop,
the absolute spiritual lord is, there is the Church, and separation
from the bishop is separation from and rebellion against God.

3. CONCLUSION

The Church is a divine institution outside of which there is no
salvation. She is much more than a mere community possessing the
Apostolic tradition, but an organism divinely ordered and constituted,
and the acceptance of the Church as one and divine is just as essential
- and apparently in the thought of Cyprian more essential than the
acceptance of the Apostolic rule of faith. This organism known as
the Catholic Church rests wholly upon the Episcopacy which, as a har-
monious college, is the heir of all the Apostolic gifts and endow-
ments, and the representative of Christ Himself. Individuals are
saved only as they are united to the bishop harmoniously. The unity
of the Church consists in the unity of the episcopate—which has been
one from the days of Christ. "Each bishop represents the whole sig-
nificance of the episcopate." "Hence the individuals are no longer to
be considered primarily as leaders of their special communities, but
as the foundation of the one Church." (Hck., Hist. Dog., Vol. II,
p. 87. Eng. Trans.) Here Cyprian generalized Ignatius' conception of
the bishop as the representative of God to the Community into the
Episcopacy being the representative of God to the One Church, and the
whole significance of the Episcopacy in each bishop. The Church is
the channel of Grace, and the only channel, through which God's
gifts may flow to men—and this is possible only through a sacrific-
ing priesthood, who absolutely control the blessings of God. The
priesthood is the Church in fact. What a transformation has been wrought in the Church, for it is indeed a transformation. Once it was the community of the holy people of God who believe on Jesus Christ, but now it amounts to this; that the Church is the people of various degrees of goodness and badness who believe in an ecclesias-tical organism and belong to the bishop. From a unity of faith, hope and love the Church has become a legal unity, a visible organism, governed by ecclesiastical law which is created and administered by the absolute lords of the Church, the bishops. Speaking of the change in the conception of the Church, Seeberg says, "By the term (Church) is no longer understood the holy people of God believing in Jesus Christ, but a group of men belonging to the episcopacy. They obey it, not because it advocates the truth proclaimed by the Apostles, but because the bishops have been endowed and appointed by God to be the leaders of the congregations, ruling them in God's name and by virtue of divine authority. This subjection under the episcopacy is the essential feature in the Church, for it constitutes her unity. Only he who obeys the bishop belongs to the Church and has relationship with God and salvation" (Hist. of Christian Doctrines, Vol. I, p. 185, Eng. Trans.) Harnack says, "According to Cyprian, the Catholic Church, to which all the lofty predictions and predicates in the Bible apply, is the one institution of salvation outside of which there is no redemption. She is this, moreover, not only as the community possessing the true Apostolic faith, for this definition does not exhaust her conception, but as a harmoniously organized federation. This Church, therefore, rests entirely on the episcopate, which sustains her, because it is the continuance of the apostolic office and is equipped with all the power of the Apostles. Accord-
ingly, the union of individuals with the Church and, therefore with Christ, is effected only by obedient dependence on the bishop, i.e. such a connection alone makes one a member of the Church." (Hist. of Dogma, Vol. II, pp. 85, 86.) The Church, then, is the Episcopate through which the grace of God is ministered to those who adhere in absolute obedience to the bishop.

In Cyprian, there is scarcely a single idea that can be called original. In most all cases it is a development or a formulation of practices or ideas already present. The ideas in his work, "The Unity of the Church", are to be found in the earlier fathers, and his work, "On Works and Alms", which became such an authority, is nothing more than a development of ideas expressed by Tertullian. "Cyprian's chief importance is perhaps due to the fact that, influenced by the consequences of the Decian storm, he founded, in union with the Roman bishop, Cornelius, what was afterwards called the sacrament of penance: in this, indeed, he was the slave, rather than the master, of circumstances; and in addition, he was yielding to Roman influences which had been working in this direction since Calistus. He established the rule of the hierarchy in the Church in the sphere of the sacrament, sacrifice, and discipline; he set his seal on Episcopalianism; he planted firmly the conception of a legal relation between man and God, of works of penance as means of grace, and of the "satisfactory" expiations of Christ. He also created clerical language with its solemn dignity, cold-blooded anger, and misuse of Biblical words to interpret and criticise contemporary affairs—a metamorphosis of the Tertullian genius for language. Cyprian by no means inherited the interest taken by Tertullian in Anti-Gnostic theology. Like all great princes of the Church, he was a theologian.
only in so far as he was a catechist. He held all the more firmly by the symbol, and knew how to state in few words its undoubted meaning, and to turn it skilfully even against allied movements, even like that of Novation" (Harnack, Hist. of Dogma, V, 25, Eng. Trans).
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AUGUSTINE'S CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH.

I. INTRODUCTION.

The great name in theology after Cyprian is that of Augustine. Among theological thinkers none were greater than the bishop of Hippo. In his voluminous writings many conflicting currents meet, and refuse to be reconciled. Eucken¹ says of Augustine, "These various tendencies are not brought together in a comprehensive system and there harmonized, nor are they, so to say, adjusted to one another from the outset, as with Aristotle; rather, each develops in isolation, and only in the end is there contact and union with the others. Hence we have sharp contrasts, halting procedure, working at cross-purposes, and manifold conflict of opposing tendencies. There result harsh contradictions, not only in small matters but in great; continued unrest, crossed and recrossed by opposing currents; but there results also a ceaseless tension and vibration of life, an ever-recurring inception of creative work, the most active flux of all things." Again he says², "This interaction of conflicting tendencies not only increases the difficulty of understanding Augustine's teachings, but also interferes with a just appreciation of the nature of the man. Possessed of an unusual sensitiveness, he is so far carried away by the impression of the moment that he lives in it exclusively and is oblivious of all else. He is thus led to extreme, fanatical assertions, which represent his convictions indeed, but not his entire faith; for here he condemns and rejects what yonder he honors and loves. The Churchly Christian in him at times speaks of culture like a narrow-minded sectarian; yet as a comprehensive and profound thinker he also treats the

ecclesiastical order, with its authority and its faith, as a thing of expediency, an institution established in the interests of the masses and of human weakness. Hence, it is possible to set one Augustine over against the other, and so to cast doubt upon the sincerity of both. Part of the contradictions disappear, if we take into account the inner development which gradually forced him from a universal and philosophical to a positive and ecclesiastical treatment of things; but the most serious contradictions survive all the changes of development, and it would be a decided mistake to attempt to force his thought, as a whole, into a system."

It is no surprise to even the casual student of Augustine that he is claimed by sects widely separated by thought and faith. The scholastics claimed him, and they could give reasons that can not be denied, to make good their claims; no less, perhaps even greater, were the claims of the mystics, for there is much in Augustine to feed the mystic mind; the Roman hierarchy claimed him in support of its hierarchical sacerdotalism, and they have much in his writings, particularly his polemical writings, to support their contention; even the most rabid Protestant must admit that his Anti-Donatist writings are amply tainted with this element: On the other hand all those protesting against the Roman hierarchy from Augustine to Luther supported their arguments by the authority of Augustine; and none can deny that Augustine's writings, living again in the mighty soul of Luther, were the ferment that produced the Protestant Reformation. It is an historical fact that Romanists and Reformers have both claimed support, and rightly, from Augustine. Through the centuries since his day we have seen Jesuits and Jansenists, Sacramentarians and Zioniglians, Ultra-Romanists and Ultra-Protestants claiming him. Luther was profoundly influenced by his doctrine of Justification, Calvin as pro-
foundly by his doctrine of predestination; although differing widely in their views, he profoundly influenced Eugenia, Anselm, and Aquinas; and the Great Popes built up the Roman hierarchical sacerdotalism upon him as a foundation, and the Anti-Gregorians appealed to him in part at least. Some one has said that "he is at once the founder of scholasticism and the first of the Western Mystics." With such a situation before us it is not to be expected that our task of finding the conception of the Church held by Augustine will be an easy one. In such a maelstrom of cross-currents we may find more than one view, and views at cross-purposes with each other at that, even mutually exclusive, but we shall go forward prepared for the worst, but hoping for the best.

II. AUGUSTINE'S CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH FROM THE STANDPOINT OF HIS PRACTICAL FAITH.

When there are no schismatics or heretics among the neighbors, Augustine is almost, if not quite, Pauline in his thinking. This is peculiarly true of the Confessions. He cries out, "Oh! how shall I find rest in Thee? Who will send Thee into my heart to inebriate it, so that I may forget my woes, and embrace Thee, my only good? What art Thou to me? Have compassion on me that I may speak. What am I to Thee that Thou demandest my love, and unless I give it Thee art angry, and threatenest me with great sorrow? Is it, then, a light sorrow not to love Thee? Alas! alas! tell me of Thy compassion, O Lord, my God, what thou art to me. Say unto my soul, I am thy salvation" (Ps. 35:3). "So speak that I may hear. Behold, Lord, the ears of my heart are before Thee; open Thou them, and 'say unto my soul, I am thy salvation.' When I hear, may I run and lay hold on Thee. Hide not Thy face from me. Let me die, lest I die, if only I may see Thy
face. Cramped is the dwelling of my soul; do Thou expand it, that Thou may enter in. It is in ruins, restore Thou it. There is that about it which must offend Thine eyes; I confess and know it, but who will cleanse it? or to whom shall I cry but to Thee? Cleanse me from my secret sins, O Lord, and keep thy servant from those of other men. I believe and therefore do I speak; Lord, Thou knowest. Have I not confessed my transgressions unto Thee, O my God; and Thou hast put away the iniquity of my heart? I do not contend in judgment with Thee, who art the Truth; and I would not deceive myself, lest my iniquity lie against itself. I do not, therefore, contend in judgment with thee, for 'if Thou Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, Who shall stand.'" (Conf. 1:5). The text and fundamental note of the whole confessions is found in the first book and first section of the first chapter: "Great art thou, O Lord, and greatly to be praised; Great is thy power, and of Thy wisdom there is no end. And man, being a part of Thy creation, desires to praise Thee,- man, who bears about with him his mortality, the witness of his sin, even the witness that Thou 'resisteth the proud,' - yet man, this part of Thy creation, desires to praise Thee. Thou movest us to delight in praising Thee; for Thou hast formed us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless until they find rest in Thee." (See also Bk. VI 6:10).

"And being thence warned to return to myself, I entered into my inward self, Thou leading me on; and I was able to do it, for Thou wert become my helper. And I entered, and with the eye of my soul (such as it was) saw above the same eye of my soul, above my mind, the Unchangeable light, . . . He who knows the Truth knows that Light, and he that knows it knoweth eternity. Love knoweth it, O Eternal Truth, and true Love, and loved Eternity! Thou art my God; to Thee do I sigh day and night. When I first knew Thee, Thou liftedst me up, that
I might see there was that which I might see, and that yet it was I that did see. And Thou didst back the infirmity of my sight, pouring forth upon me most strongly Thy beams of light, and I trembled with love and fear" (Conf. 7:10).

In 7:18 (Confess.) he says that Jesus Christ is the only Mediator, and the one way of safety, "And I sought a way of acquiring strength sufficient to enjoy Thee; but I found it not until I embraced that 'Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus, who is over all, God blessed forever,' calling upon me and saying, 'I am the way, the truth, and the life,' and mingling that food which I was unable to receive with our flesh. For 'the Word was made flesh,' that thy wisdom, by which Thou createdst all things, might provide milk for our infancy." (Also 10:68)

In his Confessions alone Augustine quotes Paul nearly three hundred and fifty times, and his fundamental position on the subjects of sin and grace, as shown by the references given above, and by the whole tone of his Confessions, is Pauline at least to a very great extent. Here we have the individual soul going direct to God the Father through the Mediator Jesus Christ. Here is immediate personal fellowship in which the soul finds its infinite delight—in short Augustine lives the life of direct personal fellowship with God—the life of faith and love. There are no go-betweens here—but the soul and its God stand face to face—and the soul cries "Abba Father." God is man's hope, and his salvation, and this not by works or merits, but by grace. In his practical faith he rests on the Grace of God, not upon merits or any other media whatever. When he wrote, as he so frequently did, as the champion of the Church and its practices, he is

1. See also Solil, I 2:7; VIII, 15; XV 27; and Confess. 2:10, 4:12,13.
the ecclesiastic, and feels that he must have the Authority of the Church to support his faith. So long as Augustine looked within his own personal experience, and was not disturbed by the shouting of heretical and schismatic neighbors, he saw clearly, as Geuter says, "that Christianity is ultimately different from everything called doctrine" (p. 494). This is the great and significant thing in Augustine - The Gospel is not a law, as many held before his time, and after for that matter, but that it was the power of God unto salvation to everyone who believeth. Augustine, as all great Christians in every age, and all ages, knew God - not by hearsay through the Church and her ordinances and priesthood, but for himself as a personal and gracious God. Harnack, speaking of Augustine, says, "The law is doctrine; the Gospel is power. The law produces enlightenment; the gospel peace. This Augustine clearly perceived, and thereby set religion in the sphere of a vital spiritual experience, while he dissociated it from knowledge and inference. He once more, indeed, placed his newly discovered truth on the place of the old; for he was a Catholic Christian; But the connexion with the past which belongs to every effective reformer need not prevent us from exhibiting his originality." (IV. 139). Hear him, "God, the true and crowning Life, in whom and from whom and through whom all things live, which truly and supremely live. God the Blessedness, in whom and from whom and through whom all things are blessed, which anywhere are blessed. . . . God, from whom to be turned away, is to fall; to whom to be turned back, is to rise again: in whom to abide is to stand firm. God, from whom to go forth, is to die: to whom to return is to revive; in whom to have our dwelling, is to live. . . . God, through whom we overcome the enemy. . . . God, through whom death is swallowed up in victory." (Solil I:3). "To Thee I feel I must return: I knock; may Thy door be opened to me;
teach me the way to Thee. Nothing else have I but the will; nothing else do I know than that fleeting and falling things are to be spurned, fixed and everlasting things to be sought. This I do, Father, because this alone I know, but from what quarter to approach Thee I do not know. Do Thou instruct me, show me, give me my provision for the way. If it is by faith those find Thee who take refuge with Thee, then grant faith; if by virtue, virtue; if by knowledge, knowledge. Augment in me faith, hope and charity, O Goodness of Thine, singular and most to be admired" (Solil. 2:5). "Now, having duly considered and weighed all these circumstances and testimonies, we conclude that man is not justified by the precepts of a holy life, but by faith in Jesus Christ, - in a word, not by the law of works, but by the law of faith; not by the letter, but by the spirit; not by the merits of deeds, but by free grace" (On the Spirit and the Letter 1:22). "We, however, on our side affirm that the human will is so divinely aided in the pursuit of righteousness, that (in addition to man's being created with a free will, and in addition to the teaching by which he is instructed how he ought to live) he receives the Holy Ghost, by whom there is formed in his mind a delight in, and a love of, that supreme and unchangeable good which is God, even now while he is still 'walking by faith' and not yet 'by sight'; in order that by this gift to him of the earnest, as it were, of the free gift, he may conceive an ardent desire to cleave to his Maker, and may burn to enter upon the participation in that true light, that it may go well with him from Him to whom he owes his existence. A man's free-will, indeed, avails for nothing except to sin, if he knows not the way of truth, and even after his duty and his proper aim shall begin to become known to him, unless he also take delight in, and feel a love for it, he neither does his duty, nor sets about it, nor lives rightly. Now, in order
that such a course may engage our affections, God's "love is shed abroad in our hearts," not through the free-will which arises from ourselves, but "through the Holy Ghost, which is given to us." (On the Spirit and the Letter I. 5).

Many more instances might be given of the same kind, but we will not multiply quotations, since the above is sufficient to our purpose. One could easily believe that much of the above was spoken by a primitive Christian, even by Paul himself, or by a Protestant of the twentieth century. The great doctrine of the Protestant Reformation stands out here most prominently, and our souls are deeply moved as the mighty spirit of Augustine pours out its faith and hope in God, and its love for Him. Here deep cries unto deep. No ecclesiasticism or sacerdotalism appears, at least on the surface, and were we to stop here we well might call Augustine a Great Protestant Mystic.

The above leads us to suspect that we shall find a corresponding conception of the Church in Augustine's writings, and we are not disappointed. He speaks of the Church often as if there were no such things as sacraments, prelates, canons, organisation, etc.

Harnack (Hist. of Dogma, VI. 64) says that the ancient traditional conception of the Church as being the body and bride of Christ stands in the foreground of Augustine's practical faith. Its proper place is in heaven, not on earth. Its members sojourn here on earth for a time, but this is not their proper home. What is called the Church upon earth is at most but a copy of the true heavenly Church, the true body and bride of Christ. "For the city of the sints is above, although here below it begets citizens, in whom it sojourns until the time of its reign arrives, when it shall gather together all in the day of the resurrection; and then shall the promised kingdom be given to them, in which they shall reign with their Prince, the King of
the Ages, time without end" (City of God XV.1; See also XV.2). This earthly Church of which he speaks as being a copy of the heavenly is united to the heavenly by hope, but to regard the present Church as the Kingdom of God is not to be tolerated; for, he says, "What is left then, but to assert that the kingdom of heaven itself belongs to the temporal life in which we now exist? For why should not blind presumption advance to such a pitch of madness? And what is wilder than that assertion? For although the Church even as it now exists is sometimes called the kingdom of heaven, it is surely so named because of its future and eternal existence." (De Virgin. 24). "The free city of God, that is, the true Jerusalem, eternal in the heavens, whose children are those who live according to God on the earth" (City of God XVII. 3).

A study of that monumental work of the last years of his life, The City of God, leads us a step further into his conception of the Church from the standpoint of his practical faith. Here he finds the beginning of the Church in the earliest ages of the world. This Church (or City of God) in fact began in the Angelic world and ran through a long historical period of development. This history is traced in six periods, namely the Deluge, Abraham, David, the Exile, Christ, and Christ's Second Coming (See Books XIV to XVIII inclusive). Ever since the fall of the angels there have been two cities, the City of God and the City of This World. The City of God is the society in which the law is "the love of God to the contempt of self." (Bk. 14:28) Its supreme desire is the peace of heaven. "In truth these two cities are entangled together in this world, and intermixed until the last judgment effect their separation. (City of God 1:35)."

1. For the above statements see City of God I.46; X.32; XVIII.49; XX.9.
Christianity is as old as the world; the Word (Christ) has always been at work and did not merely begin to save men at the incarnation. This City of God includes all believers, past, present, and to be. "For the souls of the pious dead are not separated from the Church which even now is the Kingdom of Christ. . . . For why are these things practiced, if not because the faithful, even though dead, are His members." . . The Church, then, begins its reign with Christ now in the living and in the dead. For as the Apostle says, "Christ died that He might be Lord both of the living and the dead." But he mentioned the souls of the martyrs only, because they who have contended even to death for the truth, themselves principally reign after death; but, taking the part for the whole, we understand the words of all others who belong to the Church, which is the kingdom of Christ." (City of God 20:9). In 18:47 he says that that "holy and wonderful man Job" is certainly of this spiritual company.

This conception of the Church as having its origin in the angelic world, and having passed through long periods of development from the first man to the present, even to the Second Coming of Christ, is peculiar in this, that it gives quite a secondary place to the historic Christ. The Word had been present from the beginning and all who accepted Him and believed on Him were saved wherever and whoever they might be, but this nevertheless minimizes the Incarnation and the historic Christ.

But in the last quotation (City of God 18:47) given above there is a suggestion of a more primitive conception of the Church. "Consequently where both classes exist, it is the Church as it now is, but where only the one shall exist, it is the Church as it is destined to

1. Eph. 102:12.
be where no wicked person shall be in her, . . and yet, though the tares grow in the Church along with the wheat, they do not reign with Him. For they reign with Him who do what the Apostle says, "If ye be risen with Christ, mind the things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God. Seek those things which are above, not the things which are on the earth." Of such persons he also says that their conversation is in heaven. In fine, they reign with Him Who are so in His kingdom that they themselves are His kingdom." (City of God 20:9).

It is most important that we determine if we may what view of the Church is set forth in this monumental work, The City of God. The question of whether or not he identifies the Empirical Catholic Church and the Kingdom of God must be answered. It is undeniable that Augustine identified the Church and the Kingdom (or City) of God; but this leads to the inquiry as to the content of the two terms. It should excite no question to state that Augustine when speaking of the Empirical Catholic Church would of course apply to it the terms so long in use, i. e. the Kingdom of God; but it by no means follows that because he used this term he meant the mixed body governed by the bishops. According to Augustine, the true (Charismatic) Church was included in this organized ecclesiastical society, and hence the Church was actually the Kingdom (or City) of God. When Augustine, in the City of God, speaks of the Kingdom (or City) of God as the Church, or vice versa, the concept in his mind is that of the true or Charismatic body, not the Church as composed of wheat and tares—in short, he does not mean the mixed body of the external organization, but rather the elect. One is, however, to be pardoned if he insists upon the opposite view which is certainly possible. It must be taken into consideration that the Church as governed by the bishops was an accepted
fact - that when one said Church, to the great mass of men it meant the Church governed by the bishops. The authority and power of the bishop was not in question, even in the Donatist controversy - Episcopacy, and the Catholic Church were accepted facts disputed by neither party. Then, besides, in this great work Augustine constantly places the State, or the Kingdom of the devil over against the Church as the Kingdom of God. It is no surprise that the Roman Church has interpreted Augustine to mean that the Church governed by the bishops is the City of God, and all outside the same are not of that kingdom. But in actual fact, it seems clear enough when all of Augustine's teaching bearing on this subject, especially in his practical writings and in the "City of God," are brought together, and all his teachings are read in the light of his mighty Christian spirit, the conclusion seems inevitable that by the state he meant the whole community or society of evil men and demons, i.e. the reprobate among men, and demons - and by the Kingdom (or City) of God he meant, as Harnack says, "the heavenly communion of all saints of all times, comprising the Angels." Harnack adds - speaking of the citizens of the two kingdoms - "yet he held that the former found their earthly historical form of expression and manifestation in the secular State, the latter in the empirical Church; for there were by no means two cities, kingdoms, temples, or houses of God. Accordingly the Kingdom of God is the Church." (Vol. V, p. 142, Hist. of Dogma.)

It may as well be added here as anywhere, that Augustine in this same work, Book 20:9 ff., holds that the present period, i.e., the historical Church is the millenial kingdom of Christ as announced by Revelation. At this point (Bk. 20) in the City of God it becomes quite evident that the true Church, or City of God is not the Church governed by the bishops. The Church governed by the bishops is a
mixed body of wheat and tares, but the tares do not reign with Christ; but the saints alone reign with Him; and these, and these alone constitute the kingdom (or City) of God. Augustine, however, by his teaching here, laid the foundations for the later papal claim of temporal supremacy, and whether or not he had any hierarchical or sacerdotal interest, his arguments here have been used ever since to support the same. It is unfair to Augustine, however, to so interpret him, as this was not his dominant purpose or teaching.

"From the beginning of the human race, whosoever believed on Him, and in any way knew Him, and lived in a pious and just manner according to His precepts, was undoubtedly saved by Him in whatsoever time and place he may have lived" (Ep. 102:12). "Nor are they to be thought to be in the body of Christ, which is the Church, because they become corporeally participants in its sacraments . . . they are not in the union of the Church, which, in the members of Christ, grows through connection and contact to the increase of God." (And. to Letters of Petelian). In the Unity of the Church (21, 60) and in On Baptism (7:51,99) he tells us that the saints are the unspotted bride of Christ, his dove, and the house of God, the rock upon which the Lord builds His Church, the Church which possesses the power to loose and bind. "Certainly it is clear that, when we speak of within and without in relation to the Church, it is the position of the heart that we must consider, not that of the body, since all who are within in heart are saved in the unity of the ark through the same water, through which all who are in heart without, whether they are also in body without or not, die as enemies of unity" (On Baptism 5:28-39).

Here we find a conception of the Church as the communion of saints, and in one of the strongest of his controversial writings, besides, which renders it doubly significant. Again and again this
conception of the Church is set forth by Augustine. For at such times he seems to lose sight altogether of the empirical Catholic Church with its priests, sacraments and ceremonies. The true Church is, then, in a great number of passages scattered all through his voluminous writings the society of holy - the community of the saints - and the Church is wherever these or any number of the same are gathered together. In fact, he expressly says, as quoted above, that the saints are Christ's Kingdom. They are His Kingdom, His City, His body, His house, His temple. Harnack says (History of Dogma, V, 165), "Grace on the one hand, faith, love, and hope on the other, constitute accordingly the notion of the Church." Or briefly: "the Church which is on earth exists by the remission of sins," or still more certainly, "the Church exists in love." The Church then is the communion of the Spiritual in all ages, past, present, and to come, and its law is love; in fact "the Church exists in love."

Furthermore in The City of God 20:10 he seems to teach the priesthood of all believers. "To the words, 'In them the second death hath no power,' are added the words, 'that they shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years;' and this refers not to the bishops alone, and presbyters, who are now specially called priests in the Church; but as we call all believers Christians on account of the nuptical Chrism, so we call all priests because they are members of the one Priest. Of them the Apostle Peter says, 'A holy people, a royal priesthood.'" (City of God 20:10).

3. AUGUSTINE'S CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH FROM THE STANDPOINT OF HIS CHURCHMANSHIP.

But this is far from being all that Augustine had to say and teach concerning the Church. From the Protestant standpoint, however, it is a very significant element, in fact it is the dominant conception
in his writings. The great Protesters of the Reformation era were profoundly influenced by Augustine's conception of Justification by faith, and the Church as the communion of Saints. But this mighty man of God was also a man of his times, a member of the empirical Catholic Church, yes, a bishop in the same. This saint who was so much of the primitive and modern Protestant Christian was also an ecclesiastic, and often wrote as such. It becomes our task, now, to set forth briefly his ecclesiasticism, and to seek to discover how much of a sacerdotalist he was: in short we seek now the conception of the Church as held by Augustine the Catholic Churchman.

The chief source for this study is, of course, the Anti-Donatist writings; although something of the same element is found in his other writings, as his Anti-Pelagian writings and letters. In dealing with the Donatists, Augustine says that the question at issue is "Where is the Church, whether among us, or among them?"

For a better understanding of Augustine's position in opposition to the Donatists, it may be well to state the position of the Donatists briefly. The Catholics and Donatists were at one on practically every point of doctrine and practice save one rather important point, that is to say, it was important from the standpoint of that to which it led. The Donatists held that bishops must be holy men, and that the sacraments are not valid unless administered by holy bishops. At this point they had the authority of one of the most venerated of the Church fathers, Cyprian, who held that there is no efficacy in the sacrifices of wicked or heretic priests. The Donatists not only demanded holiness of the bishop, but also of the laity. They contended that because of the holiness of their bishops and people they were the only true Catholic Church: the term Catholic to be understood to mean, "not the fellowship of the whole world, but from the observance of all
the divine commandments and of all the sacraments (Aug. Ep. 93:7,23). That the Church may be holy and remain so, all its members are to avoid association with all who are outside this true Church.

In previous chapters something of the significance of heresy and schism for the doctrine of the Church has become apparent. Cyprian was profoundly influenced in his teaching concerning the Church by the Novation schism, and now Augustine, a century and a half later is also greatly influenced by Donatism, another schism.

At the first glance the contention of the Donatists might seem reasonable and innocent enough, but in reality there was dynamite enough in these ideas to blow up the whole Catholic structure as it then stood. If holiness is to be an attribute of persons only, what is to become of the "Christian character of the Church as Catholic?" It would destroy it, and this the Catholics saw. Holiness must be an attribute of the institution, that is, of the office and mysteries of the Church. Donatism stimulated, or rather compelled the Church to take this final step in the long journey of the secularization of the Church. With Augustine the Church took this step, and in this step Catholicism was at last completed. Thus the Church is holy, but not because of its holy ministers and members, but because it possesses the means, in its sacraments and the Word, of sanctifying its individual members. He says, "Nor is it material when we are considering the question of the genuineness of the sacraments "what the recipient of the sacrament believes, and with what faith he is imbued." It is of the very highest consequence as regards the entrance into salvation, but is wholly immaterial as regards the question of the sacrament. For it is quite possible that a man may be possessed of the genuine sacrament and a corrupted faith." (On Baptism, Against the Donatists, III:14). Again, "Wherefore it is manifest that it is possible that,
with defective faith, the sacrament of baptism may yet remain without defect in any man; and therefore all that is said about the divinity of the several heretics is beside the question." (On Bap. III:14-19). (See also Ch. 15.) "So far as I can see, the case is already clear and evident, that in the question of baptism we have to consider, not who gives, but what he gives; not who receives, but what he receives; not who has, but what he has." (On Baptism IV:10). "The divine sacraments and utterances are not to be attributed to men." (Ibid., IV:11) "The baptism of Christ can not be rendered void by any perversity on the part of man, whether administering or receiving it." (Ibid., VI:1) These and many other statements of Augustine's show conclusively that he held that baptism confers an indelible character upon the recipient and that the character of the administrator does not enter at all into consideration in the question of the validity of the sacrament. It is of God and makes its own impress regardless of the recipient and the administrator.

This is also true of ordination. "As the baptized person, if he depart from the unity of the Church, does not thereby lose the sacrament of baptism, so also he who is ordained, if he depart from the unity of the Church, does not lose the sacrament of conferring baptism." (On Baptism, I:1) These two sacraments, however, are the only ones impressing an indelible stamp upon the recipient independent of the Church. The Lord's Supper apart from the cooperation of the Catholic Church impressed no such stamp (Sermo. 57:7).

It must not be concluded from the above, however, that this was all Augustine taught concerning the sacraments; for such is not the case. It would be nearer the truth, perhaps, to say that if the schismatic Donatists had never taught re-baptism and re-ordination, Augustine would not have brought forward this teaching. This is of course
mere speculation, but the fact is that only in his controversial writings does he emphasize this characteristic of baptism and ordination. Augustine had a very embarrassing problem to deal with, and he never succeeded in extricating himself. His problem was to vindicate the real objectivity of the sacraments as efficacious apart from men, and at the same time to retain them as the exclusive property of the Catholic Church; he must not completely externalize them on the one hand, nor must he confine them too strictly to the Church on the other. Augustine is not to be envied. The sacraments are only efficacious in the Church, but they are also efficacious outside the Church. The second position was absolutely necessary if he is not to advocate re-baptism and re-ordination, but this is just what Augustine did not wish to do, in fact this is just what he was refuting. On the other hand, should he give up the first proposition, the Church as necessary to the sacraments, or as the communion of the sacraments must be sacrificed - but this is just what Augustine did not want to do. Growing out of his problem another difficulty confronted Augustine, and equally embarrassing with the first, viz. if the sacraments are efficacious apart from the men who administer or receive them, how shall he escape the seemingly inevitable conclusion that the sacraments are mere magic and equally efficacious apart from faith and the Christian religion, and consequently also the Church. If he gives up the contention that they are efficacious apart from any human disposition, he becomes at once one with the Donatists, and this is just what Augustine does not wish to do; but if he lets go of the view that they are inseparable from the Church, he runs inevitably to the conclusion that they are magic and may be efficacious entirely apart from the Church, faith, or Christiarily. With the immediate neighborhood so full of horns, it is too much to expect Augustine to escape them all; and a study of
his works verifies our worst fears - he was terribly gored.

While Augustine has written voluminously on the question of the sacraments, yet out of it all comes no clear-cut well-defined doctrine of the sacraments. He did not even clearly define the number, to say nothing about any clear doctrine of the sacraments. His view seems to be somewhat as follows. To begin with, he assumed "A two-fold efficacy of the sacraments. These were (1) an indelible marking of every recipient which took place wherever the sacrament was administered, no matter by whom, and (2) an administration of grace, in which the believer participated only in the union of the Catholic Church. According to this he could teach that: the sacraments belong exclusively to the Catholic Church, and only in it bestow grace on faith; but they can be purloined from that Church, since, "being holy in themselves," they primarily produce an effect which depends solely on the Word and sign (the impression of an indelible "stamp"), and not on a human factor. Heretics have stolen it, and administered it validly in their associations." (Harnack, Hist. of Dogma, V, 151-158).

But what bearing has this discussion of the sacraments upon Augustine's conception of the Church? It shows this at least, that Augustine has gone entirely away from the Primitive Church in his view of the Church. It is, according to him a Holy Church as with the primitive Christians, but holy from an entirely different point of view. To the primitive Christian the Church was holy because composed of holy individuals, but now Augustine transposes the attribute of holiness from the individuals, i.e. from persons, and attaches it to institutions, i.e. the Church is holy because it possesses the means in the sacraments and Word of making persons holy. Whether Augustine had any sacerdotal interest here or not may well be questioned; it is quite probable that he had no such interest here, but later these seed
thoughts did develop sacerdotally, and the Roman Catholic doctrine of
the sacraments goes back to Augustine.

Of the several marks of the Church unity was the most important,
consequently to break the unity of the Church was correspondingly
great crime. "If the surrendering of the sacred books to destruction
is a crime which, in the case of the king who burned the book of Jere-
miah, God punished with death as a prisoner of war, how much greater
is the guilt of schism!" (Ep. 76:4). In this same letter he makes it
very clear that in his judgment, to cut one's self off from the Cath-
olic Church is to be cut off from the Christian world. This unity is
due to the Holy Spirit which is only in the Catholic Church, and con-
sequently can be received nowhere else. This being true, love can not
be found outside the Church, because the Holy Spirit is the sole source
of love. Of the three Christian graces, faith and hope can to a cer-
tain degree exist independently of the Church, but not so love. Sin-
ners can, consequently be purified nowhere else than in the Church.
The Church is the bride of Christ, yes it is His body. The Church is
Christ (De Unit. Eccl. 7), so those who are in the Church are the mem-
bers of Christ, and those outside are not so related to Him. All he-
retics and schismatics are outside the unity of the Church and hence
beyond the field of operation of the Holy Spirit. The inevitable con-
sequence of this view is that there is no salvation outside the Church
which has its essential unity in love. Thus the Catholic Church is a
necessary institution, for only through it God truly works.

Next to the unity of the Church as an external evidence of its
truth, Augustine places Catholicity. By this he means not the spirit
of the Church, but its extent. The fact of its extension over the
world proves its truth. "The Church can only exist where it proves
its Catholicity by union with Rome and the ancient Oriental Churches,
with the communities of the whole globe." (Harnack, Hist. of Dogma, V 149).

The Church is also apostolic. This is shown in the fact that the Catholic Church can trace its descent back to the Apostles, and the Apostolic communities: Besides it possesses the Apostolic writings and doctrines. It is then in direct descent from the Apostles. Augustine, however, does not place so much emphasis upon Apostolic succession: in fact in the City of God 20:10 Augustine teaches the universal priesthood of believers - "But they shall be priests of God and Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years:" and this refers not to the bishops alone, and presbyters, who are now specially called priests in the Church; but as we call all believers Christians on account of the mystical Chrism, so we call all priests because they are members of the one Priest. Of them the Apostle Peter says, 'A holy people, a royal priesthood.'" It must not, however, be concluded from this statement of Augustine's that he would hold the priesthood of believers in the Lutheran or Modern Protestant sense, for such is not the fact. It has already been shown that he held that ordination impressed a peculiar and indelible stamp upon all who receive it; and that he accepted without question the then existing distinction between the clergy and laity, although not insisting upon the same. This may be accounted for, however, by the fact that the distinction was generally accepted, and that none were disputing it. All Apostolic communities are very important, wherever they may be geographically, but the most important community is Rome, and consequently the most important bishop in all the Church is the bishop of Rome. The Roman bishop, however, is not a bishop of bishops, but rather a first among equals. As to the position of Peter and the Roman primacy, he is practically at one with Cyprian, so it is not neces-
sary to go into that discussion again. This much may be said, a council is superior to the Roman bishop. He contended for the infallibility of the Catholic Church; but does not seem to hold that the bishop of Rome is infallible. Here as so often in Augustine, there are so many self-contradictions that only a hold man dare assert with much confidence just what Augustine did believe, but the above is probably near the truth.

4. AUGUSTINE'S CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH FROM THE STANDPOINT OF HIS DOCTRINE OF ELECTION AND GRACE.

Augustine taught unconditional predestination, absolute inability, and irresistible grace. Because of His eternal unconditional decrees, God knows just what each individual of the race shall do, and from eternity knows his destiny. Men are absolutely unable to help themselves since the fall of Adam, and are corrupt through and through. All were in Adam and fell with his fall, and having been present in Adam are justly condemned to eternal death. No one can complain if he be condemned by God to eternal torment; for such is the logical and just end of all men. But God arbitrarily elects certain men to be saved, but in so doing he does none any injustice whatever. Those so elected shall be saved irresistibly - salvation then depends upon God's inscrutable election, and upon that alone. The real, true Church then is the number of the elect. The elect do not, as we saw in our brief study of the City of God, necessarily belong to the empirical Catholic Church. There were "elect" long centuries before the Incarnation and the beginning of the Catholic Church. He makes no question but that Job was one such. But not only have there been elect who never were Catholics, but there are now elect who are not yet Catholics. He would have us understand that there are those in the empirical Catholic
Church who are not among the elect, while on the other hand there are elect souls who have no affiliation with the Catholic Church (On Baptism V, 38). Yet Augustine the Catholic shied somewhat at his own construction at this point, and gave out that it was his conviction that practically all the elect were included within the Catholic Church at present. Yet Augustine’s conception of God never allowed Augustine the practical Christian to bind His action by any mechanical means, or to shut Him up for long in any institution. At this point Harnack and Reuter agree, as the following sentence from Harnack shows: "He" (Augustine) "never did maintain that predestination was realized by means of the Church and its communication of grace" (Hist. of Dogma, V, 167). This view, however, is destructive of all sacerdotalism. The empirical Catholic Church, i.e. the Church as governed by the bishops, is destroyed and all other conceptions of the Church except it be the view given above as being the dominant one in the City of God. Augustine, however, never drew this conclusion which is inevitable from his position, prevented, perhaps, by the fact that with all his vision he was still a Catholic Christian - to a great extent, a man of his time.

5. CONCLUSIONS.

That there is much of confusion and self-contradiction in Augustine’s conception of the Church has become very evident. That there are irreconcilible elements needs no further discussion to demonstrate. He failed splendidly to identify the empirical Catholic Church with the kingdom of God. He insists with all the power of his tremendous personality on the unity of the Church, and its holiness, and it seems at times he must mean that the Church as governed by the bishops is in actual fact the kingdom of God, and specially so when he insists upon
the sacraments as impressing an indelible stamp, i.e. baptism and ordination. It has become evident in this study that he insists that there is no salvation outside the Church because the Holy Spirit and hence love, the necessity for salvation, is confined to the Church. There is much of the ecclesiastic and something of the sacerdotalist in him, especially in his controversial writings. But what is the dominant view of Augustine relative to the Church? He was determined that there should be but one Church, one body, one bride of Christ, one kingdom of God. But the Church as governed by the bishops certainly was not the bride and body of Christ, but a mixed body. None but believers should belong to the true Church—perhaps we might say the elect. But what becomes of the visible Church on this conception of the Church? Can it be any longer visible, but rather does it not become invisible? It is still visible, he would answer, in the sacraments, but this Church visible in the sacraments is not the bride and body of Christ, is not the Kingdom of God. Yet, notwithstanding, the Church is holy, not because it is composed of holy individuals, but because in the sacraments and the Word it has the means of making holy. These sacraments, however, can not be depended upon. While outside the Church they make their indelible mark upon the recipient, they can not there be efficacious for salvation. Not only so, but even when used by the Church correctly, there can be no assurance that they will be efficacious for salvation. In no case can they be depended upon. An individual may be within the Catholic or visible Church, and use every means offered by the Church, and still have no assurance of salvation. Within the empirical Church there is a circle of the wicked and reprobate, but there is also the true Church, the believers, who are also a circle within the Catholic Church. Thus the Church is three things, the visible society in which the sacraments are properly
administered, it is also a mixed body made up of believers and the wicked, again it is the body and bride of Christ, the body of true believers, or the elect, i.e., the Church invisible whatever the exact content of this conception may be. But just what is the invisible Church? How is it to be conceived? One thing is certain, Augustine clearly distinguishes between the Church visible and the Church invisible, or it may be said, he distinguishes between the Church of the bishops and sacraments, and the Chaesatic Church, and that the latter is the true body and bride of Christ, the kingdom of God; while the former is a mixed body, made up of both wheat and tares. Harnack tells us that from the standpoint of Augustine's practical faith the Church is the body and bride of Christ, and consequently a heavenly society. He says, "what the Church is, it cannot at all be on earth; it possesses its truth, its seat, in heaven." (Hist. Dogma, V, 164). That which we call the Church on earth is but a copy of the true Church in heaven, and is united to the heavenly Church by hope. In On Virgin. 24, Augustine says, "What is left them but to assert that the kingdom of heaven itself belongs to the temporal life in which we now exist? For why should not blind presumption advance to such a pitch of madness? And what is wilder than that assertion? For although the Church even as it now exists is sometimes called the kingdom of heaven, it is surely so named because of its future and eternal existence."

Along with this conception must be placed the view set forth in his City of God, and briefly outlined above. Here the Church is not necessarily included within the empirical Church, but has existed from the beginning and comprises the believing and the angels. It existed ages before the Incarnation. This is the society of men of all ages who have lived or do live according to "the love of God to the con-
tempt of self." Such men as Job and the patriarchs are numbered with the membership of this Church. Today the believers may not be all within the Catholic Church, in the past they certainly were not. The secondary place given both the Incarnation and the sacraments is almost startling at this point. But after all is said, is this view so very different from the one just given? In fact they are not two different views, but different faces of one and the same thing. The true Church is the heavenly embracing all believers, past, present and to be, but all have been or are sojourners in this earthly land for a time. That in all ages of the world this Church has existed, and that there have always been those who truly belonged to the same.

But Augustine says that the Church which exists on earth exists by the remission of sins, or to put it in another way, "the Church exists in love." This view has been already discussed. Harnack (History of Dogma. V 145, n) says that this conception "constitutes the core of Augustine's doctrine of the Church." The essential unity of the Church consists in love, for there can be no unity without it, and consequently no Church. Faith and hope are possible to a certain extent outside of the Church, but love, without which there is no salvation, can exist only within the Church where alone the Holy Spirit dwells, and all love finds its source in the Holy Spirit. Here we find a teaching that certainly is akin to if not identical with that of the Communion of Saints, or the Community of the Saints. If Harnack is correct, as he seems to be, the very heart of Augustine's teaching concerning the Church is found in this, that the Church is the Community of the Saints, and is wherever the Communion of such persons is found (Harnack, Hist. Dog. V 165). Harnack concludes the paragraph as follows: "They are Christ's body, the house, temple, or city
of God. Grace on the one hand, faith, love and hope on the other, constitute accordingly the notion of the Church. Or, briefly: "the Church which is on earth exists by the remission of sins," or still more certainly, "the Church exists in love." In any number of expositions Augustine ignores every idea of the Church except this, which leads him to think of a Spiritual Communion alone." (V, 165). This view is not uncongenial to the two just mentioned, in fact may be a component part of a congruous whole. The Kingdom of heaven, according to this view, may well enough be a heavenly society, part of which are sojourning on the earth now, and all have at some period, in the ages gone, and that all these found love and hence unity through the Holy Spirit. In all of these he absolutely ignores the visible Church of the Sacraments, and sees only the invisible or Charismatic Church.

One other conception of the Church was noted above, viz. the Church is the number of the elect. This we noted is destructive absolutely of all external sacramental or sacerdotal devices of any or all kinds. God, according to Augustine is too big to be confined with any artificial limits, and elects whom He will to believe and to salvation. Not, this view may be made to harmonize with the three just given. It need only be added that this heavenly society recruited through all ages, and finding its unity and salvation in the gift of love by the Holy Ghost, has been and is composed of those elected by the eternal decrees of God to just that thing.

In what sense then is the Church the Kingdom of God? The empirical Catholic Church is not identical with the Kingdom (or City) of God, but the Church or body of believers in all ages of the world ruled by the Holy Spirit is identical with the Kingdom of God. The empirical Church has a place as a means to an end, i. e. it is the mechanism by which believers are gathered together, but can not be
called the Kingdom of God. The Church then, or Kingdom (or City) of God is not the empirical Catholic Church, the Society ruled by the bishops, but it is that heavenly communion of the saints of all ages in love, ruled by the Holy Spirit, it is Christ and those who reign with Him. This is not the only, but it is the dominant conception of the Church according to Augustine.
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LUTHER

Luther in his exposition of the Creed says, "The Creed calls the holy Christian Church Communionem Sanctorium, a communion (Gemeinschaft) of saints, for both mean one and the same thing. But formerly the latter phrase was not added, and it has been ill and incorrectly translated a communion (Gemeinschaft) of saints. In order to explain it clearly a different expression must be used in German, for the word ecclesia signifies no more than an assembly. Now we are accustomed to use the little word Church otherwise, and simple folk take it to mean, not the assembled congregation, but the consecrated house or building; although the building should not be called Church unless because of the congregation assembled there. For we who assemble make or take a special place for ourselves, and give the house the name of the congregation.

"So the word Church really signifies nothing but a congregation, and is a word of Greek origin (like the word ecclesia), for in their language they call it Kyria, and in Latin it is called Curia. Therefore in good German and our mother tongue it should be translated a Christian community (Gemeine) or congregation, or best of all and most clearly, a holy christendom. So likewise the word Communis, which is attached to it, should not be translated communion (Gemeinschaft), but community (Gemeine). It is merely a definition or explanation to indicate what the Christian Church is. But those who did not know Latin or German turned it into communion (Gemeinschaft) of saints; although no German would use such an expression or understand it. But to speak plain German, we ought to say a community (Gemeine) of saints, that is a community consisting only of saints,
or, better still, a holy community.

"Accordingly the simple meaning of the clause is: I believe there is a small holy flock or community on earth, consisting of holy persons, only, under one Head, Christ, called together by the Holy Spirit in one faith and understanding; possessing many gifts; but one in love, without sect or schism. Of it I too form a part, and am a member, a sharer and participator in all its blessings, through the Holy Spirit, called thereto and incorporated with it because I have heard I believe in God's Word, which is the first step towards entering it. For before we did so we were the devil's, and knew nothing of God and of Christ. So the Holy Spirit will abide with the community, that is, with Christendom, till the last day, to explain the Word by which He makes and increases this holiness so that it may increase daily, and we may become strong in faith and the fruits it brings forth." (The Greater Catechism, the Creed, Quoted from "Luther's Primary Works," Wace and Buchheim, pp. 103-104.)

"And hence there was no Christian church, for where Christ is not preached, there is no Holy Spirit to form the Christian Church, to call and gather it together, without which none can come to the Lord." (ibid p.102).

"But not to fight then with our own words, we will quote the Scriptures. StPaul says,"If anything be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace" (I Cor. 14:30). What would be the use of this commandment if we were to believe him alone that teaches, or has the highest seat? Therefore it is a wickedly devised fable—and they cannot quote a single letter to prove it—that it is for the Pope alone to interpret the Scriptures or to confirm the interpretation of them. They have assumed the autho-
and that it will result in any improvements on the health, education, and welfare of the students. However, it is important to note that these benefits are not without cost. The implementation of the new policies is expected to require significant financial resources, as well as changes to existing structures and procedures. It is hoped that these investments will yield long-term dividends in the form of improved outcomes for students. Nonetheless, it is essential to carefully consider the trade-offs and ensure that every dollar is spent wisely. In summary, the proposed changes represent a comprehensive approach to enhancing the educational experience, but they also come with associated costs and challenges. It is crucial to proceed with caution and be prepared to address any unforeseen consequences.
ity of their own selves. Although they say that this authority was given to St. Peter when the keys were given to him, it is plain enough that the keys were not given to St. Peter alone, but to the whole community. Besides, the keys were not ordained for doctrine or authority, but for sin, to bind or loose; and what they claim besides this from the keys is mere invention." (Add. to Nob. Wace and Buchheim, p. 170.)

"Moreover, if the article of our faith is right, 'I believe in the Holy Christian Church', the Pope cannot alone be right: else we must say, 'I believe in the Pope of Rome', and reduce the Christian Church to one man, which is a devilish and damnable heresy. Besides that we are all priests, as I have said, and have all one faith, one Gospel, one Sacrament." (Address to the Christian Nob. - German Nation, Wace and Buchheim, p. 171.)

Luther here clearly distinguishes between the true Christian Church and any organization or any number of organizations in which the true church may be embodied. The unity of the church he finds not in a pope, a hierarchy, or any visible organism whatever, but in oneness of faith in the great Head, Jesus Christ. The religious idea of the church in Luther excludes the legal conception, and the church becomes the community of holy believers in Christ. The church is a spiritual community or communion having a Spiritual Head. It is no visible community but invisible. It is not invisible, however, in the sense that it has no manifestation in the world, for this it certainly has, but it is invisible in that it is spiritual, constituted by holiness and faith in God through Jesus Christ.

The above is in general terms Luther's conception of the Christian Church, but in order to better understand his conception, it be-
comes necessary to examine his teachings more closely, and more in detail: for his conception of the church in large measure rests on other fundamental ideas or doctrines.

His doctrine of salvation is very significant. Sinners are saved by faith, and not by works. The Christian sacraments, Gospel, priesthood, everything is powerless to help, salvation is a matter between the individual and God, and is possible only as the individual has faith in God: not faith in the intellectual sense merely, but rather in the Pauline meaning. That is to say salvation is through absolute confidence in the forgiving love of God. This faith, however, is not possible except through a knowledge of the redeeming love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. The Gospel thus becomes a necessity for salvation, but the Gospel given, the one condition then laid down is faith, or confidence in God's forgiving love. This of course relieves the priesthood and the hierarchy of any responsibility in the matter. The church can no longer be a sacramental institution dispensing or withholding God's grace as it will, and the only channel through which God's grace reaches men. The doctrine that God is locked up in a hierarchal and sacerdotal organization is no longer possible with such a conception of salvation. A few references will suffice, for this doctrine appears everywhere in Luther's writings.

"From these considerations anyone may clearly see how a Christian man is free from all things; so that he needs no works in order to be justified and saved, but receives these gifts in abundance from faith alone. Nay, were he so foolish as to pretend to be justified, set free, saved, and made a Christian, by means of any good works, he would immediately lose faith with all its benefits." (Concerning Christian Liberty, Wace and Buchheim, p. 269). "We conclude therefore that a
Christian man does not live in himself, but in Christ and in his neighbor, or else is no Christian: in Christ by faith, in his neighbor by love". - (ibid p. 287). "This much concerning liberty, which, as you see, is a true and a spiritual liberty, making our hearts free from all sins, laws and commandments, as Paul says, 'The law is not made for a righteous man' (I Tim. 1:9), and one which surpasses all other liberties, as far as heaven is above the earth." (ibid 287). "It is not from works that we are set free by Christ, but from the belief in works, that is from foolishly presuming to seek justification through works. Faith redeems our consciences, makes them upright, and preserves them, since by it we recognize the truth that justification does not depend upon our works, although good works neither can nor ought to be absent, just as we cannot exist without food and drink and all the functions of this mortal body. Still it is not on them that our justification is based but on faith." (ibid p.288). Thus the church is not a saving institution, and something existing wholly apart from any reference to the laity, a something composed of the clergy alone. That is to say Luther rejected the papal conception of salvation and with it the papal conception of the church.

Luther's doctrine of the priesthood of all believers was most revolutionary. There is no special priestly class in the church, but all are equally priests. True, for the sake of order and decency, certain are set apart to perform the functions of ministers, but they possess in no sense special priestly prerogatives. There is no class standing between the great mass of believers and God, and acting as a medium of communication between men and God. "Hence all we who believe on Christ are kings and priests in Christ, as it is said, 'Ye
are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a pecu-
lar people, that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath
called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." (I Peter 2:9)
(Liberty of Christian Man, Wace and Buchheim, p. 267). "Nor are we
only kings and the freest of all men, but also priests forever, a dig-
nity far higher than kingship, because by that priesthood we are wor-
thy to appear before God, to pray for others, and to teach one another
mutually the things which are of God." (ibid., p. 268) "By what char-
acter are those whom we now call priests to be distinguished from the
laity? I reply, By the use of these words, "priest," "clergy," "spir-
itual person," "ecclesiastic," an injustice has been done, since they
have been transferred from the remaining body of Christians to those
few who are now, by a hurtful custom, called ecclesiastics. For Holy
Scripture makes no distinction between them, except that those who
are now boastfully called popes, bishops, and lords, it calls min-
isters, servants and stewards, who are to serve the rest in the min-
esty of the word, for teaching the faith of Christ and the liberty of
believers. For though it is true that we are all equally priests,
yet we cannot, nor, if we could, ought we all to, minister and teach
publicly." (ibid. p. 270). Very much more might be quoted to support
the claim, if such were needed, but since nobody doubts for a moment
that this was one of the central conceptions of Luther, further space
need not be occupied.

Yet in Luther the church is a means of salvation, yes, an indis-
pensable means of salvation. And strange as it may seem at first,
this view is in entire accord with his doctrine of salvation. He does
not in the least mean this in the papist sense. He teaches in his
Larger Catechism that the Holy . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Spihif'has a special community in the world, which is the mother that conceives and bears every Christian by the word of God." "Whoever would find Christ must first find the church. How should one know where Christ and His faith are, so long as one does not know where His believers are? He who would know something about Christ must no trust himself, or build bridges into heaven by his own reason, but must go to the church, visit and make inquiry of it. The church is not wood and stone but the mass of the people who believe in Christ. To them one must turn and see how they believe, live and teach who certainly have Christ with them. For outside of the Christian Church is no truth, no Christ, no salvation." (Works - 2nd Erlangen Ed. - X, 162.) At first glance this looks much like a fragment from Augustine, or even Aquinas, but upon reflection it is seen that Luther has in mind no institution, no legal organism. What Luther here means to say does not violate our Protestant sense after all. It amounts to this, that men are saved only as they have the Gospel preached to them, and that, since believers are the church, wherever the Gospel is preached the church as a matter of necessity is present. He says, "An hence there was no Christian Church, for where Christ is not preached there is no Holy Spirit to form the Christian Church, to call and gather it together, without which none can come to the Lord" (The Greater Catechism, Wace and Buchheim, p,103). Thus the church appears as a necessity for salvation, but only as a necessary agent - an agent through which the Gospel of Jesus Christ is given to men, and not in the Romanist sense. While it is just as truly a means of salvation as in the Roman conception, there is a vast difference between them, which difference is fundamental and irreconcilable. In Luther's view the church is necessary because it carries the saving Gospel of
Christ, in the Romish view the church is necessary to salvation because the church is the one only carrier of grace from God to man. A difference as wide as the poles. When Luther says church he means a far different thing also, from the concept of the papists, as we have already shown. With Luther the thing deepest down is God's revelation of Himself to men through Jesus Christ. This good news, through the Holy Spirit, creates the church, i.e. the community of believers.

We said above that Luther did not identify the church which is necessary to salvation with any ecclesiastical organisation whatever. He says, "Now Christ says that not alone in the church is there forgiveness of sins, but that where two or three are gathered together in His name they shall have the right and the liberty to proclaim and promise to each other comfort and forgiveness of sins. . . . So that not alone in the congregation may they find forgiveness of sins, but also at home in the house, in the field, in the garden; wherever one meets another there he may find comfort and rescue."

"When I lay my troubles before my neighbor and ask him for comfort, whatever comfort he gives and promises me, that will God in heaven ratify."(Works, Vol.44, p.108). Here we find also his favorite doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. It thus becomes very clear that there is no room for any special priestly class, nor for any Roman Catholic sacerdotalism or ecclesiasticism here. The word of God is the deepest thing in Luther's thought, and the church is an agent necessary to bring the Gospel to men that they through faith in the Son of God might be saved.

It might be well to ask in passing how Luther conceived the Kingdom of God, and the relation of the church to the same. In our study
of the Primitive Church it was seen that the Kingdom of God there was conceived in great measure as future. The early Christians looked forward to the coming of the kingdom. The church's chief concern was to prepare men for citizenship in this future kingdom. But not so Luther - the Kingdom of God to him is the reign of Christ in the lives of men. It is established by the preaching of the Gospel, and wherever there is faith in Christ there is the kingdom. Thus it is evidently one and the same with the true Christian Church. Luther does not confine it to the present life and men, but asserts that it extends to the heavenly world as well. Yet this kingdom is, in a sense, future also, but this present and future kingdom really is one. Here we are essentially in the future kingdom, we are already in the kingdom, but there remains yet only a veil drawn before our eyes, who are yet in this world, to conceal the beauty of the kingdom in which we already live. We shall never be in a different kingdom, but our experience shall be greatly enlarged, and we shall see the kingdom in all its glory, and the king in all his beauty. (Works - Erlængen Ed. 6:58, 14:120,179f, 17:224f, 40:45-57).

The sacraments are not necessary to the church, yet are to be used, that is, baptism and the Lord's Supper, as testimonies to the forgiving love of God. Luther says of the sacraments, "The signs by which one may know where the church is, are baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the Gospel, and not Rome, or this or that place. For where there are baptism and the gospel no one should doubt that there are saints." (Works Vol. 27:186). So we find the Protestant formula running that the marks of the true church are the Gospel and the sacraments, that is baptism and the Lord's Supper. According to the Augsburg Confession the church "is the congregation of the saints in which
the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered."
The sacraments are not, however, necessary like the Gospel, but are
helps because they testify to the Gospel.

Thus in his conception of the church we find Luther coming back
to the primitive idea that where two or three are gathered together
Christian in the name and faith of Jesus Christ, there is the true Church, the
ture Catholic Church. His conception is very simple. The church is
the community of saints which has come into existence through the
preaching of the gospel of Christ. The Scriptures are the foundation,
sure and steadfast, of the church, and the Scripture is the good news
of Jesus Christ, the revelation of God as a loving, forgiving Father.
Confidence in Christ, as revealed in the Word, then, makes Christians,
and wherever Christians are, there is the church. The unity or one-
ness of the church is found in oneness of faith in the great Head of
the church, Jesus Christ. We might sum up Luther's doctrine of the
church very briefly by saying that the Church is the community of the
saints, has its unity in Christ, its Head, that its one supreme pos-
session is the Word of God revealing through Christ the forgiving
love of God, and officered by all believers being exalted to be
kings and priests to God. "The Church of Christ, therefore, is a
body of which the spirit of Jesus is the soul. It is a company of
Christlike men and women whom the Holy Spirit has called, enlightened,
and sanctified through the preaching of the Word; who are encouraged
to look forward to a glorious future prepared for the people of God;
and who, meanwhile, manifest their faith in all manner of loving ser-

vices done to their fellow-believers." (Lindsay, Hist. of the Refor-
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Chapter VIII.

CONCLUSIONS

It now remains for us to sum up as briefly as is consistent with clearness the results of the study running through the preceding pages.

After a study of the Gospels, guided by the Pauline writings, it seemed conclusive to the author that Jesus had no purpose to found a new religious organization, but that He desired to renovate the old; in fact the Church and all doctrines of the same spring from a later date, and wholly after the death of Jesus. The Church in the sense in which we know it, and all doctrines concerning it, had their origins in the reaction of the Disciples of Jesus to the rejection and crucifixion of Jesus, and the persistent refusal of the Jews to accept Him as their long expected Messiah after His Resurrection.

The Primitive Community at Jerusalem for several years after the death of Jesus regarded itself as the true Jewish Church, and in no sense apart from the main stream of Judaism. They were in fact the true Jews, while the Pharisees were the false. They were the true sons of the law and never thought of departing from the customs of the fathers, and setting up a new and independent organization.

There could be no separate organization looked upon as of divine ordering apart from the law, to say nothing of a new hierarchy and a new sacerdotalism. To talk of such consummations in the face of the fact that this Primitive Community, and the early Christians generally, expected the speedy coming of Christ in His Kingdom, is ridiculous. The kingdom was at hand and any day or minute might mark the end of the present age. In the meantime it was the duty of the disciples to call the Jews to the acceptance of Jesus as Messiah: for as yet they
had no conception of a universal Gentile Church. Peter, however, was the founder of the Church in a good sense. Somehow he got the disciples together, cheered them up, put new courage into their hearts, led them back to Jerusalem, and held them together as a great family in which love was the unifying bond. This family circle was the true elect of God who should enjoy the rich benefits promised to the true Israel when Messiah came in His Kingdom. Thus at Jerusalem under the leadership of Peter, and after the death of Christ, the Church was founded, but its founders did not conceive of it as an independent organization, but the true Israel, and themselves the true sons of the law, whose duty it was to call all Jews to acceptance of Jesus as their Messiah, and to do this before His speedy return to judge the wicked and obstinate.

Until the murder of Stephen it had not occurred to the Christians or Pharisees that this sect of Christians was heretical in any sense. The Jews saw it long before the Jewish Christians themselves, and took measures to stamp out the heresy. Perhaps the keen insight of Paul the Pharisee first detected the danger and pointed it out to the Jews. At any rate from this time the Jews at least did not recognize the Christians as orthodox Jews, and the line of separation was drawn. Many, however, of the members of the community at Jerusalem lived and died devout Jews, and firm in the conviction that they were the true Israel, and that Jews only could enter their society. Paul, however, upon his conversion broke away from these narrow restrictions and began to proclaim a salvation free to the whole world regardless of race, nation, or previous condition of religious allegiance.

It is most important to know Paul's view of the Church, and his influence on the later developments of the doctrine of the same.
In the first place, Paul found the idea of the unity of the Church present. Whether or not the term Church was ever used in any universal sense before Paul's time is not certainly known, but it probably was not so used until taken up by him. But we are not really concerned about that, for the concept of the Kingdom of God was familiar to every Jew before Jesus came, and since Jesus took up the familiar concept and read into it a new and fuller meaning, the universal concept was already at hand, and each community was nothing more than the local manifestation of the Kingdom of God. So when Paul came on the scene the universal conception was present in the Kingdom of God, and the mission was for the Kingdom; out of this mission grew the local communities.

As in the Primitive Community, Paul's conception of the Church was that it is a brotherhood, and is open to all who accept Jesus as Saviour. The Christian Community, we saw, was from one standpoint a democracy, that is to say, all who acted in the capacity of ministers received their appointments from the Church, and held them only so long as the Church willed it; but on the other hand, according to Paul, and the view then dominant, the Church was an absolute theocracy with Christ as king. Christ alone had authority, and the Church's election or appointment of its ministers was nothing more or less than the ratification or recognition of the Charisma already conferred by God upon the person. The only right any one had to a part in the service or government of the Church was a right based upon the possession of the Spirit, and thus it was not the person who received recognition in any case, but the Spirit who spoke through the person. There was abundance of rule and organization, yet all was purely spiritual - the spirit-bearers ruled all things, i.e. the Spirit was supreme.

Paul sought unity, and conceived the Church as a unity, but this
unity was purely ideal. There existed no empirical unity even among Paul's own communities, to say nothing of unity between the Gentile and Jewish societies. The unity that comes of law and letter was not present. It was, however, the life-labor of Paul to secure unity among his own communities, and between his communities and the Jewish, but the unity sought was ever and always the unity of the Spirit. Paul held that all are children of the same Father-God, and hence members of the same great family. Paul conceived the Church as a fraternity governed by the Holy Spirit. Ecclesiasticism and sacerdotalism are excluded by Paul's views of God and salvation. We should be true to Paul were we to say that where two or three are gathered together in the faith, name, and love of Jesus Christ, there is the Church. This Church is holy, and it is holy because it is composed of holy people, not because it possesses any ordinances as means to the making of people holy. In short, we might sum up Paul's conception in the words of Christ in Mt. 18:20, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." The whole emphasis here is upon the Charismatic Church composed of holy people, and ruled wholly by the Spirit. There is unity and harmony, because each has the mind of Christ, and since each has the mind of Christ, there is harmony, because Christ is in harmony and unity with Himself - "Christ is all in all."

The death of the Primitive Apostles marked an epoch in the development of the conception of the Church. After Paul's death, changes in this direction were very rapid. Certain tendencies found in germ in Paul began to grow very rapidly after his death, and the death of the other Primitive Apostles. Paul, as we have seen, was in a large measure responsible for the development of Catholicism; unwittingly to be sure, but nevertheless certainly responsible. Not only
did he emphasize universality and unity, but certain teachings of his were later made Scripture foundation for certain tenets of Catholicism. While it is a far cry from Paul's conception of the Church to the Catholic conception, his metaphor of "body and bride" helped along the development towards Catholicism very materially, and had much to do with the ultimate view that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church which is the body and bride of Christ. The Churches were all, in Paul's time organized and governed charismatically, certainly, yet they were organized and governed. That is to say, that as the view of Christianity changed and the Spirit bearers became fewer, this organization and government could be and was legal, and ultimately developed into hierarchical and sacerdotal organization and rule. Already in the Pastoral a long move towards officialism has been made. The fundamental view of what Christianity is underwent rapid change also after Paul. In a surprisingly short time Christianity had become law instead of the life of Christ in the souls of men - it was keeping a law, instead of oneness of thought, purpose, and life with Christ.

With the passing away of the Primitive Apostles, we find then the beginnings of the Catholic Church and a changed view of what the Church is. In our study we found three great steps in the progress from the simple Charismatic Church of the Apostles to the empirical Catholic Church of the bishops in the third and following centuries.

The first step was the elevating of the Apostolic tradition written and spoken to the rank of Authority. The passing of the Apostles caused all that they had spoken or written to become at once exceedingly valuable; and led to its being carefully preserved. As the years went by, and the changed view of what Christianity actually is, together with the passing away of the Spirit-bearers, this Apostolic tradition became more and more authoritative.
The second step was taken by Irenaeus when he set forth the doctrine that the bishops alone can interpret the Apostolic deposit, and that they are given a special gift by the Spirit - the power to discern truth and error. All this time the power of the bishop was growing, and by the time of Irenaeus the bishop had become the great man of the local community. Emphasis on the bishop and loyalty to him had been, however, largely due to a desire for unity and harmony. Ignatius had done much, however, to bring him into prominence; for he can not see how there can be a Church without a bishop, and union with the bishop is necessary. His interest was, however, not hierarchical, but for unity's sake. This step taken by Irenaeus was very significant, for it places the interpretation of the Apostolic deposit in the bishop's hands, and makes him the inspired interpreter of the same. Not only so, but in this appears for the first time in any serious way the claim that the bishop is the successor of the Apostles. Irenaeus was driven to his position by the stress of controversy, the heretical Gnostics being the disturbers of the ecclesiastical peace. The "rule of faith" must not only be proved Apostolic, but also it must be shown that it has suffered no alterations since the death of the Apostles. Irenaeus proves all this by the above statement, i. e. Apostolic Succession, and the gift of discerning truth. This meant of course that heretics are to be repudiated. The bishop now is no longer a local functionary, but has relations to the whole Church as the conservor of the true and pure Apostolic teaching. The Church guards the truth, then, and alone has it. The Holy Spirit was confined to the Church by Irenaeus, so none outside the Church could have this "sure gift of truth." He tells us that "Where the Church is there the Spirit of God, and where the Spirit of God, there is the Church." In the time of Irenaeus the bishop had become a monarch, and the tendency
was to add more and more of Apostolic power to him - in short to recognize him as successor of the Apostles, and this in the light of the changed view of Christianity was powerfully affecting the conception of the Church. While the old conception is still present, and men speak still of the Church as it was conceived in the Apostolic Age, the fact is that the Church of Irenaeus was quite another thing. Because of his office the bishop has conferred upon him "the Apostolic heritage of truth" - a far cry from the Primitive Conception as held in the Apostolic Age. Rapidly, very rapidly in fact, we are passing from the Church of holy men ruled by the spirit to an empirical Church ruled by bishops, and the emphasis is rapidly shifting from individuals through whom the Spirit ruled, to institutions. The charismatic idea lived on, it is true, but the Spirit is confined to institutions and officials now. Irenaeus, however, stopped considerably short of attributing to the bishops the Apostolic office in its full sense, but he made it easy for another great Churchman to take the further step when the proper time and conditions came.

The third step was now most natural and easy, and that is, that the Catholic Church is the institution of salvation outside of which there is no salvation. The Church was coming more and more between men and God, and in that same measure was becoming a salvation mill. The immediate cause of this step is to be found in the reaction of Cyprian, the greatest ecclesiastic of his time, and one of the greatest of all time, to the Novatian Schism. The second step was forced by the reaction of Irenaeus to the Gnostic heresy, but now it is Schism caused by the differences of opinion springing out of the question of what to do with the world in the Church. It could no longer with any consistency be said that the Church was holy because of the character of its membership. The immediate cause of the division was
the great number of "lapsed" due to violent persecution. A body broke off claiming to be the true and holy Church, because no lapsed were permitted to re-enter the Church, and all its members were of such a character that the Church was a holy Church because its members were holy. This was the problem that Cyprian faced, and we have seen how he met it; he simply declared schism to be heresy, and that there is no salvation for him who puts himself without the confines of the Catholic Church. The Church alone has the Spirit and the means of salvation. It remained for Cyprian to insist that there is not only one flock, but that there is only one fold. Cyprian also views the priesthood as a sacerdotal order, and while he has no sharply worked-out theory, the fact remains that by his time there is a sacerdotal order with the bishops as the crown of the order. It would not be correct to say that he is responsible for sacerdotalism; for such was not the case. It crops out here and there even much earlier, but he makes it stand out as such as none before him did, which is, of course, only natural in the light of his view of the Church. The Church, to summarize Cyprian's view briefly, is a divine institution outside of which there is no salvation. It is much more than a mere community possessing the Apostolic tradition, but an organism divinely ordered and constituted, and the acceptance of the Church as one and divine is just as essential - and apparently, in the thought of Cyprian more essential than - the acceptance of the Apostolic rule of faith.

This organism known as the Catholic Church rests wholly upon the Episcopacy which, as a harmonious college, is the heir of all the Apostolic gifts and endowments, and the representative of Christ Himself. Individuals are saved only as they are united to the bishop harmoniously. The unity of the Church consists in the unity of the Episcopate. The Church is the channel and the only channel of grace, and grace can
reach men only through a sacrificing priesthood, who absolutely control the blessings of God. The priesthood is in fact the Church. What a transformation has been wrought since the days of Paul! Once the Church was the community of the holy people of God who believe on Jesus Christ, but now it amounts to this: that the Church is the people of varying degrees of goodness and badness who believe in an ecclesiastical organism, or salvation mill, and belong to the bishop. Obedience to the Church or bishop is now the chief requirement. It might be said that the Church is the Episcopate through which the grace of God is ministered to those who are in absolute obedience to the bishop.

It remained for the greatest Christian of his time, Augustine, to complete what Cyprian had so well wrought upon, and finish the step Cyprian had all but completed. We saw that Augustine in his struggle with the schismatic Donatists set forth a view of the Church in which he completed the transference of the attribute of holiness from persons composing the Church to the institution itself. The Church is not holy because of the characters of the persons, clergy or laity, comprising the Church, but because the Church has in its sacraments and the Word the means of making holy. Holiness is no longer a personal, but an institutional attribute. This act completed the development of the Catholic Church. Harnack (Hist. of Dogma, V, 41, 42) says, "The Donatist crisis after the Diocletian persecution, taught the Church to value ordination as imparting an inalienable title and to form a stringent view of the objectivity of the sacraments; or, to use a plainer expression, to regard the Church primarily as an institution whose holiness and truth are inalienable, however melancholy the state of its members." In the next paragraph, he adds, "In this thought Catholicism was complete. By it is explained its later his-
tory down to the present day, in so far as it is not a history of pi-
ety, but of the Church, the Hierarchy, sacramental magic, and implicit
faith."

But in our study of Augustine we found that at least Augustine
the Christian did not give up the Charismatic Church, and merge the
Kingdom of God and the Catholic Church. To save the true Church, how-
ever, he was compelled to make a distinction between the empirical
Church, that is the Church governed by the bishops, and the Charismat-
ic Church. So far as we know he was the first to set forth this dis-
tinction as Luther well illustrates. There is so much of confusion in
Augustine, however, that it is very difficult to feel sure what the
dominant conception of the Church as held by him is. The doctrine
given above which completed the development of the Catholic Church and
laid the foundations for the Roman Catholic doctrines down to the pre-
sent, is prominent, and tremendously significant from the standpoint
of outcome; but it seemed that the facts warranted our concluding that
the dominant view in Augustine's teaching is, after all, the Charismat-
ic Church. The Charismatic Church is the Kingdom of God and not the
Church governed by the bishops, i. e. the empirical Catholic Church.
Thus the great bishop who completed the development of the Catholic
Church and opened the way for all the sacerdotalism, sacramental magic
and implicit faith, of the Roman Church was strangely enough the great
Christian who distinguished and saved to history at least the Charis-
matic Church, the Church which consists of Christ and His saints.

Through the Middle Ages, and especially so in the Scholastic per-
iod, the Catholic conception of the Church was dominant. They lost
sight of Augustine's distinction and were controlled only by the Cath-
olic view as seen above. They identified, as Augustine did not, the
empirical Catholic Church with the kingdom (or City) of God, and so
interpreted Augustine. The great scholastic theologians made it their business to work out, complete, and defend the Catholic conception of the Church. The Church became the priesthood with an autocrat at the head - the pope. The laity formed practically no part of the Church; for the clergy is the Church and works upon the laity. Sacerdotalism was carried to its extreme limits. Two ideas were dominant in Luther's time: (1) The visible Church is identical with the kingdom of God on earth; and (2) The Church is the patrimony of Peter, i. e. of the bishop of Rome. The Church is the "Pope's House." We shall let Boniface VIII speak for himself: "We declare, say, define, and pronounce, that to be subject to the Roman pontiff is for every human creature an altogether necessary condition of salvation." The great theologians, as Aquinas and Scotus, practically agree with the above statement of the case by the pope. Abelard said, "The Kingdom of Christ is the universal Church so delivered into the power of Peter that nothing in it can take place without the command or permission of the Roman pontiff." But after all is said, the fact remains that although the Church had been shifting all through the Middle Ages from conciliar government to decretal, the old Catholic view of the Church as a holy institution - holy, because it had the means of making its members holy - came to be unquestioned by any one of prominence. To question it would have been fatal - in short the Middle Church only worked out and sought to defend the Catholic development seen in Cyprian and Augustine. The Church is the great institution within which all God's grace is locked up, and there can be no salvation outside of it.

With Luther we find ourselves in a very congenial and familiar circle of ideas concerning the Church. In his writings we find ourselves back in the circle of ideas controlling in the Primitive Church.
Luther clearly distinguished between the true Christian Church (the Charismatic) and any organization or any number of organizations in which the true Church may be embodied. The unity of the Church he finds not in a pope, a hierarchy, or any visible organization whatever, but in oneness of faith in the great Head of the Church, Jesus Christ. The Church becomes in Luther the community of holy believers in Christ. It is a spiritual community having a spiritual Head. In this sense it is invisible, in fact the true Charismatic Church is invisible, yet it has certain manifestations in the world, but the real Church is invisible in that it is spiritual, constituted by holiness and faith in God through Jesus Christ. Every man is his own priest, and the Church is not a mediator between God and man. Sacramental and sacerdotal magic disappear. The Church is in a proper sense necessary to salvation, says Luther, but this Church which is necessary to salvation is not identified in any way with an organization; that is with the visible Church. The Church is necessary merely as an agent through which the Gospel of Jesus Christ is given to men, and not at all in the Roman sense. In Luther's meaning the Church is necessary because it alone carries the saving gospel of Christ, in the Romanist sense the Church (empirical Roman Church) is necessary to salvation because the Church (empirical) is the one only carrier of grace from God to man — a difference as wide as the poles. When Luther says "Church", he means the community of believers, when the Papist says "Church" he means the empirical Church ruled by the pope.

Thus Luther comes back to the primitive conception that where two or three are gathered together in the name and faith of Christ, there is the true Church. His conception is very simple. The Church is the community of the saints which has come into existence through the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, and the acceptance of Christ by
the hearers. The Church is the community of the saints; has its unity in Christ, its Head; its one supreme possession is the Word of God revealing through Christ the Father's forgiving love; and officered by all believers being exalted to be kings and priests to God. Thus of through the misty distance of fifteen centuries, A Christian history Luther grasps the hand of Paul. The true Catholic Apostolic Church is the community of Christ and his brethren who have caught His spirit and are at one with Him in faith and love.