**“The Papacy. Exaltation of the Bishopric” The Present Truth 12, 6, pp. 83, 84.**

THE Scripture was fulfilled; there had, as shown in these columns last week, come a falling away. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.1}

But that there should come a falling away, was not all the prophecy—through that falling away there was to be revealed “that man of sin,” “the son of perdition,” “the mystery of iniquity,” “that wicked,” who would oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped; and who when he should appear, would continue even till that great and notable event—the second coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.2}

Referring again to 2 Thessalonians 2:4, it is seen that *self-exaltation* is the spring of the development of this power. As that Scripture expresses it, he “opposeth and exalteth *himself*.” Or, as another scripture gives it, “He shall magnify *himself* in his heart.” And another, “He magnified *himself* even to the prince of the host”—the Lord Jesus Christ. And yet another, “He shall also stand up *against* the Prince of princes.” That is, he shall reign, or assert authority above, and in opposition to, the authority of Christ; or, as the thought is developed by Paul, this power would oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple—the place of worship—of God, showing himself that he is God. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.3}

Referring also again to the instruction of Paul to the elders who met him at Miletus, there is seen a prophecy of this same spirit of self-exaltation,—a wish to gain disciples to themselves instead of to Christ. They would prefer themselves to Christ, thus at once putting themselves above Him, in opposition to Him. And this would be developed from among the bishops. “Of *your own selves* shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples *after them*.” {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.4}

This spirit was actively manifested in opposition to the apostle John while he was yet alive, for he says: “I wrote unto the church: but Diotrephes who loveth to have the pre-eminence among them, receiveth us not.” 3 John 1:9. This assertion of pre-eminence was shown in prating against the apostle with malicious words, and not only rejecting him, but casting out of the church those members who would receive him. It was but a little while after the death of the apostles until this was carried to yet further extremes. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.5}

According to the word of Christ, there is no such thing as pre-eminence, or mastership, or sovereignty of position, among men in the church. There was once an argument among his disciples as to who should be counted the greatest, and Jesus called them unto him, and said: “Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.” Mark 10:2-45. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.6}

And in warning His disciples of all times against the practie of the scribes and Pharisees of that time, who were but the popes of their day, He says they ‘love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi. But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.... Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.” Matthew 23:6-12. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.7}

**ORDER IN THE CHURCH OF CHRIST**

IN the church each member has the same rights as any other member; but for the good of all and the mutual benefit of all concerned, as well as better to carry on His work in the world, the Lord has established His church, and with it a system of church order in which certain ones are chosen to exercise certain functions for the mutual benefit of all in the organization. These officers are chosen from among the membership by the voice of the membership. Of these officers there are two classes, and two only,—bishops and deacons. This is shown by Paul’s letter to the Philippians—“Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.” Chap 1:1. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.8}

Bishops are sometimes called elders; but the same office is always signified. When Paul gave directions to Titus in this matter, he said: “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless.... For a *bishop* must be blameless, as the steward of God.” Titus 1:5-7. This is further shown in Acts 20., to which we have before referred; when Paul had called unto him to Miletus “the *elders* of the church” of Ephesus, among other things he said to them: “Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers*,“—*episkopoi*—bishops. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.9}

Peter also writes to the same effect: “The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock.” 1 Peter 5:1-3. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.10}

This text not only shows that the terms “elder” and “bishop” refer to the same identical office, but it shows that Peter counted himself as one among them; and that not only by his precept but by his example he showed that in this office, although over*seers* they were not over*rulers* or lords. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 83.11}

Such is the order in the church of Christ, and as every Christian is God’s freeman and Christ’s servant, it follows, as has been well stated, that “monarchy in spiritual things does not harmonize with the spirit of Christianity.” {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 84.1}

**HOW THE DIVINE ORDER WAS PERVERTED**

YET this order was not suffered long to remain. A distinction was very soon asserted between the bishop and the elder; and the bishop assumed a precedence and an authority over the elder, who was now distinguished from the bishop by the title of “presbyter” only. This was easily and very naturally accomplished. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 84.2}

For instance, a church would be established in a certain city. Soon perhaps another church or churches would be established in that same city, or near to it in the country. These other churches would look naturally to the original church as to a mother, and the elders of the original church would naturally have a care for the others as they arose. It was only proper to show Christian respect and deference to these; but this respect and deference was soon *demanded*, and authority to require it was asserted by those who were the first bishops. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 84.3}

Again: as churches multiplied and with them also elders multiplied, it was necessary, in carrying forward the work of the gospel, for the officers of the church often to have meetings for consultation. On these occasions it was but natural and proper for the seniors to preside; but instead of allowing this to remain still a matter of choice in the conducting of each successive meeting or assembly, it was claimed as a right that the one originally chosen should hold that position for life. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 84.4}

Thus was that distinction established between the elders, or presbyters, and the bishops. Those who usurped this permanent authority and office took to themselves exclusively the title of “bishop,” and all the others were still to retain the title of “presbyter.” The presbyters in turn assumed over the deacons a supremacy and authority which did not belong to them, and all together—bishops, presbyters, and deacons—held themselves to be superior orders in the church over the general membership, and assumed to themselves the title of “clergy,” while upon the general membership the term “laity” was conferred. {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 84.5}

In support of these three orders among the “clergy,” it was claimed that they came in proper succession from the high priests, the priests, and the Levites of the Levitical law. “Accordingly, the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites.” {PTUK February 6, 1896, p. 84.6}

A. T. JONES.

**“The Papacy. The Man of Sin Revealed” The Present Truth 12, 7, pp. 100, 101.**

LAST week we traced the growth of the distinctions by which, after the days of the apostles, the ambitious bishops created the three orders among the “clergy,” according to which “the bishops considered themselves as invested with a rank and character similar to those of the high priest among the Jews, while the presbyters represented the priests, and the deacons the Levites.” {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 100.1}

These distinctions were established as early as the middle of the second century. This led to a further and most wicked invention. As they were now priests and Levites after the order of the priesthood of the former dispensation, it was necessary that they also should have a sacrifice to offer. Accordingly, the Lord’s Supper was turned into “the unbloody sacrifice.” Thus arose that which is still in the Roman Catholic Church the daily “sacrifice” of the mass. With this also came a splendor in dress, copied from that of the former real priesthood. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 100.2}

The estimate in which the bishop was now held may be gathered from the following words of a document of the second century:— {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 100.3}

It is manifest, therefore, that we should look upon the bishop even as we would upon the Lord Himself. It is well to reverence both God and the bishop. He who honours the bishop has been honoured of God; he who does anything without the knowledge of the bishop, does (in reality) serve the devil.” {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 100.4}

The next step was that certain bishops asserted authority over other bishops; and the plea upon which this was claimed as a right, was that the bishops of those churches which had been established by the apostles were of right to be considered as superior to all others. As Rome was the capital of the empire, and as the church there claimed direct descent not only from one but from two apostles, it soon came to pass that the church of Rome claimed to be the source of true doctrine, and the bishop of that church to be supreme over all other bishops. In the latter part of the second century, during the episcopate of Eleutherius, A.D. 176-192, the absolute authority of the church of Rome in matters of doctrine was plainly asserted in the following words:— {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 100.5}

It is incumbent to obey the presbyters who are in the church,—those who, as I have shown, possess the succession from the apostles; those who, together with the succession of the episcopate, have received the certain gift of truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father. Since, however, it would be very tedious, in such a volume as this, to reckon up the successions of all the churches, we do put to confusion all those who, in whatever manner, whether by an evil self-pleasing, by vain-glory, or by blindness and perverse opinion, assemble in unauthorised meetings (we do this, I say); by indicating that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known church founded and organised at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also (by pointing out) the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the bishops. For it is *a matter of necessity that every church should agree with this church*, on account of its pre-eminent authority.... Since, therefore, we have such proofs, *it is not necessary to seek the truth among others* which it is easy to obtain from the church; since the apostles, like a rich man depositing his money in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth, so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For *she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers*. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 100.6}

When this authority and power was asserted during the bishopric of Eleutherius, it is not at all strange that his immediate successor, Victor, A.D. 192-202, should attempt to carry into practice the authority thus claimed for him. The occasion of it was the question of the celebration of what is now Easter, as already related in the preceding chapter. This action of Victor is pronounced by Bower “the first essay of papal usurpation.” Thus early did Rome not only claim supremacy, but attempt to enforce her claim of supremacy, over all other churches. Such was the arrogance of the bishops of Rome at the beginning of the third century. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 100.7}

The character of the bishopric in A. D. 250, is clearly seen by the words of Cyprian:— {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.1}

Not a few bishops who ought to furnish both exhortation and example to others, despising their divine charge, became agents in secular business, forsook their throne, deserted their people, wandered about over foreign provinces, hunted the markets for gainful merchandise, while brethren were starving in the church. They sought to possess money in hoards, they seized estates by crafty deceits, they increased their gains by multiplying usuries. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.2}

As the bishopric became more exalted, and arrogated to itself more authority, the office became an object of unworthy ambition and unholy aspiration. Arrogance characterised those who were in power, and envy those who were not. And whenever a vacancy occurred, unseemly and wholly unchristian strife arose among rival presbyters for the vacant seat. “The deacons, beholding the presbyters thus deserting their functions, boldly invaded their rights and privileges; and the effects of a corrupt ambition were spread through every rank of the sacred order.” {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.3}

These discussions which gave opportunity for the further assertion of the dignity and authority of the bishopric. Cyprian, “the representative of the episcopal system,” as Neander relates, declared that— {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.4}

The church is founded upon the bishops, and every act of the church is controlled by these same rulers.... Whence you ought to know that the bishop is in the church, and the church in the bishop; and if any one be not with the bishop, that he is not in the church. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.5}

He insisted that God made the bishops, and the bishops made the deacons, and argued thus:— {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.6}

But if we [bishops] may dare anything against God who makes bishops, deacons may also dare against us by whom they are made. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.7}

Not long afterward, there arose another subject of controversy, which caused much contention with far-reaching consequences. As the bishops arrogated to themselves more and more authority, both in discipline and doctrine, “heretics” increased. Whosoever might disagree with the bishop was at once branded as a heretic, and was cut off from his communion, as Diotrephes had counted as a heretic even the apostle John. Upon this point the representative of the episcopal system further declared:— {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.8}

Neither have heresies arisen, nor have schisms originated, from any other source than from this, that God’s priest is not obeyed; nor do they consider that there is one person for the time priest in the church, and for the time judge in the stead of Christ; whom if, according to divine teaching, the whole fraternity should obey, no one would stir up anything against the college of priests; no one, after the divine judgment, after the suffrage of the people, after the consent of the co-bishops, would make himself a judge, not now of the bishop, but of God. No one would rend the church by a division of the unity of Christ. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.9}

He therefore argued that if any person was outside of this system of episcopal unity, and was not obedient to the bishop, this was all the evidence necessary to demonstrate that he was a heretic. Consequently he declared that no one ought “even to be inquisitive as to *what*” any one “teaches, so long as he teaches out of the pale of *unity*.” In this way the truth itself could be made heresy. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.10}

Of the condition of the bishopric in 302, when the Diocletian persecution began, Eusebius says: “They were sunk in negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and were almost on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity.” Also some who appeared to be pastors were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalship, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.11}

The scripture was fulfilled. There *had* come a falling away; there was a self-exaltation of the bishopric; and THE TIME WAS COME WHEN THE MAN OF SIN SHOULD BE REVEALED. 2 Thessalonians 2:3. {PTUK February 13, 1896, p. 101.12}

A. T. JONES.

**“The Papacy. Constantine and the Bishops” The Present Truth 12, 8, pp. 115, 116.**

**THE CHURCH ENTERING POLITICS**

AS shown last week, there had come as early as the latter part of the third century of the Christian era, a falling away from the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, so that the way was fully prepared for the setting up of the Papacy; but the perfect development of that power was not yet complete. {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.1}

In order to its perfect development the Papacy must have the aid of the State. Before the Bishop of Rome could be exalted to the place he was to occupy and be recognised by all the world as the head of the Church, other bishops must be forced into submission to him by the strong arm of civil power, and the forces were at work that were to accomplish this. {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.2}

One very important factor in the setting up of the Papacy was the Emperor Constantine. Coming to the throne, Constantine found Christianity a growing religious power in the empire, and after a time he conceived the idea of turning this new religion which seemed to be displacing paganism, to his own account; likewise the bishops, as we have seen, were grasping for civil power. As Draper says: “It was the aim of Constantine to make theology a branch of politics; it was the aim of the bishops to make politics a branch of theology.” Both were in a measure successful. {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.3}

Of the state of the church at that time, Eusebius bears this testimony:— {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.4}

When by reason of excessive liberty we sunk into negligence and sloth, one envying and reviling another in different ways, and we were almost, as it were, on the point of taking up arms against each other, and were assailing each other with words as with darts and spears, prelates inveighing against prelates, and people rising up against people, and hypocrisy and dissimulation had arisen to the greatest height of malignity, then the Divine judgment, which usually proceeds with a lenient hand, whilst the multitudes were yet crowding into the church, with gentle and mild visitations began to afflict its episcopacy, the persecution having begun with those brethren that were in the army. But as if destitute of all sensibility, we were not prompt in measures to appease and propitiate the Deity; some, indeed, like atheists, regarding our situations as unheeded and unobserved by a providence, we added one wickedness and misery to another. But some that appeared to be our pastors, deserting the law of piety, were inflamed against each other with mutual strifes, only accumulating quarrels and threats, rivalship, hostility, and hatred to each other, only anxious to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves. {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.5}

The pagan persecution had caused all these divisions and disputes to be laid aside. Every other interest was forgotten in the one all-absorbing question of the rights of conscience against pagan despotism. Thus there was created at least an outward unity among all the sects of whatever name professing the Christian religion in any form. Thus was molded a compact power which permeated every part of the empire, and which was at the same time estranged from every material interest of the empire as it then stood. Here was power, which if it could be secured and used, would assure success to him who would gain it, as certainly as he could make the alliance. This condition of affairs was clearly discerned at the time. Constantine “understood the signs of the times and acted accordingly.” {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.6}

Draper says (“Intellectual Development of Europe”):— {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.7}

To Constantine, who had fled from the treacherous custody of Galerius, it naturally occurred that if he should ally himself to the Christian party, conspicuous advantages must forthwith accrue to him. It would give him in every corner of the empire men and women ready to encounter fire and sword; it would give him partisans not only animated by the traditions of their fathers, but—for human nature will even in the religious assert itself—demanding retribution for the horrible barbarities and injustice that had been inflicted on themselves; it would give him, and this was the most important of all, unwavering adherents in every legion in the army. He took his course. The events of war crowned him with success. He could not be otherwise than outwardly true to those who had given him power, and who continued to maintain him on the throne. {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.8}

Constantine was not the only one who saw this opportunity, but he being a accomplished politician, succeeded, while others failed. In addition to the advantages which offered themselves in this asserted unity of the churches, there was a movement among the bishops, which made it an additional incentive to Constantine to form the alliance which he did with the church. Although it is true that all the differences and disputes and strifes among the bishops and sects had been forgotten in the supreme conflict between paganism and freedom of thought, there is one thing mentioned by Eusebius that still remained. That was the ambition of the bishops “to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves.” Nor was it alone government in the church which they were anxious to assert; but {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.9}

**GOVERNMENT IN THE STATE**

as well, *to be used in the interests of the church*. For, as Neander testifies, “There had in fact arisen in the church ... a false theocratical theory, originating, not in the essence of the Gospel, but in the confusion of the religious constitutions of the Old and New Testaments.” {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.10}

This theocratical theory of the bishops is the key to the whole history of Constantine and the church of his time, and through all the dreary period that followed. It led the bishops into the wildest extravagance in their worship of the imperial influence, and coincided precisely with Constantine’s idea of an absolute monarchy. {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.11}

The idea of the theocracy that the bishops hoped to establish appears more clearly and fully in Eusebius’s “Life of Constantine” than in any other one production of the time. The Church was a second Israel in Egyptian bondage. Maxentius, who was emperor in Italy, and one of the four rulers in the whole Roman Empire, each scheming for supreme control, was a second Pharaoh; Constantine, who overthrew him, was a second Moses. As the original Moses had grown up in the palace of the Pharaohs, so likewise this new Moses had grown up in the very society of the new Pharaohs. {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.12}

When Constantine marched against Maxentius, it was the new Moses on his way to deliver Israel. When the army of Maxentius was defeated on the banks of the Tiber, and multitudes were drowned in the river, it was the Red Sea swallowing up the hosts of Pharaoh. When Maxentius was crowded off the bridge and by the weight of his armor sank instantly to the bottom of the river, it was the new Pharaoh and “the horse and his rider” being thrown into the sea and sinking to the bottom like a stone. {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 115.13}

Then was Israel delivered, and a song of deliverance was sung by the new Israel as by the original Israel at their deliverance. In describing this, Eusebius uses these words:— {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 116.1}

“Let us sin unto the Lord, for He has been glorified exceedingly; the horse and rider has He thrown into the sea. He is become my helper and my shield unto salvation.” And again, “Who is like to thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee, glorious in holiness, marvelous in praises, doing wonders?” {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 116.2}

Such adulation was not without response on the part of Constantine. He united himself closely with the bishops, of whom Eusebius was but one, and in his turn flattered them. A. T. JONES. {PTUK February 20, 1896, p. 116.3}

 **“The Papacy. The Church in the Fourth Century” The Present Truth 12, 9, pp. 133, 134.**

**TEMPORALLY EXALTED—MORALLY FALLEN**

THE ambition of the bishops in the fourth century “to assert the government as a kind of sovereignty for themselves,” led them, as we saw last week, to flatter Constantine by declaring him the new Moses that had come to deliver the church from bondage and set up a theocracy on earth, in which the bishops were to be the interpreters of the Divine will. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.1}

Such adulation was not without response on the part of Constantine. He united himself closely with the bishops, and, in his turn, flattered them. Eusebius says:— {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.2}

The emperor was also accustomed personally to invite the society of God’s ministers, whom he distinguished with the highest possible respect and honor, treating them in every sense as persons consecrated to the service of God. Accordingly they were admitted to his table, though mean in their attire and outward appearance; yet not so in his estimation, since he judged not of their exterior as seen by the vulgar eye, but thought he discerned in them somewhat of the character of God Himself. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.3}

This worked charmingly. Throughout the empire the courtly bishops worked in Constantine’s interest; and as only Licinius now remained between Constantine and his longed-for position as sole emperor and absolute ruler, the bishops and their political church followers prayed against Licinius and for Constantine. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.4}

As these “worldly-minded bishops, instead of caring for the salvation of their flocks, were often but too much inclined to travel about and entangle themselves in worldly concerns,” Licinius attempted to check it. To stop their meddling with the political affairs of his dominions, he forbade the bishops to assemble together or to pass from their own dioceses to others. This only tended to make the bishops more active, as the acts of Licinius could be counted as persecution. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.5}

Licinius next went so far as to remove from all public office whoever would not sacrifice to the gods; and the line was quickly drawn once more in his dominion in favor of paganism. This caused Constantine’s party to put on a bolder face, and they not only prayed for Constantine against Licinius, but they began to invent visions in which they pretended to see the “legions of Constantine,” says Neander, “marching victoriously through the streets at midday.” {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.6}

These enactments on the part of Licinius furnished the new Moses with an opportunity to conquer the heathen in the wilderness, and to go on to the possession of the promised land and the full establishment of the new theocracy. War was declared, and Constantine, with the labarum at the head of his army, took up his march toward the dominions of Licinius. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.7}

Another step was now taken in furtherance of the theocratical idea, and in imitation of the original Moses. It will be remembered that, after the passage of the Red Sea, Moses erected a tabernacle, and pitched it afar off from the camp, where he went to consult the Lord and to receive what the Lord had to give in commandment to Israel. Constantine, to sustain his part in this scheme of a new theocracy, and as far as possible to conform to the theocratical plans of the bishops, likewise erected a tabernacle, and pitched it a considerable distance from his camp. To this tabernacle he would repair and pretend to have visions and communications from the Lord, and to receive directions in regard to his expected battle with Licinius. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.8}

He soon carried this matter somewhat further, and provided a tabernacle in each legion, with attendant priests and deacons; and also another which was constructed in the form of a church, “so that in case he or his army might be led into the desert, they might have a sacred edifice in which to praise and worship God, and participate in the mysteries. Priests and deacons followed the tent for the purpose of officiating therein, according to the law and regulations of the Church.” {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.9}

Such was the original of State chaplaincies. And it is but proper to remark that the system, wherever copied, has always been worthy of the original imposture. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.10}

The outcome of the war between Constantine and Licinius was the defeat and subsequent murder of the latter. And when, in violation of his solemn oath to his sister Constantia, Constantine caused Licinius to be executed. Yet the courtier-bishop justified the wicked transaction as being the lawful execution of the will of God upon the enemy of God. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.11}

When Constantine went to take his seat as presiding officer in the Council of Nice, his theocratical flatterers pretended to be dazzled by his splendor, as though an angel of God had descended straight from heaven. He who sat at Constantine’s right hand that day, thus testifies:— {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.12}

And now, all rising at the signal which indicated the emperor’s entrance, at last he himself proceeded through the midst of the assembly, like some heavenly messenger of God. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.13}

Constantine, to sustain his part in the farce, declared openly in the council that “the crimes of priests ought not to be made known to the multitude, lest they should become an occasion of offense or of sin;” and declared that he himself would shield a bishop who should commit a crime, lest any should witness the sin and be injured by the bad example. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.14}

And when the council was closed, and the creed for which they had come together was established, he sent a letter to the “Catholic Church of the Alexandrians,” in which he announced that the conclusions reached by the council were inspired by the Holy Spirit, and could be none other than the Divine will concerning the doctrine of God. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.15}

After the council was over, he gave a banquet in honor of the twentieth year of his reign, to which he invited the bishops and clergy who had attended the council. The bishops responded by pretending that it seemed to be the very likeness of the kingdom of Christ itself. At the banquet “the emperor himself presided, and as the feast went on, called to himself one bishop after another, and loaded each with gifts in proportion to his deserts.” This so delighted the bishops that one of them—it was James of Nisibis, a member of that monkish tribe that habitually lived on grass, browsing like oxen, was wrought up to such a height that he declared he saw angels standing round the emperor. Constantine, not to be outdone saw angels standing around James; and pronounced him one of the three pillars of the world. He said, “There are three pillars of the world; Antony in Egypt, Nicolas of Myra, James in Assyria.” {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 133.16}

Constantine himself occasionally appeared in the role of preacher, and “on these occasions a general invitation was issued, and thousands of people went to the palace to hear an emperor turned preacher.” They were ready at the strong points to respond with loud applause and cheering. At times he would attack his courtiers for their rapacity and worldliness generally; and they, understanding him perfectly, would cheer him loudly for his preaching, and go on in the same old way imitating his *actions*. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 134.1}

When his mother sent the nails of the “true cross” to him from Jerusalem with the instruction that some of them should be used as bridle bits for his war-horse, it was counted a further evidence that the kingdom of God was come; for it was made to be the fulfilment of that which “Zechariah the prophet predicted, ‘that what is upon the bridles of the horses shall be holiness unto the Lord Almighty.’” And when he appointed his sons and nephews as Caesars to a share in the governmental authority, this was made to be a fulfilment of the prophecy of Daniel 7:17, “The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom”! {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 134.2}

Other instances of this mutual cajolery might be given, but space forbids. After Constantine’s death Eusebius, whom Neander describes as “one of the best among the bishops of Constantine’s court,” pretended to hesitate as to whether it would not be committing gross sacrilege to attempt to write his life, and when he did write it he could compare him to no one but the Saviour Himself. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 134.3}

By the plain, unbiassed [*sic*.] facts of history, Constantine stands before the world as a confirmed and constant hypocrite, a perjurer, and a many times murderer, his own family not escaping his blood-thirsty jealousy. And yet this bishop, knowing all this, hesitated not to declare him the special favourite of God; to liken him to Jesus Christ; to make God indorse him to the human race as an example of godliness. {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 134.4}

When one of the best of the bishops of his court, one who was familiar with the whole course of his evil life, could see in the life and actions of such a man as this, a Moses, and the kingdom of God—when in such a life this could be seen by one of the *best* of the bishops, we can only wonderingly inquire what could not be seen there by the worst of the bishops! {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 134.5}

Can anybody wonder, or can any reasonable person dispute, that from such a mixture compose of such bishops and such a character, there should come *the mystery of iniquity in all its hideous enormity!* {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 134.6}

It was thus that the Church played the harlot with the world in the early part of the fourth century. And thus it was by proving recreant to the Lord and by courting the favour of corrupt princes, that the Bishop of Rome was at last exalted to that place where he is described as sitting “in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” {PTUK February 27, 1896, p. 134.7}

A. T. JONES.