(question) I made the statement that we have two statements which seem to contradict each other. Then I rasied the question. How are we going to reconcile them. And I said that it would seem to me that if the predominant castom, or the custom to be **state* continued permanently is the layging on the **ja* hands of the presbytery, then there are fairly easy ways of explaining the statement that the laying on of Paul's **nabax* hands, such as Paul might have been a member of the presbytery, included in those who laid them on, or that Paul might have acted as an apostle in designating Timothy for certain functions, aside from the normal action of his having been designated for spiritual services by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. I said that it was not so difficult to reconcile from the viewpoint that the normal thing is the presbytery laying on the hands.

But on the other hand, I said, if you take the position which is taken by great parts of Christendom, a that it is the bishop that lays the hands on, he has good support for it in Paul's statemeth. I mean mean that he can interpret it in such a way as to have. But he has got a tough problem. What is he going to think it means, the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. He can't say that was a custom which was only used in those days and has no relevance for today, because there is no evidence of anything like the apostolic which a ceased. I say the problem is easier reconciled than the one in the other. I didn't mean to dogmatically, at this point, to jump to

Well, now, I want to take up E, a survey of N.T. teaching regarding the officers of the church. Just a survey, now. We could take a very long time on this, but for the purposes of our course we do not dare. But the survey will be vital and helpful. N.T. teachings regarding the officers of the church. What does the N.T. say about the pope explicity? The word never occurs in the N.T., as you know. There are claims made by the Roman Church based upon N.T. statements, but they don't use any specific word pope, as a matter of fact the word pope was not used for the bishop of Rome exclusively until the 8th or 9th Century A.D. It was used in a large part of the church