

major orders in a certain relation one to the other--dea con, preist, ~~bishop~~ bishop, pope. There is a deep controversy about the sub-deacon. I sometimes say rather humorously, "The sub-deacon is a kind of ecclesiastical hermaphrodite. You don't know whether he belongs to the minor orders or to the major orders. You don't know whether he is a man or a woman." That, of course, is only a matter of question. There is this hierarchy then. The hierarchy is a dominant ~~body~~ body in the church. That is rather amusingly expounded by ~~Mix~~ Malgarnatis, the celebrated Jesuit commentator. Malgarnatis comes to the text, "Blessed are they which sow beside all water, who lead there the feet of the ox and the ass," and his interesting comment, interesting because it is private opinion although I don't think it has any solid, exegetical foundation, is that the ox represents the clergy and the ass the patient laity. Holding this view of the hierarchy an immediate question arose. How is the voice of the church to be heard? Two answers have been returned. a. The voice of the church is heard in the determination of counsellors. The Roman Church mistakenly accused that councils were composed at all times entirely of bishops. That is, of course, an historical blunder. The Council of ³⁻⁴ Basra, for instance, is a liberal council, of course, but in the Council of Basra you are told that there were so many bishops and two presbyters for every bishop. Our Roman Catholic and Anglo-Catholic friends try to suggest that that meant that every bishop had two presbyters, rather heavily weighted if he had. So that historically we can refute that, but we are now looking at the Roman view. But it soon became apparent that the councils contradicted one another. How are we to determine the reliable councils? There is a council, for instance, that says that any ~~man~~ man that takes up arms shall be forthwith ~~excommunicated~~ excommunicated. These agencies seek to destroy brothers at the present time. But the Church of Rome hasn't told that, and the whole of Christendom hasn't effected that. How may we determine then the reliable councils? Here two suggestions were made in the early days. a. Those councils that represented the whole Church were to be regarded as authoritative.