

themselves universal bishops. Now you see how in one way the Bishop of Constantinople had a tremendous advantage. He was at the seat of empire, but in another, in many other ways the Bishop of Rome had tremendous advantage. In Rome there was no emperor to be superior to the Bishop. There was no one in Rome who could claim a higher position in the world than the Bishop of Rome could. Even the representative of the empire usually didn't have his headquarters at Rome. He was somewhere else in Italy and he was only a ruler of a province. In Constantinople, there was the emperor right there and if the bishop said something the emperor didn't like the emperor was apt to try to make a change in the bishop, and they often did. Yes? (Student) Yes. In the time of Constantine it would seem likely that not over perhaps a tenth of the people of Rome were Christians but within the next century probably ninety-five per cent became nominal Christians. The great change came between 390 and 400 in the reign of Theodosius when they ceased to allow the Roman senate to adore the empress, of the pagan gods and removed them all, and paganism, and from that time on the city of Rome was very largely nominally Christian but at the time of Constantine it probably was a fairly small part of the population, but yet. Now the strife, then, between the Bishop of Rome and the Bishop of Constantinople to see who was first is something which inevitably occurred. You cannot have two heads in any organization. There's always a strife as to who is the real head. It invariably comes. But in this case the Bishop of Rome had the great advantage of being alone in his area. He had the great advantage that he had the large western area in which he was the only patriarch while in the East there were the churches of Alexandria and of Antioch which were much older than the city of Constantinople and which were jealous of Constantinople, and also, of course, the fact that the emperor was in Constantinople and he to quite an extent not only overshadowed the Bishop but had the right to change the Bishop; he had the same right regarding the Bishop of Rome and, you remember, did take the Bishop of Rome and throw him into prison on various occasions, but Rome was so far away that his authority over the Bishop of Rome tended to be allowed more or less to fall into so that the time came now by about 800 when the Bishop of Rome was almost in the West for leadership. There were sections of the church which refused to admit