

THE RIDDLES IN BISHOP BROWN'S HERESY CASE

BY THEODORE SCHROEDER

“WHY on earth does Bishop Brown (twice found guilty of heresy) make such a fuss about being kicked out of the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church?” This question is probably being repeated by millions, after each of the numerous eruptions of extraordinary newspaper publicity, which have centered around Bishop Brown's case of heresy. Probably no ecclesiast, either orthodox or heretical, has ever before, within the same length of time, gotten a quarter of the publicity that has been bestowed upon Bishop Brown. And the end has not yet arrived. The above questions will often be repeated, after the meeting of the House of Bishops early in October, when Bishop Brown's case will come up for final action. Perhaps the most remarkable thing about it which gives this heresy trial most of its news value, is the persistence of Bishop Brown's fight to remain in the House of Bishops.

Bishop William Montgomery Brown is over seventy years of age. He has long been on the retired list, and receives no money from the Church. Even during his active service to the Church, he always put more money into church-work than he received for his services. For a dozen years he has not attended a meeting of the House of Bishops, nor performed any public ecclesiastical function. Neither does he care to resume active responsibilities. And yet he fights, submitting to considerable inconvenience and expense, in a seemingly futile effort to retain his status as a member of the House of Bishops. What is the meaning of it all?

DIFFICULTIES OF THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS

Insofar as any Bishops may be obsessed by the importance of earthly and ecclesiastical pomp, and the objective reality of heavenly phantasms, perhaps they should not be considered capable of imaging any other Bishop as being obsessed by plain humanitarian

idealism. Because they are ignorant of the psychology of conflicting urges, the Bishops cannot imagine an extremely religious person who temporarily expresses his religious temperament in atheistic or materialistic terminology. Those who have a need for being judged by the clothes they wear, will be prone to judge others by some of their words, the clothes for part of their thoughts, rather than to judge them by what they really are. Accordingly, most of Bishop Brown's fellow-Bishops cannot understand him. Since apparently he is neither fighting for supernatural glory, nor American dollars, he must surely be insane. Any other explanation is apparently unthinkable, *for Bishops*, unless they are still orthodox enough to believe in demonic possession. Furthermore, to excuse Bishop Brown on the ground of insanity may both express and create the illusion that a charitable attitude is being held by the House of Bishops toward an "unfortunate" member. It also contains the soothing suggestion that maybe all doubt that is cast upon the "Divine Realities" within either Church or State, are evidence of insanity. Of course, they must insist upon Bishop Brown's insanity. But, why not put him out of the House of Bishops because of such insanity?

The only trouble with this theory is that Bishop Brown won't play the part, according to the ordinary conception of what an insane man should do. Also, he is very disconcerting because of the very devilish cunning which he exhibits in the management of his defense. Some bishops have expressed it almost as bluntly as this: "Bishop Brown has manoeuvred to secure extraordinary publicity, in support of a defense which is terribly clever for embarrassing and humiliating conservative Bishops." I conclude, therefore, that it is not his heresy which troubles the Bishops, half so much as his economic views. But, because they are not ready to admit that the Church is a mere political club, they cannot tell the public that this is the cause of their desire to expel him. Herein is another cause for distress. On the other hand, when Bishop Brown demands a standard of orthodoxy in terms of a uniform theological mental content, they are equally silent and helpless.

Because they are unable to meet the demands of the situation, the Bishops experience a feeling of inadequacy. Not knowing enough about their own psychologic imperatives, they explain their discomfiture in terms of the objective stimulus, namely: Bishop Brown. Accordingly, they must hate him with the exact intensity by which they are distressed; consequently nothing can be considered in ex-

planation, extenuation, or compromise, as to Bishop Brown's heresy.

In fact, it is quite freely and ruefully admitted that by his defense this "insane" Bishop has evinced so unusual an intellectual acumen, that it was wholly beyond the mental capacity of the Bishops to anticipate it, even in imagination. They thought the trial would be all over in an hour or two. The first trial lasted for five long, tense and embarrassing days. The second lasted two whole days, each with much newspaper publicity. This miscalculation also makes them sad. If, as they now say, Bishop Brown's heresy is due to a want of proper education, it looks as if their conception of proper education is one that would have left him too ignorant to make any effective defense.

Many Bishops are now free to admit that the whole heresy hunt was a great mistake, but, unhappily, they cannot undo it. That is another cause for being sore. They were not prepared for such a tremendous showdown, and are quite conscious that, in the estimation of a large share of the public, they have been made to look almost ridiculous. That damages their vanity without redress. Since Bishop Brown is the objective factor in their disappointment and chagrin, many of them must get relief by hating him and all of his ways. If the Bishops, themselves, were not considerably more heretical than Mr. Brown, they would certainly tell us that both Bishop Brown's heresy, and his unusual defense of it, exhibit only the superhuman cunning of Satan, whom the heretical Bishop must be serving under a secret written contract, signed with his own blood. According to such a more conservative orthodoxy, Bishop Brown should be burned or stoned to death as being a wizard. For such a more rigorous orthodoxy the Bishops are perhaps a bit too intelligent (too heretical); or, is it that they are too masochistic, or too cowardly? The only alternative is that the House of Bishops shall accept Bishop Brown's challenge to define orthodoxy, in terms of a required uniform mental content.

For this challenge their much-vaunted superior intelligence seems to be inadequate. So then, the House of Bishops is floundering between the devil of the older orthodoxy and the deep sea of modern science. Had their boasted intellectual superiority been more real, then they would have turned the tables, and made Bishop Brown and his defense look ridiculous and themselves as maintaining an attitude of assured confidence, instead of childlike resentment. As it is, it looks to the outsider as if the whole matter were a conflict between a conventional and an unconventional mode of

satisfying an egoistic religious urge. Had the Bishops been able to define orthodoxy, they could thereby have eliminated the greater part of the defendant's spectacular tactics, and made the defense appear very commonplace.

WHY BISHOP BROWN STICKS

Let me try to make a partial explanation of Bishop Brown as I see him, and as I hope that he wishes to be understood. Perhaps mere ordinary humans can be made to understand him, even though his fellow Bishops fail to do so. I asked Bishop Brown why he didn't get out. He answered: "I wish to build on the past, and could not sever myself from it, even if I wished to do so. I have scores of vestigial organs in my body, that seem useless without being harmful. Why should I have them all cut out? When any of my vestigial organs endanger my health, I will not hesitate to have such of them removed. The same is true of my mental life. I must build on the past and I cannot wholly disconnect myself from it. I still enjoy the ceremonials and drama of the Church services. For me these no longer symbolize the miraculous or supernatural. However, by having brought down to earth the supposed reality behind the creeds and ceremonials, and by relating religion quite exclusively to the practical problem of improving our human relations *here* and *now*, the services have become more meaningful and more real for me, than when I considered them as a means to supernatural glory. So long as these remaining habits of the past do not impair my mental life or growth, I could not justify a desire to disconnect from *all* of these habits and associations of my mental past. More efficiently than ever before, I can make the Church and all its forms a useful vehicle for transporting a live message of real progress, and of human use here and now."

BISHOP BROWN'S SUBJECTIVE CONFLICT

I suspect that among Bishop Brown's present associates there are persons who could show him some flaw in this logic; in fact, I think that I see the flaw. Therefore, I am convinced that Bishop Brown has much more of the old-fashioned religion tucked away in his "vestigial" or unconscious mentation than he himself is aware of.

I would not be much surprised if in some early morning hour I should find him around at the back door of some old-fashioned fundamentalist shrine, making generous donation for its support. In my view, Bishop Brown's extravagant sentimentalism implies an almost incurable religious component in his temperament. If religious devotion is still possible for him, then the zeal of his defense is not the whole-hearted expression of a well-unified, exclusive devotion to the social betterment, such as might conceivably be promoted by his contest. In that situation, the unconsciously working urges of his personality will dominate some section of his actual conduct, quite in contradiction to some of his conscious attitudes or of their realizations. So the zeal of his defense, if not determined objectively, furnishes us the exact measure of the religious zeal that is now being ineffectively repressed, because it comes in conflict with some contrary, and equally sentimental interest. In such a situation one might infer that Bishop Brown had merely reverted to an emotional attachment to the economic class of his youth, in which he suffered greatly as one of the exploited poor.

In that event, Bishop Brown's internal conflict of impulses might, on the one hand, be a desire to help the exploited ones, and an equally intense emotional aversion to institutionalized religion, as the chief bulwark of legalized exploitation, for which the Church furnishes a social and moral gloss. This impulse predisposed him to accept a communist creed, and compels him to rationalize his aversion to exploitation in terms of an opposition to the Church, or to its theology. It may be only a confusion between theology and religion, which makes our "heretic" express himself in atheistic and materialistic terms. Various other Bishops of his Church, being similarly confused, have become quite blind to the religious element of his personality. Therefore, they view him through a critical logic, and not with psychologic insight. To describe Bishop Brown's personality as that of a "religious 'atheist,'" is, for the psychologically blind ones, an unintelligible paradox. To their psychologically unformed minds, a Christian spirit and an atheistic rationalization cannot be combined in one person.

On the other hand, Bishop Brown's subjective conflict probably consists, in part, of an essentially religious (sentimental) temperament, with its former theological rationalization temporarily suppressed. So then his tenacious clinging to the "vestigeal" religious habits of his past, might come to be viewed as the continued sentimental, unconscious need for a phantasmal solace, to neutralize the

suffering of his childhood, just such a fictitious solace as the Church always offers, and religion supplies.

DEMANDS STANDARD OF ORTHODOXY

I will now describe some actual conduct in relation to Bishop Brown's defense, and leave the readers to see, if, with that help, they can make the still better explanation of the riddle.

Probably Bishop Brown would say that he has never asked anything more of the House of Bishops than that it shall *adequately* translate its creeds into concrete mental imagery before asserting a belief in them, or *defining* orthodoxy and heresy. That seems a reasonable request. But the ire of the Bishops is aroused by the very fact that it seems so reasonable, and yet is apparently quite beyond their capacities. Bishop Brown admits that, if the ancient literalism as to miracles and the supernatural remains the test of orthodoxy, then he is a one hundred per cent heretic. But he insists that, by the same test, not one Bishop is one hundred per cent orthodox. So far, the House of Bishops has not denied that. But, without waiting for their answer, he has asked them to prove their own orthodoxy, according to any exact general standard that has been authoritatively established by the Church, by which they are also willing to depose themselves as well as him. That also is so obviously fair that they cannot, with self-approval, ignore it; but neither have they the ability to supply such a standard. There is where the shoe pinches. If the creeds have no definable uniform mental content, then the whole ecclesiastical establishment that tries to live by doctrine alone becomes ridiculous.

As early as 1922, Bishop Brown wrote a letter to the House of Bishops which contained the following proposition: "If the members of the House of Bishops will place themselves on record as believing the representations of the Bible, literally interpreted, concerning the creation of Adam and Eve; the planting of the Garden of Eden; the Fall of Adam and Eve; and its effects; the birth of Jesus; His death and descent into hell; His resurrection and ascension into Heaven; and His second coming to raise all deceased men, women and children from the dead, and judge and send them to Heaven or Hell, I will resign, and do hereby agree to resign my seat in the House."

That offer of the year 1922 has not yet been accepted, though both mailed to the House of Bishops and published in the periodical press. The charges of heresy were not served on Bishop Brown until the year 1924. Obviously the Bishops did not find this apparently easy way of getting rid of their "heretical" brother to be so easy as it seemed. This embarrassment is apparently due to some unorthodox or unChristian intellectual vanity, which makes it impossible for them to proclaim a one hundred per cent adherence to the standards of the old orthodoxy.

WHY NOT BOW TO AUTHORITY?

Some Bishops find fault with Bishop Brown somewhat after this manner: "The trouble with Bishop Brown is his conceit. Probably every one of us has at some time been through his skepticism. When our own intellect led us away from a satisfactory and a wholly orthodox solution for the problem of our troubled souls, we humbly bowed to the authority of the whole Church, as being possessed of more collective wisdom than any one of us could possibly have. Only Bishop Brown's vanity can be preventing him from likewise subordinating his personal judgment to the collective wisdom of the whole Church. There is no other way out of his difficulty, except that he shall humbly bow to the authority of the Church in all matters of doctrine, or get out of the priesthood."

No Bishop is known to me who, in this respect, has contradicted the Rev. C. S. Hughson, who has said: "No one Bishop, nor any party of the Church, can be infallible, but the whole Catholic Church herself speaks infallibly when she declares what we must believe or do in order to be saved."¹

When I asked Bishop Brown why he did not bow to this "infallible" authority of the whole Church, he answered: "First, I do not know that the American Church as a whole, has ever made any interpretation of the creeds. Secondly, because I do not believe even the whole Church is so infallible that it is incapable of growth and of new revelations. Any other position would imply omniscience, which I cannot accord to any body of humans—not even to the House of Bishops, nor to the General Assembly. The Church is no more infallible than a labor union convention, composed of men and women who are graduated only from the school of hard knocks.

¹ *The Apostles Creed*, by Rev. C. S. Hughson, p. 25.

The Church is mine as much as it is that of the other Bishops. I have a duty to work from within to convert them to my way of thinking about humanizing religion. Furthermore, I believe that other Bishops, who attach the most value to authority, are quite as vain and wilful as I am. I suspect they will bow to the authority of the Church only until they find themselves in the minority, and that they will fight as I do against being declared in the minority. I also suspect that they do not all bow to the infallible authority of the Church, as it has expressed itself in former times."

"You are a psychologist," he said to me. "I wish you would tell me what you think about the possibility, psychologically speaking, of anyone subordinating and thus actually changing his personal deliberate judgment to the contrary opinion of a group of his peers. I can understand from my own experience that before one has deliberated upon a subject, of metaphysics or theology let us say, it is easy to act the part of a parrot or of a phonograph with respect to Church authority. As a parrot I felt as self-righteous as if I had achieved a personal judgment about a difficult controverted matter. Let me make it concrete," continued Bishop Brown. "Let us assume that a very young child is taught to say, 'Twice two is four.' For a long time it may repeat the words without adequately grasping their significance or visualizing their meaning. If later the child actually visualizes the facts symbolized by the words, then is it psychologically possible for that child to thereafter *believe* that twice two make seven, merely because the illiterate parents say so and seem to be honest? It appears to me that no authority could make it possible for this child thereafter to believe, *in the sense of visualizing the facts*, that twice two makes seven. Such a child could only make the affirmation without ascribing any meaning to them."

I suggested that this seemed to imply that he thought his fellow-bishops to be hypocrites. "Oh, no," he protested. "Not one of them could possibly be a conscious hypocrite. But what I mean is that one can very conscientiously affirm *as if believing* in any impossibility, so long as one does not attempt to translate the words into a concrete mental image of things and their behavior; and so long as one does not co-ordinate this one situation or affirmation with all of our other experience and knowledge. Any very young child or a parrot could honestly say, 'I believe that twice two makes seven,' or 'I believe in bodily restoration and resurrection, long after death and decay,' so long as it has not learned to make its words harmonize in mental content with the ordinary meaning of such words, nor

with other human experiences, such as the chemistry of life and decay. The bishops can do likewise. They say I am not highly educated, but I have at least learned late in life to understand this little bit of the psychology of belief. Have they learned even that much?"

"There is another answer to this proposition of submitting to the infallible authority of the whole Church. The first article of the Apostles Creed has been officially and authoritatively interpreted thus: 'Almighty Father did, at the beginning, create form, and *make of naught*, heaven and earth, and all things contained in this world' " (p. 31).

"Personally, I find it a little difficult to believe that a single member of the House of Bishops now believes in the creation of the universe out 'of naught,' because I am sure they are better educated than myself, or even Mr. Bryan. I also wonder if they really believe in the creedal 'hell' or the creedal 'resurrection,' as these have in the past been interpreted by the same 'infallible' authority of 'the whole Church' and of the State. Just look at these pages," said Bishop Brown, as he handed me a well-thumbed and torn copy of the *Formularies of Faith*, which had been carefully indexed with his pen. Here was the statement that, "Almighty God for the transgression of this commandment, *caused brimstone and fire* to rain down from heaven." Also on the Day of Judgment "we shall be cast into the *brenning lake of hell, where is fire, brimstone, weeping, wailing, and gnashing of teeth without end*" (p. 162). And, again, interpreting the seventh article of the Apostles Creed: "And all others, which shall be judged to *everlasting pain* and death, being upon His left hand, He *shall send them down into Hell* there to be *punished in body and soul eternally with fire that never shall have end*, which was prepared from the beginning of the world unto the Devil and his angels" (pp. 239-249). "Is it possible for them to believe that a body of flesh and bone would *never* be consumed or chemically decomposed by such a crematory? I find it a bit difficult to believe," continued Bishop Brown, "that any of my fellow-bishops will really bow whole-heartedly to the authority of the whole Church even upon the matter of the resurrection. See this!" Here is what he showed me, again from the *Formularies of Faith*.

"That is to say, that we shall rise and live again in the *salsame bodies* and souls that we now have, and so shall utterly overcome (evade and escape?) death" (p. 43). Here is another: "Almighty God shall, by the operation of His Holy Spirit, stir and raise up

again *the very flesh and bodies* of all men, women, and children, both good and bad, Christian and heathen, that ever lived here in this world, from the beginning of the same, and died before that day, and although the said flesh and bodies were dead before and buried, yea *and consumed by fire and water*, or by any other means destroyed, yet I believe that God shall, of His infinite power, make them all at that day whole and perfect again, and so every man generally shall resume and *take again the very selfsame body and flesh* which they had while they lived here on earth, and so shall rise from death and live again in the *very selfsame body and soul* which they had before" (pp. 59-60; see also, pp. 236, 238, 239, 251).

"At that time it was not yet generally known that physical growth was not a matter of mere additions to the chemical parts which constitute the body at birth. Now, however, specialists tell us that during every seven years or so, all the particles of our body are eliminated and replaced by new cells. Do the Bishops still believe in a resurrection of the very same chemical particles or body cells with which we were born? But that was the conception of the credal resurrection as given in the Formularies (p. 42). Could they now accept that opinion, even on the authority of the whole Church?"² Before the General Convention of 1789 set forth and established the Book of Common Prayer as the Liturgy of the American Church, a solemn concordat was entered into with the Church of England, that the Church in the United States would not depart from the

² These quotations are from the *Institution of the Christian Man*, dated 1537, which was popularly known as "The Bishop's Book." I had heard some question as to whether this formulation really was supported by the authority of the whole Anglican Church. Upon examination I found the following historic conclusions expressed on this subject. "The Bishop's Book" consisted of the *Articles About Religion Set Out by the Convocation, and Published by the King's Authority*, in the year 1536. The "Institution" was "Compiled by a Royal Commission Consisting of All the Bishops . . . Eight Arch-Deacons, and Seventeen Other Doctors of Divinity or of Law . . . Most of those Concerned in the Subsequent Compilation of the Prayer Book Being of the Number. These Were All Members of Convocation and All (without exception) Subscribed Their Names to the Book as Its Authors: But From the Traditions Which Connected Still More Closely With the Convocations, Probably It Was Afterwards Subscribed by the Whole Body of Each Province. . . . There Has Not Been Such a Comprehensive Consensus of Opinion Gathered Together At Any Time Since Then in the Church of England. Introduction to the: *Doctrine of the Church of England*, 1868."

Church of England in any point of doctrine, and would retain the same discipline and forms of worship.³

"If the House of Bishops will say that they bow to the authority of the whole Anglican Church in all of such antique literalism as is found in the *Formularies of the Faith* then I, too, will bow to that authority, or resign. I suspect that many bishops now repudiate much of the action of the whole Anglican Church of the past, and are content to quibble about the resurrection of a 'spiritual body' only. I only want them to face all such issues publicly and with manly candor. Why have they dodged a specific answer to every definite issue of this character that has been raised in my behalf? The public can decide. By the way, why do they not bow to the authority of a whole Church in its declarations against the jurisdiction of one bishop over another? I wonder if the authority of the whole Church was designed only to make me humble and to leave their arrogance in tact? Or, is it a power which they also acknowledge, even when it conflicts with their own intelligence and vanity? Or, their lust for power? Or for pelf? I just wonder out loud like that. Perhaps, upon second thought, I should not have expressed such ideas, and I think I prefer that you shall not use it against me."

I repeated to Bishop Brown the argument that the House of Bishops should be considered something like a social club. If, then, he found himself out of harmony with its social life, that he should not resist the effort to exclude him. He claimed the analogy to be a false one, because the House of Bishops is not a social club. On the contrary, it is more like a trade union of workers organized for human betterment, manifesting their vague and general unity of purpose under the more concrete religious symbols. That the creed is indefinable shows that there is no specific belief or behavior which constitutes the indispensable element of union. Therefore, once having been initiated, as it were, he remains always a member of this ecclesiastical trade union, to-wit, The House of Bishops, which provides only for "excommunicating such as are guilty of manifest crimes."⁴

"Since I have not been penalized for 'manifest crimes' the rules of our organization and the Canon law as to the indelibility of orders, if respected, require that I be allowed to retain my place in the

³ Rev. Edwin Augustine White, *D. D. General Convention and Dogma, Churchman*, 132:10; July 11, 1925.

⁴ *Formularies of Faith*, p. 278.

House of Bishops as one of the workers for a better world. No analogies drawn from the rules of mere secular social clubs can be allowed to over-rule the positive Canon law in this matter. If the House of Bishops shall esteem their own wilfulness more sacred than the Canon law, they will use their admitted physical ability to exclude them. It is up to them to show how much respect they have for the authoritative declarations of our Church."

Bishop Brown further contended that, since the Church is an organization to promote human betterment under the Protestant Episcopal symbols, and since he is devoted both to such work and to its symbols, as if these were a copyrighted trade-union label, there rests upon all an obligation for mutual tolerance as to differences in the point of emphasis, in promoting human welfare. Bishop Brown's present declarations put the greatest emphasis upon accelerating the democratization of welfare. With many of his fellow-bishops the emphasis appears to be upon the perpetuation of aristocratic privileges. If this difference is the secret cause for the desire to expell Bishop Brown, such merely social reasons will be satisfactory, even though a misleading rationalization and mask, but can furnish no actual grounds for expulsion under the Canon law. Bishop Brown has not thwarted or impeded any social betterment for which the ecclesiastical trade-union is presumably organized. On the other hand, the metaphysical abstractions of the creed, which can be so interpreted as to furnish a plausible pretext for accomplishing any desired and (which desire the creed did not create), also falls short when a definition of the creeds in terms of uniform mental content is demanded.

After numerous conversations with Bishop Brown, I believe that I can fairly summarize his conscious purposes about as follows: He would like credit for liberalizing the Church. He believes that it is impossible to define orthodoxy in terms of any uniform mental content. He wishes the House of Bishops to admit that as a psychologic fact, and to act accordingly. From this it would automatically follow, that the Church would be officially committed to the "broad Church" policy. Although Bishop Brown once counted himself as of the High Church party, he now believes that the official policy should be neither "High" nor "Low," but "Broad."⁵ By this he understands that everyone who lives a conventionally righteous life, who enjoys working for human betterment under the creedal and ceremonial symbols of the Church, shall be eligible to member-

⁵ See Hawsis, *Contemporary Review*, June, 1890.

ship in the House of Bishops, as well as to be admitted among its financial supporters. Some Bishops have declared that those who support the Church financially may have this larger liberty, but would deny it to only those who consume the wealth so contributed. Bishop Brown repudiates all such discrimination as to the different degrees of orthodoxy which are to be required from those who only supply funds, and those who, consume the Church funds. He would have the Church act upon the assumption that, what is sauce for the geese is also sauce for the ganders.

Bishop Brown is more than a mere theoretical humanitarian. With him, humanitarianism is felt as a religious passion, and therefore is open to a suspicion of emotional distortion. His acceptance of a radical economic program is the effect, and not a cause of his humanitarianism. His apparent emotional disturbance will probably hinder conduct that is always wholly consistent with his theory. He wishes the Church to be liberal enough to admit all like himself to the pulpit, as well as to the pews. If the House of Bishops will place the Church on record as opposed to the liberal attitude of the Broad Church party, then the publicity given to his contentions and trial will, for many persons, discredit the claims of superior intelligence which is so often made for the House of Bishops. Bishop Brown is insistent that the House of Bishops shall put itself on record in the full light of a public discussion of the issues which he is emphasizing. He desires those who support the Church, as well as those who only take their naps in the Church, may hereafter know what sort of Church this is.

He believes that he cannot be put upon trial alone. Inevitably, he says, the House of Bishops is also on trial before the enlightened portion of public opinion, even Protestant Episcopal public opinion. When judgment shall have been passed upon Bishop Brown, quite inevitably and automatically the House of Bishops will, by that same token, pass a judgment upon itself and upon the Church. What will that verdict be? This is also the question which really interests the public. The fate of Bishop Brown matters very little. He insists that deposition can never prevent him from being a highly religious person or a real Bishop in a real Catholic Church, whatever such words may mean.