SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST BIBLE STUDENTS' SOURCE BOOK

1. Abraham, Astronomical Knowledge of, According to Jewish Traditions

SOURCE: C. J. Gadd, *History and Monuments of Ur* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1929), pp. 176, 254. Used by permission of the publisher and of Chatto & Windus, Ltd., London.

[p. 176] In Berossus, the native historian who wrote in Greek at the beginning of the third century before Christ, a reference to these events was detected by subsequent writers upon Jewish history. Josephus has this: "Berossus makes mention of our father Abraham without naming him; he says, 'In the tenth generation after the Flood there was among the Chaldaeans a certain just man and great, and well seen in astronomy."" ...

[p. 254] There has come down to us (at third hand) a fragment purporting to be quoted from the historian Eupolemus, an Alexandrian Jew who wrote several works on Jewish history which have not survived. It may be, however, that the fragment in question was actually written by an imitator of Eupolemus, in the second century. In any case his words are as follows: "in the tenth generation [after the Flood], in the city Kamarina of Babylonia, which some call the city Urié (that is, being interpreted, city of the Chaldaeans), there was born in the thirteenth generation Abraham, who surpassed all in (nobility of) birth and wisdom. He also it was who invented astrology and the Chaldaean art [of magic], and by reason of his eminent piety was well-pleasing to God."

2. Abraham, Expedition of

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 75, 76. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 75] Genesis 14 can no longer be considered as unhistorical, in view of the many confirmations of details which we owe to recent finds. For example, the route along the edge of the Syrian Desert used to be rejected as unsuit- [p. 76] able for such a remote age, but now we know that there was a line of Early and early Middle Bronze fortresses running south along it. Such names as Chedorlaomer and Arioch have apparently been identified in Elamite and Mari sources from the Patriarchal Age. The chieftains of the Execration Texts (p. 8) are surrounded by retainers bearing the same Egyptian

designation (spelled hanaku in a cuneiform tablet from fifteenth century Palestine) as the

hanikim of Gen. 14:14*ff*. Jerusalem is also mentioned in the Execration Texts. There are also a good many words and phrases not paralleled elsewhere in the Bible, which are found in recently deciphered documents from the second millennium. Unfortunately, however, we cannot yet date this chapter, though the writer's personal preference is for the seventeenth century B.C., several generations after the reign of Hammurabi (about 1728–1686 B.C.).

3. Abraham—Hagar in the Light of Sumerian Law

SOURCE: C. Leonard Woolley, *The Sumerians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928), pp. 102, 103. Used by permission.

[p. 102] A barren wife could be divorced, taking back her dowry and receiving a sum of money by way of compensation; otherwise the husband could take a second wife, but in that case he not only continued to be responsible for the maintenance of the first but had to safeguard her position in the [p. 103] home; the new wife was legitimate, but not the equal of the old, and a written contract defined the degree of her subservience, thus

she might be obliged 'to wash the feet of the first and to carry her chair to the temple of the god'. In practice, however, the status of the two women must have been somewhat anomalous, and to forestall this the wife might present to her husband one of her own slaves as a concubine; on giving birth to a child the slave-woman automatically became free (which was not the case if the husband took one of his own slaves into his harem) but was by no means the equal of her old mistress; indeed, should she rashly aim at becoming her rival, the mistress could reduce her again to slavery and sell her or otherwise get rid of her from the house;—the history of Abraham, Sarah and Hagar is an illustration of this, for in every detail Abraham was not acting weakly or arbitrarily but was putting into practice the old Sumerian law in which he had been brought up.

4. Abraham—Payment for Cave Silver, by Weight SOURCE: C. Leonard Woolley, *The Sumerians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928), pp. 117, 118. Used by permission.

[p. 117] There was no coined money and ... all trade was by barter. For local dealing values were generally reckoned in barley-but for larger sums and for distant trade gold and silver were more workable standards, the shekel of silver being the unit; in the period of Sargon of Akkad gold was worth eight times its weight in silver. Sometimes, undoubtedly, the metal was handled in a recognizable form, ingots, rings, &c., which would facilitate reckoning, but even so the value had to be verified by the scales;— Abraham buying the cave at Macpelah 'weighed ... 400 shekels of silver, current money with the merchant'. The manner of doing business may be illustrated by a (later) letter from a merchant to his partner living in another city, who has sent to him one Shamashbel-ilani with a demand-note for fourteen shekels; he writes: 'I have sent to Warad-ilishu two-thirds of a mina of silver' (1 mina=60 shekels) 'and the receipt of that has been acknowledged in writing in the presence of my witnesses. He has gone to Assyria... As concerning what thou hast written about the fourteen [p. 118] shekels of Shamash-belilani, I have not paid him the money. Catch Warad-ilishu and make him weigh out the silver with interest more or less; from this sum take the fourteen shekels and send me the balance.'

5. Advent Christian Church

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 15, 16.

[p. 15] *History*. The disappointment felt by the Adventists at the passing of October 22, 1844, the date set by S. S. Snow for the second advent of Christ, resulted in confusion and much discussion as to the accuracy of the calculations. In 1852, Jonathan Cummings, F. H. Berick, and several others, mostly young men who had recently joined the Advent movement, began to teach that the Lord had bestowed upon them the "high and distinguishing gift of understanding the time" for the coming of Christ, which they claimed would be in the autumn of 1853 or the spring of 1854. Inasmuch as this view was not acceptable to the main body of Adventists, a paper was started in Lowell, Mass., and named The World's Crisis, for the advocacy of this 1854-time argument. This caused a division among the Adventists. When 1854 passed without bringing the end of the age the men who had led the movement admitted their mistake, and it was hoped that their followers would rejoin the original body.

By this time, however, a well-marked difference of opinion had developed among the Adventists in reference to the immortality of the soul. The followers of Mr. Cummings had for the most part accepted the doctrine that man is by nature wholly mortal and is unconscious in death, and that immortality is not inherent in mankind, but is the gift of

God to be bestowed in the resurrection on those only who have been true followers of Christ. The main body of Adventists, on the other hand, accepted, in general, the doctrine of the conscious state of the dead and the eternal suffering of the wicked. Owing largely to this difference, which they considered to be upon a vital point, when a general conference met at Boston, June 5, 1855, the followers of Mr. Cummings did not unite in it, but held a conference of their own on the same day. From this time the separation between the two bodies was definitely recognized. Those who had separated from the main body [see editors' note below] organized the Advent Christian Association at Worcester, Mass., November 6, 1861, and have since borne the name "Advent Christian Church." This branch of the Adventists now holds simply to the general imminence of the Christ's return, but takes the position that "no man knoweth the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh." They also emphasize that side of their faith which deals with the nature of man.

Doctrine. The Declaration of Principles held by this church, as unanimously approved by the Advent Christian Association and General Conference of America, in 1900, emphasizes the following points:

- 1. The Bible is the Word of God, containing a revelation given to man under divine supervision and providence; its historical statements are correct, and it is the only divine standard of faith and practice.
- 2. As revealed in the Bible, (*a*) there is one God, the Father, Creator of all things; (*b*) Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, came into the world, died for man's sins, was raised for his justification, ascended into heaven as the High Priest and Mediator, and will come again to judge the living and the dead, and reign forever and ever; (*c*) the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, sent from God to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, sanctifies man and seals him unto the day of redemption.
- 3. Man was created for immortality, but through sin has forfeited his divine birthright, and only through faith in Christ can become partaker of the divine nature and live forever.
- 4. Death is, to all persons, righteous and wicked, a condition of unconsciousness, to remain unchanged until the resurrection at Christ's second coming, when the righteous will receive everlasting life, while the wicked will be "punished with everlasting destruction," suffering complete extinction of being.
- 5. Salvation is free to all who in this life and age accept the conditions, all hope of future probation or universal salvation being excluded.
- 6. Jesus Christ, according to His promise, will, "in like manner" as He went into heaven, come again to this earth to reign forever, and this coming is the hope of the church, inasmuch as upon it depend the reward of the righteous, the abolition of sin, and the renewal of the earth to become the eternal home of the redeemed.
- [p. 16] 7. Bible prophecy indicates the approximate time of Christ's return, and the great duty of the hour is the proclamation of this soon-coming redemption.
- 8. The church, an institution of divine origin, includes all Christians of whatever name, but the local organization should be independent of outside control, subject to no dictation of priest, bishop, or pope, although recognizing true fellowship and unity of action.
- 9. The only ordinances recognized are baptism and the Lord's Supper, immersion being considered the only true baptism. Admission to the church is by vote of the majority after

baptism and profession of faith. Open communion is practiced and the invitation to the Lord's Supper is general, participation being left to the individual.

- 10. The first day of the week, set apart by the early church in commemoration of the resurrection, is held to be the proper Christian Sabbath, to be observed as a day of rest and religious worship.
- 11. War as a means of settling international disputes is held to be contrary to the spirit and teachings of Christ, contrary to the spirit of true brotherhood, and inimical to the welfare of humanity. Christians are justified in refusing to bear arms for conscience' sake.

Organization. In accordance with the principles outlined, the Advent Christian Church is congregational in church government, each church being absolutely independent in its own management...

For fellowship and the better conduct of such work as belongs to them in common, the churches are associated in annual conferences, which are grouped in five districts, while the Advent Christian General Conference represents the entire denomination.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1958), 30,586 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 252). The "main body" of Millerites from whom the Advent Christians separated existed for a time under the name of "Evangelical Adventists," but it is now defunct. Separate from either of these, and at that time much smaller, was the group that in 1861 organized as the Seventh-day Adventists, which see.]

6. Adventist Bodies

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 3-6.

[p. 3] *General Statement*. What is known as the "Advent movement" originated with William Miller, who was born at Pittsfield, Mass., February 15, 1782, and died in Low Hampton, Y., December 20, 1849. He bore a good reputation as a farmer and citizen, served as a captain in the War of 1812, and was a diligent student and a great reader, although he had only a common-school education. For some years he was an avowed deist, but, as he said, "found no spiritual rest" until, in 1816, he was converted and united with the Baptists. After his conversion, as objections to the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures were pressed upon him in the same way that he had formerly pressed them upon others, he determined to devote himself to a careful study of the Bible, laying aside commentaries and using the marginal references and Cruden's Concordance as his only helps. As a result of this study he became satisfied that the Bible is its own interpreter, and that it is "a system of revealed truths, so clearly and simply given that the 'wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein."

At that time very little was heard from pulpit or press respecting the second coming of Christ, the general impression being that it must be preceded by the conversion of the world and the millennium, a long period of universal holiness and peace. As Mr. Miller studied the prophetic portions of the Bible, he became convinced that the doctrine of the world's conversion was unscriptural; that not only the parable of the wheat and the tares, as explained by Christ in Matthew xiii, 24–30, 36–43, but many other passages, teach the coexistence of Christianity and anti-Christianity while the gospel age lasts. As the period of a thousand years, during which Satan is bound, mentioned in Revelation xx, and from which the conception of the millennium is derived, lies between the first resurrection (Rev. xx, 4–6), which he understood to include all of the redeemed, and that of "the rest of the dead" (Rev. xx, 5), his conclusion was that the coming of Christ in person, power, and glory must be pre-millennial. He believed that at this coming there would be a resurrection of all the dead in Christ, who, together with all the redeemed then alive, would be "caught up to meet the Lord in the air"; that the wicked would then be judged,

and the present heavens and earth dissolved by fire, to be followed by their regeneration as the inheritance of the redeemed, involving the glorious, immortal, and personal reign of Christ and all His saints.

As to the time when the Advent might be expected, Mr. Miller's conclusion was as follows:

In examining the prophecies ******* I found that only four universal monarchies are predicted in the Bible to precede the setting up of God's everlasting kingdom; that three of those had passed away—Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Grecia—and that the fourth, Rome, had already passed into its last state *******. And finding all the signs of the times, and the present condition of the world, to compare harmoniously with the prophetic description of the last days, I was compelled to believe that the world had about reached the limits of the period allotted for its continuance.

Moreover, as a result of his study of prophetic chronology, he believed not only that the Advent was at hand, but that its date might be fixed with some definiteness. Taking the more or less generally accepted view that the "days" of prophecy symbolize years, he was led to the conclusion that the 2,300 days referred to in Daniel viii, 13, 14, the beginning of which he dated from the commandment to restore Jerusalem, given in 457 B.C. (Daniel ix, 25), and the 1,335 days of the same prophet (xii, 12), which he took to constitute the latter part of the 2,300 days, would end coincidentally in or about the year 1843. The cleansing [p. 4] of the sanctuary, which was to take place at the close of the 2,300 days (Daniel viii, 14), he understood to mean the cleansing of the earth at the second coming of Christ, which, as a result of his computations, he confidently expected would occur some time between March 21, 1843, and March 21, 1844, the period corresponding to the Jewish year.

The public labors of Mr. Miller, according to the best evidence to be obtained, date from the autumn of 1831, when he accepted an invitation to go to Dresden, N. Y., to speak on the subject of the Lord's return. He gave several addresses, with the result that many persons were "hopefully converted." Other invitations quickly followed, and thus began a work which in a few years, though not without opposition, spread far and wide, ministers and members of various evangelical denominations uniting in the expectation of the speedy, personal, and premillennial coming of Christ. The first general gathering of those interested in this subject was held in Boston in October 1840. The call for this gathering simply invited Christians of all denominations to come together to compare views and to confer as to the best means of promulgating this important truth. The Advent movement Mr. Miller was further assisted by the appearance of a number of papers, such as the Midnight Cry, the Signs of the Times, and the Trumpet of Alarm, emphasizing these views.

As the time approached when the coming of Christ was expected there was widespread interest and elaborate preparation. When the Lord did not come in the spring of 1844, Mr. Miller published to the world his mistake. However, in the summer of Samuel Sheffield Snow, George Storrs, and several other prominent leaders, began to preach that the second advent of Christ would occur on October 22, 1844, which was the date that year of the Jewish Day of Atonement. Great numbers of the Adventists eagerly accepted this view. Mr. Miller and Joshua V. Himes held aloof from any public advocacy of this theory. But Mr. Miller did write a letter which appeared in the Advent Herald under date of October 16, 1844, in which he expressed his faith in this October date for the coming of Christ and announced that if this prediction too should fail, he would suffer twice as much disappointment as he had experienced before. The passing of this date

without the occurrence of the expected event was a source of great disappointment to Mr. Miller, as well as to those who had so strongly advocated it, and their followers. Mr. Miller did not, however, to the end of his life, change his views with regard to the premillennial character of the Advent itself, or his belief that "the day of the Lord is near, even at the door."

In its beginning the Adventist movement was wholly within the existing churches and there was no attempt to establish a separate denomination. Mr. Miller himself during the greater part of his work was a Baptist licentiate. In June 1843, however, the Maine Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church passed resolutions condemning the movement, and from that time considerable opposition was manifested. In some cases Adventists were forced to leave the churches of which they were members; in others they withdrew voluntarily, basing their action, in part, on the command to "come out of Babylon" (Rev. xviii, 4), including under the term "Babylon" not only the Roman Catholic Church, but the Protestant churches. Mr. Miller and other leaders earnestly deprecated this interpretation, yet it influenced some to leave the old communions.

The Adventists who, for either of the causes mentioned, withdrew from the existing churches generally formed organizations of their own, although in some places they omitted any formal organization, considering either that the time was too short or that organization was sinful. No definite move was made, however, toward the general organization of the adherents of the Adventist doctrines until 1845. In that year, according to an estimate made by Mr. Miller, there were Advent congregations in "nearly a thousand places, numbering *** some fifty thousand believers." A conference was called at Albany, N. Y., in April 1845, for the purpose of defining their position, and was largely attended, Mr. Miller being present. A declaration of principles was adopted, embodying the views of Mr. Miller respecting the personal and premillennial character of the second advent of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, and the renewal of the earth as the abode of the redeemed, together with cognate points of doctrine, which have been summarized as follows:

- 1. The present heavens and earth are to be dissolved by fire, and new heavens and a new earth are to be created whose dominion is to be given to "the people of the saints of the Most High."
- [p. 5] 2. There are but two Advents of the Saviour, both of which are personal and visible. The first includes the period of His life from His birth to the Ascension; the second begins with His descent from heaven at the sounding of the last trump.
- 3. The second coming is indicated to be near at hand, even at the doors; and this truth should be preached to saints that they may rejoice, knowing that their redemption draws nigh; and to sinners that they may be warned to flee from the wrath to come.
- 4. The condition of salvation is repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Those who have repentance and faith will live soberly and righteously and godly in this world, looking for the Lord's appearing.
- 5. There will be a resurrection of the bodies of all the dead, both of the just and the unjust. Those who are Christ's will be raised at His coming; the rest of the dead, not until a thousand years later.
- 6. The only millennium taught in the Word of God is the thousand years intervening between the first resurrection and that of the rest of the dead.

- 7. There is no difference under the gospel dispensation between Jew and Gentile, but God will render to every man according to his deeds. The only restoration of Israel is in the restoration of the saints to the regenerated earth.
- 8. There is no promise of this world's conversion. The children of the kingdom and of the wicked one will continue together until the end of the world.
- 9. Departed saints do not enter their inheritance at death, that inheritance being reserved in heaven ready to be revealed at the second coming, when they will be equal to the angels, being the children of God and of the resurrection; but in soul and spirit they enter the paradise of God, to await in rest and comfort the final blessedness of the everlasting kingdom.

The somewhat loosely organized body formed at the general conference of Adventists held at Albany, N. Y., in April 1845 continued for a decade to include practically all the Adventists except those who held to the observance of the seventh, rather than the first, day of the week as the Sabbath. In 1855 the discussions, in which Jonathan Cummings had so prominent a part, resulted in the withdrawal of some members and the subsequent organization of the Advent Christian Church. The Adventists who continued their adherence to the original body were for the most part those who believed in the doctrine of the conscious state of the dead and the eternal suffering of the wicked, claiming on these points to be in accord with the personal views of Mr. Miller. They, however, felt the need of closer association, and in 1858 organized at Boston, Mass., the American Millennial Association, partly for the purpose of publishing material in support of their belief and partly as a basis of fellowship. Some years later the members of this society adopted the term "Evangelical Adventists" as a denominational name, with a view of distinguishing themselves from other bodies with which they differed on doctrinal points.

For some years the association published a periodical bearing at different periods the names, Signs of the Times, Advent Herald, Messiah's Herald, and Herald of the Coming One. It contributed to the support of the China Inland Mission and of laborers and missions in other fields, but as the older members died many of the younger families joined other evangelical denominations, and the number of churches and members diminished rapidly. In 1906 they reported 18 organizations with 481 members, 16 church edifices, and \$27,050 as value of church property; 9 Sunday schools with 57 officers and teachers and 264 scholars; and 8 ministers. When the inquiries for the census of 1916 were made, it appeared that all the churches, except a few in Pennsylvania, had disbanded or discontinued all services, and from those in Pennsylvania no information could be obtained. The denomination as an ecclesiastical body has, therefore, been dropped from this report.

Discussions in regard to the nature of the Advent, and particularly in regard to the future life, resulted in the formation of other bodies independent in organization but agreeing in the belief that the Advent is to be personal and premillennial and is near at hand and in their recognition of the influence of Mr. Miller and those immediately associated with him...

Two bodies listed in 1906 were not included in the table for 1916 or later censuses. The omission of the Evangelical Adventists is [p. 6] explained in a preceding paragraph. [For the principal Adventist bodies, see Advent Christians; Seventh-day Adventists.] The Churches of God (Adventist), Unattached Congregations, if any of these churches existed in 1936, 1926, or 1916, were probably included among the independent churches or merged with other Adventist bodies. The denomination reported prior to 1936 as "Churches of God in Christ Jesus" is more or less a local name, and it is also known, in some localities, as "Church of God of the Abrahamic Faith" [so listed in *YAC*, 1961]. An investigation shows the general conference to be organized under the name "Church of God," but in order to distinguish it from many other churches of this name the location of its headquarters is added for definiteness, … "(Oregon, Ill.)."

[EDITORS' NOTE: YAC, 1961, p. 252, lists the following Adventist bodies, with their 1959 membership figures:

Advent Christian 30,586 ('58) Church Church of God (Abrahamic Faith) 5,400 Life and Advent 363 Union **Primitive Advent** 586 Christian Church Seventh-day 311,535 (in U.S.).] Adventists

7. Adventists—Name Originated With Millerites

SOURCE: William Miller, "The Albany Conference," The Advent Herald, 9 (June 4, 1845), 130.

But it is again said that we have no right to be called Adventists, because there are others who believe in the premillennial advent; and that to apply it to ourselves is arrogancy. To this I reply, that it cannot be arrogancy if no others claim to belongs to us exclusively... It should, however, be understood, that words are entirely arbitrary, and that custom alone establishes their use. Was the term Adventist in use ten years ago? No,—it is not in the dictionary: it is a newly-coined word, made by appending an affix to the word Advent. In the use of the word it has been only applied to those of like precious faith with ourselves: and by its use the community understand who, and who alone are intended. The coiners of the word are entitled to it, and those who associate with them. But let it be distinctly understood, that at the Albany Conference [of the main body of Millerites in 1845], the question did not arise whether we should adopt that name. It was already upon us; and the only question that arose respecting, it, was whether when speaking of some fanatics who call themselves Adventists, the word should be permitted to remain in that connection.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The name "Adventists" distinguished the Millerites from the other group of premillennialists known as the "Literalists." Both groups taught "the Advent near" in opposition to the then dominant postmillennialist view that did not expect that event for a thousand years at least. The two groups differed (see No. 1085) in regard to the *nature* of the millennium and the kingdom. The Adventists taught that man's probation (that is, the opportunity for salvation) would end forever at the Second Advent, and that no human beings would be alive during the millennium except the redeemed in their glorified and immortal state. The Literalists envisioned a millennial kingdom comprising glorified saints, nonglorified Jews and nations (see No. 1073). Miller's setting of a date for the advent was not the major point of difference. Some of Miller's colleagues never accepted the definite time, whereas some English Literalists set dates.

The Millerites' millennial view survives among their principal heirs, the Advent Christians and Seventh-day Adventists, except that the Seventh-day Adventists place the saints in heaven during the millennium, with the earth renewed at the end of that period. On the other hand, the majority of present-day premillennialists (mostly futurists) have inherited the Literalists' view which, in the intervening years, they have developed into elaborate systems.

In the face of these differences, it is appropriate that the term "Adventist," originating with the Millerites, is to this day applied to the group of denominations descended from the Miller movement (see Adventist Bodies; see also the table under "Adventist" in the Merriam-Webster Unabridged Dictionary and the supplement in *The Oxford English Dictionary*). It is true that Webster applies the term in the broad sense also to anyone believing the advent to be near, and thus to others besides Adventists. But Adventists are premillennialists only in the literal sense of expecting the Advent before the millennium. They differ basically from even the older "historic" premillennialists (see Nos. 1070–1072) on the nature of the millennium; and their historicist view of prophecy (see Nos. 1257–1259) differs from that of the futurists, who have pre-empted the term *premillennialist* to the point that they equate premillennialism with futurism, and often even with its dispensationalist variety. In fact, an Adventist who announces himself as a premillennialist, without explanation, is likely to be misunderstood and credited with holding the whole futurist-dispensationalist system of doctrine. Therefore the distinctive name *Adventist* remains valid and useful as denoting the groups derived from the Miller movement.]

8. Albigenses, Roman Catholic Description of

SOURCE: Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 189–), Vol. 3, No. 6, pp. 9, 10. From the Latin of B. Guidonis (Bernard Guy), Pratica Inquisitionis Heretice Pravitatis, part 5, ch. 1., sec. 4.

[p. 9] It would take too long to describe in detail the manner in which these same Manichean heretics preach, and teach their followers, but it must be briefly considered here.

In the first place they usually say of themselves that they are good Christians, who do not swear, or lie, or speak evil of others; that they do not kill any man or animal nor any thing having the breath of life, and that they hold the faith of the Lord Jesus Christ and His Gospel as Christ and His Apostles taught. They assert that they occupy the place of the apostles, and that on account of the above mentioned things those of the Roman Church, namely, the prelates, clerks and monks, persecute them, especially the Inquisitors of Heresy, and call them heretics, although they are good men and good Christians, and that they are persecuted just as Christ and his apostles were by the Pharisees.

They moreover talk to the laity of the evil lives of clerks and the prelates of the Roman Church, pointing out and setting forth their pride, cupidity, avarice and uncleanness of life and such other evils as they know. They invoke with their own interpretation and according to their abilities the authority of the Gospels and the Epistles against the condition of the prelates, churchmen and monks, whom they call Pharisees and false prophets, who say but do not.

Then they attack and vituperate, one after the other, all the sacraments of the church, especially the sacrament of the Eucharist, saying that it cannot contain the body of Christ, for had this been as great as the largest mountain Christians would have consumed it entirely before this. They assert that the host comes from straw, that it passes through the tails of horses, to wit, when the flour is cleaned by a sieve [of horse hair]. That moreover it passes through the body and comes to a vile end which, they say, could not happen if God were in it. Of baptism, they assert that water is material and corruptible, and is therefore the creation of the Evil Power and cannot sanctify the soul, but that the churchmen sell this water out of avarice, just as they sell earth for the burial of the dead, and oil to the sick when they anoint them, and as they sell the confession of sins as made to the priests. Hence, they claim that confession made to the priests of the Roman Church is useless, and that, since the priests may be sinners, [p. 10] they can not loose nor bind, and being unclean themselves, cannot make another clean. They assert, moreover, that

the Cross of Christ should not be adored or venerated, because, as they urge, no one would venerate or adore the gallows upon which a father, relative or friend had been hung. They urge farther that they who adore the cross ought for similar reasons to worship all thorns and lances, because as Christ's body was on the cross during the passion so was the crown of thorns on his head and the soldier's lance in his side. They proclaim many other scandalous things in regard to the sacraments. They, moreover, read from the Gospels and the Epistles in the vulgar tongue, applying and expounding them in their favor and against the condition of the Roman Church in a manner which it would take too long to describe in detail, but all that relates to this subject may be read more fully in the books they have written and infected, and may learned from the confessions of such their followers as have been converted.

9. Alcohol—Alcoholism a Sign of Immaturity.

SOURCE: Andrew C. Ivy, "Is Alcohol the Cause of Alcoholism?" *Listen*, 11 (March–April, 1958), 31. Copyright 1958 by the American Temperance Society, Washington. Used by permission.

The alcoholic is, without doubt, immature. The same, however, applies to the person who serves alcohol to liven up the party or who uses it to relax or to have fun and enjoy life. *The use of a drug to do these things indicates the lack of sufficient maturity, education, experience, and intelligence to relax, have a good time, and enjoy life without the use of a drug.* After all, is this not the reason why, regardless of much research, no specific set of predisposing personality traits has been found to predict with any degree of certainty the susceptibility of a person to becoming an alcoholic? Is not the difference in the immaturity of the social or moderate drinker and the alcoholic actually only one of degree, namely, the degree to which the drug alcohol is required to make life more bearable or enjoyable?

10. Alcohol—Alcoholism, Forms of

SOURCE: Andrew C. Ivy, "Is Alcohol the Cause of Alcoholism?" *Listen*, 11 (March–April, 1958), 14. Copyright 1958 by the American Temperance Society, Washington. Used by permission.

Alcoholism exists when there is enough alcohol in the blood to impair the mental and bodily functions of the drinker. Alcoholism, in any or all of its forms, is a disease, by definition of the term "disease." A disease refers to a departure of the mind or body from a state of normality of health or function. However, *alcoholism in any of its forms is a self-inflicted disease*.

Acute alcoholism refers to impairment of a short duration, and varies in severity from that impairment of judgment, sense of caution, and of skills which occurs after the consumption of one or two cocktails or at a blood concentration of from .02 to .05 per cent, to that extent of impairment which leads to paralysis and death.

Chronic alcoholism refers to any one or the totality of impairments which result directly or indirectly from the more or less continuous, or periodic, consumption of alcohol for months or years.

11. Alcohol, and Chemistry of Life

SOURCE: Robert S. Carroll, *What Price Alcohol*? p. 101. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

Alcohol forms no tissues, cannot be stored as energy, offers no biochemical protection, and acts only for the body's good as a very quickly oxidizing fuel. Besides, it tends to neutralize the vital alkaline reserve by furnishing an excess of lactic acid. Alcohol must always be inadequate in the vital chemistry of life. We can only vision unused excess amounts as threatening, for no other drug is so remarkably diffusible—so rapidly invades lymph, cerebrospinal fluid, bile, pancreatic juice, saliva, even the amniotic fluid surrounding the unborn child. When compared to other foods, alcohol's place is only a ration for the starving.

12. Alcohol, and Moral Responsibility to Starving Millions SOURCE: Everett Tilson, *Should Christians Drink?* pp. 100, 101. Copyright © 1957 by Abingdon Press, Nashvile. Used by permission.

[p. 100] A billion ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed human beings [are] on the march. Though ignorant, they are no longer proud of their ignorance. Though hungry, they are not willing to remain so. They refuse any longer to accept their lot as an inescapable fate. On the far side of some drastic change, too poor to care whether it comes by evolution or revolution, they glimpse the dawn of a brighter and more prosperous tomorrow. Determined to rush the season of their prosperity, tired of the fawning attitude of the slave, they are now busy outfitting history with a pair of wings.

If these people have blood in their eyes because they do not have bread on their tables, is it because God's good earth has a surplus crop of human beings? Not according to Robert Brittain. In his highly significant book *Let There Be Bread* he defends the theory that the earth can adequately support not only its present population but a doubled population. We have only to [p. 101] enlist our present technological know-how in the war against starvation rather than against one another. Indeed, according to his estimate we could see ease every hunger pain on earth for less than the average amount Americans alone spend on beverage alcohol in two years.

If Brittain is within a country mile of the truth, he raises the question of how we can use alcohol anywhere without abusing men everywhere. Forgetting its intoxicating capacities and thinking only of its utter uselessness, how can we justify such enormous waste in the face of such urgent want? How much better are we than the priest or Levite? Is it any worse to hurry past the victim of robbers on the way to church than to trade the price of a starving man's dinner for a cocktail?

13. Alcohol, and Traffic Fatalities

SOURCE: Paul W. Kearney, "Driver Had Been Drinking," condensed from *Traffic Safety* in the *Reader's Digest*, 75 (October, 1959), 41, 42. Copyright 1959 by The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, N.Y. Used by permission.

[p. 41] "It can be stated unequivocally that alcohol is the single largest factor in our motorcar-accident situation," Dr. Horace E. Campbell, chairman of the Colorado State Medical Society's automotive-safety committee, told the conference of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators last year. "It [p. 42] is equal to all other causes combined"...

Legally, any driver with .15 percent or more alcohol in his blood is considered intoxicated. Any driver with .05 to .15 percent is not considered intoxicated unless there is corroborating evidence...

A mounting volume of research and experience proves that the limits are much too liberal, that driving skill begins to deteriorate measurably after more than one drink, or at about one fifth of the blood alcohol level our courts consider intoxicating. Said seven world medical authorities on the subject at the Symposium on Alcohol and Road Traffic at the University of Indiana in 1958: "It is the opinion of this committee that a blood alcohol concentration of .05 percent will definitely impair the driving ability of some individuals ... and at a concentration of .10 percent all individuals are definitely impaired."

14. Alcohol—Branding of Alcoholics as Sick a Fallacy

SOURCE: Edward J. McGoldrick, Jr., "Are Alcoholics Sick People?" *Listen*, 6 (April–June, 1953), 8. Copyright 1953 by the American Temperance Society, Washington. Used by permission of the publisher and the author.

The premise that the alcoholic is sick not only operates to his detriment, but contains within itself a profound fallacy, more far-reaching in its scope than its mere application to the alcoholic. It represents a basic materialism of thought which actually deprives one of all responsibility for one's life and conduct, and of the very basis for self-respect.

15. Alcohol, Cause of Domestic Strife

SOURCE: Mildred L. Lillie, "It Is the Law," *Listen*, 12 (March–April, 1959), 28. Copyright 1959 by the American Temperance Society, Washington. Used by permission.

A great part of the domestic strife in our country today can be attributed directly or indirectly to the excessive use of beverage alcohol in the home. The seriousness of the problem of individual consumption may range from that of the alcoholic to the one who deceives himself into believing that he only drinks "socially" outside of the home, or in his own home, for what he calls "relaxation."

16. Alcohol, Cause of Human Misery and Unhappiness

SOURCE: Robert S. Carroll, *What Price Alcohol*? p. 8 Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

Had this been all—could this today be all—the story of alcohol would be differently told. If from the beginning of its use each drinker could have known the swift comfort of his cups and wrapped the curse of its fulfillment as cerements to be buried with him forever, we would be living in a more content world and the vast problem of human misery and unhappiness would exist only as a fraction. Wars might never have been fought, countless murders never committed, domestic tragedies would have been minimized, Bedlams today be far less numerous, and crime divided by three. We cannot forego the temptation to quote with partial acceptance the words of the lawgiver, "… visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation."

17. Alcohol, Christian's Duty Toward Legislation Concerning SOURCE: Everett Tilson, *Should Christians Drink?* pp. 108, 109. Copyright © 1957 by Abingdon Press, Nashville. Used by permission.

[p. 108] (1) The government has a responsibility for reviewing and rewriting legislation in the direction of human welfare; (2) Christians have the responsibility of so using their right to the free ballot as to guarantee the election of a government that will take this responsibility seriously.

Until we rescind this mandate to work for legislation in promotion of the common good, we have no right to treat the government as a mere referee. Until the rules of the game have been perfected beyond the possibility of improvement, we must ceaselessly urge the govern- [p. 109] ment to alter them. We must exert every possible effort in the hope of humanizing the conditions under which men wage the struggle for character.

This does not mean that we may some day legislate into existence the kingdom of God. But it does mean that we have no excuse for sitting on the sidelines while others legislate it out of existence. Or at least, if we do, we help turn the potential citizens of Paradise Regained into the drunken bums of Skid Row, and some of society's most promising people into the strait-jacketed guests of neuro-psychiatric wards. People in the grandstand cannot wash their hands of all blame for the fatal collisions they witness on the track of life.

18. Alcohol, Condemned

SOURCE: Robert S. Carroll, *What Price Alcohol?* p. 99. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

The scientific study of alcohol—intensive, increasingly intelligent, and eminently fair these latter years—has little good to say for it... Frankly, we cannot think of this drug longer as being on trial. It has already been condemned.

19. Alcohol, a Depressant

SOURCE: Haven Emerson, *Alcohol and Man* (New York: Macmillan, 1939), p. 12. Copyright 1932 by Haven Emerson. Used by permission of the author's heirs.

The chief action of alcohol on the central nervous system, formed by the brain and spinal cord, is that of a depressant. In all probability alcohol is taken in the majority of cases, for its depressant effect, for with this come escape from worries and anxieties, freedom from the restraint of social convention and of self-criticism. The subject becomes less keenly aware of his environment, and his judgment becomes less acute.

20. Alcohol, Depressant Effect of

SOURCE: Robert S. de Ropp, *Drugs and the Mind* (New York: St. Martin's Press, n.d.), p. 121. Copyright © 1957 by Robert S. de Ropp. Used by permission.

Alcohol is a protoplasmic poison with a purely depressant effect on the human nervous system. Its depressant effect is so strong that, taken in sufficient amount, it will render a man unconsciousness, functioning in this respect as a general anesthetic. It could, in fact, be used as an anesthetic and in the past frequently was, but the dose of alcohol which renders a man insensible is dangerously near to the dose that puts him to sleep once and for all.

21. Alcoholic—Developmental Pattern of Alcoholism

SOURCE: Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., "The Alcoholic Is Sick," *Christian Herald* 83 (October, 1960), 14, 63. Copyright 1960 by Christian Herald Association, Inc., New York. Used by permission of the Christian Herald Association and the author.

[p. 14] Here are some common alcoholic symptoms which can help one recognize the illness. As they are listed, they give an outline of the developmental pattern of alcoholism:

Increased dependence on alcohol as a personality crutch (the most prominent symptom of the earliest stage).

Blackouts (temporary amnesia during heavy drinking).

Sneaking drinks (drinking more than one's group considers proper).

Defensiveness and rationalization about drinking.

Week-end drunks.

Marital difficulties related to excessive drinking.

Loss of control of the amount one drinks (one drink leads to a chain reaction).

Losing friends because of drinking behavior.

Drinking in the morning.

Losing time from work because of drinking.

Midweek drunks (loss of control of the occasion of drinking).

Increased family chaos. (Wife tries frantically to control husband's drinking.)

Losing advancement on job because of drinking.

Daytime drunks.

Loss of job.

Wife takes over role as head of the family and provider. May or may not divorce husband.

Drinking alone.

[p. 63] Antisocial behavior and personality change.

Having benders.

Hiding supply of liquor.

Having "shakes" (tremors).

Changing drinking pattern and/or geographical residence in search of the secret of controlled drinking.

Nameless fears.

Hospitalization for drinking.

Alcoholic lives to drink, drinks to live.

Admits to self inability to control drinking.

Admits to others inability to control drinking.

Hits bottom-gets help or goes under.

22. Alcoholic—Early Predisposing Factors to Drinking

SOURCE: Robert S. Carroll, *What Price Alcohol*? pp. 278, 279. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 278] The quick pick-me-ups of sweets in childhood, the dependence of many youths on the influence of caffein in tea, coffee, and chocolate, reinforced today from puberty on by increasingly concentrated absorption of nicotin, early result in the acquiring of an hourly need for drugged foods. From these milder drug-helps it is [p. 279] an easy step to light drinks, then to the essence of false help—hard liquor.

23. Alcohol, Education Concerning, Encouraged

SOURCE: Matthew W. Hill, "Facing the Alcohol Problem Realistically," *Listen*, 11 (Jan.–Feb., 1958), 29. Copyright 1957 by the American Temperance Society, Washington. Used by permission.

How can the youth be taught the nature and potential danger of alcohol as a beverage?

Alcohol education should be given in all fields, in chemistry, physiology, hygiene, social science, economics, etc. See that young people get the facts. Incidentally, the individual who exercises much influence over what young people are going to think, and going to do is the coach of our football or basketball teams, and of other sports as well.

If some of the classes in social science, or other social subjects, could go down to the police court on Monday morning and see the "gentlemen of distinction" who are lined up there, arrested over the weekend as drunk and disorderly, it would certainly be an eye-opening experience; because there's nothing in the advertising that indicates such a result from drinking.

24. Alcohol, Effect of, on Emotional Tone

SOURCE: Robert S. Carroll, *What Price Alcohol?* p. 21. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

Alcohol whips up nothing, stimulates nothing. It slips roseate glasses over eyes to refute the truth, for alcohol's power over humankind is its fateful capacity rapidly and effectively to change the emotional tone from minus to plus, from depression to exaltation, from apprehension to confidence, from fear to recklessness. But every step of this change is a falsifying of things as they are, a substitution of things as we would wish them to be. With too many of us the following of desire and the sidestepping of duty have evolved a background of undesirable tension. We do not want to know ourselves as we

are, and here is a drug which, for the time at least, allows that which we would be to pretend that it is.

25. Alcohol, Effects of, Upon Nervous Tissue

SOURCE: Robert S. Carroll, *What Price Alcohol*? p. 106. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

We have condensed the substance of thousands of pages into a few paragraphs in outlining the pernicious influence of alcohol upon the various organs of the body... Our interest from first to last centers about the unquestioned ill-effects of this drug upon nervous tissue, not its hurt to the body, ever its injury to the brain. This discounting, discrediting, destroying agent while often associated with a lowering of general health is the sole cause of alterations in conduct, scaling the gamut from mild euphoria to wild insanity, on to driveling dementia.

26. Alcohol, Indictment Against

SOURCE: Roy L. Smith, "There Can Be No Armistice!" The Christian Advocate, 116 (Nov. 20, 1941), 3.

The verdict against alcohol has been brought in by the highest and most competent authorities in the land. Chemically, it is a poison; socially, it is a criminal; economically, it is a wastrel; politically, it is a corruptionist; spiritually, it is a destroyer; pathologically it is a depressant and not a stimulant as is generally believed; psychologically, it is a blighter of the finest and most sensitive intellectual capacities.

27. Alcohol—Moral Issues in Alcoholism

SOURCE: Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., "The Alcoholic Is Sick," *Christian Herald*, 83 (October, 1960), 63. Copyright 1960 by Christian Herald Association, Inc., New York. Used by permission of the Christian Herald Association and the author.

To recognize that alcoholism is an illness is not to deny that there are complex moral issues involved. Christian theology has held that all men are sinners, in that they tend to abuse that degree of freedom which they possess. It seems obvious that the prealcoholic's abuse of his freedom of choice played some role in the causation of alcoholism. But, the pre-alcoholic is suffering from personality damage before he encounters alcohol. A person is able to sin only to the extent that he has freedom of choice. The greater the underlying personality damage, the less one's freedom.

28. Alcohol, Personal Resistance to, Unknown

SOURCE: Robert S. Carroll, *What Price Alcohol*? p. 98. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

No one knows his personal resistance until drink has had its chance with him. Some will taste and let alone. More will touch and compromise. A minority will drink and be damned.

29. Alcohol—Susceptibility to Alcoholism

SOURCE: Andrew C. Ivy, "What Everyone Should Know About Alcoholic Beverages," *Listen*, 13 (May-June, 1960), 7. Copyright 1960 by the American Temperance Society, Washington. Used by permission.

At the present time there is no way to determine beforehand who is and who is not susceptible to becoming an alcoholic or a drinking driver. *But we do know that the only absolute way to avoid becoming an alcoholic or a drinking driver is to practice total abstinence*.

30. Alcohol—Susceptibles to Alcoholism Described

SOURCE: Everett Tilson, *Should Christians Drink?* pp. 94–98. Copyright © 1957 by Abingdon Press, Nashville. Used by permission.

[p. 94] Selden Bacon distinguishes three types of people particularly susceptible to alcoholism: (1) the one too long dependent on some older person, (2) the overly aggressive and domineering individual or the bully type, and [p. 95] (3) the antisocial introvert. Despite their wide differences, not satisfied with a "moral holiday," people of all three types have in common an almost irresistible compulsion to go into moral retirement. If these people are not rescued somehow from the edge of despair and cultivated into maturity, this compulsion easily leads to extreme dissipation. However, if strongly tempted by the appeal of high faith and sincere love, the urge to get away from it all can be counteracted by the challenge to get into something creative and constructive. In other words, the path taken by potential alcoholics in their quest for escape from life's meaninglessness will depend in large measure on the character of their environment. It will depend on the relative strength of the opposing temptations, on the one hand, to destructive dissipation and, on the other, to constructive participation.

The availability of alcohol combines with the respectability of social drinking and clever advertising to clothe the temptation to escapism with a highly dangerous glamor. Once a potential alcoholic has followed the bottle into fantasy land, resistance to subsequent temptation varies in almost direct proportion with the distance of his journey down the road of indulgence...

[p. 96] We must counter the gentle urging to join in the fellowship of the "soused" with the sincere invitation to participate in the fellowship of the saved. The Christian faith has a cure for the aggressive individual who thinks more highly of himself than he ought—a gospel whose promise of self-discovery hangs on the condition of self-denial. The Christian faith has a cure for the too dependent individual—a God from whose love flows the joy of freedom. The Christian faith has a cure [p. 97] for the lone wolf who eschews company in his waltz across the stage of time—a fellowship in which he ever feels the heartbeat of anxious partners. However, despite the obvious potency of this Christian prescription for the escapist streak in modern man, somebody has to fill it. This need defines the offensive phase of our responsibility in the struggle for Christlike character.

The other side of our task calls for the suppression of whatever enhances the appeal of the opposing temptation. This means genuine concern for our weaker brother will express itself in activity for the prohibition of whatever may predispose him to the satisfaction of that weakness, the perpetuation of his immaturity or the postponement of his encounter with reality—unless the contribution of the questionable product includes the satisfaction of legitimate needs which might otherwise go unmet.

Does beverage alcohol meet this condition? What about its effect on travel? Drivers under its influence annually commit more murders than all the most wanted criminals in the past two decades have committed. Though the courts seldom confront drunken drivers with any more serious charge than that of manslaughter, they are responsible for getting drunk if not for what they do after becoming drunk. What of its influence on the family? Between one fourth and three fourths of all divorces have it as a primary cause of or a major contributing factor. While the degree of its influence on industry, sports, crime, juvenile delinquency, and other aspects of our individual and corporate life greatly varies, in each [p. 98] area the nature of its influence falls in the same disruptive and destructive category.

31. Alcohol—Withdrawal From Reality

SOURCE: Robert S. Carroll, *What Price Alcohol?* p. 79. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

Alcohol is preëminently the agent of withdrawal from reality. Under its influence there is no difficulty from which one may not escape. The harassment of long repressed primal libido finds appeasement, even the mental automatics fade into alcoholic dreamlife.

32. Alexander the Great, Ability of, Shown by Speed of Campaigns SOURCE: W. W. Tarn, "Alexander: The Conquest of the Far East," chap. 13 in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 6 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927), pp. 425, 426. Used by permission.

[p. 425] He was a master in the combination of various arms; he taught the world the advantages of campaigning in winter, the value of pressing pursuit to the utmost, and the principle of "march divided, fight united." He marched usually in two divisions, one conducting the impedimenta and his own [division] travelling light; his speed of movement was extraordinary. It is said that he attributed his military success to "never putting anything off." ... [p. 426] The enormous distances traversed in unknown country imply a very high degree of organizing ability; in ten years he had only two serious breakdowns… Had a lesser man attempted what he achieved, and failed, we should have heard enough of the hopeless military difficulties of the undertaking.

33. Alexander the Great, Ambition of (Ancient Historian on) SOURCE: Appian, *Roman History* ii. 21. 149; translated by Horace White, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 503, 505. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 503] Yet he [Alexander] was never defeated, and he finished almost every war in one or two battles. He conquered [p. 505] many foreign nations in Europe and made himself master of Greece, a people hard to control, fond of freedom, who boasted that they had never obeyed anybody before him, except Philip for a little while under the guise of his leadership in war; and he also overran almost the whole of Asia. To sum up Alexander's fortune and power in a word, he acquired as much of the earth as he had seen, and died while he was considering and devising means to capture the rest.

34. Alexander the Great, as "First King" of Greece

SOURCE: Justinus ix. 4, trans. in George Willis Botsford and Lillie Shaw Botsford, A Source-Book of Ancient History (New York: Macmillan, 1934), pp. 270, 271.

[p. 270] He [Philip] desired that he [p. 271] should not be called king, but general of Greece.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Philip, Alexander's father, was the first Macedonian king who brought the Greek states under his control, and thus formed the Macedonian Empire. Appian's statement implies that since he was not known as "king" to his Greek subjects his son and successor Alexander the Great was the first to be recognized as "king" of Greece. Appain says that the Greeks rated him above Philip (see No. 33). For the reason why Alexander's Empire can be called "Greek," see No. 787n.]

35. Alexander the Great, as "First King" of Greece

SOURCE: W[illiam] H[enry] Boulton, *Greece and Rome (The Ancient Lands and Bible Series,* No. 6. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co., Ltd., [1934]), p. 73. Used by permission.

It must be remembered that Philip of Macedon never bore the title of king in relation to Greece, he was only the hegemon ["chief," "leader"] of the association of Grecian peoples and cities. Alexander freely used the title of king.

36. Alexander the Great, as Leader

SOURCE: George Stephen Goodspeed, A History of the Ancient World (New York: Scribner, 1912), pp. 242–244, 246, 247.

[p. 242] Alexander is the flower of the Greek race, the supreme fig- [p. 243] ure in its gallery of heroes. In physical strength and beauty, in mental grasp and poise, in moral purpose and mastery, he was pre-eminent among the men of his time. Of high, almost sentimental, ideals of honor, a warm-hearted, genial companion and friend, the idol of his troops, fearless even to recklessness in the day of battle, he knew how to work tirelessly, to hold purposes with an iron resolution, to sweep all opposition from his path, and to deny himself pitilessly for the fulfilment of his plans. To reach so high a station, to stand alone at the summit of human achievement, was for so young a man almost fatally dangerous. Alexander did not escape unharmed. Power made him sometimes arbitrary and cruel. Opposition drove him to crimes which are without excuse... In thirteen years of incessant activity he mastered the world and set it going in new paths. While accomplishing this task he made his name immortal...

The greatness of Alexander as a general is clearly revealed in the full accounts of the battles he fought and the campaigns he carried through to success. He was the mightiest conqueror the world had ever seen. But it has been reserved for modern scholars to emphasize the most splendid and enduring elements of his career: his genius for organization, his statesmanship, his far-reaching plans of government and administration. Like all his great predecessors in the field of arms, he was no mere fighter for the sake of fighting, nor did the lust of acquisition spur him on to useless and empty conquests. The crowning and deci- [p. 244] sive proof of this is seen in the cities which he founded. No conquest was complete until he had selected sites for new settlements, and these sites were chosen with an unerring insight into the opportunities for trade as well as for defence. Sixteen Alexandrias all over the east go back to him as founder, the greatest of which was the Egyptian metropolis... It is said that he founded in all some seventy cities. Many of them were so wisely planted that they exist to this day as flourishing centers of commercial life...

[p. 246] Alexander had had himself greeted as a son of Zeus by the oracle of Amon, which enjoyed a great repute in the entire Greek world in the fourth century B.C. In 324 B.C. he demanded that each city should enrol him in its circle of deities. This was done reluctantly in some [p. 247] places, as in Athens and Sparta, but in general it was done with enthusiasm; for henceforth the cities could take orders from Alexander without loss of self-respect. To obey their gods was a duty, while on the other hand, to acknowledge the authority of an outside king would have been humiliating to places which in theory were free and self-governing. This was the way in which Alexander organized his vast empire.

37. Alexander the Great, as Ruler of Greece

SOURCE *Arrian* i. 1; translated by E. Iliff Robson, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvared University Pres, 1954), p. 5. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

The death of Philip [king of Macedonia] is placed in the archonship of Pythodemus at Athens; Alexander, then about twenty, succeeded, being Philip's son, and came into the Peloponnesus; so runs the story. There he gathered together the Peloponnesian Greeks and requested from them the leadership of the Persian expedition, which they had already granted to Philip. All agreed except the Lacedaemonians, who replied that their country's custom did not permit them to follow others; it was theirs to take the lead of others. The Athenians also made some show of violence; but they collapsed at Alexander's first approach and conceded to him a position even more honourable than had been given to

Philip. Alexander then returned to Macedonia and began to get ready for the Asian expedition.

38. Alexander the Great—Conquest of Persia, Portrayed in Prophecy SOURCE: Charles H. H. Wright, *Daniel and His Prophecies* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1906), pp. 174, 175.

[p. 174] The rapidity of Alexander's conquests is vividly portrayed by the progress of the he-goat. Rapidly crossing the Hellespont with 40,000 Greek troops, Alexander gained his first victory over the Persian armies at the Granicus, B.C. 334, and overran in that year and part of the next the whole of Asia Minor. He took by siege several important cities, while other cities opened [p. 175] their gates at the mere summons of the conqueror. Alexander gained a decisive victory over Darius Codomanus, who commanded in person, at the battle of Issus in November of the next year (B.C. 333). He then invaded Phoenicia and captured Tyre, thus destroying the base from which a Persian fleet might have operated. Palestine submitted to his authority. He besieged Gaza, overran Egypt, and, turning northwards to Babylon, defeated Darius in the decisive battle of Arbela, in B.C. 331. Ere B.C. 330, Alexander had taken possession of Babylon and Susa, burned Persepolis, and put an end to the Persian empire. Thus did the he-goat with its one horn cast down the two-horned ram to the ground and trample upon it.

39. Alexander the Great, Conquests of—Rapidity

SOURCE: Plutarch *Moralia*, "On the Fortune of the Romans," 326. 13; translated by Frank Cole Babbitt, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), p. 377. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Alexander, ... by great good luck and brilliant successes, the result of his invincible daring and lofty aspirations, was sweeping swiftly through the world like a shooting star.

40. Alexander the Great, Conquests of—Speed

SOURCE: A. E. R. Boak and others, *The Growth of European Civilization* (3d ed., 1946), pp. 59, 60. Copyright 1938, 1941, 1943, by F. S. Crofts & Co., Inc., New York. Used by permission of Appleton-Century Crofts, Inc.

[p. 59] In the spring of 334 B.C. Alexander crossed over to Asia Minor at the head of an army of some thirty-five thousand Macedonians and Greeks... Four years later he had overthrown the Persian empire founded by Cyrus the Great, and set himself up as its ruler by right of conquest. Another four years were spent in the subjugation of the wild tribes of the Iranian Plateau and the more civilized peoples of the Indus Valley. In this short space of eight years Alexander had annexed an area of little less than two million square miles, containing a population of more than twenty million persons. The amazing rapidity of his conquest, a feat all the more remarkable in view of the small force at his disposal, was due in large part of the superior organization of the Macedonian army, the excellence of Alexander's generals, trained in [p. 60] the school of his father, Philip, and his own superlative qualities as a general and a leader of men.

41. Alexander the Great, Daniel's Prophecy Shown to, Josephus' Account

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* xi. 8. 5; translated by Ralph Marcus, Vol. 6 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 473, 475, 477, 479. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 473] When he [Jaddua, the Jewish high priest] learned that Alexander was not far from the city, he went out with the priests and the body of citizens... [p. 475] He approached alone and prostrated himself... [p. 477] And, when the book of Daniel was

shown to him [Alexander], in which he had declared that one of the Greeks would destroy the empire of the Persians, he believed himself to be the one indicated; and in his joy he dismissed the multitude for the time being, but on the following day he summoned them again and told them to ask for any gifts which they might desire. When the high priest asked that they might observe their [p. 479] country's laws and in the seventh year be exempt from tribute, he granted all this. Then they begged that he would permit the Jews in Babylon and Media also to have their own laws, and he gladly promised to do as they asked. And, when he said to the people that if any wished to join his army while still adhering to the customs of their country, he was ready to take them, many eagerly accepted service with him.

42. Alexander the Great, Death of, "in the Flower of His Age" SOURCE: Justin, *History of the World* xiii. 1, trans. by T. Brown (2d ed., rev.; London: John Matthews, 1713), p. 154.

Alexander the Great, being thus taken off in the Flower of his Age, and in the Height of his Victories, there was a mournful Silence all over *Babylon* among all sorts of People. The conquer'd Nations could not believe the Report.

43. Alexander the Great, Influence of, as Conqueror

SOURCE: Edwyn Robert Bevan. *The House of Seleucus*, Vol. 1 (London: Edward Arnold, 1902), p. 28. Used by permission.

It would not be easy to name any other period of ten years in the history of the world beside the reign of Alexander in which as momentous a change passed over as large a part of the earth—a change which made such difference in the face of things. Suddenly the pageant of the greatest empire ever known had been swept away... In the spring of 323 before Christ the whole order of things from the Adriatic away to the mountains of Central Asia and the dusty plains of the Panjab [i.e., Punjab] rested upon a single will, a single brain, nurtured in Hellenic thought. Then the hand of God, as if trying some fantastic experiment, plucked this man away.

44. Alexander the Great, Succeeded by Puppet Heirs; Then Division of Empire

SOURCE: Joseph Ward Swain, *The Ancient World*, Vol. 2, pp. 40–42. Copyright 1950 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 40] The right to choose the king of Macedon belonged by custom to the leaders of the army, and even before Alexander was decently buried, the generals fell to quarreling among themselves about the succession. Everyone professed a desire to see the Empire and dynasty continue, but under whom should they continue? Alexander's wife Roxane was expecting a child, and some generals favored delay and the acceptance of this child, if it were a boy; others favored Alexander's feeble-minded and illegitimate half brother, later called Philip III [or Philip Arrhidaeus]. In either case, a long regency would be necessary, and dissension centered principally about the appointment of a regent. At last a compromise was effected whereby Philip III and the infant Alexander IV were declared joint kings with three leading generals sharing the regency...

[p. 41] The twenty years that followed Alexander's death were rendered chaotic by the struggles of these willful men, who came to be called the Diadochi or "Successors." The more ambitious generals believed that they might get the whole Empire for themselves and therefore spoke loudly of preserving Alexander's noble work. Less sanguine rivals sought only a portion of the Empire, since they saw no chance of getting it all, and they solemnly deplored the fact that no mere [p. 42] mortal could perpetuate the noble Macedonian's superhuman achievements. Costly wars were fought with mercenary troops by skillful and unscrupulous contenders, and military action was supplemented by propaganda vigorously defending or attacking Alexander's system and ringing all the changes on loyalty, liberty, and the like, as seemed most expedient at the moment.

The details of this fighting need not delay us. As soon as one general was eliminated, another rose to take his place. Olympias obtained the death of Philip III in 317; a year later Cassander had her assassinated; and in 309 he murdered Roxane and her son, Alexander IV, thus exterminating the old Macedonian dynasty. Thereafter, the generals could no longer pretend that they were trying to save Alexander's empire for his son, and in 306 Antigonus took the title of king for himself. The other generals quickly followed suit. At last, in 301, an important battle was fought at Ipsus in west-central Asia Minor, where Antigonus was defeated and killed by a coalition of his rivals. The victors then divided the Empire amongst themselves. Cassander got Macedonia and Greece; Lysimachus took Thrace and much of Asia Minor; Ptolemy retained Egypt, Cyrenaica, and Palestine; and the rest of Asia [Syria and eastward] went to Seleucus [see Alexander's Empire].

45. Alexander the Great, World Empire of (Arrian's View)

SOURCE: Arrian *Anabasis* vii. 1, 30; translated by E. Iliff Robson, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 205, 301. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 205] Thence some authorities say he [Alexander] proposed to sail into the Euxine Sea to Scythia and Lake Maeotis; others, that he intended to make for Sicily and the Iapygian promontory; for he was already rather distressed that the Roman name was growing very widely extended.

As for what was in Alexander's mind, I for my part have no means of conjecturing with any accuracy, nor do I care to guess...

[p. 301] For I myself believe that there was at that time no race of mankind, no city, no single individual, whither the name of Alexander had not reached. And so not even I can suppose that a man quite beyond all other men was born without some divine influence. Moreover, oracles are said to have prophesied Alexander's death, and visions coming to different persons, and dreams, dreamed by different persons; there was also the general regard of mankind leading to this same conclusion, and the memory of one more than human.

46. Alexander's Empire—Alexander's Heirs as Temporary Puppet Kings

SOURCE: Albert A. Trever, *History of Ancient Civilization*, Vol. 1, pp. 472, 473. Copyright 1936 by Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 472] Alexander's conquests had not succeeded in permanent political unification of the Greco-Oriental world. The Greeks had never supported the aggressions of Macedon, and the unity of the old Persian Empire had always depended chiefly upon the personal force of the ruler. Thus at the conqueror's death the great historical and natural divisions of the ancient world were sure to reappear, unless a superman like himself should succeed him. But in 323 B.C. Alexander left no will, and no heir save the unborn child of Roxane. Tradition tells that when his friends asked him to name his successor, he whispered, "To the best man." His nearest kin was a feeble-minded half-brother, Philip Arridaeus. Any one of his veteran Macedonian generals might have carried on, but no

one of them could command the loyalty of the rest and overcome the natural centrifugal tendencies. A compromise was agreed upon—to accept both Philip and the child of Roxane, if a son, with Perdiccas, the chief general, as regent... When Roxane bore a son, there were thus two kings, a moron and a babe, and each general was practically independent in his satrapy...

[p. 473] In Asia there began a general scramble of Alexander's successors (the Diadochi) for the supreme power. Perdiccas was assassinated in 321 B.C., and Antipater, his successor as regent, died two years later. Antigonus won against the Alexander party in Asia, and Cassander, son of Antipater, had by the year 316 B.C. won control of Macedon, including Athens and a large part of Greece. Philip and the mother of Alexander he put to death, and he imprisoned the young prince...

The murder of young Alexander in 310 B.C. left the several generals independent rulers.

47. Alexander's Empire, at Death of His Posthumous Son Alexander (*c*. 310 B.C.)

SOURCE: *Diodorus Siculus* xix. 105. 2–4; translated by Russell M. Geer, Vol. 10 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 119. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Now Cassander perceived that Alexander, the son of Roxanê, was growing up and that word was being spread throughout Macedonia by certain men that it was fitting to release the boy from custody and give him his father's kingdom; and, fearing for himself, he instructed Glaucias, who was in command of the guard over the child, to murder Roxanê and the king and conceal their bodies, but to disclose to no one else what had been done. When Glaucias had carried out the instructions [*c*. 310/09 B.C.], Cassander, Lysimachus, and Ptolemy, and Antigonus as well, were relieved of their anticipated danger from the king; for henceforth, there being no longer anyone to inherit the realm, each of those who had rule over nations or cities entertained hopes of royal power and held the territory that had been placed under his authority as if it were a kingdom won by the spear [see Nos. 44, 46].

48. Alexander's Empire, Dismembered at Battle of Ipsus (301 B.C.) SOURCE: W. W. Tarn, "The Heritage of Alexander," chap. 15 in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 6 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927), pp. 462, 482, 483, 492, 495, 498, 499, 502, 504. Used by permission.

[p. 462] The story of the Successors [of Alexander], in the tradition, is the story of a struggle for power among the generals. War went on almost without intermission from 321 to 301 B.C.; and, except for the brief episode of Antipater's regency, the conflict was one between the centrifugal forces within the empire, represented by the satraps (territorial dynasts), and whatever central power stood for unity. The conflict falls into two divisions; in the first the central power represents the kings [the mentally defective half brother and the posthumous son of Alexander; see No. 44], but after 316 it means Antigonus, who claimed personally to stand in Alexander's place. But though the actors changed, the issues were the same throughout; the end was complete victory for the dynasts...

[p. 482] The death of Eumenes left Antigonus in virtual control of Asia... [p. 483] His aim was to obtain the whole empire for himself without reference to the royal house... But he kept up appearances; ... he claimed to act for Alexander's son, and his army made him regent...

The old central power was dead; but it had merely been replaced by another, far more energetic, ambitious, and businesslike, and controlled by a single brain... Seleucus persuaded Ptolemy, Lysimachus, and Cassander, that Antigonus' ambition threatened their very existence, and the three rulers formed a definite alliance. Cassander [held] ... Macedonia, ... Ptolemy ... Egypt... Lysimachus ... held the Dardanelles crossings... The history of the next four years, 315–312, is that of the first war between Antigonus and the coalition...

[p. 492] The peace of 311, though only an uneasy truce, marked the beginning of the dissolution of the Empire into independent states, a process completed ten years later. The dynasts did not yet call themselves kings, and continued to strike Alexander's money; but they emphasized their independence by founding capitals in their own names, though all but Cassander waited till Alexander IV was dead. [310 or early 309.] Seleucus built Seleuceia on the Tigris; ... Lysimachus, ... Lysimacheia near Gallipoli; ... Antigonus, ... Antigoneia on the Orontes; Ptolemy, ... Ptolemais as capital of Upper Egypt...

[p. 495] The story of the six years [from 307 to 301] is that of his [Antigonus'] second struggle to secure the empire for himself.

[p. 498] In the spring of 306 ... Antigonus thereon assumed the royal title,—a frank usurpation, though confirmed by his army,—and conferred the like title on [p. 499] Demetrius [his son]. It meant, not that Antigonus was king of his section of Asia, but that he claimed to be monarch, jointly with Demetrius, of Alexander's empire...

Ptolemy after his victory [over Antigonus] also took the title of king (305), and was followed by Cassander, Lysimachus, and Seleucus. The title affirmed their independent rule in their respective territories; Antigonus of course did not recognize this...

[p. 502] The four kings renewed the coalition of 315, but this time not to bridle Antigonus but to destroy him...

[p. 504] In spring 301 ... at Ipsus near Synnada the two great armies met in the "battle of the kings." ... Antigonus was defeated and killed... The struggle between the central power and the dynasts was ended, and with Antigonus' death the dismemberment of the Graeco-Macedonian world became inevitable. Demetrius fled to Ephesus, while Lysimachus and Seleucus divided Antigonus' kingdom. Cassander was recognized as king of Macedonia.

49. Alexander's Empire, Divided (Ancient Historian's Account) SOURCE: Pausanias *Description of Greece* i. 6. 4–7; trans. by W. H. S. Jones, Vol. 1 (London: William Heinemann, 1918), pp. 31, 33. Reprinted by permission of Harvard University Press and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 31] The death of Perdiccas immediately raised Ptolemy to power [in Egypt], who both reduced the Syrians and Phoenicia, and also welcomed Seleucus, son of Antiochus, who was in exile, having been expelled by Antigonus; he further himself prepared to attack Antigonus. He prevailed on Cassander, son of Antipater, and Lysimachus, who was king in Thrace, to join in the war, urging that Seleucus was in exile and that the growth of the power of Antigonus was dangerous to them all. For a time Antigonus prepared for war, and was by no means confident of the issue; but on learning that the revolt of Cyrene had called Ptolemy to Libya, he immediately reduced the Syrians and Phoenicians by a sudden inroad, handed them over to Demetrius, his son, a man who for all his youth had already a reputation for good sense... [p. 33] Ptolemy saved his empire by making a stand with an army at Pelusium while offering resistance with warships from

the river... Antigonus thus failed to reduce Egypt or, later, Rhodes, and shortly afterwards (301 B.C.) he offered battle to Lysimachus, and to Cassander and the army of Seleucus, lost most of his forces, and was himself killed.

50. Alexander's Empire, Divided at Ipsus

SOURCE: Albert A. Trever, *History of Ancient Civilization*, Vol. 1, p. 473. Copyright 1936 by Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

In 307 B.C. Antigonus and his brilliant son Demetrius began a struggle for supremacy. Demetrius freed Athens from Macedon, and restored the democracy. He also inflicted a crushing naval defeat on Ptolemy off Cyprus, and thus secured the command of the sea. He and his father then assumed the royal name as joint heirs of Alexander. But they failed in their invasion of Egypt, and lost control of Greece to Cassander. Finally, in the decisive Battle of Ipsus in Phrygia in 301 B.C., they met defeat at the hands of Ptolemy and Seleucus of Babylon. Antigonus was slain, but Demetrius escaped to Greece. This was the last attempt to restore the shattered empire of Alexander. Lysimachus now held Asia Minor north of the Taurus, Seleucus held Mesopotamia and Syria; Cassander held Macedonia; and Ptolemy held Egypt and southern Syria.

51. Alexander's Empire, Divided Into Four Kingdoms.

SOURCE: C. E. Van Sickle, *A Political and Cultural History of the Ancient World*, Vol. 1 (Boston: Houghton, 1947), p. 600. Copyright 1947 by Clifton E. Van Sickle. Used by permission.

The years 318 to 301 inclusive were marked by the attempt of Antigonus the One-Eyed to unite the whole Empire under his own rule. He was an able soldier and administrator, but his age was against him, and he had no claim to rule except his ability to enforce obedience. Ptolemy made himself impregnable in Egypt. Seleucus mastered Babylonia and the eastern provinces. Lysimachus controlled the eastern part of the Balkan peninsula, and Cassander set himself up in Macedonia with weak suzerainty over Greece. Both Antigonus and his opponents began to call themselves kings. Antigonus claimed the whole empire, while they were content with their respective dominions. In 301, the coalition got the upper hand. At Ipsus, in Phrygia, they closed in on Antigonus, who fell fighting. The empire was irretrievably divided.

When the victors of Ipsus divided the spoils, they created a new political map of the Near East which was to endure for a long time—in some places until the Roman conquest. To Egypt, Ptolemy had now added Cyrene, Cyprus, Palestine, and isolated cities on the coast of Asia Minor. Seleucus controlled Syria, Babylonia, southern Asia Minor, and the Iranian Plateau eastward to the Hindu Kush Mountains and the central Asiatic steppes. Lysimachus added western Asia Minor to his original holdings, and Cassander had to content himself with Macedonia and the suzerainty over Greece. Within his own territories, each was an absolute sovereign. A new state system had come into existence with the beginning of a new Hellenistic world.

52. Alexander's Empire, Divided Into Four Kingdoms Plus Fragments (301 B.C.).

SOURCE: W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1927), p. 9. Used by permission.

The victors divided the spoils; Lysimachus taking Asia Minor north of Taurus and Seleucus Mesopotamia and Syria; Ptolemy however [who already held Egypt] had occupied Syria south of Aradus and Damascus during the Ipsus campaign, and Seleucus, who never forgot that he owed to Ptolemy both life and kingdom, did not demand its retrocession, though he preserved his claim. Cassander, the soul of the coalition, was content with Macedonia; Demetrius [the defeated son of Antigonus] still ruled the sea, and held Tyre and Sidon, some cities in Asia Minor, and parts of Greece.

53. Alexander's Empire, Divided Into Four Kingdoms, Then Three SOURCE: M. Rostovtzeff, *A History of the Ancient World*, trans. by J. D. Vol. 1. (2d ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), pp. 353, 355. Used by permission.

[p. 353] Either Philip Aridaeus, Alexander's half-brother, or Alexander's posthumous son by Roxana, might be considered the lawful heir. But personal ambition and thirst [p. 355] for power prevailed over devotion to the dynasty in the minds of Alexander's generals...

Antigonus, surnamed The One-eyed, one of the ablest generals, who also possessed a capable assistant in his son, Demetrius Poliorcetes, came nearest to realizing the conception of an undivided empire under his personal rule. But even his authority was not recognized by other generals who ruled separate provinces—Lysimachus in Thrace, Seleucus in Babylonia, Ptolemy in Egypt, and Cassander in Macedonia. They united to inflict a decisive blow on Antigonus in a battle at Ipsus in Asia Minor in 301 B.C., which cost, Antigonus his life.

The battle of Ipsus settled the question: the undivided monarchy of Alexander ceased to exist. It split up into a number of component parts, of which the three most important were these: Syria, including all the eastern parts of Alexander's kingdom and some of Asia Minor; Egypt; and Macedonia [see No. 54n.]

54. Alexander's Empire, Divided Into Four Parts, Later Three SOURCE: E. S. Shuckburgh, *Greece*, pp. 235, 236. Copyright 1905 by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 235] Nevertheless the ultimate division of the Empire into separate and independent kingdoms was foreshadowed by the division of the provinces among the chief generals of Alexander, who were not likely long to submit to any one chief, or to act together. In fact, from this time to B.C. 301 there was a constant succession of wars—the result of which was the formation of four considerable kingdoms: Macedonia, Syria, Egypt, and Thrace. [p. 236] These kingdoms were reduced to three on the death of Lysimachus, King of Thrace, in B.C. 281, whose dominions were divided between the kings of Egypt and Syria.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Thus Thrace, one of the four divisions of 301 B.C., was eliminated twenty years later, while the other three, Egypt, Macedonia, and the Seleucid Empire (later known as Syria), continued as important kingdoms until they were incorporated, one by one, into the Roman Empire. Because of this, many historians, in covering this period briefly, omit any mention of the earlier fourfold division and speak of Alexander's empire as splitting finally into three parts. Both four and three can be considered correct, depending on the date referred to. In the later period there remained the three principal kingdoms plus some fragments. Some would see a fourth in Pergamum, which was the most important of the states that grew among the fragments (see No. 55). Certainly at the decisive battle of Ipsus, 301 B.C., which settled the question of a united empire versus a divided one (see Nos. 46, 48), the outcome was a division into four kingdoms.]

55. Alexander's Empire, Divisions of, in Later Period (*c*. 275 A.D.). SOURCE: Albert A. Trever, *History of Ancient Civilization*, Vol. 1, p. 474. Copyright 1936 by Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The wars had finally resulted [about 275 B.C.] in a permanent division, in accord with geographical conditions: the Seleucid Empire in Asia, the empire of the Ptolemies in Egypt and Syria, Macedon under the Antigonids, and Pergamum under the Attalids. The other states of note were Epirus under Pyrrhus, Sparta, Athens, and the two Greek federal leagues.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The time here referred to is a later stage in the division of Alexander's empire. Pergamum was not one of the original four kingdoms, but rose later, uniting some of the smaller fragments, and including some of the former territory of Lysimachus. Of the original four Syria, Macedonia, and Egypt survived as important eastern states until taken over by Rome. See No. 54n.]

56. Alexander's Empire, Eastern Division of, Seleucus' Kingdom (Seleucid Empire)

Source: Appian, *Roman History* xi. 9. 55; translated by Horace White, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 209. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

At this division all Syria from the Euphrates to the sea, also inland Phrygia, fell to the lot of Seleucus. Always lying in wait for the neighboring nations, strong in arms and persuasive in diplomacy, he acquired Mesopotamia, Armenia, the so-called Seleucid Cappadocia, the Persians, Parthians, Bactrians, Arabs, Tapyri, Sogdiani, Arachotes, Hyrcanians, and all the other adjacent peoples that had been subdued by Alexander, as far as the river Indus, so that he ruled over a wider empire in Asia than any of his predecessors except Alexander. For the whole region from Phrygia to the Indus was subject to Seleucus.

57. Alexander's Empire, Eastern Division of, Seleucus' Successors (Seleucids)

SOURCE: Edwyn Bevan, *Jerusalem Under the High-Priests* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1940), p. 23. Used by permission.

The line of kings descended from Seleucus are what we call the Seleucid dynasty. They did not have one royal name for all the kings, as the Ptolemies had, but the earlier kings were all called either Seleucus or Antiochus. Later on other names came in as well. The territory which at the outset this dynasty aspired to hold was all the Asiatic part of Alexander's empire from the Mediterranean to the frontiers of India.

58. Antichrist, Early Pope on

SOURCE: Pope Gregory the Great (590–604), Letter to Emperor Mauricius Augustus (against assumption of title "universal" by Patriarch of Constantinople) in his *Epistles*, bk. 7, letter 33, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 226 (2d pagination).

Whosoever calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest, is in his elation the precursor of Antichrist, because he proudly puts himself above all others. Nor is it by dissimilar pride that he is led into error; for, as that perverse one wishes to appear as God above all men, so whosoever this one is who covets being called sole priest, he extols himself above all other priests.

58. Antichrist, Early Pope on

SOURCE: Pope Gregory the Great (590–604), Letter to Emperor Mauricius Augustus (against assumption of title "universal" by Patriarch of Constantinople) in his *Epistles*, bk. 7, letter 33, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 226 (2d pagination).

Whosoever calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest, is in his elation the precursor of Antichrist, because he proudly puts himself above all others. Nor is it by dissimilar pride that he is led into error; for, as that perverse one wishes to appear as God above all men, so whosoever this one is who covets being called sole priest, he extols himself above all other priests.

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

59. Antichrist, Newman on

SOURCE: John Henry Newman, "The Protestant Idea of Antichrist," *The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review*, 28 (October, 1840), 431, 432.

[p. 431] All the offices, names, honours, powers which it [the Church] claims depend upon the determination of the simple question—Has Christ or has He not left a representative behind Him?

Now if He has, then all is easy and intelligible; this is what churchmen maintain; they welcome the news; and they recognize in the Church's acts but the fulfillment of the high trust committed to her. But let us suppose for a moment the other side of the alternative to be true;--supposing Christ has left no representative behind Him. Well then, here is a society which professes to take His place without warrant. It comes forward instead of Christ and for Him; it speaks for Him, it develops [sic] His words; it suspends His appointments, it grants dispensation in matters of positive duty; it professes to dispense grace, it absolves from sin;---and all this of its own authority. Is it not forthwith according to the very force of the word "Antichrist?" He who speaks for Christ must be either His true servant or Antichrist; and nothing but Antichrist can he be, if appointed servant there is none. Let his acts be the same in both cases, according as he has authority or not, so is he most holy or most [p. 432] guilty. It is not the acts that make the difference, it is the *authority* for those acts. The very same acts are Christ's acts or Antichrist's, according to the doer: they are Christ's if Christ does them; they are Antichrist's, if Christ does them not. There is no medium between a Vice-Christ and Antichrist.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This article, printed about five years before Newman joined the Church of Rome, was a review of J. H. Todd's *Discourses on the Prophecies Relating to Antichrist*. Later it was published as an essay in Newman's *Essays Critical and Historical*.]

60. Antichrist, Two meanings of, Reinhold Niebuhr on SOURCE: Reinhold Neibuhr, *Faith and History*, pp. 235, 236. Copyright 1949 by Charles Scribner's Sons,

New York. Reprinted by their permission and that of James Nisbet and Company, Ltd., London. [p. 235] The "Anti-Christ" can be, and has been, interpreted in two ways. The symbol can be interpreted as meaning that the most explicit form of evil, the most obvious defiance of God appears at the end of history. It can also be interpreted as meaning that the evil which appears at the end is the assertion of selfish ends in the name of Christ or in the name of God. It is not possible to choose absolutely between these two interpretations; but it is important to recognize that both are legitimate interpretations of the final evil. It is particularly important for the church not to disavow the second interpretation, because it is the form of the evil to which the church is tempted. It is not tempted to defy God explicitly; but it is tempted to insinuate [p. 236] historical evils into the final sanctity. It succumbs to that temptation whenever it identifies its own judgements with God's judgements; or whenever it pretends that the meaning of history has culminated in the church as an historical institution.

61. Antichrist, Westminster Confession on

SOURCE: Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 27 (originally 25), "Of the Church," sec. 6, in *A Harmony* of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards, ed. by James Benjamin Green (1958), p. 189. Copyright 1951 by John Knox Press, Richmond, Va.

C[onfession of] F[aith] XXVII, 6

The Lord Jesus Christ is the only head of the church, and the claim of any man to be the vicar of Christ and the head of the church, is without warrant in fact or in Scripture, even anti-Christian, a usurpation dishonoring to the Lord Jesus Christ. [EDITORS' NOTE: In the original form of the Confession, before revision, sec. 6 (of chap. 25) was more specific. It read: "There is no other head of the Church but the Lord Jesus Christ: nor can the Pope of Rome, in any [p. 659] sense be head thereof, but is that Anti-christ, that man of sin and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God" (see Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. 3, pp. 658, 659).]

62. Apostasy, Apostles Would Be Surprised at SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed.; by J. B. Bury, chap. 50, Vol. 5 (2d ed.; London: Methuen & Co., 1901), p. 394.

If the Christian apostles, St. Peter or St. Paul, could return to the Vatican, they might possibly inquire the name of the Deity who is worshipped with such mysterious rites in that magnificent temple [i.e. the Church of St. Peter]: at Oxford or Geneva, they would experience less surprise; but it might still be incumbent on them to peruse the catechism of the church, and to study the orthodox commentators on their own writings and the words of their Master.

[EDITORS' NOTE: "Vatican" here appears to be a slip of the pen, but probably is not. Whereas in present usage the term means the papal palace on the Vatican Hill, in ancient times Vatican was used also of the adjacent valley, in which stands the "magnificent temple" of St. Peter's Church. See Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in; Church, Early, Changes in.]

63. Arab Conquest—Abu Bekr Forbids Acts of Pillaging and Indiscriminate Slaughter

SOURCE: Abu Bekr (the Caliph, or successor of the Prophet), farewell advice to army leaders before the Syrian campaign, quoted in William Muir, *The Caliphate, Its Rise, Decline, and Fall* (rev. ed.; Edinburgh: John Grant, 1924), p. 65.

Men, ... I have ten orders to give you, which you must observe loyally: Deceive none and steal from none; betray none and mutilate none; kill no child, nor woman, nor aged man; neither bark nor burn the date palms; cut not down fruit trees nor destroy crops; slaughter not flocks, cattle, nor camels, except for food. You will fall in with some men with shaven crowns; smite them thereon with the sword. You will also meet with men living in cells; leave them alone in that to which they have devoted themselves.

64. Arab Conquest, and the Nestorian Christians

SOURCE: Henri Lammens, "Le Chantre des Omiades" ("The Singer of the Ommiads") [part 1], *Journal Asiatique* ("Asiatic Journal"), ninth series, Vol. 4 (July–August, 1894), 119, 120. French.

[p. 119] After the councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451) the Nestorians, proscribed by the Byzantine emperors, repulsed by the Catholics, anathematized by the Monophysites or Jacobites, directed all their activity toward eastern Asia. Although never successful in making any noteworthy establishments on the Syrian bank of the Euphrates, by the end of half a century they had attracted to their communion almost all the countries situated beyond that river. Lower Mesopotamia, Chaldea, the ancient kingdom of Hira, Arabia, were the first countries invaded by the rising flood of Nestorianism. From there it spread to, and over, Persia and India and extended clear into China and Tartary. At the time of Ahtal's birth [*c*. A.D. 640], the Nestorian Catholicos of Ctesiphon had under him close to 200 bishops, 20 of whom were metropolitans...

[p. 120] As for the Christian Arabs, they were irremediably lost for orthodoxy. The Moslem conquest further aggravated this situation, and it was welcomed with joy by the Nestorians and the Jacobites, who were tired of the annoying domination of Byzantium. In return, the new masters granted them certain privileges, that proved particularly beneficial to the Nestorians.

65. Arab Conquest—Mohammed's Attitude Toward the Nestorians

SOURCE: Henri Lammens, "Le Chantre des Omiades" ("The Singer of the Ommiads") [part 1], *Journal Asiatique* ("Asiatic Journal"), ninth series, Vol. 4 (July–August, 1894), 120, 121. French.

[p. 120] If we can believe the assertions made by the Hashimite 'Abdallah, son of

Isma'ïl, in his famous letter to 'Abdalmasïh the Kindite, the preferences of the Prophet's disciples for the followers of Nestorius were of even more ancient origin. "Of all the Christians," he says, "they are the most congenial to the Moslems, and the closest to them in their beliefs. The Prophet praised them, and bound himself to them with solemn promises. He purposed to thus express his appreciation for the service rendered him by the members of the Nestorian religious orders in predicting the high mission to which he was called. Moreover, Mohammed loved them [p. 121] with the most sincere affection, and he liked to talk with them."

66. Archeological Methods—Dating by Poterry

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 34–36. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 34] That the monuments of Egypt and Assyria and Babylonia have shed much light on the historical background of the Old Testament scarcely needs to be said. For no modern textbook of Israelite history ignores this light, and no [p. 35] one would to-day dream of studying the history of the Hebrews except in the setting of the larger history of the ancient Near East. It is not only from texts, however, that light is shed. Explorations and excavations that yield no scrap of written material may yet bring help to the historian...

In modern archaeological work, pottery is of the greatest possible importance. Its value lies in its worthlessness and indestructibility, for it is broken pottery which is so useful. Nothing is easier to break than pottery; but few things are [p. 36] harder to destroy. It is cast out, to become buried in the dust and to preserve its story. It was cheap and plentiful, and once broken was useless, save sometimes to serve as writing material for ephemeral purposes as ostraka. Its life was normally short, and hence in most cases the broken fragments lie in the deposits dating from the age when they were used. But types of pottery are continually changing. The very shape of vessels varied from age to age, and still more the ornamentation. In one locality pottery of a certain type may be found side by side with material that can be dated within close limits, and so the approximate date when that type of pottery was used can be determined, to be confirmed, perhaps, in another district by independent evidence of the age of a deposit. And then, by the careful study of the types of pottery found in places where there is no other evidence for the age of the deposit, the comparison with the datable types becomes important. It was the late Sir Flinders Petrie who first perceived the significance of this evidence, and while his sense of its importance was received at first with some derision, its value is today universally recognized and the scientific care with which it has been studied and classified enables it to be used with reasonable confidence.

67. Archeology, and Early Ignorance of Bible Backgrounds

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Bible Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 1, 4. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1] When Adam Clarke published his famous *Commentary on the Holy Scriptures* (1810–26), in which he gathered all available material for the elucidation of the Bible, nothing whatever was known about the world in which the Bible arose except what could

be extracted from extant Greek and Latin authors. The ancient Orient was still mute... From the chaos of prehistory the Bible projected as though it were a monstrous fossil, with no contemporary evidence to demonstrate its authenticity and its origin in a human world...

[p. 4] When comparative archaeology is combined with the results secured from the philological study of written documents, it becomes possible to write a real history of civilization...

68. Archeology, and Increased Knowledge of the Bible

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Bible Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 1, 4. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

The reader may rest assured: nothing has been found to disturb a reasonable faith, and nothing has been discovered which can disprove a single theological doctrine—except that of verbal inspiration, which is not included in any standard creed. The real value of these discoveries lies elsewhere. The Bible now forms, humanly considered, part of a great whole, to the outside parts of which it can be related. Its languages, the life and customs of its peoples, its history, and its ethical and religious ideas are all illustrated in innumerable ways by archaeological discovery. But though the Bible arose *in* that world, it was not *of* that world; its spiritual values are far richer and deeper, irradiating a history which would otherwise resemble that of the surrounding peoples.

69. Archeology, and Its Role in Biblical Study

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 14, 15, 18, 25. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 14] The study of the material remains of the ancient past is often useful in "proving" the Bible to be true and accurate, and quite frequently the apologetic employment of archeological data is necessary, especially in dealing with rationalistic skepticism and destructive criticism. But it is a mistake to view this as the most important use of archeology... The Bible, when legitimately approached, does not need to be "proved" either by archeology, geology or any other science. As God's revelation to man, its own message and meaning, its own claims of inspiration and internal evidence, its own fruits and results in the life of humanity are its best proof of authenticity. It demonstrates itself to be what it claims to be to those who *believe* its message... [p. 15] Scientific authentication may act as an aid to faith, but God has so ordained that simple trust (which glorifies Him) shall always be necessary in dealing with Him or His revealed truth.

For this reason many scholars devoid of faith still reject the revealed meaning and message of the Old Testament in spite of numberless archeological proofs of its authenticity. For the same reason it is utter folly for anyone to postpone faith in the Bible until all the problems it contains are solved... In dealing with the Bible faith is as essential in the learned scholar, if he would correctly interpret and evaluate the results of his research, as it is in the illiterate savage, if he would find spiritual regeneration through the Word of God preached by the missionary...

Nevertheless archeology in confirming the Bible has performed an important function in dealing a fatal blow to die-hard radical higher critical theories, which have especially plagued Old Testament study.

Before the advance of research in Biblical lands, especially in the last half century, reams of what has been subsequently proved by archeology to be sheer nonsense were written by scholars who viewed the Bible as legend, myth, or at best unreliable history.

Acting as a corrective and a purge, archeology has exploded many of these erratic theories and false assumptions that used to be paraded in scholarly circles as settled facts. No longer can higher critics, for example, dismiss the Hebrew patriarchs as mere legendary figures or deny that Moses could write. Archeology has shown the falsity of both these and numerous other extreme contentions...

[p. 18] Making the sacred Scriptures more fully intelligible to the human mind is undoubtedly the real function of archeology. On the divine side, however, the Bible as a revelation from God, does not need archeological light to make it understandable and spiritually vital any more than it needs to be proved authentic or true. Multitudes were spiritually regenerated and made fully apperceptive of the treasures of divine wisdom contained in Scripture long before the advent of modern archeology. Yet, it must be remembered that the Bible is not only a divine book, but a human book as well.

As the product of God's revelation communicated to and through man, on the human side the Bible may be rendered more fully understandable as a result of light shed upon it from external sources—whether it be ancient history, modern archeology, or any other branch of learning. And anyone who would understand the Bible as fully as possible has no right to neglect light that may be obtained from extra-Biblical sources. As W. F. Albright aptly observes: "It is only when we begin to appreciate the Bible adequately in its human side that we can fully appreciate its greatness as the inspired revelation of the Eternal Spirit of the universe."⁸ [Note 8: "The Old Testament and Archeology," in *Old Testament Commentary* (Philadelphia, 1948), p. 168.]

Examples of archeological illustration and explanation of the Old Testament are exceedingly numerous and are continually increasing as new archeological discoveries are being made...

[p. 25] Then, too, it ought to be added that archeology has in a most astonishing manner rediscovered whole nations and resurrected important peoples of antiquity known heretofore only from obscure Biblical references.

It is no exaggeration to say that on the human side and as far as its historical and linguistic aspects are concerned, the Old Testament has become a new book as archeology has made it more understandable by setting it against the illuminating background of its environment and by correlating it with the life and customs out of which it sprang. This is the distinctive role of archeology in the study of the Old Testament. Archeology has yielded momentous results up to the present and gives fair promise of even greater contributions in the future as research in Biblical lands goes forward.

70. Archeology, Development of, From 1798

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 5, 6. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 5] In our account of the recovery of the archaeological remains of Bible Lands, we shall follow a roughly chronological order, that is, we shall take each country in the order in which it emerged into the foreground of antiquarian interest and activity. First, therefore, comes Egypt, whose magnificent temples and tombs stood through the centuries, defying the destructive forces of nature and the quarrying activities of man. The first serious effort to record them was made by the savants who accompanied

Napoleon to Egypt in 1798, and who prepared the stately tomes of the Description de

l'Egypte (1809–13)... In 1799 the soldiers of Napoleon's army accidentally discovered

the famous Rosetta Stone, which fell into the hands of the British and was deposited in the British Museum... [p. 6] After the initial publication [of the Egyptian hieroglyphic text] by Champollion in 1822 progress was rapid... The description of the surface remains that had been inaugurated by Napoleon's expedition, was continued by Champollion in a great posthumous work, by Rosellini, and especially by Lepsius in his standard publication on the monuments of Egypt and Nubia (1849–56).

71. Archeology, Development of, in Last Hundred Years

SOURCE: H. H. Rooley *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, p. 34. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

The last hundred years have been fruitful above all others in bringing to light an abundance of material which has transformed the study of the Old Testament, and it is hard for us to realize how much knowledge is open to us that was not available a century ago. In the interval between the two world wars there has been very great archaeological activity, and material has been brought to light faster than it could be fully studied and assimilated.

72. Archeology—Distrust of the Bible Changed to Confirmation SOURCE: Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1954), pp. 6–8. Copyright 1954 by Cornell University. Used by permission.

[p. 6] Until the eighteenth century the Bible was universally accepted as a trustworthy history book of antiquity. Indeed, the Book was regarded as being literally true, the Creation, the Flood, Noah's Ark, the walls of Jericho, and all. But as the Age of Reason dawned and in turn gave way to nineteenth-century philosophies of evolution and scientific materialism, the Bible, in common with the New Testament and all records of antiquity, Greek, Roman, and the rest, came to be very considerably discounted as a reliable basis for the reconstruction of history.

The heroic doings of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as described in the Book of Genesis, were discounted as mere myth. The very existence of Moses was doubted. Joshua was believed to have had little or nothing to do with the Israelite conquest of Canaan. David and Solomon were considered greatly overrated. Extensive parts of the prophetic books were attributed not to the prophets themselves but to redactors and disciples who lived several centuries later in different circumstances. The story of the Babylonian Exile was relegated to the realm of fiction. And so on.

This negative attitude to the Bible was reflected in more recent times, for example, in the writings of the well-known social philosopher Bertrand Russell, and the historiographer R. G. Collingwood. In his popular *History of Western Philosophy* [1944] Lord Russell wrote:

The early history of the Israelites cannot be confirmed from any source outside the Old Testament, and it is impossible to know at what point it ceases to be purely legendary. David and Solomon may be accepted as kings who probably had a real existence, but at the earliest point at which we come to some- [p. 7] thing certainly historical there are already two kingdoms of Israel and Judah [ninth century B.C.]. [Used by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc., New York.]And a year later, in his posthumous book on *The Idea of History* [1945], Collingwood dismissed in less than one page as "theocratic history and myth" the entire Biblical material.

It is unfortunate that these scholars—and there are very many more—have not kept up with the more recent discoveries and analyses of the ancient Near East. For today, in considerable degree, the pendulum has swung the other way. Modern historians do not, to be sure, accept every part of the Bible equally as literal fact. Yet they have come to accept much of the Biblical data as constituting unusually reliable historical documents of antiquity, documents which take on new meaning and pertinence when they are analyzed in the light of the newly discovered extra-Biblical sources. Indeed, even the mythical parts of the Bible are now generally regarded as reliable reflection of fact, empirically grounded, and logical in their way. It is a question of understanding the perspective and circumstances involved.

Archaeology and the Bible. This radical re-evaluation of the significance of the Bible has been necessitated by the archaeological discoveries of the past three decades. The civilizations which flourished in the Fertile Crescent of old are better known today than anyone before World War I thought possible. The material, social, and religious configurations of the Sumerian, Egyptian, Babylonian, Hurrian, Assyrian, Canaanite, Hittite, and Aramean societies can be delineated to an increasingly satisfactory degree. It is now possible to see the entire [p. 8] ancient Near East from a thoroughly new perspective, and so it has become necessary to re-examine the Biblical record in the light of our broadened understanding. More and more the older view that the Biblical data were suspect and even likely to be false, unless corroborated by extra-Biblical facts, is giving way to one which holds that, by and large, the Biblical accounts are more likely to be true than false, unless clear-cut evidence from sources outside the Bible demonstrate the reverse.

73. Archeology, Effect of, on Biblical Theology

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 550. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of the author and Abingdon Press, Nashville.

In conclusion we emphasize the fact that archeological discovery has been largely responsible for the recent revival of interest in biblical theology, because of the wealth of new material illustrating text and background of the Bible. As the reader will have seen from this article, new archeological material continues to pour in, compelling revision of all past approaches to both Old and New Testament religion. It becomes clearer each day that this rediscovery of the Bible often leads to a new evaluation of biblical faith, which strikingly resembles the orthodoxy of an earlier day. Neither an academic scholasticism nor an irresponsible neo-orthodoxy must be allowed to divert our eyes from the living faith of the Bible.

74. Archeology, Effect of, on Biblical Views

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, p. 36. Copyright 1942 by The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore. Used by permission.

While the epoch-making archaeological discoveries of the past century have been particularly important because of the new evidence which they bring for cultural history, their significance for the history of religion is much greater than is commonly supposed. The history of Israelite religion, which we find recorded in the Old Testament, can now be much better understood than it was a generation ago. Neither conservative nor liberal interpretation remains unaffected by the flood of archaeological information, though a rational conservative attitude has less to apprehend from the new material than either extreme position.

We use the term "archaeology" in its inclusive sense, covering all written documents and unwritten materials from the ancient Near East.

75. Archeology, Inspiration of the Bible Reinforced by

SOURCE: George A. Barton, *Archaeology and the Bible*, Preface, pp. iv, v. Copyright 1916 by American Sunday-School Union, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. iv] Not the least service that archaeology has rendered has been the presentation of a new background against which the inspiration of the Biblical writers stands out in striking vividness. Often one finds traditions in Babylonia identical with those embodied in the Old Testament, but they are so narrated that no such conception of God shines through them as shines through the Biblical narrative. Babylonians and Egyptians pour out their hearts in psalms with something of the same fervor and pathos as the Hebrews, but no such vital conception of God and his oneness gives shape to their faith and brings the longed-for strength to the spirit. Egyptian sages developed a social conscience comparable in many respects with that of the Hebrew prophets, but they lacked the vital touch [p. v] of religious devotion which took the conceptions of the prophets out of the realm of individual speculation and made them the working ethics of a whole people. Archaeology thus reinforces to the modern man with unmistakable emphasis the ancient words, "Men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit" (2 Peter 1:21).

76. Archeology—"Israel Stela" of Merneptah (*c*. 1230 B.C.)—Earliest Extant Non-Biblical Mention of the Name "Israel"

SOURCE: Merneptah, inscription on the "Israel Stela," trans. in James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (2d ed.), pp. 376, 378. Copyright 1955 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 376] Year 5, 3rd month of the third season, day 3, under the majesty of the Horus: Mighty Bull, Rejoicing in Truth; the King of Upper and Lower Egypt: Baen-Re Meri-Amon; the Son of Re: Merne-Ptah Hotep-hir-Maat. The magnification of the strength and the exaltation of the strong arm of the Horus: Mighty Bull, who smites the Nine Bows, whose name is given to eternity forever. The relation of his victories in all lands, to cause that every land together know and to let the virtue in his deeds of valor be seen...

[p. 378] The princes are prostrate, saying: "Mercy!"

Not one raises his head among the Nine Bows. Desolation is for Tehenu; Hatti is pacified;

Plundered is the Canaan with every evil;

Carried off is Ashkelon; seized upon is Gezer;

Yanoam is made as that which does not exist:

Israel is laid waste, his seed is not;

Hurru is become a widow for Egypt!

All lands together, they are pacified;

Everyone who was restless, he has been bound.

77. Archeology—"Israel Stela" of Merneptah (*c*. 1230 B.C.)—Earliest Known Non-Biblical Mention of Name of Israel. Alternate Translation Arranged in Strophic Form

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archaeology," *BASOR*, 74 (April, 1939), 21, 22.

[p. 21]. The earliest reference to the people of Israel occurs in this stela, in the following passage:

The princes are prostrate, while they say, "peace!"

There is no one who raises his head among the Nine Bows.

Libya (Thnw) is ruined, Khatti is pacified;

The Canaanite land is despoiled with every evil.

[p. 22] Ascalon is carried captive, Gezer is conquered;

Yanô'am is made as though it did not exist. The people Israel is desolate, it has no offspring;

Palestine (Khüru) has become a widow for Egypt.

Arranged correctly in its original strophic form, the connection is much clearer than it is in the usual translation. In the second distich Libya, the land of the Hittites (eastern Asia Minor and northern Syria), and the land of the Canaanites (primarily the Coastal Plain of Palestine and southern Syria) are put on a par, which is eminently reasonable. In the third distich three Canaanite cities are similarly correlated. In the fourth distich Israel is correlated with Palestine, as is shown both by the strophic arrangement and by the parallelism. In other words, Israel, here mentioned for the first time in Egyptian sources, was then much more than a petty tribe; it had already become a strong and dangerous people, though not yet settled, as proved by the determinative for "people" which follows the syllabically written name.

78. Archeology—Kings of Israel and Judah in Assyrian Records SOURCE: James B. Pritchard, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 128, 129. Copyright 1958 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 128] Until a little more than a hundred years ago the thirty-nine kings of the two Hebrew kingdoms during the period of the divided monarchy were known only from the Bible [p. 129] and writings dependent upon it. Then from the earth of the region of the upper Tigris River there emerged records of the Assyrian kings mentioning Omri, Ahab, Jehu, Menahem, Hoshea, Pekah, and Hezekiah. Not only were these Israelite and Judaean enemies and subjects mentioned by name, but specific details of geography, dates, and amounts of tribute received were recorded in cuneiform.

79. Archeology—Kings of Israel and Judah in Assyrian Records of Tiglath-pileser

SOURCE: James B. Pritchard, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 150–152. Copyright 1958 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New, Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 150] When Layard excavated the palace of Tiglath-pileser III at Nimrud, he could not transport all the inscribed slabs to England. But, realizing the importance of the inscriptions, he made paper squeezes and brought them back to the British Museum. There they were stored. Two decades later George Smith, who was then interested in fragments of clay tablets from Nineveh, made comparisons with the squeezes and came upon a startling cuneiform text. It was a summary of the campaigns of Tiglath-pileser III against Israel and mentioned the events which are described by the author of the Book of Kings. In 1870 he published the text in the third volume of Rawlinson's great *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*. The inscription mentions the first "Exile" of Israel and gives the valuable information that Hoshea in his conspiracy had the backing of the Assyrian king.

As for Menahem I overwhelmed him like a snowstorm and he ... fled like a bird, alone, and bowed to my feet. I returned him to his place and imposed tribute upon him, to wit: gold, silver, linen garments with multi- [p. 151] colored trimmings, ... great... I received from him. Israel ... all its inhabitants and their possessions I led to Assyria.

They overthrew their king Pekah and I placed Hoshea as king over them. I received from them 10 talents of gold, 1,000 [?] talents of silver as their tribute and brought them to Assyria.

Tiglath-pileser's attention was not limited to the northern kingdom of Israel; he boasts of tribute from the kings of the south as well. On a clay tablet found at Nimrud there is an inventory of booty:

I received the tribute of ... Sanipu of Bit-Ammon, Salamanu of Moab, ... Mitinti of Ashkelon, Jehoahaz [p. 152] of Judah, Kaushmalaku of Edom, ... Hanno of Gaza...

80. Archeology—Kings of Israel in Assyrian Records

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, Archeology and the Old Testament, pp. 23, 24. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 23] Contemporary Assyrian records of the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. fill in many gaps in the Hebrew historical narratives and greatly enrich our knowledge of such Israelite kings as Ahab and Jehu. The former, as Assyrian *Ahabbu*, appears prominently in the Monolith Inscription of the great Assyrian conqueror, Shalmaneser III (858–824 B.C.), as one of the important members of a military coalition, who furnished two thousand chariots and ten thousand soldiers to resist the Assyrian advance at Karkar on the Orontes River in 853 B.C. Jehu, the usurper and the ruthless extirpator of the house of Omri, actually appears on the Black Obelisk which Austen Layard found in 1846 in Shalmaneser III's palace at Nimrod [see editors' note]. Jehu is shown kneeling before the Assyrian monarch, and the following words accompany the picture: "Tribute of Iaua

[Jehu] son of Omri [*mar Humri*]. Silver, gold ... lead, staves for the hand of the king, javelins, I received from him."

The appearance of the name of Omri in the Assyrian records [p. 24] in connection with Jehu, who did not enter the historical scene until more than a century after the death of the founder of the important Omride dynasty in Israel, illustrates the political reputation Omri enjoyed, at least among the Assyrians, which is doubtlessly intentionally passed over in the Old Testament (cf. I Kings 16:23–28) because of the king's negative religious influence (Mic. 6:16). The Moabite Stone set up by King Mesha of Moab (II Kings 3:4) about 830 B.C. and discovered in 1868 likewise supports the fact that Omri enjoyed great political prestige. The king of Moab's own testimony to this fact appears as follows: "As for Omri, king of Israel, he humbled Moab many years [literally, days]" and "occupied the land of Medeba, and [Israel] had dwelt there, in his time and half the time of his son [Ahab] ..."

Beside the Moabite Stone the Lachish Ostraca are of particular importance among Palestinian inscriptions. Discovered in 1935 and 1938 in the ruins of the latest Israelite occupation of Tell ed-Duweir (Lachish) in southern Palestine, these twenty-one letters possess unusual philological significance, since they form the only known corpus of documents in classical Hebrew prose. Besides they shed valuable light on the time of Jeremiah, just preceding the fall of Jerusalem (587 B.C.), being generally dated in the autumn of 589 or 588 B.C., shortly before the commencement of the Chaldean siege of Lachish.

[EDITORS' NOTE: "Nimrod" is *Nimrûd*, ancient Calah. See *SDADic* on "Jehu." Except for the "see reference" referring to this note, the bracketed material in the quotation is from the source.]

81. Archeology—Kings, Record of, Supplemented by Contemporary Document (Moabite Stone)

SOURCE: Ira Maurice Price and others, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, p. 242. Copyright 1958 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

This inscribed stone [the Moabite Stone] written in Phoenician script gives a supplement to the records of the reigns of Omri, Ahab, Jehoram, and Jehoshaphat. Omri had subdued Moab, and had collected from Moab a yearly tribute. Ahab had also enjoyed the same annual revenue, amounting, under Mesha's reign, to the wool of 100,000 lambs

and 100,000 rams (2 Kings 3:4–27). At the close of Ahab's reign, Mesha refused longer to pay this tribute. The allied kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom, with their armies, marched against Mesha. The Moabites fled into the strong fortress, Kir-hareseth, where Mesha offered up his own son on the wall as a burnt offering to Chemosh, his god. This stone was set up by king Mesha, to Chemosh, about 850 B.C., to commemorate his deliverance from the yoke of Israel.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: For a description and picture of this stone, with an account of its discovery and a translation of the complete inscription, see *SDADic* on "Moabite Stone."]

82. Archeology—Mesopotamian "Cities of Nimrod"

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 87–89. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 87] The beginning of Nimrod's kingdom is said to be "Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar" (Gen. 10:10).

The cities of Babel, Erech and Akkad are now well known through archeological discoveries to have been among the earliest great capitals of the civilized world. These ancient centers of population and empire, said to be "the beginning" of Nimrod's kingdom, are described as being "in the land of Shinar." The term, as it is here employed in the Hebrew Bible, denotes the entire alluvial plain of Babylonia between the Tigris and the [p. 88] Euphrates, in approximately the last two hundred miles of the course of these great rivers as they flowed in ancient times. In the cuneiform inscriptions the region is divided into a northern portion, called Akkad, in which Babel (Babylon) and the city of Akkad (Agade) were situated and a southern portion called Sumer in which Erech (ancient Uruk) was located.

Babel (in Akkadian, *bab–ilu*, signifying "gate of God") dates from prehistoric times. It did not itself, however, become the capital of a great empire until in the old Babylonian Period (*c*. 1830–c. 1550 B.C.). Under Hammurabi (1728–1686 B.C.) of the first dynasty of Babylon, the city became mistress of all Babylonia, and as far northwestward as the powerful city of Mari on the middle Euphrates. But its Euphrates. But its history goes back far beyond this period to the earliest pre-Semitic era in the lower Tigris-Euphrates Valley.

Erech, Akkadian Uruk, is represented by modern Warka, situated about a hundred miles southeast of Babylon in a marshy region east of the Euphrates. Here was discovered the first ziggurat or sacred temple-tower and evidence of the first cylinder seals.

Akkad was the name given to northern Babylonia from the city of Agade which Sargon brought into great prominence as the capital of a new Semitic empire dominating the Mesopotamian world from about 2360–c. 2180 B.C.

Calneh has not been clearly elucidated by archeology. Attempts have been made to identify it with Nippur, one of the oldest cities of central Babylonia. It is also thought by some that the shorter form of Hursagkalama (Kalama), a twin city of Kish, is meant. Others identify it with the Calno of Isaiah 10:9 on the basis of the Septuagint text.

An account of the founding of Assyria by the Hamitic Cushites of Babylonia is appended to the notice of the establishment of their imperial power in Babylonia. Out of Babylonia it is said Nimrod "went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh, and [p. 89] Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah (the same is the great city)" (Gen. 10:11, 12).

... That Babylonia was the oldest seat of civilization in the great plain of the two rivers, and that Nineveh was (so to say) colonized from it, are indeed in harmony with what we learn from the monuments: politically as well as in its whole civilization, writing, and religion. Assyria in early times was dependent upon Babylonia.²⁰ [Note 20 cites S. R. Driver, *The Book of Genesis*, 122.]

83. Archeology, New Testament Writers Proved Accurate by SOURCE: Camden M. Cobern, *The New Archeological Discoveries*, p. 488. Copyright 1929 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

It is a most suggestive fact that while these unrivaled discoveries of the monuments and inscriptions of the ancient world have in scores of instances cast discredit upon the accuracy of classical historians and ancient writers, they have served only to put in clearer light the remarkable knowledge and scrupulous exactness of the New Testament writers. The account of Paul's visit to Athens sounds to modern scholars who are best acquainted with the Athens of the first century like the report of an eye witness.

84. Archeology, Old Testament Historicity Confirmed by SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*, pp. 176, 177. Copyright 1942 by The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore. Used by permission.

[p. 176] Since the Old Testament is historical in essence as well as in canonical purpose, archaeology becomes an indispensable aid to our understanding of it. Only through archaeological research can biblical history become a scientific discipline, since history can in general become scientific only by the consistent application of arhchaeological or other equally rigorous methodology (*From the Stone Age to Christianity*, pp. 75ff.; above, pp. 1ff.). There can be no doubt that archaeology has confirmed the substantial historicity of Old Testament tradition...

[p. 177] Archaeology makes it increasingly possible to interpret each religious phenomenon and movement of the Old Testament in the light of its true background and real sources, instead of forcing its interpretation into some preconceived historical mould. Archaeology checks all extreme views with regard to the meaning and content of biblical tradition. Neither radicalism nor ultra-conservatism receives any support from the discoveries and the deductions of the archaeologist. In general archaeology confirms the traditional picture of the evolution of religious life and throughout thought through Hebrew, Israelite and Jewish history.

85. Archaeology, Old Testament Rediscovery Brought by SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 16, 17. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 16] Considerable light has been shed on the Old Testament by archaeology, which may be said to have brought a further re-discovery of this Book. The brilliant achievements of the nineteenth century, more particularly in the realm of the decipherment of inscriptions in long-forgotten languages, added greatly to our knowledge of the world in which Israel was set. We know far more of the rise and fall of empires than the Old Testament itself could have told us, and we can see how the fortunes of Israel were affected by events that happened far beyond her borders... The work of the nineteenthcentury has been continued in the twentieth, and not alone have further texts of historical interest been found, but a new technique has made unconsidered trifles yield rich secrets, so that even where no texts are found it is possible to determine and to date some of the outstanding events of the history of excavated sites. Besides this, religious

objects and religious texts have been found, and we have a considerable knowledge of the cultural and religious background of the [p. 17] Old Testament.

86. Archaeology—Patriarchal Age, Society of SOURCE: Cyrus H. Gordon, *The World of the Old Testament* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958), pp. 115, 118, 120, 121, 122. Copyright 1953 by Ventnor Publishers, Inc.; copyright © 1958 by Cyrus H. Gordon. Used by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc.

[p. 115] The analogies, to be pointed out presently, between the society of Nuzu [Nuzi] and of the Hebrew Patriarchs are so numerous and striking that scholars are agreed that the patriarchal narratives in Genesis portray a genuine social picture. We shall soon look into the various aspects of the narratives and see that some of the reputed anachronisms and legendary features are correct historically...

[p. 118] In the patriarchal narratives (Genesis 14:5) it is stated that among the inhabitants of Palestine are the Rephaim; whose mention is often misconstrued as a mythological illusion. However, as we have observed, the references to the Rephaim in Ugaritic administrative documents show that real people bore that name in Canaan of the Amarna Age.

Inasmuch as Sarai, the wife of Abram, was childless, she gave Hagar as a concubine to Abram for the purpose of producing an heir (Genesis 16:2). This is not an isolated instance of unfeminine generosity, but in accordance with the laws and customs of the times as we know from the Nuzu and other cuneiform tablets. It is interesting to note that Hagar later receives an annunciation that she is to bear a child (Genesis 16:11). As noted above, such annunciations are typical of Canaanite literature and we find them in the Ugaritic documents as well as the Bible. The angel predicting Ishmael's birth tells Hagar that the lad will be "a wild ass of a man" (Genesis 16:12). This is not an insult but a compliment because the wild ass was then to be found in the desert and it was the choicest beast of the hunt...

[p. 120] It is not easy for every modern reader to understand the atmosphere of Hebrew society. Background is necessary, but the most important single element in obtaining the background is to read and reread the biblical text until it becomes familiar and real. Nearly always we can know that we understand a biblical passage correctly when its literal ¹⁴ meaning fits smoothly into the general context. [Note 14: It cannot be overemphasized that the discoveries of archeology tend to justify the literal meaning of the text as against scholarly and traditional interpretation. This holds not only for the Bible but for ancient texts in general.]...

[p. 121] Abraham and Isaac are said to have had dealings with Abimelech of Gerar, a king of the Philistines. This is generally regarded as an anachronism, because it is held that the Philistines first migrated from Caphtor to Canaan around 1200 B.C. However, the fact is that the wave of Sea People, which included Philistines, around 1200 B.C. was only a late migration in a long series of migrations that had established various Caphtor folk in Canaan long before 1500 B.C. ...

[p. 122] That the Caphtorians were already recognized in Canaan as the masters par excellence of the arts and crafts, including metallurgy, is reflected by the fact that the divine artisan (Kothar-and-Hasis) in the Ugaritic pantheon comes from Caphtor, where his workshop is located. In the light of this many-sided evidence, the presence of Caphtorians in Canaan during the time of Abraham is not anachronistic. Furthermore, the general historicity of the incident is favored by the fact that the social institutions exhibited are not those of later Hebrew times.

87. Archeology—Patriarchal Manners and Customs Corroborated

SOURCE: Alfred Jeremias, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East*, trans. by C. L. Beaumont, vol. 2, p. 2. Copyright 1911 by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Used with their permission.

An idealistic legend with no background of fact would certainly not have made the Patriarchs dwell as strangers in the land, obliged to bargain with barbarians for a burialplace. They would further have suppressed the marriage of a Jacob to two sisters, forbidden in Lev. xviii. 18. Also many strong human features, showing as blemishes in the brilliant popular heroes, would be inexplicable in the composition of fables of popular ideal characters. But, above all, the correctness of *milieu* testifies we are dealing with tradition, not with poetry. The background of contemporary history and the details of

manners and customs agree with those we find recorded upon the monuments of these periods, and answer for it that the Biblical tradition was drawn from good sources.

88. Archeology—Patriarchal Narrative, Accuracy of, Demonstrated SOURCE: Nelson Glueck, "The Age of Abraham in the Negeb," *BA*, 18 (Feb., 1955), 8.

The archaeological evidence of the existence of Middle Bronze I civilization in the Negeb is ... in harmony with the Biblical allusions. A considerable number of permanent, agricultural villages with stone houses existed there in the times of Abraham. Their inhabitants cultivated the soil in many of its *wadis* and probably engaged also in animal husbandry and to a certain degree in commerce. Important travel and trade routes crisscrossed their territory. The pottery they employed is in no wise distingu[i]shable from the Middle Bronze I types found elsewhere in Palestine and Trans-jordan.

89. Archeology—Patriarchal Stories Substantiated; Wellhausen Refuted SOURCE: Alfred Jeremias, *The Old Testament in the light of the Ancient East*, trans. by C. L. Beaumont, vol. 2, p. 45. Copyright 1911 by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Used with their permission.

We have shown how the *milieu* of the stories of the Patriarchs agrees in every detail with the circumstances of Ancient-Oriental civilisation of the period in question, as borne witness to by the monuments. The actual existence of Abraham is not historically proved by them. It might be objected: it is included in the picture. In any case, it must be allowed, the tradition is ancient. It cannot possibly be a poem with a purpose of later time. In view of the situations described, we might say the story could more easily have been composed by an intellectual writer of the twentieth century after Christ, knowing Oriental antiquity by means of the excavations, rather than by a contemporary of Hezekiah, who would have used the civilisation of his own time in descriptions, and certainly would not have any excavated antiquities. Wellhausen worked out from the opinion that the stories of the Patriarchs are historically impossible. It is now proved that they are possible. If Abraham lived at all, it could only have been in surroundings and under conditions such as the Bible describes. Historical research must be content with this. And Wellhausen may be reminded of his own words (Komposition des Hexateuch 346): "If it (the 9th Israelite tradition) were only possible, it would be folly to prefer any other possibility."

90. Archeology—Patriarchs' Long Life Span, Sidelights on SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 18, 19. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 18] An extended life span [see Gen. 1–11] [p. 19] for the lives of antediluvian celebrities is revealed by archeology to be a familiar feature in the traditions of the ancient Near East. What is striking indeed is that the longevity attributed to the patriarchs

before the flood in the Hebrew Bible is exceedingly modest in comparison with the Babylonian kings of the same period [as listed in Babylonian sources], ... whose average reign was from thirty thousand to forty-five thousand years. In contrast, the oldest descendant in the line of Seth, Methuselah, lived to be only 969 years, and the average life span, counting Enoch who was translated without dying at the age of 365, was slightly over 857 years.

There is no decisive reason for not believing that the Scriptural representations are literally true.

He ... who is duly impressed by the excellence of man's original estate, will have no difficulty in accepting the common explanation that even under the curse of sin man's constitution displayed such vitality that it did not at first submit to the ravages of time until after many centuries had passed. Besides— a fact established by fossil finds—there are ample indications of a more salubrious climate in the antediluvian days. Nor should we forget that here is the race of godly men who lived temperately and sanely.¹¹ [Note 11: H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Genesis* (Grand Rapids, 1950), Vol. I, p. 234.]

The value of the archeological evidence in the case of original longevity does not lie in the conclusion that the Hebrews happened to hand down with more restraint than the Babylonians the primitive traditions of the original stock of which both peoples were descendants. There is no valid reason why they should have done so. The manifest soberness of the Hebrew account is an indication of its inspiration as divine truth. The Babylonian lists are illuminating as representing an independent and confirmatory, though grossly exaggerated, tradition of that which appears in Genesis 5 as authentic historical fact given by divine revelation.

91. Archeology—Solomon's Copper Works at Ezion-geber SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 226, 227. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 226] Archeology not only attests the historical reasonableness of the fact that Phoenician seamen and artisans aided Solomon in building and operating his fleet in the Red Sea, but clearly illustrates an additional point. Phoenician technicians built the seaport of Ezion-geber for him. An important copper smeltery discovered there by Nelson Glueck (1938–40), the first ever found, was certainly the work of Phoenician craftsmen who were widely experienced in the art of setting up copper furnaces and refineries at the smelting settlements in Sardinia and in Spain (the later Tartessus) which were called Tarshish, after which the ships specially equipped for transporting such ore and metal cargoes were called Tarshish ships.

The construction of the copper refinery at ancient Ezion-geber (modern Tell el-Kheleifeh) is unusually good, as Glueck has [p. 227] noted, and points to practical knowledge and skill which were the result of long experience. The inescapable conclusion is that Hiram's technicians, who were expert in the business, were responsible for the construction of the smeltery and that it dates from the tenth century B.C. and was rebuilt at various later periods. Tell el-Kheleifeh was, therefore, a *tarshish*, or metal refinery like the Phoenician stations of the same name in Sardinia and Spain.

The discovery of the copper refinery at Tell el-Kheleifeh illustrates the brief but important Biblical reference to copper smelting and casting in the Jordan Valley (1 Kings 7:46) and points to another prolific source of Solomon's wealth. As Glueck says, it was Solomon "who was the first one who placed the mining industry in the Wadi Arabah upon a really national scale." As a result copper became the king's principal export and his merchants' main stock in trade. Putting out from Ezion-geber laden with smelted ore, his fleet brought back in exchange other valuable goods obtainable in Arabian ports or from the nearby coasts of Africa. [See Nelson Glueck, *The Other Side of the Jordan* (New Haven, 1940), pp. 98, 84, 85.]

92. Arianism, Doctrine of, Defined by Church Historian SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), pp.

644–646.

[p. 644] The doctrine of the Arians ... [p. 645] is in substance as follows:

The Father alone is God; therefore he alone is unbegotten, eternal, wise, good, and unchangeable, and he is separated by an infinite chasm from the world. He cannot create the world directly, but only through an agent, the Logos. The Son of God is pre-existent, before all creatures, and above all creatures, a middle being between God and the world, the creator of the world, the perfect image of the Father, and the executor of his thoughts, and thus capable of being called in a metaphorical sense God, and Logos, and Wisdom. But on the other hand, he himself is a creature, that is to say, the first creation of God, through whom the Father called other creatures into existence; he was created out of nothing (not out of the essence of God) by the will of the Father before all conceivable time; he is therefore not eternal, but had a beginning, and there was a time when he was not.

Arianism thus rises far above Ebionism, Socinianism, deism, and rationalism, in maintaining the personal pre-existence of the Son before all worlds, which were his creation; but it agrees with those systems in lowering the Son to the sphere of the created, which of course includes the idea of temporalness and finiteness. It at first ascribed to him the predicate of unchangeableness also, but afterwards subjected him to the vicissitudes of created being. This contradiction, however, is solved, if need be, by the distinction between moral and physical unchangeableness; the Son is in his nature $(\phi \dot{\upsilon} \zeta \epsilon_1)$ changeable, but remains good $(\chi \alpha \lambda \dot{\upsilon} \zeta)$ by a free act of his will. Arius, after having once robbed the Son of divine essence, could not consistently allow him any divine attribute in the strict sense of the word; he limited his duration, his [p. 646] power, and his knowledge, and expressly asserted that the Son does not perfectly know the Father, and therefore cannot perfectly reveal him. The Son is essentially distinct from the Father, and—as Aëtius and Eunomius afterward more strongly expressed it—unlike the Father; and this dissimilarity was by some extended to all moral and metaphysical attributes and conditions. The dogma of the essential deity of Christ seemed to Arius to lead of necessity to Sabellianism or to the Gnostic dreams of emanation. As to the humanity of Christ, Arius ascribed to him only a human body, but not a rational soul, and on this point Apollinarius came to the same conclusion, though from orthodox premises, and with the intention of saving the unity of the divine personality of Christ.

93. Armageddon, Held to Be Near SOURCE: Leland Stowe, *While Time Remains,* pp. 12, 21. Copyright 1946 by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 12] Those foremost world authorities who split the atom and made the bomb have assured us that Armageddon and Doomsday are now suspended over the heads of *our* generation...

[p. 21] In your lifetime and in mine—at any time after another four or five years—it is now conceivable that atomic rockets and similar missiles may destroy between 100,000,000 and 500,000,000 human beings; a large percentage of them Americans.

94. Armageddon, Warning Concerning

SOURCE: Douglas MacArthur, concluding address at the ceremony of the surrender of Japan, *The New York Times*, Sept. 2, 1945, p. 3. Copyright 1945 by The New York Times. Used by permission.

A new era is upon us... We have had our last chance. If we do not now devise some greater and more equitable system Armageddon will be at our door.

95. Arminianism, Positions of

SOURCE: Frederic Platt, "Arminianism," in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 1, pp. 808, 811–813. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[p. 808] The creed of the Arminians was set forth in the Five Articles of the Remonstrance addressed in 1610 to the States-General of Holland and West Friesland, from which fact its adherents received the name of Remonstrants. The articles were drawn up by Uyttenbogaert and signed by forty-six ministers... Briefly summarized, the following are their positions. The first asserts conditional election, or election dependent on the foreknowledge by God of faith in the elect and of unbelief in those who are left in sin and under condemnation. The second asserts universal atonement in the sense that it is intended, although it is not actually efficient, for all. The third asserts the inability of man to exercise saving faith, or to accomplish anything really good without regeneration by the Holy Spirit. The fourth declares that the grace of God is indispensable in every step of the spiritual life, but that it is not irrestible. The fifth asserts that the grace of the Holy Spirit is sufficient for continual victory over temptation and sin; but the necessity of the final Perseverance of all believers is left doubtful. This last article was afterwards so modified by the followers of Arminius as to assert the possibility of falling from grace...

The leading principles of Arminianism ... are: (a) the universality of the benefit of the Atonement; (b) a restored freedom of the human will as an element in the Divine decrees and in opposition to the assertion of the absolute sovereignty of God. Apart from these and kindred questions involved in the problem of predestination, Arminianism has no definite theological distinctness. It attempts no fresh statement of the doctrines of God and man. These were accepted as they stood in the recognized creeds and confessions of Christendom; its general theological system was that of the orthodox Protestant Churches. But its specific contribution was of sufficient importance to rank it amongst the few really outstanding and permanent developments in theological thought...

[p. 811] Theologically, Arminianism is a mediating system throughout... Absolutism is its persistent opposite: moderation, the mark of its method. The failure to appreciate this position accounts for the frequent and grave misunderstanding of Arminianism, and for the natural ease with which its delicately balanced judgment has declined, in the hands of some of its exponents, towards theological positions with which it had no true affinity... In Holland, Arminianism, gliding by almost imperceptible degrees, ultimately reached a position with little to distinguish it from Socinianism. In England, where there was a presage of Arminian thought long before the time of Arminius and his system, its principles found an interesting development, and their profession an unusual environment. The influence was seen in the ambiguity or comprehensiveness of the Articles of the English Church... The restored Arminianism of Arminius, with its emphasis on the grace of God, emerged into strength in England in the Evangelical Revival of the 18th century. The Wesleys came of a sturdy Arminian stock of this type. And probably the ablest expositions in English of the Arminian system are to be found in the writings of John Wesley, John Fletcher, Richard Watson, and William Burt Pope, the Wesleyan theologians. Methodists throughout the world, with the exception of the

Calvinistic Methodists in Wales, ... are convinced Arminians, who profess to adhere to the original Arminianism of Arminius and his followers of the earlier type... The Wesleyan type of Arminianism, with its Evangelical note, is at present the most influential. It has spread widely throughout the British Empire and America, and is based upon the conviction that the Calvinistic positions are incompatible with Divine equity and human freedom, whilst its loyalty to the doctrines of grace is the best vindication of Arminianism from the common charge of Pelagianism and Socinianism. Lacking the doctrinal loyalty and the Evangelical vitality of the Arminianism of Methodism, Dutch Arminianism is a dwindling force...

Arminianism ... provides a philosophical *via media* between Naturalism and Fatalism. As an active criticism of Calvinism it is based upon two position—the restless and dominant demand for equity in the Divine procedure, on the one hand, and such a reference to the constitution of man's [p. 812] nature as will harmonize with the obvious facts of his history and experience, on the other...

[p. 813] Arminianism stood generally for the strengthening of the scientific temper and for the principle of moderation, which represented dawning methods of far-reaching importance in the intellectual life of the modern nations. On the other hand, this attitude favoured the growing tendency towards Rationalism and Latitudinarianism into which Arminian theology frequently drifted. But that this drift represented any necessary effect of the Arminian movement is disproved by the fact that it was the Arminian system of thought which lay at the theological sources of the great Methodist revival in the United Kingdom and America during the 18th cent., whose leaders re-stated Arminianism in modern theology in its purest form, and vitalized it with the warmth of religious emotion and the joyous assurance of the Evangelical spirit. Arminianism in the glow of the spiritual enthusiasm of the early Methodist evangelists has been truly described as 'Arminianism on fire.'

96. Arminius, Views of, on Predestination

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," *Christianity Today* 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 18, 19. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

[p. 18] Theological literature often gives the impression that Arminius simply "denied predestination." It was his well-grounded fear that Beza, and Gomarus, the supralapsarian interpreters of Calvin, were in danger of divorcing the doctrine from Christology and making Christ the mere instrument or means of carrying out a prior, abstract decree. Arminius sought to state the doctrine in the light of Scripture and in integral relation to Christology, and he referred often to Malachi, Romans 9, the "universalist" texts, and particularly the emphasis of Ephesians 1:4 that God "hath chosen us in him." For his contention that election must be understood "in Christ" he found considerable support also in the Dutch confessions and in Calvin himself.

The "first decree," then, for Arminius, was that by which God appointed "his Son, Jesus Christ, for a Mediator, Redeemer, Saviour, Priest, and King, who might destroy sin by his own death, might by his obedience obtain the salvation which had been lost, and might communicate it by his own virtue." Christ is thus not merely the agent but the very foundation of election. The second decree was to receive into favor sinners who are "in Christ" by repentance and faith, and the third had to do with "sufficient and efficacious" [p. 19] means of grace. The final decree was the election of particular individuals on the basis of the divine foreknowledge of their faith and perseverance. Arminius thus affirmed the doctrine that Christ is the foundation of election and adumbrated the position that He is the content of election. He retained the position that this makes man responsible for his own believing. It would seem, however, that Arminius built his doctrine of election on the notion of foreseen faith, and thereby made man's decision the cause or concurring cause of salvation (man electing God). It should be noted, however, that Arminius put the latter notion in a position subordinate to the appointing (or electing) of Jesus Christ, and that election in terms of foreseen faith can stand neither alone nor first. Arminians have not always kept this distinction clearly, and the Remonstrance of 1610 itself begins with what Arminius put in fourth place. This tendency, carried to its conclusion, leads to a defection in emphasis from free grace to free will (a point made forcefully by Robert E. Chiles, "Methodist Apostasy: From Free Grace to Free Will," *Religion in Life,* Vol. XXVII, No. 3, 1958).

The free grace of God in Jesus Christ did confront sinful man with a "decisionquestion" for Arminius, but the response of faith was not done in strength which is some sort of residue of goodness. Apart from Christ there could be no response, but the response of faith is nevertheless man's act, an act to be sure not of achievement and merit but of surrender and acceptance. In this act man gives all glory to God, but for it he himself is responsible. Grace, for Arminius, created freedom and responsibility; it did not destroy or displace them.

97. Assemblies of God, General Council

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 71.

History. Following a great revival movement which swept around the world in 1906 and 1907, a considerable number of churches, missions, or assemblies in the United States found a common interest in a distinctively evangelistic type of mission work. This was at first purely independent and voluntary, but some association and mutual fellowship became recognized as valuable and necessary for the purpose of establishing doctrinal standards and providing effective methods of home and foreign missionary work.

In the spring of the year 1914, a group of pastors of independent churches issued a call for all interested in Bible order, system, evangelism, and united doctrine to meet at Hot Springs, Ark. About 100 delegates came to this meeting. Some were former ministers of evangelical denominational churches and others were serving as pastors of churches, not having had previous denominational membership. An organization was agreed upon based on the principles of voluntary unity and cooperation in religious effort. This organization was first incorporated in Arkansas in October 1914, and then in Missouri in November 1916, under the name of "The General Council of the Assemblies of God."

Doctrine. The doctrine of the Assemblies of God tends mostly toward Arminian principles, emphasizing the inspiration of the Scriptures; the fall and redemption of man; the baptism in the Holy Ghost accompanied by the speaking in other tongues; sanctification as the goal for all believers; the church a living organism; a divinely called and scripturally ordained ministry; divine healing; the premillennial and imminent coming of Jesus to judge the world in righteousness, while reigning on earth for a thousand years; everlasting punishment for the wicked, and a new heaven and a new earth for the believers. While they recognize human government and affirm unswerving loyalty to the United States, the Assemblies of God claim that as followers of the Prince

of Peace they are constrained to declare that they could not conscientiously participate in war...

Organization. The polity of the denomination is a combination of the Congregational and Presbyterian systems. The local churches are Congregational in the conduct of their affairs, and their sovereignty in this respect is fully recognized by the General Council constitution. They act, however, under the advice and suggestions of the district and general presbyters...

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Membership (1959), 505, 703 (YAC 1961, p. 252.]

98. Astrologers, Successors of Chaldean Priests

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc. 1960), p. 82.

The *mathematici* [astrologers] of the Roman empire were the successors of the ancient Chaldean priests, and they never forgot it. They love ... to consider the exercise of their profession as a priesthood.

99. Astrology, Ancient Babylonian Method of Ascertaining the Will of the Gods

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), p. 93. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

The poet apostrophizes the doomed city [of Babylon] in the words, "Let now the astrologers, the star-gazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up and save thee from the things that shall come upon thee." (Isa. XLVII, 13) The Hebrew term for 'astrologers' means 'the dividers of the heavens', while the 'monthly prognosticators' refers to an important function of the $bar\hat{u}$, namely, the determination of lucky and unlucky days and months. But by the time of Deutero-Isaiah Babylonian astrology was already very ancient, probably the oldest of all the methods of ascertaining the will of the gods. According to Babylonian belief the things which happened in heaven were the pattern of terrestrial events, and the movements of the celestial bodies determined human destinies... In the ordering of the universe which followed the conquest of Tiamat, each of the great gods, Anu, Enlil, and Ea, was assigned his own portion of the heavens; within these 'ways' of the gods, as they were called, the planets were assigned their stations. All the planets and stars, as then known to the Babylonians and Assyrians, had their names and were regarded as gods of greater or lesser degree, with their places in the mythology and the cult. Shamash, as the sun, and Adad, as the weather god, were the special patrons of the astrological aspect of divination, although many other divinities, such as Nannar, or Sin, the moon-god, and Ishtar, as Dilbat, or Venus, played an important part in the observations and calculations of the star-gazers.

100. Astrology—Ancient "Omen Astrology" Preceding Later "Scientific" Type

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, Astrology in Roman Law and Politics, p. 5. Copyright 1954 by The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The extravagant claims of ancient and modern sources about the antiquity of Mesopotamian scientific astrology, claims already occasionally suspected in ancient times, have had to be modified considerably. Prezodiacal astrology, i. e. astrology practiced prior to the introduction of the zodiacal system of constellations, cannot be regarded as "horoscopal astrology," but only as a form of star omen technique, whose predictions had the primitive character illustrated in the following sample of Mesopotamian hemerology:

When on the first of the month of Nisan the rising sun appears red like a torch, white clouds rise from it, and the wind blows from the east, then there will be a solar eclipse on the 28th or 29th day of the month, the king will die that very month, and his son will ascend the throne.

Omens of this type were common, but, after the evolution of the horoscopal astrology, came to be frowned upon by scientific Chaldaean astrologers...

The earliest ... horoscope known so far is a cuneiform text ... from April 29, 410 B.C.

101. Astrology, Babylonian-Hellenistic, "Scientific" (Horoscopal), Late

Development

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, p. 3. Copyright 1954 by The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Scientific astrology has rightly been called "the product of a marriage of religion and science." Born and slowly developed in Mesopotamia—the first extant horoscope dates only from 410 B.C.—it reached its ultimate development in the Hellenistic era. Then Egypt, especially Alexandria, became a renowned center of such studies. This led both Greek and Roman authors to the mistaken concept, still encountered in many a modern treatment of the subject, that Egyptian astrology was either older, or at least coeval with Mesopotamian astrology and developed parallel with but independent from it. Scientific astrology—in contrast to omina, omen-astrology and the like—was based on the investigation of planetary positions at the time of birth (or conception).

102. Astrology, Babylonian-Hellenistic, Theology of, in Roman Empire SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 27, 28, 56.

[p. 27] We see at the same time [after the 4th century B.C.] some very peculiar beliefs of the sidereal religion of Babylon creeping into the doctrines of the philosophers [such as the triad of the moon, sun, and Venus as rulers of the zodiac]... [p. 28] The echo of the same theory extended even to the Romans...

[p. 56] We shall be struck with the power of this sidereal theology [particularly, worship of the sun, moon, and planets], founded on ancient beliefs of Chaldean astrologers, transformed in the Hellenistic age under the twofold influence of astronomic discoveries and Stoic thought, and promoted, after becoming a pantheistic Sun-worship, to the rank of official religion of the Roman Empire.

103. Astrology, Egyptian, Late Development

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 43, 44.

[p. 43] Astrology was *unknown* in ancient Egypt: it was not until the Persian period, about the sixth century [B.C.], that it began to be cultivated there... The history of this dissemination confirms what we said both about the late date of this religious development in Babylonia and about the irresistible prestige which the brilliant discoveries of astronomy conferred upon it from the Assyrian period onwards. This foreign religion was gradually naturalised in Egypt: the huge zodiacs, which decorated the walls of the temples, show how sacerdotal teaching succeeded in grafting the learned doctrines of the Chaldeans on native beliefs and in giving them an original development. National pride even ended by convincing itself that all this religious erudition was purely indigenous. About the year 150 B.C. there were composed in Greek—undoubtedly at Alexandria—the mystic treatises attributed to the fabulous king Nechepso and his

confidant, the priest Petosiris, which became as it were the sacred books of the growing faith in the power of the stars. These apocryphal works of a mythical antiquity were to acquire incredible authority in the Roman world...

[p. 44] It [the Hermetic literature] has a considerable importance in relation to the diffusion throughout the Roman Empire of certain doctrines of side-real religion moulded to suit Egyptian ideas. But it had only a secondary influence. It is not at Alexandria that this form of paganism was either produced or chiefly developed, but among the neighbouring Semitic peoples.

104. Astrology, in the Graeco-Roman World

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), pp. 257, 258. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

[p. 257] Astrology stood high in esteem throughout the Graeco-Roman centuries as at once a religion and a science, a speculative system and a mystical experience. It was "the scientific theology of waning heathenism." It offered its answer to man's Whence, Why, and Whither. It offered man support in the present world from the thraldom of Fate and beyond death a home in or beyond the stars, as Titus assured his soldiers at the siege of Jerusalem that the souls of the fallen warriors would enter the ether and be seated in the stars. It was the sacerdotal origin and bore the charm of venerable antiquity, to which the Graeco-Roman age was so sensitive. From the days of Alexander the Great, whose campaigns disestablished the priestly colleges of the Euphrates, the influence of Babylonian stellar religion grew apace in the Greek world, the soil of which had been prepared by the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle, who assigned high honour to the heavenly bodies. From [p. 258] the beginning of our era it made rapid progress in the Roman world to become predominant in the third century. It is not by accident that it was in the most virile competitor of Christianity—Mithraism—that astralism played the played the largest part.

105. Astronomy, Babylonian, Developed After 500 B.C.

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (2d ed.; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1957), pp. 97, 98, 101, 102.

[p. 97] There is scarcely another chapter in the history of science where an equally deep gap exists between the generally accepted description of a period and the results which have slowly emerged from a detailed investigation of the source material... Thanks to the work of these scholars [Epping and Kugler], it very soon became evident that mathematical theory played the major role in Babylonian astronomy as compared with the very modest role of observations, whose legendary accuracy also appeared more and more to be only a myth. Simultaneously the age of Babylonian astronomy had to be redefined. Early Mesopotamian astronomy appeared to be crude and merely qualitative, quite similar to contemporary Egyptian astronomy. At best since the Assyrian period, a turn toward mathematical description becomes visible and only the last three centuries B.C. furnished us with texts based on a consistent mathematical theory of lunar and planetary motion. The latest astronomical text has been identified recently by Sachs and Schaumberger, with the date of 75 A.D. These late theories, on the other hand, proved to be of the highest level, fully comparable to the corresponding Greek systems and of truly mathematical character...

[p. 98] Ptolemy states that practically complete lists of eclipses are available since the reign of Nabonassar (747 B.C.) while he complains about the lack of reliable planetary observations. He remarks that the old observations were made with little competence,

because they were concerned with appearances and disappearances and with stationary points, phenomena which by their very nature are very difficult to observe...

[p. 101] Around 700 B.C., under the Assyrian empire, we meet with systematic observational reports of astronomers to the court. Obviously the celestial omens have now reached primary importance. In these reports no clear distinction is yet made between astronomical and meteorological phenomena. Clouds and halos are on equal footing with eclipses. Nevertheless, it had been already recognized that solar eclipses are only possible at the end of a month (new moon), lunar eclipses at the middle. The classical rule that lunar eclipses are separated from one another by six months, or occasionally by five months only, might well have been known in this period. We should recall here Ptolemy's statement that eclipse records were available to him from the time of Nabonassar (747 B.C.) onwards.

It is very difficult to say when this phase developed into a systematic mathematical theory. It is my guess that this happened [p. 102] comparatively rapidly and not before 500 B.C.

106. Astronomy, Babylonian, Down to Christian Era

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *Astronomical Cuneiform Texts*, Vol. 1 (12 Bedford Sq., London, W.C.I: Lund Humphries, [1955]), pp. 4, 6, 10.

[p. 4] All available information, explicit dates as well as palaeographical evidence, etc., concurs in proving that all the texts published here were written in the Seleucid period, i.e., during the last three centuries B.C. ...

About one hundred of our texts come from an archive in Uruk. The rest, about 200 tablets, are more difficult to localize, but ... there are good reasons to believe that the non-Uruk tablets came from Babylon...

[p. 6] Babylon remains as a center whence came not only Reisner's religious texts but also a large number of business documents and astronomical texts...

The above-mentioned facts make it at least very plausible that the ephemerides of the Spartali collection and ... [others] form a uniform group written by the scribes of a temple in Babylon. The continued existence of temples in this city in spite of the removal of inhabitants to Seleucia is proved by Reisner's texts. This is confirmed by Pausanias²⁴ who reports that the "Chaldeans" were left in their quarters around the temple of Bel. [Note 24: Pausanias I, 16, 3 (ed. Schubart, p. 34, Loeb Cl.L. p. 80/81). *Cf.* also Bikerman IS p. 176 and CAH VII p. 187f.]...

[p. 10] The ephemerides from Uruk cover the short period from about 80 S.E. to 160, whereas the Babylon texts begin later, about 130 S.E. [182 B.C.], but extend to the very latest period of cuneiform writing (S.E. 360 = A.D. 49).⁴⁴ [Note 44: The latest date known from cuneiform texts is an "almanac" for 75 A.D.]

107. Astronomy, Babylonian, Influence of

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (2d ed.; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1957), ed. p. 156.

Babylonian influence is visible in two different ways in [Hellenistic] Greek astronomy: first, in contributing basic empirical material [arithmetical computations] for the geometrical theories ...; second, in a direct continuation of arithmetical methods which were used simultaneously with and independently of the geometrical methods.

108. Astronomy, Greek, and Astrology

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, pp. 8, 9. Copyright 1954 by The American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 8] Nor should one make too much of the intensification of Greek cultural relations with the Orient during the era of the Persian wars. Even if "Chaldaean priests," including the renowned *magus* Osthanes did accompany the Persian host to Greece in 480—a Chaldaean sage at that time was said to have accurately predicted to Euripides' father the glory of the new-born child—we may safely assume that only small groups like the Pythagoraeans or similar circles of scholars would readily benefit from such opportunities of cultural contacts...

The rapidly rising Greek interest in astronomy prepared the ground for the future development of Hellenistic astrology. Already towards the end of the fifth century the study of astronomy had become an integral part of "higher studies." ...

[p. 9] The Platonic circle would have had ample opportunity of familiarizing itself with oriental developments in the realms of astronomy, astrology, and cosmology...

Altogether it can hardly be doubted that by the middle of the fourth century B.C. elements of pre-zodiacal and even of horoscopal astrology had become known to at least a number of Greek scholars.

109. Astronomy, in Ancient Egypt

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (2d ed.; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1957), pp. 71, 80–82, 91, 96.

[p. 71] Mathematics and astronomy; played a uniformly insignificant role in all periods of Egyptian history...

[p. 80] Egyptian astronomy had much less influence on the outside world for the very simple reason that it remained through all its history on an exceedingly crude level which had practically no relations to the rapidly growing mathematical astronomy of the Hellenistic age. Only in one point does the Egyptian tradition show a very beneficial influence, that is, in the use of the Egyptian calendar [p. 81] by the Hellenistic astronomers. [In] this calendar ... a year consists of 12 months of 30 days each and 5 additional days at the end of each year. Though this calendar originated on purely practical grounds, with no relation to astronomical problems, its value for astronomical calculations was fully recognized by the Hellenistic astronomers...

A second Egyptian contribution to astronomy is the division of the day into 24 hours, though these "hours" were originally not of even length but were dependent on the seasons. These "seasonal hours", twelve for daylight, twelve for night, were replaced by "equinoctial hours" of constant length only in theoretical works of Hellenistic astronomy...

Finally, we have to mention the "decans" (to use a Greek term) [p. 82] which have left no direct traces in modern astronomy... In Hellenistic times the Egyptian decans were brought into a fixed relation to the Babylonian zodiac which is attested in Egypt only since the reign of Alexander's successors. In this final version the 36 "decans" are simply the thirds of the zodiacal signs, each decan representing 10° of the ecliptic.

[p. 91] In summary, from the almost three millen[n]ia of Egyptian writing, the only texts which have come down to us and deal with a numerical prediction of astronomical phenomena belong to the Hellenistic or Roman period. None of the earlier astronomical documents contains mathematical elements; they are crude observational schemes, partly religious, partly practical in purpose...

[p. 96] *Appendix*. The reader may have missed a reference to the astronomical or mathematical significance of the pyramids. Indeed, a whole literature has been built up around the "mysteries" of these structures, or at least one of them, the pyramid of Khufu (or "Cheops").Important mathematical constants, e. g. an accurate value of π , and deep

astronomical knowledge are supposed to be expressed in the dimensions and orientation of this building. These theories contradict flatly all sound knowledge obtained by archeology and by Egyptological research about the history and purpose of the pyramids. The reader who wants to see an excellent account of these facts should consult the paper by Noel F. Wheeler, Pyramids and their Purpose, Antiquity 9 (1935) p. 5–21, 161–189, 292–304.

110. Atheism, Julian Huxley's Expression of

SOURCE: Julian S. Huxley, *Man Stands Alone* (New York: Harper), pp. 290, 291. Copyright 1941 by Julian S. Huxley. Used by permission.

[p. 290] I do not believe in the existence of a god or gods...

[p. 291] Even if a god does exist behind or above the universe as we experience it, we can have no knowledge of such a power; the actual gods of historical religions are only the personifications of impersonal facts of nature and of facts or our inner mental life.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Huxley said essentially the same thing, that the supernatural is not needed, and that religion itself is the product of evolution, in his speech on "The Evolutionary Vision" at the Darwin Centennial celebration, Nov. 26, 1959, at the University of Chicago (see Roy Gibbons, "Religions Doomed by New Thinking, Huxley Contends," news report in the Chicago *Daily Tribune*, Nov. 27, 1959, p. 1).]

111. Atonement, Day of, Ancient and Modern Observance SOURCE: "Atonement, Day of," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1959), pp. 190, 191. Copyright 1959 by Encyclopedia Publishing Company, Ltd. Used by permission of I. J. Carmin-Karpman, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

[p. 190] *Atonement, Day of* (Heb. *Yom Kippur*): Solemn fast-day observed on *Tishri* 10, described in Lev 23:32 as a "Sabbath of solemn rest" (literally "Sabbath of Sabbaths"). Though listed in the Bible among the series of festivals, it is distinguished as a day on which a man must cleanse himself of all sin (Lev. 16:30). According to rabbinic

tradition (*Bava Batra* 121*a*), it is the day on which [p. 191] Moses came down from Mt. Sinai with the second tablets of the law and announced to the people the Divine pardon for the sin of the Golden Calf. Besides cessation of all manner of work and abstention from food, drink, and sexual intercourse, the day was outstanding for the elaborate

Temple ceremonial (fully described in the talmudic tractate *Yoma*). This included the dispatch of scapegoat to the wilderness "for AZAZEL." Only on the D. of A. was the high priest allowed to enter the Holy of Holies clad—not in his golden vestments—but in white linen, symbolic of purity and humility. On his appearance at the conclusion of the service, he was greeted with rejoicing by the people, confident that their sins had been forgiven. Except for the absence of priestly ceremonial, the observance of this day in late Judaism is similar in character to that of Temple procedure. An essential part of the Additional Service on the D. of A. is a description of the sacrificial service performed on this occasion in the Temple. Another characteristic is the confession of sin as prescribed for the high priest. It is phrased in the plural because of the mutual responsibility of all Jews (*Shevuot 39a*). The confession enumerates ethical lapses exclusively and covers almost the whole range of human failings. Especially impressive are the Evening Service (called KOL NIDRE, from its opening formula canceling rash vows between man and God) and the Concluding (NEILAH) Service which ends with the invocation of the *Shema* and

the declaration: "Next year in Jerusalem." Reform Judaism retains the general structure of the traditional services.

112. Atonement, Day of, Books Opened on

SOURCE: Philip Birnbaum, *High Holyday Prayer Book*, p. 774. Copyright 1951 by Hebrew Publishing Company, New York. Used by permission.

On this day, when thou dost open the books, be thou gracious to those who glorify thy name; on this Day of Atonement let us sanctify thee, O Holy One.

O cast the accuser into chains, proclaim the fulfillment of the captives' hope; on this fast of the tenth, let us sanctify thee, O Holy One.

113. Atonement, Day of, a Day of Judgment, in Jewish Prayer Book

SOURCE: Philip Birnbaum, *High Holyday Prayer Book:* **Yom Kippur**, pp. 506, 508. Copyright 1960 by Hebrew Publishing Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 506] The great shofar is sounded; a gentle whisper is heard; the angels, quaking with fear, declare: "The day of judgment is here to bring the hosts of heaven to justice!" Indeed, even they are not guiltless [p. 508] in thy sight. All mankind passes before thee like a flock of sheep. As a shepherd seeks out his flock, making his sheep pass under his rod, so dost thou make all the living souls pass before thee; thou dost count and number thy creatures, fixing, their lifetime and inscribing their destiny ...

On Rosh Hashanah their destiny is inscribed, and on Yom Kippur [the Day of Atonement] it is sealed.

114. Atonement, Day of, a Day of Judgment, in Jewish Ritual

SOURCE: Philip Birnbaum, *High Holyday Prayer Book:* Yom Kippur, pp. 282, footnote. Copyright 1960 by Hebrew Publishing Company, New York. Used by permission.

According to the Tur and Abudarham, Incording to the Amidah for

Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur so as to allude to the biblical expression ובכן אבוא אל

המלך ("and so I will come to the king"—Esther 4:16), thereby emphasizing the idea that we come to plead before the supreme King of kings on judgment-day.

115. Atonement, Day of, a Day of Judgment, in Jewish Tradition

SOURCE: Talmud **Rosh Hashanah** 16*a*, 16*b*, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), pp. 57–59, 63. Used by permission.

[p. 57] *MISNAH*. [16*a*] AT FOUR SEASONS [DIVINE] JUDGMENT IS PASSED ON THE WORLD: AT PASSOVER IN RESPECT OF [p. 58] PRODUCE; AT PENTECOST IN RESPECT OF FRUIT; AT NEW YEAR ALL CREATURES PASS BEFORE HIM [GOD] LIKE CHILDREN OF MARON ...; AND ON TABERNACLES JUDGMENT IS PASSED IN RESPECT OF RAIN.

GEMARA... It has been [p. 59] taught: 'All are judged' on New Year and their doom is sealed on the Day of Atonement...

[16b] [p. 63] R. Kruspedai said in the name of R. Johanan: Three books are opened [in heaven] on New Year, one for the thoroughly wicked, one for the thoroughly righteous, and one for the intermediate. The thoroughly righteous are forthwith inscribed definitively in the book of life; the thoroughly wicked are forthwith inscribed definitively in the book of death; the doom of the intermediate is suspended from New Year till the Day of Atonement; if they deserve well, they are inscribed in the book of life; if they do not deserve well, they are inscribed in the book of left.

116. Atonement, Day of, in Jewish Practice a Day of Joy

SOURCE: Mishnah Ta'anith 4.8, trans. in The Babylonian Talmud, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.;

London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), Ta'anith 26b, p. 139. Used by permission.

R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: There never were in Israel greater days of joy than the fifteenth of Ab and the Day of Atonement. On these days the daughters of Jerusalem used to walk out in white garments which they borrowed in order not to put to shame any one who had none. All these garments required ritual dipping. The daughters of Jerusalem came out and danced in the vineyards exclaiming at the same time, Young man, lift up thine eyes and see what thou choosest for thyself. Do not set thine eyes on beauty but set thine eyes on [good] family. Grace is deceitful, and beauty is vain; but a woman that feareth the Lord, she shall be praised. And it further says, Give her of the fruit of her hands; and let her works praise her in the gates.

117. Atonement, Day of—No Atonement for Willful Sin

SOURCE: Mishnah Yoma 8.9, trans. in The Babylonian Talmud, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London:

The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), Yoma 85b, pp. 423, 424. Used by permission.

[p. 423] If one says: I shall sin and repent, sin and repent, no opportunity will be given to him to repent. [If one says]: I shall sin and the Day of Atonement will procure atonement for me, the Day of Atonement procures for him no atonement. For transgressions as between man and the Omnipresent the Day of Atonement procures atonement, but for transgressions as between man and his fellow the Day of Atonement does not procure any atonement, until he has pacified his fellow. This was expounded by R. Eleazar b. Azariah: From all your sins before the Lord shall ye be clean, i.e., for transgressions as between man and the Omnipresent the Day of Atonement procures atonement, but for transgressions as between man and his fellow. This was expounded by R. Eleazar b. Azariah: From all your sins before the Lord shall ye be clean, i.e., for transgressions as between man and the Omnipresent the Day of Atonement procures atonement, but for transgressions as between man and his fellow the Day of Atonement does not procure atonement until he has pacified his fellow. R. Akiba said: Happy are you, Israel! Who is it before whom you become clean? And who is it before whomm you become clean? Your Father which is in heaven, as it is said: And I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean. And it further says: Thou hope [p. 424] of Israel, the Lord! Just as the fountain renders clean the unclean, so does the Holy One, blessed be He, render clean Israel.

118. Atonement, Day of, Prohibitions on

SOURCE: Mishnah Yoma 8.1, trans. in The Babylonian Talmud, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London:

The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), Yoma 73b, p. 353. Used by permission.

On the Day of Atonement it is forbidden to eat, to drink, to wash, to anoint oneself, to put on sandals, or to have marital intercourse. A king or bride may wash the face, and a woman after childbirth may put on sandals. This is the view of R. Eliezer. The Sages, however, forbid it.

119. Azazel, Jewish Interpretations of

SOURCE: "Azazel," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1959), col. 205. Copyright 1959 by Encyclopedia Publishing Company, Ltd. Used by permission of I. J. Carmin-Karpman, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

Azazel: Name possibly designating the "scapegoat" or the "demon" to whom the scapegoat was sent (Lev. 16). On the Day of ATONEMENT, two goats were prescribed as sin-offerings for the people. The high priest cast lots and designated one goat "for the Lord" and the other "for Azazel." The latter was sent into the wilderness and cast over a

precipice. In apocryphal and midrashic sources, A. is variously represented as a fallen angel or an arch-demon, the personification of impurity. The origin of the name is uncertain. The term is used in modern Hebrew as an imprecation.

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

120. Babylon, Ancient, and Rome

SOURCE: Chr[istopher] Wordsworth, Union With Rome (London: Longmans, 1909), pp. 6-8.

[p. 6] We must not neglect the *historical* parallel between Babylon and Rome. Babylon had been and was the Queen of the East, in the age of the Hebrew Prophets; and Rome was the Mistress of the West when St. John wrote. Babylon was called *The Golden City, the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency*. She claimed Eternity and Universal Supremacy. She aid in her heart, *I will ascend into heaven, I will* [p. 7] *exalt my throne above the stars of God. I shall be a Lady for ever. I am, and none else beside me: I shall not sit as a Widow, neither shall I know the loss of children.* In these respects also, Babylon was imitated by Rome. She also called herself the *Golden City,* the *Eternal City.*

Again: the King of Babylon *was the rod of God's anger, and the staff of his indignation* against Jerusalem for its rebellion against him. Babylon was employed by God to punish the sins of Sion, and to lay her walls in the dust. So, in St. John's own age, the Imperial legions of Rome had been sent by God to chastise the guilty City which had crucified His beloved Son.

Again: the Sacred Vessels of God's Temple at Jerusalem were carried from Sion to Babylon, and were displayed in triumph on the table at the royal banquet in that fatal night, when *the fingers of a man's hand came forth from the Wall* and terrified the King.

So, the Sacred Vessels of the Jewish Temple, which were restored by Cyrus, and the Book of the Law, and the Golden Candlestick, and the Table of Shewbread, [p. 8] were carried captive in triumphal procession to the Roman Capitol: and even now their effigies may be seen at Rome, carved in sculpture on one of the sides of the triumphal Arch of Titus, the Imperial Conqueror of Jerusalem.

121. Babylon, Center of Semitic Civilization

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, A History of Babylonia and Assyria (6th ed., rev.; New York: Abingdon, 1915), Vol. 2, pp. 575, 576.

[p. 575] Babylon stood for more than mere Semitic power. It stood in a large sense for Semitic civilization. As has been so often pointed out before in these pages, Assyria represented far more than Babylonia the prowess of the Semite upon fields of battle. Babylon had stood for Semitic civilization, largely intermixed with many elements, yet Semitic after all. Here were the great libraries of the Sem- [p. 576] itic race. Here were the scholars who copied so painstakingly every little omen or legend that had come down to them out of the hoary past. Here were the men who calculated eclipses, watched the moon's changes, and looked nightly from observatories upon the stately march of constellations over the sky. Here were the priests who preserved the knowledge of the ancient Sumerian language, that its sad plaints and solemn prayers might be kept for use in temple worship. Much of all this was worthy of preservation—if not for any large usefulness, certainly for its record of human progress upward.

122. Babylon, Center of the Semitic Religion

SOURCE: Morris Jastrow, Jr., *The Religion of Babylon and Assyria* (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1898), pp. 649, 650.

[p. 649] The Assyrian rulers regarded it as both a privilege and a solemn duty to come to Babylon and invoke the protection of Marduk and Nabu. In E-Sagila the installation of the rulers over Babylonia took place, and a visit to Marduk's temple was incomplete without a pilgrimage across the river to E-Zida [in Borsippa]. The influence exerted by these two temples upon the whole course of Babylonian history from the third

millennium on, can hardly be overestimated. From the schools grouped around E-Sagila and E-Zida, went forth the decrees that shaped the doctrinal development of the religion of Babylonia and Assyria... The thought of E-Sagila and E-Zida must have stored up emotions in the breast of a Babylonian and Assyrian, that can only be compared to a pious Mohammedan's enthusiasm for Mecca, or the longing of an ardent Hebrew for Jerusalem... The priests of Marduk could view with equanimity the rise and growth of Assyria's power. The influence of E-Sagila and E-Zida was not affected by such a shifting of the political kaleidoscope. Babylon remained the [p. 650] religious center of the country. When one day, a Persian conqueror—Cyrus—entered the precincts of E-Sagila, his first step was to acknowledge Marduk and Nabu as the supreme powers in the world; and the successors of Alexander continue to glory in the title, 'Adorner of E-Sagila and E-Zida.'

123. Babylon, Cultural Capital, Compared With Rome

SOURCE: Hugo Winckler, *The History of Babylonia and Assyria*, trans. and ed. by James Alexander Craig (New York: Scribner, 1907), pp. 61, 62.

[p. 61] In the history of the world Rome alone can be compared with Babylon when we consider the important r"le which this city of Marduk played in Western Asia. As in the Middle Ages Rome exercised its power over men's minds and, through its teaching, dominated the world, so did Babylon from this time [the 1st dynasty] in the ancient Orient. Just as the [p. 62] German kings strove to gain for themselves world-sovereignty in papal Rome, as the heiress of world power, so shall we find later a similar claim by the kings of Assyria who look back to Babylon. The influence of this dynasty appears most conspicuously in the admiration in which it was held when Babylonian independence was hastening to its close. When after the fall of Nineveh Babylon again rose to political independence under Nebuchadrezzar, and, for the last time, appeared as mistress in Western Asia every exertion was put forth to represent the new kingdom as a rejuvenation of the ancient empire of Khammurabi.

124. Babylon, Description of—Citadel-Palace in Nebuchadnezzar's Time

SOURCE: Leonard W. King, *A History of Babylon and Assyria*, Vol. 2 (London: Chatto & Windus, 1919), pp. 27, 28. Used by permission.

[p. 27] It is clear that a Babylonian citadel was not simply a fortress to be used by the garrison for the defense of the city as a whole: it was also a royal residence, into which the monarch and his court could shut themselves for safety should the outer wall of the city itself be penetrated... In the case of the Southern Citadel of [p. 28] Babylon, on which excavations have now been continuously carried out for sixteen years, we shall see that it formed a veritable township in itself. It was a city within a city, a second Babylon in miniature.

The Southern or chief Citadel was built on the mound now known as the Kasr, and within it Nebuchadnezzar erected his principal palace, partly over an earlier building of his father Nabopolassar. The palace and citadel occupy the old city-square or centre of

Babylon, which is referred to in the inscriptions as the *irṣit Bâbili*, "the Babil place." ... We may conclude that the chief fortress of Babylon always stood upon this site, and the city may well have derived its name Bâb-ilî, "the Gate of the Gods," from the strategic position of its ancient fortress, commanding as it does the main approach to E-sagila, the famous temple of the city-god. [See No. 211.]

125. Babylon, Description of-Herodotus' Account

SOURCE: *Herodotus* i. 178–183; translated by A. D. Godley, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946), pp. 221, 223, 225, 227, 229. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 221] When Cyrus had brought all the mainland under his sway, he attacked the Assyrians. There are in Assyria many other great cities; but the most famous and the strongest was Babylon, where the royal dwelling had been set after the destruction of Ninus [Nineveh]. Babylon was a city such as I will now [p. 223] describe. It lies in a great plain, and is in shape a square, each side an hundred and twenty furlongs in length; thus four hundred and eighty furlongs make the complete circuit of the city. Such is the size of the city of Babylon; and it was planned like no other city whereof we know. Round it runs first a fosse deep and wide and full of water, and then a wall of fifty royal cubits' thickness and two hundred cubits' height. The royal cubit is greater by three fingers' breadth than the common cubit.

Further, I must show where the earth was used as it was taken from the fosse and in what manner the wall was wrought. As they dug the fosse, they made bricks of the earth which was carried out of the place they dug, and when they had moulded bricks enough they baked them in ovens; then using hot bitumen for cement and interposing layers of wattled reeds at every thirtieth course of bricks, they built first the border of the fosse and then the wall itself in the same fashion. On the top, along the edges of the wall, they built houses of a single chamber, facing each other, with space enough between for the driving of a four-horse chariot. There are an hundred gates in the circle of the wall, all of bronze, with posts and lintels of the same. There is another city, called Is, eight days' journey from Babylon, where is a little river, also named Is, a tributary stream of the river Euphrates; from the [p. 225] source of this river Is rise with the water many gouts of bitumen; and from thence the bitumen was brought for the wall of Babylon.

Thus then was this wall built; the city is divided into two parts; for it is cut in half by a river named Euphrates, a wide, deep, and swift river, flowing from Armenia and issuing into the Red Sea. The ends of the wall, then, on either side are built quite down to the river; here they turn, and hence a fence of baked bricks runs along each bank of the stream. The city itself is full of houses three and four stories high; and the ways which traverse it—those that run crosswise towards the river, and the rest—are all straight. Further, at the end of each road there was a gate in the riverside fence, one gate for each alley; these gates also were of bronze, and these too opened on the river.

These walls are the city's outer armour; within them there is another encircling wall, well-nigh as strong as the other, but narrower. In the midmost of one division of the city stands the royal palace, surrounded by a high and strong wall; and in the midmost of the other is still to this day the sacred enclosure of Zeus Belus, a square of two furlongs each way, with gates of bronze. In the centre of this enclosure a solid tower has been built, of one furlong's length and breadth; a second tower rises [p. 227] from this, and from it yet another, till at last there are eight. The way up to them mounts spirally outside all the towers; about halfway in the ascent is a halting place, with seats for repose, where those who ascend sit down and rest. In the last tower there is a great shrine; and in it a great and well-covered couch is laid, and a golden table set hard by. But no image has been set up in the shrine, nor does any human creature lie therein for the night, except one native woman, chosen from all women by the god, as say the Chaldaeans, who are priests of this god.

These same Chaldaeans say (but I do not believe them) that the god himself is wont to visit the shrine and rest upon the couch, even as in Thebes of Egypt, as the Egyptians say (for there too a woman sleeps in the temple of Theban Zeus, and neither the Egyptian nor the Babylonian woman, it is said, has intercourse with men), and as it is likewise with the prophetess of the god at Patara in Lycia, whenever she be appointed; for there is not always a place of divination there; but when she is appointed she is shut up in the temple during the night.

In the Babylonian temple there is another shrine below, where is a great golden image of Zeus, sitting at a great golden table, and the footstool and the chair are also of gold; the gold of the whole was said by the Chaldeans to be of eight hundred talents' weight. [p. 229] Outside of the temple is a golden altar. There is also another great altar, whereon are sacrificed the full-grown of the flocks; only sucklings may be sacrificed on the golden altar, but on the greater altar the Chaldeans even offer a thousand talents' weight of frankincense yearly, when they keep the festival of this god; and in the days of Cyrus there was still in this sacred demesne a statue of solid gold twelve cubits high. I myself have not seen it, but I tell what is told by the Chaldeans. Darius son of Hystaspes purposed to take this statue but dared not; Xerxes his son took it, and slew the priest who warned him not to move the statue. Such is the adornment of this temple, and there are many private offerings besides.

126. Babylon, Description of—Herodotus' Account in the Light of Present Remains

SOURCE: Leonard W. King, *A History of Babylon and Assyria*, Vol. 2 (London: Chatto & Windus, 1919), pp. 21–24, 27, 37, 38. Used by permission.

[p. 21] Herodotus reckons that the walls of Babylon extended for four hundred and eighty stades, the area they enclosed forming an exact square, a hundred and twenty stades in length each way. In other words, he would have us picture a city more than fifty-three miles in circumference. The estimate of Ctesias is not so large, his side of sixty-five stades giving a circumference of rather over forty miles... [p. 22] It is true that Oppert accepted them [Herodotus's figures], but he only found this possible by stretching his plan of the city to include the whole area from Bâbil to Birs-Nimrûd, and by seeing traces of the city and its walls in every sort of intervening mound of whatever period.

As a matter of fact part of the great wall, which surrounded the city from the Neo-Babylonian period onward, has survived to the present day, and may still be recognized in a low ridge of earth, or series of consecutive mounds... The whole length of the citywall, along the north-east side, may still be traced by the position of these low earthen mounds, and they prove that the city on this side measured not quite two and threequarter miles in extent. The eastern angle of the wall is also preserved, and the south-east wall may be followed for another mile and a quarter as it doubles back towards the Euphrates. These two walls, together with the Euphrates, enclose the only portion of the ancient city on which ruins of any importance still exist. But, according to Herodotus and other writers, [p. 23] the city was enclosed by two similar walls upon the western bank, in which case the site it occupied must have formed a rough quadrangle, divided diagonally by [p. 24] the river. No certain trace has yet been recovered of the western walls, and all remains of buildings seem to have disappeared completely on that side of the river. But for the moment it may be assumed that the city did occupy approximately an equal amount of space upon the western bank; and, even so, its complete circuit would not have extended for more than about eleven miles, a figure very far short of any of those given by Herodotus, Ctesias and other writers.

Dr. Koldewey suggests that, as the estimate of Ctesias approximates to four times the correct measurement, we may suspect that he mistook the figure which applies to the whole circumference for the measure of one side only of the square. But even if we accept that solution, it leaves the still larger figure of Herodotus unexplained. It is preferable to regard all such estimates of size, not as based on accurate measurements, but merely as representing an impression of grandeur produced on the mind of their recorder, whether by a visit to the city itself, or by reports of its magnificence at second-hand...

[p. 27] In fact it is only in the matter of size and extent that the description given by Herodotus of the walls of Babylon is to be discounted; and those are just the sort of details that an ancient traveller would accept without question from his local guide. His total number for the city-gates is also no doubt excessive, but his description of the wall itself as built of burnt-brick tallies exactly with the construction of its outer face, which would have been the only portion visible to any one passing outside the city...

[p. 37] In the later part of his reign Nebuchadnezzar changed the aspect of the riverfront entirely. To the west of the quay-walls, in the bed of the river, he threw out a massive fortification with immensely thick walls, from twenty to twenty-five metres in breadth...

It is possible that the subsequent change in the course of the Euphrates may be traced in part to this huge river-fortification. Its massive structure suggests that it had to withstand considerable water-pressure, and it may well have increased any tendency of the stream to break away eastward. However that may be, it is certain that for a considerable time during the Persian and Seleucid periods it flowed round to the eastward of the Kaşr, close under three sides of the [p. 38] citadel and rejoined its former bed to the north of Marduk's temple and the Tower of Babylon... This temporary change in the river's course, which the excavations have definitely proved, explains another puzzle presented by the classical tradition—the striking discrepancy between the actual position of the principal ruins of Babylon in relation to the river and their recorded position in the Persian period. Herodotus, for example, places the fortress with the palace of the kings (that is, the Kaşr), on the opposite bank to the sacred precinct of Zeus Belus (that is, Etemen-anki, the Tower of Babylon). But we have now obtained proof that they were separated at that time by the Euphrates, until the river returned to its former and present bed, probably before the close of the Seleucid period.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For map and description see *SDACom*, Vol. 4, pp. 794–799; *SDADic*, "Babylon."]

127. Babylon, Description of—Temple Tower

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 49, 50. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 49] The largest and most splendid of Babylonian temples was, naturally, that of Marduk, the tutelary god of Babylon. Its Babylonian name was Esagila, 'the house that lifts up its head'. It was a vast quadrangular enclosure on the east bank of the Euphrates, surrounded by high turreted walls. In the northern part of the great court was the

ziqqurat, the temple-tower, commonly known as 'the Tower of Babel', of which more will be said later; in the southern half of the court was the temple of Marduk, with its fifty-five side-chapels. The Sacred Way, or processional street passed up the ... side of

the temple, on which lay the four great gates by which processions entered and left the sacred enclosure. Within the temple Esagila were the chapels of Zarpanit, Marduk's consort, Nebo his son, Ea the god of wisdom and the Ocean, Nusku the Fire-god, Tashmetu the goddess of Hearing (i.e., hearing prayer), and various other gods and goddesses. Babylonian and Assyrian kings had vied with each other in enriching the great shrine with gifts. When Esagila was rebuilt in the reign of Esarhaddon, that king made gifts of silver and gold vessels to the value of fifty minas; the statue of Marduk, his table, chair, and footstool, were of solid gold, and weighed eighty talents. The 'golden heaven', which had a part in the ceremonies of the New Year Festival at Babylon, was a baldachin or canopy of gold or cloth of gold upon which the planets were represented...

[p. 50] *The ziqqurat*. This remarkable feature of the complex of temple buildings has been found in most of the ancient city-sites excavated in Mesopotamia. The form of the ziqqurat varied in different localities, but its general pattern was that of a great rectangular tower, rising by diminishing stages to a summit on which there was a chapel, originally perhaps a temporary wooden structure, in which the ritual of the sacred marriage was celebrated. The different stages were reached by external ramps or stairways. Underneath the building was a chamber, sometimes called *gigunu*, about the purpose of which scholars are not wholly in agreement, but which may have been used for some important part of the New Year ritual. The ziqqurat was not, like the Egyptian pyramid, a royal tomb, but the tradition that it was the tomb of Bel may have arisen from its use as the place where the dead body of the god lay concealed before his resurrection at the central moment of the New Year Festival at Babylon. It is certain that the ziqqurat was not, in the strict sense, a temple, i.e., the abode of a god, but it was a sacred building

and played a most important part in the great Babylonian rituals. **128. Babylon,** Destroyed by Sennacherib, Rebuilt by Esarhaddon

SOURCE: Esarhaddon's inscription on a black basalt memorial stone, trans. in Daniel David Luckenbill, Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia, Vol. 2, sec. 643, p. 243, and explanatory note, sec. 639. Copyright 1927 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

643. Seventy years as the period (*lit.*, measure) of its desolation he wrote (down in the Book of Fate). But the merciful Marduk—his anger lasted but a moment—turned (the Book of Fate) upside down and ordered its (the city's) restoration in the eleventh year...

639. [Luckenbill's introductory note:] The restoration of Babylon, which Sennacherib had so ruthlessly destroyed, was one of the main "planks" in the "platform" of his son and successor. A number of monuments, dated in the year of accession, show that Esarhaddon was quite serious in the matter of placating the Babylonian part of his empire. Of course, it would not have been wise to state boldly that he intended to restore what his father had destroyed. So we have the god's anger with his city assigned as the cause of the city's devastation. Seventy years, as the period of its desolation, was written down by Marduk (in the Book of Fate). "But the merciful Marduk—in a moment his heart was appeased—turned it [the book] upside down, and for the eleventh year ordered its restoration." The Babylonian numeral "70," turned upside down or reversed, becomes "11," just as our printed "9," turned upside down, becomes "6."

129. Babylon, Empire of—Independence Won by Nebuchadnezzar's Father, 626 B.C.

SOURCE: Babylonian Chronicle, tablet BM 25127, obverse, lines 7–15, trans. in D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1956), p. 51. Used by permission.

- 7. The Assyrian army came to Nippur and Nabopolassar retreated before them;
- 8. [the Assyrian troops] and men of Nippur came after him as far as Erech.
- 9. In Erech they did battle against Nabopolassar and then retreated before Nabopolassar.
- 10. In the month of Iyyar the Assyrian army had come down into Babylonia. On the 12th of the month of Tisri the Assyrian troops
- 11. when they came against Babylon, on that same day the Babylonians,
- 12. when they had gone out from Babylon, did battle against the Assyrian army
- 13. and heavily defeated the Assyrian army, captured their spoil.
- 14. For one year there was no king in the land. On the twenty-sixth day of the month of Marcheswan, Nabopolassar
- 15. sat upon the throne in Babylon. (This was) the 'beginning of reign' of Nabopolassar. [EDITORS' NOTE: This ancient clay tablet gives us the date and circumstances of the successful revolt of Babylon from a long subjection to Assyria. Thus was founded the Neo-Babylonian kingdom by Nabopolassar, Nebuchadnezzar's father, who became king approximately Nov. 23, 626 B.C.]

130. Babylon, Empire of, Nebuchadnezzar the Great Builder of SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria* (6th ed., rev.; New York: Abingdon, 1915), 2, 504 Vol. 2, pp. 504, 505.

[p. 504] So began one of the longest and most brilliant reigns (604–562 B.C.) of human history. Nebuchadrezzar has not left the world without written witnesses of his great deeds... [p. 505] The great burden of all the inscriptions is building. In Babylon was centered his chief pride, and of temples and palaces, and not of battles and sieges, were his boasts.

131. Babylon, Empire of—Nebuchadnezzar's Successors SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire [Achaemenid Period]*, pp. 35–37. Copyright 1948

by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of The University of Chicago Press. [p. 35] After a long and successful reign, the great Babylonian conqueror

[Nebuchadnezzar] passed away on October 7, 562. After less than two years of rule, his son Amel-Marduk had by August 13, 560, been followed by Nebuchadnezzar's son-inlaw, Nergal-sharusur; he in turn lasted only until May 22, 556, when a tablet is dated by his youthful son, Labashi-Marduk.

Two such brief reigns gave hope to the nationalists, who had always resented the alien rule of the Chaldaean dynasty. Three days after the tablet dated by Labashi-Marduk, there is another dated by a rival, Nabu-naid. According to him, Labashi-Marduk was a youth without understanding who, contrary to the will of the gods, had seated himself upon the throne of the kingdom. There are hints of the palace revolution to which he owed his new position, of the support by nobles and army, but in very truth it was by the command of Marduk, his lord, that Nabu-naid was raised to the lordship of the land. He also claims that he is the representative of Nebuchadnezzar and Nergal-sharusur, his predecessors. At any rate, after less than two months' rule, the young king was put to death with horrible torture, and Nabu-naid was sole ruler of the remnants of the Chaldaean Empire...

[p. 36] In this hope, Nabu-naid made alliance with Cyrus, who thereupon openly rebelled against Media. To fulfil his part of the agreement, [p. 37] Nabu-naid promptly levied an army against the "rebels" who lived in the countries once held by Nebuchadnezzar. Before he left, Nabu-naid handed over the "kingship" of Babylonia to his eldest son, Bel-shar-usur (Belshazzar as he is called in the Book of Daniel), and started off for Harran. No aid for the city was possible, since the revolt of Cyrus kept Astyages busy at home.

132. Babylon, Fall of, at Various Times

SOURCE: Raymond Philip dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), p. 167.

It is not necessary to enumerate all the catastrophes which overtook the city of Babylon, for it fell more than once into the hands of its foes. However, there is advantage in noting that Babylonia's great metropolis succumbed five times to foreign invasion during a period of about two centuries, extending from the latter part of Assyrian overlordship to the fourth Persian king. When Sennacherib captured it in 689 B.C., he devastated much of its area. Ashurbanipal caused the city to surrender in 648 B.C. Cyrus added it to his kingdom in 539 B.C. Darius I subdued the rebellious capital in 521 B.C. Xerxes I turned much of it into ruins in 483 B.C. All these events are described in any good history of Babylonia. Military conquest affected the fortunes of Babylon at many critical stages in its history. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that its capitulation to Cyrus in 539 B.C. should be designated 'The Fall of Babylon,' as if no other like event had occurred in the city's history. Even the submission of Babylon to Alexander in 331 B.C. pales in importance when compared with the disaster which brought the Neo-Babylonian empire to a close.

133. Babylon, Fall of, to Alexander (331 B.C.)

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, p. 517. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

As he neared the city, flourishing again after its ruin by Xerxes, the conqueror was met by priests and nobles, bringing their gifts of welcome and promising to surrender Babylon's treasures. After such a demonstration, the Persian satrap Mazaeus could only ratify formally the submission already accomplished. The garrison commander, Bagophanes, came out from the citadel in which the royal treasure was guarded; he ordered flowers for the streets and crowns to honor the new Great King. Frankincense and other costly perfumes burned on the silver altars, Magi chanted hymns, and Chaldaeans and Babylonians followed their example. To the joy of the whole population, Alexander commanded that the temples be rebuilt, above all that of Bel Marduk, which had lain waste since its destruction by Xerxes.

134. Babylon, Falls Gradually Into Decay

SOURCE: Leonard W. King, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Vol. 2 (London: Chatto & Windus, 1919), pp. 248–288. Used by permission.

[p. 284] With the permanent loss of Babylon's independence [at its capture by Cyrus], ... the period covered by the history draws to an end. The epoch forms a convenient stopping-place; but, unlike the fall of the Assyrian empire, her conquest made but little difference to the life and activities of [pp. 285] the population as a whole...

Babylon's commercial life and prosperity suffered no interruption in consequence of the change in her political status. Taxation was not materially increased, and little was altered beyond the name and title of the reigning king in the dates upon commercial and legal documents.

This state of things would doubtless have continued, had not the authority of the Persian empire itself been rudely shaken during the reign of Cambyses, Cyrus' son and successor...

[p. 286] After Cambyses' death, the Persian army was led back by Darius, a prince of the same house as Cyrus and his son; Gaumata was surprised and murdered, and Darius firmly established on the throne. Darius continued to act with extraordinary energy, and

in the course of a single year succeeded in quelling the rebellions in Babylon and in the various provinces. On the rockface of Behistun in Persia, on the road from Babylon to Ecbatana, he has left us sculptured portraits of himself and the rebel leaders he subdued. The latter include Nidintu-Bêl and Arakha, the two pretenders to the Babylonian throne.

The sieges of Babylon by Darius mark the beginning of the city's decay. Her defences had not been seriously impaired by Cyrus, but they now suffered considerably. The city was again restless during Darius' closing years, and further damage was done to it in the reign of Xerxes, when the Babylonians made their last bids for independence. For Xerxes is said not only to have dismantled the walls, but to have plundered and destroyed the great temple of Marduk itself. Large areas in the city, which had been a wonder of the nations, now began to lie permanently in ruins. Babylon entered on a new phase in 331 B.C., when the long struggle between Greece and Persia was ended by the [p. 287] defeat of Darius III. at Gaugamela. For Susa and Babylon submitted to Alexander, who on proclaiming himself King of Asia, took Babylon as his capital. We may picture him gazing on the city's great buildings, many of which now lay ruined and deserted. Like Cyrus before him, he sacrificed to Babylon's gods; and he is said to have wished to restore E-sagila, Marduk's great temple, but to have given up the idea, as it would have taken ten thousand men more than two months to remove the rubbish from the ruins. But he seems to have made some attempt in that direction, since a tablet has been found, dated in his sixth year, which records a payment of ten manehs of silver for "clearing away the dust of E-sagila."

While the old buildings decayed, some new ones arose in their place, including a Greek theatre for the sue of the large Greek colony. Many of the Babylonians themselves adopted Greek name and fashions, but the more conservative elements, particularly among the priesthood, continued to retain their own separate life and customs. In the year 270 B.C. we have a record that Antiochus Soter restored the temples of Nab– and Marduk at Babylon and Borsippa, and the recent diggings at Erech have shown that the old temple in that city retained its ancient cult under a new name. In the second century we know that, in a corner of the great temple at Babylon, Marduk and the God of Heaven were worshipped as a two-fold deity under the name of Anna-Bêl; and we hear of priests attached to one [p. 288] of Babylon's old shrines as late as the year 29 B.C. Services in honour of the later forms of the Babylonian gods were probably continued into the Christian era.

The life of the ancient city naturally flickered longest around the ruined temples and seats of worship. On the secular side, as a commercial centre, she was then but a host of her former self. Her real decay had set in when Seleucus, after securing the satrapy of Babylon on Alexander's death, had recognized the greater advantages offered by the Tigris for maritime communication. On the foundation of Seleucia, Babylon as a city began rapidly to decay. Deserted at first by the official classes, followed later by the merchants, she decreased in importance as her rival grew.

135. Babylon, Greater Part of, Deserted in Strabo's Day (End of first Century B.C.)

SOURCE: Strabo, The Geography of Strabo xvi. 1.5; translated by Horace Leonard Jones, Vol. 7

(Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 201. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

What was left of the city [Babylon] was neglected and thrown into ruins, partly by the Persians and partly by time and by the indifference of the Macedonians to things of this kind, and in particular after Seleucus Nicator [d. 280 B.C.] had fortified Seleuceia on the tigris near Babylon, at a distance of about three hundred stadia therefrom. For not only he, but also all his successors, were strongly interested in Seleuceia and transferred the royal residence to it. What is more, Seleuceia at the present time has become larger than Babylon, whereas the greater part of Babylon is so deserted that one would not hesitate to say what one of the comic poets said in reference to the Megalopolitans in Arcadia: "The Great City is a great desert."

136. Babylon, in 5th Century A.D., a Swamp SOURCE: Alfred Jeremias, *The Old Testament in the Light of the ancient East*, trans. by C. L. Beaumont, Vol. 1, p. 294. Copyright 1911 by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Used with their permission.

Cyril of Alexandria says that in the beginning of the fifth century Babylon was changed into a swamp in consequence of the bursting of the canal banks.

137. Babylon, Influence of "Chaldean" Priests Retained Under Persian, Macedonian, Seleucid, and Parthian Rule in Babylonia

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, 1956), pp. 122, 123.

[p. 122] But it was Babylon that retained the intellectual supremacy, even after its political ruin. The powerful sacerdotal caste ruling it did not fall with the independence of the country, and it survived the conquests of Alexander as it had previously lived through the Persian domination. The researches of Assyriologists have shown that its ancient worship persisted under the Seleucides [Seleucids], and at the time of Strabo [1st century A.D.] the "Chaldeans" still discussed cosmology and first principles in the rival schools of Borsippa and Orchoë. The ascendancy of that erudite clergy affected all surrounding regions; it was felt by Persia in the east, Capadocia in the north, but more than anywhere else by the Syrians, who were connected with the Oriental Semites by bonds of language and blood. Even after the Parthians had wrested the valley of the Euphrates from the Seleucides [late 2d century B.C.], relations with the great temples of that region remained uninterrupted...

[p. 123] That [Babylonian] influence manifested itself in various ways. First, it introduced new gods. In this way Bel passed from the Babylonian pantheon into that of Palmyra and was honored throughout northern Syria. It also cause ancient divinities to be arranged in new groups... Finally, and most important, astrolatry wrought radical changes in the characters of the celestial powers, and, as a further consequence, in the entire Roman paganism.

138. Babylon—Lion in Art

SOURCE: Robert Koldewey, *The Excavations at Babylon*, trans. by Agnes S. Johns (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1914), p. 46. Used by permission.

The lion, the animal of Ishtar, was so favourite a subject at all times in Babylonian art that its rich and lavish employment at the main gate of Babylon, the Ishtar Gate, is by no means abnormal.

139. Babylon, Lion, Winged, a Common Symbol in

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic* [*Mythology*] (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), p. 277. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York.

Every known representation of the battle of Bêl and the Dragon in Babylonia and Assyria represents the dragon either as a winged lion with scaly body and bird talons, or as a serpent monster.

140. Babylon—Panbabylonian Theory, Passing of, Predicted

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1908), pp. 211, 218, 222–225.

[p. 211] The theory that the whole religion of Babylonia and Assyria, nay, practically the whole of the serious thinking and writing of both realms, rests down upon a

Weltanschauung, a great *theory of the universe*, owes its origin and exposition at least in its chief form to Professor Hugo Winckler, of the University of Berlin [and Alfred Jeremias]...

[p. 218] According to this view [the "Panbabylonian" theory of Winckler and Jeremias] astrology is the last word of science in antiquity. There is no view of myth or legend or history to be taken without it. But it sweeps out far beyond Babylonia and Assyria. All peoples of antiquity come within its scope. Is there a mystery anywhere, this ancient Oriental conception of the universe will explain it. Naturally enough, Israel is swept within its province. Saul is the Moon, and David is Marduk, and Solomon is Nabu. The entire literature of Israel, all her history, all her theology, all her thinking are, so this theory would have it, but the outworking of the Babylonian idea. Everything in Israel is Babylon, and Babylon is everything...

[p. 222] It is, I think, not unfair to say that the theory continually plays fast and loose with [p. 223] the religious facts as the actual texts reveal them, and applies them now in one way and now in another. It is likewise undeniable that many of the astrological materials are quite otherwise explained...

This effort to unlock all doors with one key, to explain all mysteries with one theory, has been repeatedly tried before and has always gone down to failure. Perhaps the most striking of these failures is the magnificent effort of Charles François Dupsuis. It all began with an investigation of the origin of the Greek months. From that he passed to a study of the constellations, and thence to an attempt to locate the origin of the zodiac... [p. 224] Champollion showed readily enough that the Egyptian use of the zodiac dates only to the Greco-Roman period, and the whole theory crumbled at once to pieces. But before this had happened Dupuis had gone on to use this principle, which he believed he had discovered, to erect a tremendous system by which he sought to explain the origin of all religions. The learning of the book is fairly staggering. It excited at the time great and bitter controversy, and then, without any particular disproof, its theories melted quietly away like the morning mists and disappeared.

But men are slow to learn by such examples, [p. 225] and the failure of Dupuis did not prevent Professor Friedrich Max Müller and George William Cox from bringing out a new explication of the so-called Solar Myth by which they hoped to explain many mythological difficulties and not a few of their origins. Of all this theory it is now possible for Andrew Lang to say: "Twenty years ago the philological theory of the Solar Myth was preached as 'scientific' in the books, primers, and lectures of popular science. To-day its place knows it no more."² [Note 2: This Solar Myth theory in its day attempted to explain almost everything in a number of realms. It drew forth a most amusing answer, extremely clever in its use of the terminology of the theory,... which proved on Max Müller's principles that Max Müller himself was a solar myth... Perhaps one might dare to say that these new expositions of a supposed Babylonian theory of the universe are no more secure than the theories of Dupuis, Max Müller, and Cox, and that "like a wave shall they pass and be passed."] [EDITORS' NOTE: Rogers was right. The Panbabylonian theory also has become outmoded. See No. 141.]

141. Babylon—Panbabylonianism Exposed

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (2d ed.; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1957), pp. 138, 139.

[p. 138] The reader should be warned against the use of Jeremias, Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur. With the use of an enormous learned apparatus, the author develops the "anbabylonistic" doctrine which flourished in Germany between 1900 and 1914, only to be given up completely after the first world war. The main thesis of this school was built on wild theories about the great age of Babylonian astronomy. combined with an alleged Babylonian "Weltanschauung" based on a parallelism between "macrocosm and microcosm". There was no phenomenon in classical cosmogony, religion, literature which was not traced back to this hypothetical cosmic philosophy of the Babylonians. A supreme disregard for textual evidence, wide use of secondary sources and antiquated translations, combined with a preconceived chronology of Babylonian civilization, created a fantastic picture which exercised (and still exercises) a great influence on the literature concerning Babylonia. Kugler was one of the few scholars in Germany who did not fall for these theories. In a little book called "Im Bannkreis Babels" he demonstrated drastically the absurdities which can be reached by the panbabylonistic methods. He collected 17 pages of striking parallels between the history of Louis IX of France and Gilgamesh, showing that Louis IX was actually a Babylonian solar hero.

[p. 139] The panbabyonistic school no longer has any followers. But it seems to me that Kugler's example should be studied by every historian because it demonstrates far beyond its original purpose how easy it is to fit a large body of evidence into whatever theory one has decided upon.

142. Babylon, Ruins of—an Early Excavator's Impression SOURCE: Austen H. Layard, *Discoveries Among The Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* (New York: Harper, 1856), p. 413.

Shapeless heaps of rubbish cover for many an acre the face of the land... On all sides, fragments of glass, marble, pottery, and inscribed brick are mingled with that peculiar nitrous and blanched soil, which, bred from the remains of ancient habitations, checks or destroys vegetation, and renders the site of Babylon a naked and hideous waste. Owls start from the scanty thickets, and the foul jackall [*sic*] skulks through the furrows.

143. Babylon, Ruins of, as Seen by Excavator SOURCE: Robert Koldewey, *The Excavations at Babylon*, trans. by Agnes S. Johns (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1914), pp. 12, 14–16. Used by permission.

[p. 12] The heights of Babil afford a fine view ... over the entire city, especially towards evening when the long purple shadows cast on the plain throw up the golden yellow outlines of the ruins in high relief. No human habitation is in sight. The villages on the left bank of the Euphrates—[p. 14] Kweiresh, where our house is, and Djumdjumma farther south—are so buried among the green date palms that one can scarcely catch a glimpse of even a wall. On the other bank are Sindjar and Ananeh also concealed in the same way, although the latter village with the farm of Karabet stands forward somewhat more clearly. The Euphrates is fringed with palms which cluster more thickly near the water...

To those accustomed to Greece and its remains it is a constant surprise to have these mounds pointed out as ruins. Here are no blocks of stone, no columns: even in the excavations there is only brickwork, while before work commenced only a few brick projections stood out on the Kasr. Here in Babylonia mounds form the modern representatives of ancient glories, there are no columns to bear witness to vanished magnificence.

The great mound, the Kasr or castle, forms the centre of the city. It is the great castle of Nebuchadnezzar that he built for a palace, completing the work of his father, Nabopolassar... It commanded, the approach to the greatest and [p. 15] most renowned sanctuary of Babylonia, the temple of Marduk called Esagila. This lies somewhat farther to the south, buried 20 metres deep under the great mounds of Babylon, Amran Ibn Ali, a name acquired from the sanctuary which is upon it, the tomb of Amran the son of Ali. It is 25 metres high, the highest of all the mounds, and owes this to the fact that after all the other sites were abandoned it was occupied for habitation right up to the Middle Ages, under Arab rule. Close by to the north lies the rectangular ruin of the tower of Babylon, E-temen-an-ki, on a small plain called Sachn, that represents its sacred precincts. Due east of the Kasr a smaller but unmistakably higher mound rises from the plain, called from its red colour Homera. It conceals no buildings, but from top to bottom it consists of brick fragments. We shall return to it later. Close by, almost due north and south, extends the low ridge of ruins of the inner city wall that encircled the inner portion of the city in a line not vet fully traced. Between Homera and Amran, as well as to the south of the latter, and between the Kasr and Babil, we see the plain broken by a number of low mounds distributed in groups. Here clustered the dwellings of the citizens of Babylon, and the recollection of them has so far survived to the present day that one of these groups southeast of the Kasr is called by the Arabs Merkes, the city or centre of the dwellings. It is here that the dwellings and streets of the city of the time of the Persian kings, and as far back as that of the earliest Babylonian kings, have survived in the mass of ruins. Externally these remains present the appearance of mountainous country in miniature; heights, summits, ravines, and tablelands are all here. At Merkes there is a sharp hill visible from a distance, due to an excavation previous to our expedition when the rubbish dug out was collected there. There are also public buildings buried in the ruins. Thus between Homera and Merkes there is a Greek temple, on Merkes itself is a temple, and there are two in the so-called Ishin aswad, the district southeast of Amran.

Where there are no mounds, husbandry is carried on [p. 16] to some extent. In the eastern corner, in the angle of the outer wall, the overflow of water collects in a lake during the period of irrigation. But even in this low quarter of the city there were once dwellings, which the course of centuries has covered with the enveloping shroud of the shifting and levelling sands.

144. Babylon, Ruins of, Erroneous Stories Concerning, Likely Origin of SOURCE: Walter Andrae, *Babylon* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Company, 1952), p. 231. German. Used by permission.

Another incident occurred in Babylon, according to O. Reuther. Adherents of a Bibledevoted sect, two women and three men, came to sinful Babylon and wanted to see everything. In the evening they sat on the banks of the Euphrates and sang sacred songs with very lively tunes. In the hotel they conducted prayer meetings to which they invited us. Besides they drank whisky. Koldewey [the excavator] conducted them through the ruins, showed them a hill of cinders as the site of the fiery furnace, a deep excavation as Daniel's lions' den, and the throne chamber where the "menetekel" appeared on the wall. There lay one of the millions of pieces of bricks with the stamp of Nebuchadnezzar (there were none of Belshazzar) and the credulous pounced upon it. They had found the piece of the wall with the inscription. With all gravity Koldewey took the piece home with him and denied them the wish to possess it. Such an extraordinary valuable find he could under no circumstances give away; they would have to content themselves with the joy of discovering it.—As we later reproached him for giving these poor people such humbug, he replied, "How so? He who believes is blissful. Should I take their joy away from them and disappoint them? To the end of their life it will be for them their great experience." Was he right?

145. Babylon, Ruins of, Excavator's Impression of

SOURCE: Robert Koldewey, *The Excavations at Babylon*, trans. by Agnes S. Johns (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1914), p. 314. Used by permission.

When we gaze to-day over the wide area of ruins we are involuntarily reminded of the words of the prophet Jeremiah (50.39): "Therefore the wild beasts of the desert, with the wild beasts of the islands, shall dwell there, and the owls shall dwell therein: and it shall be no more inhabited for ever; neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation."

146. Babylon, Ruins of, Fulfill the Prophecies

SOURCE: Sven Hedin, Bagdad Babylon, Ninive (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1917), pp. 135, 136. German.

[p. 135] But how literally were the predictions of the Old Testament prophets fulfilled The desert round about makes a less dreary impression than these heaps of rubble and desolate, naked walls For one does not expect anything of the desert, while these ruins speak of past grandeur and extinguished splendor. The huge wall masses of the high Ishtar gate stand nude after the fire destroyed the roofs and panels of cedarwood. Not even the Bedouins erect their tents here. I saw only jackals, and at that in daytime, sneaking out of their hiding places. What an impressive truth, therefore, the words of the prophet Jeremiah proclaim... [Jer. 50:39, 40; 51:37, 58.]

Never did I read the books of the Old Testament with greater attention and deeper interest than in the days while visiting the ruins of Babylon and Nineveh. Stories that formerly sounded like fables or fairy tales became reality here. Names of kings thus far [p. 136] barely known—Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, Nebuchadnezzar—no longer pass by like phantoms or specters, but take form. How incomparably less impressive are all museums with their fragments from that time as against these ruins of palace chambers and throne halls where those ancient kings lived, ruled, administered justice, and received vassals and ambassadors. The river, in whose slowly running waters were mirrored the cubical forms of palaces and temples, formerly bore its vessels, and the circle of the horizon as uniform as that of the sea, and now a country of burned plain and glowing hot deserts—not a paradise of oases and gardens as closely placed as the spots in a panther's hide—this horizon was viewed also by their eyes when at sundown they walked the battlements of their palaces. Daniel's words about Nebuchadnezzar here take on deeper meaning (Dan. 4:29, 30: "At the end of twelve months he was walking on the roof of the royal palace of Babylon. [v. 30] And the king said, 'Is not this great Babylon, which I have built by my mighty power as a royal residence, and for the glory of my majesty?"").

147. Babylon, Ruins of, Fulfill the Prophecies

SOURCE: George Rawlinson, *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, [190–]), Vol. 2, pp. 520, 521.

[p. 520] When we turn from this picture of the past to contemplate the present condition of the localities, we are first struck with astonishment at the small traces which remain of so vast and wonderful a metropolis. "The broad walls of Babylon" are "utterly broken" down, and her "high gates burned with fire." [Jer. 51:58.] "The golden city hath ceased." [Isa. 14:4.] God has [p. 521] "swept it with the besom of destruction." [Isa. 14:23.] "The glory of the kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," is become "as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah." [Isa. 13:19.] ... The whole country is covered with traces of exactly that kind which it was prophesied Babylon should leave. [Jer. 51:37: "And Babylon shall become heaps." Compare 50:26.] Vast "heaps" or mounds, shapeless and unsightly, are scattered at intervals over the entire region.

148. Babylon, Ruins of, in the 12th Century SOURCE: Benjamin of Tudela, quoted in Robert William Rogers, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Vol. 1 (6th ed., rev.; New York: Abingdon, 1915), p. 109.

The ruins of the palace of Nebuchadnezzar are still to be seen [twelfth century], but people are afraid to venture among them on account of the serpents and scorpions with which they are infested.

149. Babylon, Without an Inhabitant

SOURCE: Walter Andrae, *Babylon* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Company, 1952), p. 231. German. Used by permission.

Cardinal Altmayer, ... who had his archiepiscopal palace in Mosul, ... entertainingly declared he had in reality come as the archbishop of Babylon to become acquainted with his oldest see, where for 1,000 years there had been no Catholic, in fact no inhabitant; for the present-day Arab villages lie in the most ancient bed of the Euphrates, but the site of the old city is empty of inhabitants.

150. Babylon, Religion of—Astrology

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), p. 15. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

Throughout the entire history of Babylonian religion, observation of the heavenly bodies played a great part in religious belief and practice. It was thought that the movements of the stars and planets influenced the fortunes of nations and individuals, and many tablets have been discovered containing such astrological material.

151. Babylon, Religion of—Bel Marduk

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1908), pp. 80, 81.

[p. 80] When Babylon came to be the chief city of Babylonia, and so its local god, Marduk, rose in estimation, the honors of En-lil [the chief god in an earlier period] were gradually transferred to him. He was called Bel-Marduk, and in still later times the name Bel even began to supplant Marduk and the god of Babylon was called [p. 81] simply Bel. To Marduk was also ascribed the honor and title of creator of the world, which had originally belonged to En-lil.

152. Babylon, Religion of—Bel-Marduk, God of Babylon

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic [Mythology]* (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races.* Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), pp. 156, 157. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York. [p. 156] Marduk is the Bel of Babylonian and Assyrian religion, corresponding to the West Semitic Ba'al, "lord." Bêl-Marduk, as a mighty figure in ancient religion, represents the spring sun and the older Ninurta. His great festival, beginning at the spring equinox and lasting for eleven days, was called *zagmuk*, "beginning of the year," or the

akitu, from a special part of the festival or procession to the "house of the akitu," which was the essential part of the New Year festivals in the old Sumerian calendars of all the great cults...

[p. 157] On the eighth day of the festival all the great gods of Babylonia were required to travel to Babylon in ceremonial ships and meet in the hall of assembly of Esagila, Marduk's temple, where the fates for the ensuing year were determined. On the eleventh day when Marduk returned to his temple from the "house of Akitu" outside the city the following hymn was sung:

O Bêl, when thou enterest thy temple may thy temple rejoice to thee.

O mighty Bl-Marduk, when thou enterest thy temple may thy temple rejoice to thee.

Repose O Bl, repose O Bl, may thy temple rejoice to thee.

May the gods of Heaven and Earth say to thee, "repose, O Bêl."

153. Babylon, Religion of—Bel-Marduk, Prayers to

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 103, 105. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 103] Ritual of the Babylonian New Year Festival.

In the month Nisan, on the second day, two hours before the end of the night, the

urigallu ... [principal priest] shall rise and wash himself with water from the river; he shall go in before Bel, then he shall put on a linen garment; he shall say this prayer before Bel:

Bel, without equal in his anger;

Bel, merciful king, lord of the lands,

Causing the great gods to be favorably disposed;

Bel, whose glance overthrows the mighty;

Lord of kings, light of mankind, fixer of destinies.

Bel, Babel is thy seat, Borsippa is thy crown.

The wide heavens compose thy liver;

Bel, with thine eyes thou dost behold the universe;

With thine oracles thou dost control the oracles;

With thy glance thou dost give the law;

With thine arms thou dost crush the mighty...

[p. 105] In the month Nisan, on the fourth day, three and a third hours before the end

of the night, the *urigallu* shall rise, and wash himself with water from the river; he shall

put on a linen garment; before Bel and Beltia ... he shall address this incantation to Bel; he shall utter this prayer to Bel:

Most mighty lord of the Igigi, most exalted of the great gods,

Lord of the regions, king of the gods, Marduk, who dost fix the destinies,

Glorious, exalted, most high prince;

Who holdest the kingship, possessest the lordship; ...

Be gracious to thy city, Babel;

Have mercy on thy temple, Esagila At thy exalted word, lord of the great gods, May the light shine upon the children of Babel ...

154. Babylon, Religion of-Bel Transmitted to Rome, Through

Palmyra, as a Sun-God

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, 1956), pp. 123, 124, and note, p. 252, 253.

[p. 123] Bel passed from the Babylonian pantheon into that of Palmyra and was honored throughout northern Syria... Finally, and most important, astrolatry wrought radical changes in the characters of the celestial powers, and, as a further consequence, in the entire Roman paganism...

[p. 124] The importance which the introduction of the Syrian religions into the Occident has for us consists therefore in the fact that indirectly they brought certain theological doctrines of the Chaldeans with them, just as Isis and Serapis carried beliefs of old Egypt from Alexandria to the Occident. The Roman empire received successively the religious tribute of the two great nations that had formerly ruled the Oriental world. It is characteristic that the god Bel whom Aurelian brought from Asia to set up as the protector of his states, was in reality a Babylonian who had emigrated to Palmyra,⁵⁹ a cosmopolitan center apparently predestined by virtue of its location to become the intermediary between the civilizations of the Euphrates and the Mediterranean.

[p. 252, Note 59:] The text of Zosimus (I, 61), according to which Aurelian brought from Palmyra to Rome the statues of [Helios (the Sun) and Bel]..., proves that the [p. 253] astrological religion of the great desert city recognized a supreme god [Bel] residing in the highest heavens, and a solar god, his visible image and agent, according to the Semitic theology of the last period of paganism.

155. Babylon, Religion of—Divination

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 39, 40. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 39] A very large part of the religious literature is [p. 40] devoted to magic and divination: astrology, liver divination (hepatoscopy), lecanomancy (oil dropped into water), oneiromancy (divination by dreams), omens from monstrous births, etc., etc. This vast literature is of great importance for the history of culture, and since Accadian magic and divination spread throughout the Near East as early as the second millennium B.C., it is significant because it enables us clearly to understand the nature of the ideas against which the religious leaders of Israel struggled ceaselessly for a thousand years.

156. Babylon, Religion of—Fertility Rite in New Year Festival SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), p. 60. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

The remaining features of the ritual were a ceremony called 'the fixing of destinies', determining the prosperity of the New Year; the very important ceremony of the Sacred Marriage, which probably took place in a chapel on the summit of the ziqqurat [or ziggurat, temple tower]; in this ceremony the king represented the god, while a priestess

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

of high rank played the part of the goddess. This piece of ritual was considered essential for the fertility of the land.

157. Babylon, Religion of—Gods in Trinities

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), p. 28. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

A second triad of divinities ... was composed of Sin, the moon-god, Shamash, the sun-god, and Adad, or Hadad, the storm-god, while the associated female figure was that of the goddess Ishtar.

[Editors' Note: For the oldest trinity, see No. 167.]

158. Babylon, Religion of, Immorality in

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 52, 53. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 52] The priesthood was not confined to men, but women formed part of the staff of the great temples. It was considered an honour to belong to the order of priestesses, and we hear of several kings who dedicated their daughters to the priestly calling. The Code of Hammurabi lays down rules for their behaviour and defines their civil rights. Some of them lived in a special abode or cloister, but in general they were free to move about in society. Their most important function was to serve as sacred prostitutes at the

great seasonal festivals. Their Akkadian name, *qadishtu*, corresponds to the [p. 53]

Hebrew *qedēshah* who figures in early Hebrew [idolatrous] religion. The temple of Ishtar, naturally, contained a large staff of such women, who were known by the special name *ishtaritu*.

159. Babylon, Religion of—Influence on Greek Civilization

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 25, 26, 33.

[p. 25] The reality of Hellenic borrowings [duodecimal systems, hours, sun dial, ecliptic, zodiac, etc.] from Semitic sources remains none the less indisputable...

To this first influx of positive knowledge corresponds a first introduction into the Greek systems of the mystic ideas which Orientals attached to them...

[p. 26] Certain facts recently brought to light indicate that the relations, direct or indirect, between the centres of Babylonian learning and of Greek culture, were never at any time entirely broken off.¹ [Note 1: Kugler, *Im Bannkreis Babels*, 1910, p. 116 ss.]...

[p. 33] Contact ... was established in the Seleucid Empire between Hellenic culture and Babylonian civilisation.

160. Babylon, Religion of—Influence on Israel

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 44, 45.

[p. 44] It is difficult to fix the date at which the influence of the "Chaldeans" began to be felt in Syria, but it is certainly not later than ... the eighth century B.C.; and ... we may regard it as indisputable that before the Exile (597 B.C.) Israel [p. 45] received from Babylon, along with some astronomical knowledge, certain beliefs connected with starworship and astrology. We know that idolatry was repeatedly introduced into Zion. Thus king Manasseh caused the chariot of Shamash, the Sun-god, to be accepted there; he dared to set the "Queen of the Heavens" by the side of Iahweh.

161. Babylon, Religion of—Influence on Persia, Syria, and Rome

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 44–46.

[p. 44] The ascendancy of an erudite clergy who ruled there [in Babylonia and Nineveh], was extended at an early date over all surrounding countries, eastwards over Persia, northwards over Cappadocia. But nowhere was it so readily accepted as among the Syrians, who were united with the Oriental Semites by community of language and blood...

[p. 45] Bel of Babylon was worshipped all over northern Syria... The naturalistic and primitive worship which these [Semitic] peoples paid to the Sun, the Moon, and certain stars such as Venus, was systematised by a doctrine which constituted the Sun— Identified with the Baals, conceived as supreme gods—the [p. 46] almighty Lord of the world, thus paving the way in the East for the future transformation of Roman paganism...

The Seleucid princes of Antioch showed as great deference to the science of the Babylonian clergy as the Persian Achaemenids had done before them. We find Seleucus Nicator consulting these official soothsayers about the propitious hour for founding Seleucia on the Tigris.

162. Babylon, religion of—Influence Widespread

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 42–44.

[p. 42] They [the astrological beliefs of the Chaldeans] penetrated as far as India, China, and Indo-China, where divination by means of the stars is still practiced at the present day... In the opposite direction they spread to Syria, to Egypt, and over the whole Roman world [see Nos. 101, 161, 1343], where their influence was to prevail up to the fall of paganism and lasted through the Middle Ages up to the dawn of modern times...

[p. 43] Astrology was *unknown* in ancient Egypt: it was not until the Persian period, about the sixth century, that it began to be cultivated there... This foreign religion was gradually naturalized in Egypt: the huge zodiacs, which decorated the walls of the temples, show how sacerdotal teaching succeeded in grafting the learned doctrines of the Chaldeans on native beliefs...

[p. 44] Syria, lying as it does nearer than Egypt to Babylon and Nineveh, was more vividly illumined by the radiance of those great centres.

163. Babylon, Region of—Ishtar

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 30, 31. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 30] The female divinity associated with the second triad [see No. 157] is the bestknown and most widely worshipped goddess in the whole Babylonian and Assyrian pantheon, the goddess Ishtar. The usual form of her name in Sumerian is India. Although she is, as already stated, associated with the second triad of gods, yet, at an early date, she ousted Anu's legitimate consort, the colourless figure Antu, from her place, and became herself the consort of the high god Anu. She gradually came to absorb into herself the attributes of most of the other female divinities, and was known as 'the goddess' *par excellence*.

She figures largely in Babylonian mythology, especially in the Flood stories and the Epic of Gilgamesh, of which we shall have more to say later. Ishtar presents two very distinct aspects. On the one hand she is the goddess of love and procreation, and those sacred persons known as 'heirodules', or temple prostitutes, were attached to her temples;

on the other hand, she was also the goddess of war, especially in Assyria, and is figured on seals as armed with bow and quiver; she is even represented as bearded like the god Ashur. In Babylonian astrology her heavenly body was the planet Dilbat, or Venus, and the Bow-star, or Sirius, was also assigned to her. Her sacred number was 15, i.e., half of her father Sin's sacred number. Her symbol was an eight- or sixteen-pointed star. She is generally represented as riding on, or accompanied by, her sacred beast, the lion, though, as on the Ishtar gate of Babylon, she is also associated with the dragon form, the mushrussu.

As might be expected, there were many cities where Ishtar was worshipped and had her temples, but her chief centre was Erech where her temple staff comprised both male and female hierodules. Here she was worshipped as the Mother-goddess, [p. 31] and as the goddess of love and procreation. Other centres of her cult were Ashur, Babylon, Calah, Ur, Nineveh, and Arbela; in the last-mentioned city she was pre-eminently the goddess of war.

164. Babylon, Religion of—Ishtar, Mother Goddess

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, Semitic [Mythology] (Vol. 5 of The Mythology of All Races. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), p. 34. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York.

The myth of Ishtar, Astarte, Atargatis, is one of the principal factors in Sumerian and Semitic religion. She is often represented as a mother with a child at her breasts (the Babylonian Nintud)... Common and ubiquitous throughout Mesopotamia, Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, is this nude figure [clay figurine] of Ishtar as the goddess of Love and Harlotry. It is found prolifically in Babylonia from the West Semitic period onward, in Elam, Syria, among the Hittites, Egypt, the Aegean islands, Asia Minor, Phoenicia, and Canaan. It would seem that a figurine of this Aphrodite Vulgaris was possessed by every household, and many carried cylinder seals with the nude goddess engraved upon them. These are probably examples of the household gods called teraphim by the Hebrews.

165. Babylon. Religion of—Polytheistic Concepts

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, The Religion of Babylonian and Assyria (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1908), pp. 88, 89.

[p. 88] The Babylonians, with all their wonderful gifts, were never able to conceive of one god, of one god alone, of one god whose very existence makes logically impossible the existence of any other deity. Monotheism transcends the spiritual grasp of the Babylonian mind.

Amid all this company of gods, amid all these speculations and combinations, we must keep our minds clear, and fasten our eyes upon the one significant fact that stands out above all others. It is that the Babylonians were not able to rise above polytheism; that beyond them, far beyond them, lay that great series of [p. 89] thoughts about God that ascribe to him aloneness, to which we may add the great spiritual ideas which to-day may be roughly grouped under Ethical Monotheism. Here and there great thinkers in Babylonia grasped after higher ideas, and were able only to attain to a sort of pantheism of a speculative kind. A personal god, righteous and holy, who loved righteousness and hated sin, this was not given to them to conceive.

But to the poor little Hebrew folk who once were slaves in Egypt, to them did these great thoughts come, and to them came the amazing power so to state them in history as to give mankind once and for all a conception of God of such power that the men who

seize it begin at once a transformation of life of surpassing grandeur and importance. Wherein the Babylonian religion fell short, therein the Hebrew rose to conquer.

166. Babylon, Religion of-Sin, the Moon-God

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), p. 28. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

Sin is thought to be of nomadic origin, and in early Arabian cult the moon is masculine, while the sun is feminine. Although, since the name Sin is Semitic, the invading Semites may have brought the cult of the moon-god with them, nevertheless he is found in the early Sumerian lists under the name Nannar. While he is called the son of Enlil in the Sumerian lists, his genealogy is not carried back further, and he seems to occupy an independent place among the early Mesopotamian gods. The phases of the moon were of special importance in the cult, and the period of darkness had the

distinctive name of *bubbulu*; it was thought to be a time when evil spirits were particularly dangerous. Sin was regarded as the lord of the calendar, by whom days, months, and years were fixed; but he was also a vegetation-god, and to him the fertility of cattle was ascribed. His sacred number was naturally 30, and his emblem was the crescent. His beard was of lapislazuli, and on the relief of Maltaia he is represented as riding on his sacred beast, the winged bull. Ur and Harran were the two chief centres of his cult in Mesopotamia. His consort was Ningal, the mother of the sun-god.

As day was thought to succeed night in the Oriental way of regarding their relation, the next god in the triad, Shamash, the sun-god, was thought of as the son of Sin.

167. Babylon, Religion of, Sumerian Origin of

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic [Mythology]* (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), pp. 88, 89. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York.

[p. 88] The Sumerian pantheon in variety and numbers exceeds that of both Greek and Roman religions combined... This pantheon and the liturgies and litanies which were based upon it, were accepted as sacred and canonical by the Semites of Babylonia and Assyria, and remained essentially unchanged throughout the temple worship of both kingdoms until the end of the Assyrian empire in 612 B.C. In Babylonia the adherents of this great religious system continued in unmolested by their Persian, Greek, and Parthian conquerors after the fall of the Neo-Babylonian kingdom in 538 [539] B.C., and Babylonian editions of Sumerian temple liturgies, lists of gods, and myths were used and read as late as the second century B.C. ...

[p. 89] The complicated Sumerian pantheon was obviously the work of theologians and of gradual growth. Almost all the names of deities express some aspect of nature worship, some personification of natural powers, ethical or cultural functions, perfectly intelligible to the Sumerologist. The names of their oldest trinity, An, "Heaven-god," Enlil, "Earth-god," and Enki, "Watergod," are not lost in the mysteries of folk-lore. They are names given to definite mythological conceptions by clear thinking theologians and accepted in popular religion... The earliest written records from which any information concerning the Sumerian deities can be obtained is found twenty-five feet below modern plain level at Kish and at a prehistoric site, modern Jemdet Nasr, seventeen miles northeast of Kish, and from a period *circa* 4000 B.C. On the prehistoric tablets only the trinity An, Enlil, Enki is found, possibly Babbar the Sun-god also. Since in their mythology all the gods descended from An, the Sky-god, it is extremely probable that the priests who constructed this pantheon were monotheists at an earlier stage, having only the god An, a word which actually means "high." This is to be expected, for we have here not a mythology springing from primitive religion, but speculation based upon nature, spiritual, and ethical values.

168. Babylon, Religion of—Tammuz (Dumu-zi)

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), p. 31. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

A figure closely connected with Ishtar, but whose place and rank in the pantheon is obscure, is the ancient Sumerian god Tammuz. His Sumerian name, Dumu-zi, means 'true son'. In the Babylonian king-lists, among the kings who reigned 'before the Flood' we find the name of Dumuzi, the Shephered, while, after the Flood, among the kings of the first dynasty of Erech, immediately preceding Gilgamesh, is Dumuzi, the Fisher. It is difficult to say whether these two figures were originally one. In the numerous Tammuzliturgies, we find preserved the myth of the descent of Tammuz into the underworld, the mourning of Ishtar for her brother-spouse, the descent of Ishtar into the underworld in search of Tammuz, and the triumphant return to earth of the two divinities, bringing back joy and fertility with the spring. It is clear that Tammuz plays the part of a vegetationgod, dying with the dying year and reborn with the spring flowers and the young corn. In the later development of the cult in Babylonia, the myth and ritual of the dying and rising god became stereotyped as the great Babylonian New Year Festival... But while the cult of Tammuz ceased to be a state-cult in Babylonia and Assyria, it was preserved among the common people, and passed into Syria and Canaan. In Syria he was identified with Adonis, and as late as the beginning of the sixth century B.C. we find in Israel that the ritual weeping for Tammuz was still being practised by the women. (Ezek. viii, 14.)

169. Babylon, Religion of—Tammuz, Weeping for SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 36. 37. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 36] There is only one explicit reference to the cult of Tammuz in the Old Testament, namely, the well-known passage in Ezek. viii, 14, in which the prophet describes his vision of the women [p. 37] of Jerusalem weeping for Tammuz at the north gate of the Temple at Jerusalem. An indirect reference may be found in Isa. xvii, 10,

where the words *nit'e na'amanim* are usually interpreted as referring to the 'gardens of Adonis', a feature of the Phoenician form of the Tammuz cult.

170. Babylon, Religion of—Unlucky Days (Not Connected With Bible Sabbath)

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 60, 61. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 60] One other seasonal element of the [Babylonian] cult may be mentioned, namely, that connected with the phases of the moon. The Babylonian religious calendar, while determined in part by the agricultural seasons, was originally a lunar calendar, like all early calendars, and the phases of the moon were carefully observed and were the subject of many omens. The two most important points of the moon's course, from the religious point of view, were the full moon (*shabattum*), and the day of the moon's total

disappearance (*bubbulum*); the latter was regarded as a specially dangerous period, and was marked by fasting, prayers, and other rites. The new moon also was watched for, [p. 61] and its appearance, marking the beginning of the month, was an occasion for ritual. It

is possible that the early Hebrew 'new moons' and 'sabbaths' (Isaiah i, 13–14) were lunar festivals, marking new moon and full moon, and may go back to the common origin in ancient custom of both Babylonian and Canaanite lunar feasts. But it is extremely unlikely that the later Hebrew Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, had any connection

with the Babylonian shabattum. In the Assyrian period the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-

first, and twenty-eight of the month were unlucky days, and the nineteenth was called 'the day of wrath', and was marked by special fasts and prayers.

171. Babylon, Woman and Prophecy, Alive in the West

SOURCE: George Adam Smith, *The Book of Isaiah*, Vol. 2 (Vol. 11 of *The Expositor's Bible*, New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1908), p. 199. Used by permission of Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich.

The shell of Babylon, the gorgeous city which rose by Euphrates, has indeed sunk into heaps; but Babylon herself is not dead. Babylon never dies. To the conscience of Christ's seer, this *mother of harlots*, though dead and desert in the East, came to life again in the West.

172 Babylon, Woman of Prophecy—Antiquity Interpretation

SOURCE: Ch[ristopher] Wordsworth, *Union With Rome* (London: Longmans, 1909), pp. 19, 20. [p. 19] The interpretation, which identifies the Church of Rome with the Apocalyptic

Babylon, does *not date from* the Reformation; the truth is, that it was *prior* to the Reformation, and did much to *produce* the Reformation.

In the seventh and following centuries, the *Church* of Rome was united with the *City* of Rome, by the junction of the temporal and spiritual Powers in the Person of [p. 20] the Roman Pontiff; and when the Church of Rome began to put forth her new dogmas, and to enforce them as necessary to salvation, then it was publicly affirmed by many, (although she burnt some who affirmed it,) that she was fulfilling the Apocalyptic prophecies concerning Babylon.

173. Babylon, Woman of Prophecy—Identified With Rome

SOURCE: Ch[ristopher] Wordsworth, Union With Rome (London: Longmans, 1909), pp. 13, 14.

[p. 13] To sum up the evidence on this portion of the inquiry; We have in our hands a Book, dictated by the Holy Spirit to St. John, the beloved Disciple, the blessed Evangelist, the last surviving Apostle,—a Book predicting events from the day in which it was written even to the end of time; a Book designed for the perpetual warning of the Church, and commended to her pious meditation in solemn and affectionate terms. In it we behold a description, traced by the divine finger, of a proud and prosperous Power, claiming universal homage, and exercising mighty dominion: a Power enthroned upon many waters, which are Peoples, and Multitudes, and Nations, and Tongues; a Power arrogating Eternity by calling herself a Queen for ever: a Power whose prime agent, by his Lamb-like aspect, bears a semblance of Christian purity, and yet, from his sounding words and cruel deeds, is compared to a Dragon: a Power beguiling men from the pure faith, and trafficking in human souls, tempting them to commit spiritual adultery, alluring them to herself by gaudy colours and glittering jewels, and holding in her hand a golden cup of enchantments, by which she intoxicates the world, and makes it reel at her feet.

This power, so described in the Apocalypse, is identified in this Divinely inspired Book with

- (1) a Great City; and that City is described as
- (2) seated on seven Hills. It is also characterized as

(3) *that Great City,* which *reigned* over the Kings of the Earth in the time of St. John. And
(4) it is called *Babylon*.

Having contemplated these characteristics of this [p. 14] prophetic description, we pause, and consider,—*what* City in the world corresponds to it?

It *cannot* be the *literal* Babylon, for *she* was not built on seven hills, nor was she the Queen of the Earth in St. John's age. It is some Great City which then existed, and would continue to exist to our age. Among the very few Great City which then were, and still survive, One was seated on Seven Hills. She was universally recognized in St. John's age as the Seven-hilled City. She is described as such by the general voice of her own most celebrated writers for five centuries; and she has ever since continued to be so characterized. She is represented as such on her own Coinage, the Coinage of the World. This same City, and no other, then reigned over the Kings of the Earth. She exercised Universal Sovereignty, and boasted herself Eternal. This same City resembled Babylon in many striking respects;—in dominion, in wealth, in physical position, and in historical acts, especially with regard to the Ancient Church and People of God. This same City was commonly *called* Babylon by St. John's own countrymen, and by his disciples. And, finally, the voice of the Christian Church, in the age of St. John himself, and for many centuries after it, has given an almost unanimous verdict on this subject-that the Sevenhilled City, that Great City, the Queen of the Earth, Babylon the Great of the Apocalypse, is the City of ROME.

174. Babylon, Woman of Prophecy, Interpretation of, by a Roman Catholic Priest

SOURCE: Père [Bernard] Lambert, "Antichrist and Babylon" (an extract from his *Exposition of the Predictions and Promise Made to the Church During the Last Times of the Gentiles*), in *The Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*, 3 (Jan., 1851) 40–43.

[p. 40]. If we examine, in good faith (*de bonne foi*), the different features which the harlot in the Apocalypse is said to possess, it is very difficult not to recognize, under this emblem, the "City of Rome."

"I will tell thee," says the angel to St. John, "the mystery of the Woman and the Beast, who has seven heads and ten horns. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the Woman is seated. Inasmuch as it is a woman that thou sawest, this is the great city that ruleth over the kings of the earth."

That there may be some other city that sitteth on seven hills besides Rome is, indeed, very possible, but the reigning over the kings of the earth as well can be predicted of Rome alone. She alone of all that are built on seven hills has, in the first place, reigned over the kings of the earth by a temporal dominion, and for eighteen centuries has continued to lord it over a large number of princes, kings, and people, by the ascendancy of her religion. No other city in the world shares this remarkable characteristic with the city of Rome. This first point is not, cannot be disputed. But next to this it is natural to inquire, if it is of Rome while yet Pagan, or of Rome when become Christian, but degenerate and corrupted, that John speaks under the name of Babylon the Great? It is certain, in the first place, that the Babylon, which the apostle describes with features so marked and frightful, its abominations and future ruin, cannot be the ancient city of that name so often accursed by the prophets. The terrible catastrophe which he pictures is for a far-distant future.

Next, the first, or literal, Babylon was no longer in existence when John wrote his Revelation... [See editors' note.] [p. 41] What likelihood is there that the prophecy of John should have for its object a city which is no longer in existence, in which no person in the world now takes any interest, and of which no traces remain but in the pages of history? But once more, this point is clearly a settled one.

Neither can it be Pagan Rome that the apostle mentions. The guilty city in question is shown him as a profound mystery. She even carries her name written on her front (Rev. xix. 5); and the apostle was seized with astonishment on beholding it. Her guilt is excessive; the severest punishment will be far below her deserts. But these abominations are cloked over with a certain external covering which conceals her deformity. It requires great attention and a superior light to discover what she is, and what she deserves in the judgment of truth.

But if the design of St. John had been to speak of ancient Pagan Rome, how could it have been astonishing, how would it have been mysterious or difficult to comprehend that an idolatrous city, openly the enemy of the true God, bent on abolishing her [i.e., his] worship and exterminating his worshipers, should be odious in his eyes and devoted to a signal punishment? There is, then, no reason to believe, that, in throwing his eyes down the perspective of the future, from which he was separated by so many centuries, the holy apostle points us to a Christian city, but still such as shall then be depraved and corrupted, charged with guilt, making religion subservient to her pride, domination, and avarice, and such as shall merit God's pouring over her the vials of his indignation. It is to her to whom he applies the mounful epithet, which will attach to her towards the end of the second dispensation, the Mother of Fornications and Abominations of the Earth.

It is from her principally that there will burst into open day the abuses and mischief, which in the last times are destined to inundate the Gentile Church, and consummate the mystery of iniquity, by substituting for the spirit of the Gospel an unbridled pride, a violent desire to invade and subjugate everything. Blinded by ambition, this mysterious woman will change the august but moderate prerogatives into foolish and turbulent pretensions, which cause infinite evils to religion and Governments. She will be in her own eyes, and wishes to be in the eyes of all throughout the world, an absolute ruler, set free from all law, and superior to every power, the only source and fulness of all authority. She will strive to put under her feet, all that is greatest in that age, all that is most eminent in religion. She will believe that she [p. 42] has alone the right to give laws without receiving them at the hands of any person. She will usurp, at least in her conduct, the august and incommunicable title of the Holy and True. (Rev. iii, 7.) By a necessary consequence of this attempt, she will desire that all her mandates should be executed without resistance, that all her words should be revered as infallible oracles. Not contented with having invaded or annihilated the most sacred rights of those whom she ought to cherish as brethren, she will extend her domination, even over the spouse of the Son of God. She will leave no means unemployed to reduce her to slavery; she will lord it with tyranny over her, whom she ought herself to obey. Such large excesses will be furnished with unlimited permission to plunge herself into still greater. By degrees she will be led even to proscribe and anathematize the most important parts of the depository of faith. She will prostitute her favours, she will furnish with arms a number of teachers of lies, who have conspired to ruin the faith. Abusing the ascendancy which her prerogatives have given her, she will make kings and pontiffs, priests and Levites, and

the faithful of every rank and state, drink the cup of her abuses, her errors and her attempts against righteousness and truth. She will erect into laws the most palpable and grossest simonies, and the most shameful traffic in holy things. She will set all an example of pride and tyranny. She will lull sinners to sleep by her arbitrary dispensations, and by a scandalous expenditure of the treasure of the Church. She will asperse by her iniquitous censures the characters of the just, who will have refused to burn incense to her tyranny, or to fall in with her infamous irregularities. She will make open war on the most astounding miracles, however so little adverse to her pride or her disastrous policy.

All these excesses, and many others which we pass over in silence, will make up the character of the symbolic woman, whom St. John did not see except with profound astonishment, and who in the end of the dispensation is to take so signal a part in affairs, will be the cause of so many evils, will produce so many double-dealers and victims, will bring to its crowning height the Mystery of Iniquity, and will entail on the Gentile Church—the accomplices of her crimes and falsehoods, the dreadful inflictions so often announced in Scripture.

It is an objection not less frivolous than odious to say, that Protestants have *also* looked at Rome as the harlot of the Apocalypse. There are here two extremes to avoid, the one the adopting the erroneous and schismatic views of the sec- [p. 43] taries of the sixteenth century: the other the applauding to excess the Court of Rome. We ought neither to follow blind and headstrong heretics, who, under the vain pretext of reform, have trampled underfoot the holiest institutions, nor to imitate the *superstitious and deluded* Catholics who respect thousands of practices which the Gospel condemns.

But because the original chair of St. Peter did not deserve the outrages of these bitter and headstrong innovators, it does not follow that the Popes may not before or after that epoch fall into great excess, and declare war on the most important truths. Still less just is it to conclude, that at some future time, they cannot more criminally abuse their ministry, and that towards the end of the Gentile dispensation, (when the defection or apostasy, spoken of by St. Paul, shall reach its consummation,) one of these Pontiffs carrying the depravity to its height, may not, to his own destruction, verify in his person that which the prophet Ezekiel and others have so clearly announced for the last times of the Gentile dispensation.

Whoever since the second or third century should have asserted that the Mystery of Iniquity was consummated, of which St. Paul pointed out the first germ, and that it consisted in the Catholics believing in the real presence of the Eucharist, and the verity of the sacrifice of the mass, in their offering prayers for the dead, and in fasting at Lent; whoever, I say should have asserted his, would have been justly considered an innovator, or a fanatic.

But this does not prevent the Mystery of Iniquity from being destined, after progressive increase, to arrive one day at its consummation among the Gentiles, to work their entire reprobation. The essential thing for us is to discern well its nature, and by what marks we may recognise it, with a view to assure oneself against that fatal disease. It would be great madness, or show much bad faith, to conclude from thence, that the features under which St. John describes the harlot, *cannot at any time* apply to Rome; no, not even in that day when Jesus Christ, tired with our impenitence and our crimes, shall remove us from his kingdom.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Lambert is not entirely correct; Babylon was still inhabited in the first century, even though largely in ruins. See No. 406.]

175. Babylon, Woman of Prophecy, a Mystery

SOURCE: Chr[istopher] Wordsworth, Union With Rome (London: Longmans, 1909), pp. 61-63.

[p. 61] *Heathen* Rome doing the work of heathenism in persecuting the Church was *no* Mystery. But a *Christian Church*, calling herself the Mother of Christendom, and yet *drunken with the blood of saints*—this *is* a *Mystery*. A *Christian Church* boasting her-[p. 62] self to be the Bride, and yet *being* the Harlot; styling herself Sion, and being Babylon—this *is* a *Mystery*. A *Mystery* indeed it is, that, when she says to all, "Come unto me," the voice from *heaven* should cry, "*Come out of her, My People*." A *Mystery* indeed it is, that she who boasts herself the city of Saints, should become *the habitation of devils:* that she who claims to be Infallible should be said to *corrupt the earth:* that a self-named "*Mother of Churches,*" should be called by the Holy Spirit the "*Mother of Abominations:*" that she who boasts to be Indefectible, should in one day be destroyed, and that Apostles should rejoice at her fall: that she who holds, as she says, in her hands the Keys of Heaven, should be cast into the lake of fire by Him Who has the Keys of hell. All this, in truth, *is* a great MYSTERY.

Nearly Eighteen Centuries have passed away, since the Holy Spirit prophesied, by the mouth of St. John, that *this* Mystery would be revealed in *that City* which was then the Queen of the Earth, the City of Seven Hills,—the CITY of ROME.

The Mystery was then dark, dark as midnight. Man's eye could not pierce the gloom. The fulfillment of the prophecy seemed improbable,—almost impossible. Age after age rolled away. By degrees, the mists which hung over it became less thick. The clouds began to break. Some features of the dark Mystery began to appear, dimly at first, then more clearly, like Mountains at day-break. Then the form of the Mystery became more and more distinct. The Seven Hills, and the Woman sitting upon them, became more and more visible. Her voice was heard. Strange sounds of blasphemy were muttered by her. Then they became louder and louder. And the golden chalice in her hand, her scarlet attire, her pearls and [p. 63] jewels were seen glittering in the Sun. Kings and Nations were displayed prostrate at her feet, and drinking her cup. Saints were slain by her sword, and she exulted over them. And now the prophecy became clear, clear as noon-day; and we tremble at the sight, while we read the inscription, emblazoned in large letters "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT," written by the hand of St. John, guided by the Holy Spirit of God, on the forehead of the CHURCH of ROME.

176. Baptism—Calvin on Meaning of Word

SOURCE: John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, bk. 4, chap. 15, sec. 19, trans. by John Allen (7th Am. ed., rev.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian board of Christian Education, 1936), Vol. 2, p. 599.

Whether the person who is baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, is of no importance; Churches ought to be left at liberty, in this respect, to act according to the difference of centuries. The very word *baptize*, however, signifies to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient Church.

177. Baptism, Catholic, by a Layman

SOURCE: A Catholic Dictionary, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.), p. 45. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

A lay person can baptize validly and in case of emergency (*e.g.*, when an unbaptized person is dying and no cleric can be obtained) is bound to do so. Anybody—man, woman, child, Catholic, Protestant, Jew—may do it, provided there is the intention to do what the Church does when baptizing, that the water is poured on the head of the person

to be baptized, and that the requisite words—"I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost"—are said at the same time. Though the sacrament is validly administered, it is gravely illicit for a lay person to baptize in other than cases of necessity. Midwives are required by canon law to know how to baptize in case of necessity.

178. Baptism, Catholic Catechism on

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1913), pp. 67, 68.

[p. 67] 322. Why is Baptism the most necessary Sacrament? Baptism is the most necessary Sacrament

1) because without Baptism no one can be saved,

2) because without Baptism no other Sacrament can be received.

"Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3. 5).

323. How is Baptism administered?

Baptism is administered by pouring water on the head of the person to be baptized, and at the same time pronouncing the words: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Any *natural* water. Enough to touch, and flow from the skin. "Going therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. 28. 19).

324. What takes place in the soul of the person baptized?

The soul of the person baptized is cleaned from all sin and sanctified by the grace of God.

Definition: Baptism is that Sacrament by which we are cleansed from all sin and sanctified by the grace of God.

Effects of Baptism. *It takes away:* 1) original sin, 2) all sins committed before Baptism, 3) the eternal punishment, 4) all temporal [p. 68] punishment. *It gives:* 1) sanctifying grace, 2) it makes us children of God, 3) heirs of Heaven, 4) members of the Catholic Church[,] 5) it infuses into the soul the divine virtues, 6) it imprints an indelible mark on the soul.

179. Baptism, Faith Essential to Benefit of (Luther on)

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Large Catechism*, trans. by John Nicholas Lenker, in *Luther's Catechetical Writings*, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis, Minn.: The Luther Press, 1907), pp. 163, 164. [FRS No. 45.]

[p. 163] We have here the words: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." To what do they refer but to baptism, that is to "the water" comprehended in God's ordinance? Hence, it follows that he who rejects baptism, rejects God's Word, and faith, and Christ who directs us, and binds us, to baptism.

226. In the third place, having seen the wonderful benefit and great power of baptism, let us notice further who receives it, what baptism offers and how it benefits us. This also is most clearly and beautifully expressed in these same words: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" that is, faith alone makes one worthy profitably to receive this saving, divine water. Inasmuch as the blessing is proffered and conveyed in the words which are connected with the water and in union with it, it can be received only on condition that we heartily believe it. Without faith baptism avails nothing, although it is in itself a divine, inestimable treasure. Therefore, the few words, "He that believeth," are so pregnant that they exclude and fling back all works that we may do with the view of

thereby obtaining and meriting salvation. For it is decreed that whatever is not of faith can neither contribute nor receive anything whatever. But if they say, as they are wont to do: Baptism itself is a work, and you say that works avail nothing for salvation; where then is faith? You must answer: Yes, our works truly avail nothing for salvation, but baptism is not our work, it is the work of God (for you will, as said, make a wide distinction between Christ's baptism and a bath-keep- [p. 164] er's baptism); what God does is salutary and necessary for salvation; it does not exclude but demands faith, for without faith we could not lay hold of it. For in the mere fact that you allow the water to be poured over you, you have not so received nor retained baptism that it is a blessing to you. But you receive the blessing if you submit to it as a divine injunction and ordinance, so that, baptized in the name of God, the salvation promised in the water may be yours. This it is not within the reach of hand or body to attain; the heart must believe it.

180. Baptism, Importance of Rite, Luther on.

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Large Catechism*, trans. by John Nicholas Lenker, in *Luther's Catechetical Writings*, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis, Minn.: The Luther Press, 1907), pp. 158, 159. [FRS No. 45.]

[p. 158] Observe first, that these words [Mt 28:19; Mk 16:16] contain God's command and ordinance; we should not doubt, then, that baptism is of divine origin, and was not devised and invented by men. As truly as I can affirm that the Ten Commandments, [p. 159] the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer are not spun from man's imagination, but revealed and given by God himself, so can I, likewise, boast that baptism is no human plaything, but is instituted by God himself; and, moreover, it is solemnly and strictly commanded that we be baptized or we shall not be saved. We are then not to regard it a trivial matter, as the putting on of a new scarlet garment. It is of the greatest importance that we recognize baptism in its excellent, glorious and exalted character. For it is the cause of the most of our contentions and battles; the world is full of sects exclaiming that baptism is merely an outward form and that outward forms are of no use. But whether it be an outward form or not, here stand the Word and command of God, which have instituted, established and confirmed baptism. Whatever God institutes and commands cannot be useless; it is most precious, even if in appearance it is not worth a straw.

181. Baptism, Infant—Introduction

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible* (1957 ed.), pp. 140, 213, 214, notes 37, 39–41. Published 1955 by The Westminster Press. Used by permission of The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, and Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., London.

[p. 140] So far as the practice of the post-apostolic church is concerned, it is certain that infant baptism appeared quite early, though it was not unchallenged,³⁷ and it is well known that there was a time when ideas of baptismal regeneration caused baptism to be deferred until the end of life.³⁹ The question cannot therefore be settled by appealing to the practice of the New Testament ⁴⁰ or of the Early Church, and it is far more important to approach it in terms of Biblical thought, and of the significance which the New Testament attaches to the rite.⁴¹.

[p. 213; Note 37:] *Cf.* F. J. Leenhardt, *E.Th.R.* [*Études Théologiques et Religieuses*], xxv, 1952 [or 1950? *Cf.* notes 39, 40] p. 149: 'It is necessary to go to the third century to find incontestable evidence of the existence of paedobaptism. Remarkably enough, the first attestation is hostile to the practice, which is opposed as an innovation without justification'; also Th. Preiss, *La Vie en Christ*, 1951, p. 133: 'We should never forget that paedobaptism only became general with Constantine' (Preiss's essay 'Le Baptême des Enfants' appeared first in *Verbum Caro*, 1947, pp. 113–22, to which the present writer has had no access, and in German translation in *Th.L.Z.*, lxxiii, 1948, cols. 651ff.). The view of Preiss is that infant baptism is valuable in a Christian family but has no meaning where there is no serious likelihood of Christian training. Nevertheless he thinks it is a good thing that there should be some Christian families which do not practise infant baptism...

[Note 39:] R. E. White, *E.T.* [*The Expository Times*], li, 1949–50, p. 110, observes that 'such giants as Gregory Nazienzen, Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose and Augustine were not baptized until they reached manhood, although all had Christian mothers'. To these Leenhardt, *E.Th.R.*, xxv, 1950, p. 149, adds Jerome, and cites the remark of F. Lovsky: 'Here indeed are facts more worthy of comment than the laborious constructions placed on enigmatic texts of Irenaeus or Clement of [p. 214] Alexandria' (*Foi et Vie*, March–April 1950, pp. 109ff.; to this the present writer has had no access).

[Note 40:] *Cf.* F. J. Leenhardt, *Le Baptême Chrêtien*, pp. 66f., where it is agreed that Calvin's attempted demonstration that infant baptism is taught in the Bible is unconvincing, and maintained that it would be easier to conclude that infants are pure and therefore in no need of baptism. *Cf.* also *E.Th.R.* xxv, 1950, p. 144, where Leenhardt says that 'Calvin professed a doctrine of the sacrament formally at variance with that which supported paedobaptism; nevertheless he retained paedobaptism... Calvin avoided the contradiction, as will be shown, by emptying infant baptism of its authentic sacramental character.' *Cf. ibid.*, p. 201.

[Note 41:] ... *Cf. B.Q.* [*Baptist Quarterly*, London], xi, 1942–45, p. 316, where the present writer [Rowley] has said: 'If it could be proved conclusively that in the first century A.D. infants were baptized, that would not justify a practice that was not in accord with the New Testament teaching of the meaning of baptism; and if it could be conclusively proved that in the first century A.D. infants were not baptized, that would not of itself rule out the practice, if it accorded with the New Testament teaching of its essential significance.'

182. Baptism, Infant, and the New Testament

SOURCE: Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, trans. by J.K.S. Reid (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1951. Distributed in the USA by Alec R. Allenson, Naperville, Ill.), p. 26. Used by permission.

It can be decided only on the ground of New Testament *doctrine*: Is infant Baptism compatible with the New Testament conception of the essence and meaning of Baptism?

183. Baptism, Infant, Luther on

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Large Catechism*, trans. by John Nicholas Lenker, in *Luther's Catechetical Writings*, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis, Minn.: The Luther Press, 1907), pp. 165, 167. [FRS No. 45.]

[p. 165] 231. A question arises here with which the devil and his band confuse the world; the question of the baptism of infants, whether they also have faith and can properly be [p. 166] baptized? To this we reply in brief: Let the simple and unlearned dismiss this question from their minds and refer it to those posted on the subject. But if you must answer, then say: That the baptism of infants is pleasing to Christ his own work demonstrates. He has sanctified many of those who had received this baptism, and today not a few can be found whose doctrine and life attest the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. We also, by the grace of God, have received the power of interpreting the Scriptures and of knowing Christ, which is not possible without the Holy Spirit. Now if God did not approve infant baptism he would not have given to any of these the Holy Spirit, not even in the smallest measure. In short, from time immemorial to this day, no one on earth could have been a Christian. Now, since God has confirmed baptism through the gift of his Holy Spirit, as is plainly evident in some of the fathers-St. Bernard, Gerson, John Huss and others—and the Christian church will abide to the end of the world, it must be confessed that infant baptism is pleasing to God. For God can never be his own opponent, nor support lies and knavery, nor bestow his grace and Spirit to that end. This is perhaps the best and strongest proof for the simple and unlearned people. For no one can take from us, or overthrow, the article of faith, "I believe in the holy Christian Church, the communion of saints."

232. Furthermore, we maintain that the vital concern is not the presence or the absence of faith inasmuch as the latter can not vitiate baptism itself; God's Word and command is the vital concern. This is perhaps a little strongly expressed, but it is based upon what I have already said, that baptism is simply water and God's Word in and with each other: that is, when the Word accompanies the water, baptism is rightly administered although faith be not present; for faith does not constitute baptism, it receives it. Now, baptism is not vitiated, even if it is not rightly received or made use of; because it is not bound to our faith, but to the Word of God.

Even though a Jew came to us in our day with deceit and [p. 167] an evil purpose and we baptized him in all good faith, we should have to admit that his baptism was genuine. For there would be the water accompanied by God's Word, although he failed to receive it as he should...

234. We do the same in infant baptism. We bring the child with the conviction and trust that it believes, and pray God to grant it faith. But we do not baptize the child upon that; we do it solely upon God's command. Why so? Because we know that God does not lie. I and my neighbor, in fact, all men, may err and deceive, but the Word of God cannot err.

184. Baptism, Jewish, Probable Pre-Christian Origin of

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible* (1957 ed.), p. 135. Published 1955 by The Westminster Press. Used by permission of The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, and Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., London.

Next there was Jewish proselvte baptism. It is disputed how far we can accept this as older than Christian baptism, but the evidence, though less full than might have been desired, points to the probability that it is older. It doubtless sprang from the background of the ordinary lustrations, but it was different in significance. It was concerned with a spiritual experience, and not with physical impurity. It was therefore symbolic rather than cleansing in itself, and it marked the experience of conversion from paganism to Judaism. Moreover, it was a sacrament and not merely a lustration. It was an administered and a witnessed rite, which was performed once for all, and it involved a clear recognition by the person baptized of the significance of the act. While proselyte baptism is not mentioned in the Old Testament, and all our detailed information about it comes from a time later than the writing of the New Testament, it is probable that this rightly reflects the nature of the ceremony and its significance. It was therefore no formal act, but an act which had to be charged with meaning by the bringing to it of the spirit which made it the organ of the spirit of the baptized person. There were, however, some exceptions to this, at which we shall look later, for under certain circumstances children, and even unconscious children, might be baptized. Leaving these out of consideration for the moment, we observe that this ceremony marked the entry of aliens into the Covenant, and it required that they should bring to it the spirit of loyalty and acceptance of its obligations comparable with that which Israel brought to the Covenant at its first establishment under Moses.

185. Baptism, Mode of—Catholic Rite

SOURCE: A Catholic Dictionary, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.), p. 44. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

For valid Baptism it is necessary that ordinary water of any sort be applied to the person to be baptized in such a manner that it flows upon his head; it may be applied by infusion, immersion or aspersion ...; one application of the water is sufficient for

validity. At the same time must be pronounced, in any language and with the requisite intention, the words "I baptize thee (or 'This person is baptized' in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

- i. In the Western church, Baptism may only be lawfully conferred by infusion, and there should be three distinct pourings...
- ii. In the Eastern churches. In all Eastern rites Baptism is by a triple immersion except that the Armenians, Syrians and Melkites combine a semi-immersion with infusion.

186. Baptism, Mode of—Conybeare and Howson on Immersion SOURCE: W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul,* chap. 13 (reprint: Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1953), p. 345 (1–vol. ed.).

It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water.

187. Baptism, Mode of—Immersion, a Death to Sin, Luther on SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Large Catechism*, trans. by John Nicholas Lenker, in *Luther's Catechetical Writings*, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis, Minn.: The Luther Press, 1907), pp. 168, 169. [FRS No. 45.]

[p. 168] 237. Lastly, we ought to know what baptism signifies and why God ordained just this outward sign and rite for the sacrament by which we are first taken into the community of Christians. The act or rite consists in being placed into the water, which flows over us, and being drawn from it again. These two things, the placing in the water and [p. 169] the emerging from it, signify the power and efficacy of baptism; which is simply the mortifying of the old Adam in us and the resurrection of the new man, both of which operations continue in us as long as we live on the earth. Accordingly, a Christian life is but a daily baptism, which, once entered upon, requires us incessantly to fulfill its conditions. Without ceasing we must purge out what is of the old Adam, so that what belongs to the new man may come forth. But what is the old man? Inherited from Adam, he is passionate, hateful, envious, unchaste, miserly, lazy, conceited and, last but not least, unbelieving; thoroughly corrupt, he offers no lodgment to what is good. Now, when we enter Christ's kingdom, such corruption should daily decrease and we should become more gentle, more patient, more meek, and ever break away more and more from unbelief, avarice, hatred, envy and vain-glory.

188. Baptism, Mode of—John Wesley on Ancient Practice SOURCE: John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament* (reprint: London: The Epworth Press, 1952), p. 540, comment on Rom. 6:4.

4. *We are buried with him,*—Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.

189. Baptism, Mode of—Luther on Immersion

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, trans. and ed. by William Hazlitt (London: H. G. Bohn, 1857), p. 165. [FRS No. 44.]

In 1541, Doctor Menius asked Doctor Luther, in what manner a Jew should be baptized? The Doctor replied: You must fill a large tub with water, and, having divested the Jew of his clothes, cover him with a white garment. He must then sit down in the tub, and you must baptize him quite under the water. The ancients, when they were baptized, were attired in white, whence the first Sunday after Easter, which was peculiarly

consecrated to this ceremony, was called *dominica in albis*. This garb was rendered the more suitable, from the circumstance that it was, as now, the custom to bury people in a white shroud; and baptism, you know, is an emblem of our death. I have no doubt that when Jesus was baptized in the river Jordan, he was attired in a white robe.

190. Baptism, Mode of—Pouring, Luther on

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Large, Catechism,* trans. by John Nicholas Lenker, in *Luther's Catechetical Writings*, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis, Minn.: The Luther Press, 1907), p. 165. [FRS No. 45.]

For this reason, two things take place in baptism: water is poured upon our bodies, which can perceive nothing but the water; and the Word is spoken to the soul, that the soul may have its share also. Now, as water and Word constitute one baptism, so shall both body and soul be saved and live forever: the soul through the Word, in which it believes; but the body because it is united with the soul and grasps baptism in such a manner as it may.

191. Baptism, Significance of, Reinhold Niebuhr on

SOURCE: Reinhold Niebuhr, *Faith and History*, pp. 240–241. Copyright 1949 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and James Nisbet, Ltd., London.

[p. 240] A community of grace, which lives by faith and hope, must be sacramental. It must have sacraments to symbolize the having and not having of the final virtue and

truth. It must have sacraments to express its participation in the *Agape* of Christ and yet not pretend that it has achieved that love. Thus the church has the sacrament of baptism in which "we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should also walk in newness of life" (Romans 6:4). The admonition that "we should" walk in newness of life is a nice indication in Pauline thought of his consciousness of the Christian's having and yet not having that new life which is the fruit of dying to self. Christian participates sacramentally and by faith in Christ's dying and rising again; but he must be admonished that he should walk in that newness of life which is ostensibly his assured possession. He is assured that he is free from sin and yet admonished: [p. 241] "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body" (Romans 6:12).

192. Baptist Bodies

SOURCE: CRB 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 87–90.

[p. 87] *History*. The history of the early Baptist churches in New England is one of constant struggle for existence. The Puritan government of Massachusetts was so bitter in its opposition that nearly a century after Roger Williams there were but eight Baptist churches in that colony. Conditions elsewhere were similar, although farther south there was less persecution. Down to the middle of the eighteenth century it seemed probable that the General, or Arminian, wing would be dominant in New England at least, although in Philadelphia the controversy had resulted in a victory for the Calvinists. With the Great Awakening in 1740, and the labors of Whitefield, two significant changes appeared in Baptist church life. Calvinistic views began to predominate in the New England churches, and the bitter opposition to the Baptists disappeared. By 1784 the 8 churches in Massachusetts had increased to 73, and extension into the neighboring colonies had begun. With this growth, however, there developed a conflict similar to that found in the history of other denominations. The "New Lights," later known as "Separates," were heart and soul with Whitefield in his demands for a regenerated church membership; the "Old Lights," or "Regulars," earnestly opposed the introduction of hitherto unrecognized qualifications for the ministry or, indeed, for church membership. From New England the movement spread, becoming for a time especially strong in several Southern States. In the South the two parties eventually united in fellowship, and

reorganized as United Baptists. In New England the conflict wore itself out, the Baptist churches being modified by both influences.

[p. 88] With the general emancipation from ecclesiastical rule that followed the Revolutionary War, all disabilities were removed from the Baptists in the different States, and the new Federal Constitution effaced the last vestige of religious inequality. Under the influence of the later preaching of Whitefield, the close of the eighteenth century was marked by a renewal of revival interest, and a new development of the Arminian type of Baptist churches. For some time the Free Baptists, or Free Will Baptists, as they were variously called, drew considerable strength from the Regular Baptists, but the latter soon became as strong as ever...

In 1814 the General Missionary Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States of America for Foreign Missions was formed.

The missionary work of this organization, however, represented only a part of its scope or achievement. It was, indeed, the first step toward bringing the various local churches together and overcoming the disintegrating tendencies of extreme independence. Heretofore the Baptists alone had had no form of ecclesiastical organization. Now, through the necessities of administration, there was furnished just what was needed to combine the different units into a whole, and arouse what has come to be known as "denominational consciousness." ...

As the discussion in regard to slavery became acute, there arose the differences which resulted in three conventions—northern, southern, and national. The northern churches, Baptist as well as others, were strongly antislavery; the southern churches, Baptist as well as others, if not always proslavery, certainly not antislavery. A crisis was reached when the question was raised whether the General Missionary Convention (called also the Triennial Convention because it met once in 3 years) would appoint as a missionary a person who owned slaves. To this a very decided negative was returned, and since that involved a denial of what were considered constitutional rights, the southern churches withdrew in 1845 and formed the Southern Baptist Convention had hitherto done for the entire Baptist denomination. It was not a new denomination; simply a new organization for the direction of the missionary and general evangelistic work of the churches of the Southern States.

The development of the National Baptist Convention, representing the Negro churches, was naturally slower, and when the census of Baptists for 1926 was taken numerous divisions made it necessary to use the new term, "Negro Baptists," which for statistical purposes includes all the various organizations known as the "National Baptist Convention, U. S. A.," the "National Baptist Convention of America," the "LottCarey Missionary Baptists," and the colored Baptist churches, that were formerly included in the Northern Baptist Convention.

[p. 89] *Doctrine*. Baptists agree with other evangelical bodies on many points of doctrine. Their cardinal principle is implicit obedience to the plain teachings of the Word of God. Under this principle, while maintaining with other evangelical bodies the great truths of the Christian religion, they hold: (1) That the churches are independent in their local affairs; (2) that there should be an entire separation of church and state; (3) that religious liberty or freedom in matters of religion is an inherent right of the human soul; (4) that a church is a body of regenerated people who have been baptized on profession of

personal faith in Christ, and have associated themselves in the fellowship of the gospel; (5) that infant baptism is not only not taught in the Scriptures, but is fatal to the spirituality of the church; (6) that from the meaning of the word used in the Greek text of the Scriptures, the symbolism of the ordinance, and the practice of the early church, immersion in water only constitutes baptism; (7) that the scriptural officers of a church are pastors and deacons; and (8) that the Lord's Supper is an ordinance within the church observed in commemoration of the sufferings and death of Christ.

The beliefs of Baptists have been incorporated in confessions of faith. Of these, the Philadelphia Confession, originally issued by the London Baptist churches in 1689 and adopted with some enlargements by the Philadelphia Association in 1742, and the New Hampshire Confession, adopted by the New Hampshire State Convention in 1832, are recognized as the most important. The Philadelphia Confession is strongly Calvinistic. The New Hampshire Confession modifies some of the statements of the earlier documents, and may be characterized as moderately Calvinistic. But while these confessions are recognized as fair expressions of the faith of Baptists, there is nothing binding in them, and they are not regarded as having any special authority. The final court of appeal for Baptists is the Word of God. Within limits, considerable differences in doctrine are allowed, and thus opportunity is given to modify beliefs as new light may break from or upon the Word. Among Baptists heresy trials are rare.

Organization. Baptist Church polity is congregational, or independent. Each church is sovereign so far as its own discipline and worship are concerned, calls or dismisses its own pastor, elects its own deacons or other officers, and attends to its own affairs...

For missionary and educational or other purposes, Baptist churches usually group themselves into associations and State conventions. The oldest is the Philadelphia Association, organized in 1707, which stood alone until 1751, when the Charleston Association was formed in South Carolina...

[p. 90] Besides local associations and State conventions, the Baptists have general, or national conventions... Like the local associations, none of these larger organizations has any authority over the individual churches.

193. Baptists—American Baptist Association SOURCE: *CRB* 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 249.

History. The American Baptist Association is not a separate and distinct denomination, but it is a separate and distinct group of Baptists. They separated themselves from the convention groups because they regarded the methods and polity of the convention as an innovation among Baptists. They claim that their associations are a direct continuance of the cooperative work in missions, benevolences, etc., since the time of Christ and the Apostles. They sincerely believe that those Baptists who work with the conventions, though they may be orthodox in faith, have departed from the New Testament principles of church cooperation.

The purpose of this body is to do missionary, evangelistic, benevolent, and educational work throughout the world. They do not unionize with other religious sects and organizations because they believe that their churches are the only true churches; they believe also that the Lord Jesus Christ gave the commission (Matt. 28:18–20) to the churches, and that they are, therefore, the divine custodians of the truth, and that they only have the divine right of carrying out the commands of Jesus as stated in the great

commission, and of executing the laws of the kingdom, and of administering the ordinances of the Gospel.

They believe that each church is an autonomous, independent body, and that the churches are amenable only to Christ as Lord and Master. They believe also that each church is on a perfect equality with every other like church, and therefore should have an equal representation in all their associated work.

Doctrine. The American Baptist Association accepts the New Hampshire Confession of Faith that has been so long held by American Baptists. They believe in: The infallible verbal inspiration of the whole Bible; the Triune God; the Genesis account of creation; the Deity of Jesus Christ; the virgin birth of Christ; the sufferings and death of Christ as vicarious and substitutionary; the bodily resurrection and glorification of His saints; they believe in the second coming of Christ, personal and bodily as the crowning event of the gospel age, and that His coming will be premillennial; the Bible doctrine of eternal punishment of the wicked; that in the carrying out of the commands of Jesus in the great commissions, the churches are the only units, all exercising equal authority, and that responsibility should be met by them according to their several abilities: that all cooperative bodies such as conventions, associations, etc., are only advisory bodies and cannot exercise any authority whatsoever over the churches. They believe furthermore that salvation is wholly by grace through faith without any admixture of law or works, and that the church was instituted during the personal ministry of Jesus Christ on the earth. They believe also in the absolute separation of church and State, and in the principle of absolute religious freedom.

Organization. They believe that in the strict sense the American Baptist Association is not an organization, but is a cooperation of the churches composing it. But since all the churches cannot meet in the annual meetings, churches elect three messengers who represent them in these annual meetings, and for convenience in their deliberations the messengers when assembled in their annual meetings elect a president, and three vice presidents; two recording secretaries; and a secretary-treasurer. They are strictly congregational in their polity. All questions are settled by a majority vote of the messengers present, except ... [certain questions which require] a two-thirds majority vote...

The American Baptist Association proper never meets since it would be a physical impossibility for all the churches composing it to meet at one time. Hence the annual meetings are called "The meeting of the messengers composing the American Baptist Association."

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 647,800 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 252).]

194. Baptists—American Baptist Convention (Formerly Northern Baptist Convention)

SOURCE: CRB 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 107-110.

[p. 107] *History and Organization. Northern Baptist origins.*—Beginning with the oldest branches of Northern Baptist activity, Baptist work before the war of the American

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Revolution was confined [p. 108] to plans of individual local churches and small groups of neighboring churches, called associations. These associational groups appeared in Virginia, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; and gradually the associations themselves came to stand together for the propagation of their form of faith, for the general principle of freedom of conscience in religious concerns, and for mutual defense of their forms of organization. The first Baptist commonwealth, founded in Rhode Island by Roger Williams, an associate of men like Cromwell and Milton in England and of Governor Winthrop in the New England colonies, grew into areas of influence like that of the Philadelphia Association which, in turn, was the mother of other associations like the Warren Association, in Rhode Island. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Benjamin Franklin all acknowledged indebtedness to the Baptists of Virginia and Rhode Island for principles so well established and proved valid that they embodied them in their drafts of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States. These early associations established libraries, schools, colleges, and churches in their humble and meager way, some of which have become institutions of national prominence and great fame. But it was not until the nineteenth century that Baptists in the North had grown to numbers large enough, and means of travel and communication had become sufficiently general through the railroad and the telegraph, for the denomination, along with other denominations, to envision an organic and organized career for the group as a whole.

Northern Baptists after separation from the South.—The Northern Baptist churches withdrew from organic connection with the Southern Baptist churches about 1844. While it is generally supposed that this rift was caused by differences of opinion regarding slavery, as was the case in some other denominations, the real reason for the breach was a difference over the method of raising and distributing missionary moneys...

Organization of a new denomination.—A great change in the methods of the Northern Baptists resulted from the formation of the Northern Baptist Convention, at Washington, D. C., in 1907. In the scheme of things, the convention exists as a corporation, chartered under the laws of the State of New York, with broad powers to conduct religious work, receive and expend funds, act as financial trustee, and affiliate itself with other similar bodies. Previously the churches operated through their missionary societies. Now, they united their far-flung interests in an inclusive corporation...

[p. 109] The constituent factor in the Northern Baptist group is the local church. Each church is independent of every other church and of the convention itself, except as they act together by agreement. The convention sessions are delegated assemblies, composed of delegates from the churches, duly accredited, and ex-officio delegates from certain national and State bodies. The managing body of the convention is the General Council, when the convention is not in session; but the convention, when in session, has supreme authority in its own affairs...

Interdenominationl relationships.—The denomination has reacted favorably in some measure to the tendency toward cooperation and unity among the Christian denominations... Closer relations than formerly are now maintained with the General Baptists, the Disciples of Christ, the Southern Baptist Convention, and the National Baptist Convention. Fraternal delegates are sent as messengers to various Baptist bodies

in Canada... About 25 years ago the Northern Baptist Convention received into [p. 110] full fellowship and all privileges of service the Free Will Baptists...

Doctrine. The doctrinal requisites for Baptists are at an almost irreducible minimum. Although various groups and assemblies, at various times, have endeavored to formulate "Confessions of Faith," such as the "New Hampshire Confession"; and although many local churches have "Articles of Faith" and "Church Covenants," these last are adopted by the individual churches, are for their own use locally, and are binding on no other churches than the ones which adopted them. Even in the local church there is wide liberty of opinion permitted concerning these doctrinal statements. The number and length of them tends steadily to decrease. One reason for this light hold of creedal statement is that Baptists generally hold to the view that the Bible itself, especially the New Testament, is the only proper compendium for faith and practice; and the individual conscience and intelligence, enlightened by the Divine Spirit, is the proper interpreter thereof. The second reason is that the epoch-making and successful battle which early American Baptists and others made for freedom of conscience in religion and worship was calculated to reduce the amount of regimentation of thought among them.

Baptists, in general, believe in religious freedom, the validity and inspiration of the Scriptures, the Lordship of Christ, the immortality of the soul, the brotherhood of man, the future life, the need of redemption from sin, and the ultimate triumph of the Kingdom of God. Various groups and individuals hold to other items of conviction, which are not so universally accepted, and by many are regarded as secondary.

While, for centuries, Baptists generally have stood for the validity and value of two ordinances, baptism and the Lord's Supper, their insistence has been limited to those two; and their views as to the vital efficacy of those ordinances have gradually shaded into a conviction of their value as an aid to Christian witness and comfort, rather than as a vital necessity for Christian character. This increasing liberalism is especially characteristic of Northern Baptists, and has come about more or less through the increase of scholarship and the association and conference in the north of many more diverse groups than are found elsewhere in the land.

So-called fundamentalism, or reactionary and conservative bodies of thought revolving around the Scriptures and theology, is found somewhat among Northern Baptists; but this phenomenon is not peculiar to them, being found also in practically all evangelical communions.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1957), 1,555,360 (YAC, 1961, p. 252).]

195. Baptists—Free Will Baptists

SOURCE: CRB 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 175.

History. One of the influential factors in early Baptist history, especially in the Middle States, was a Welsh church, organized in Wales in 1701, which emigrated the same year to Pennsylvania. Two years later it received a grant of land known as the "Welsh Tract," where the colony prospered and was able to send a number of able ministers to various sections. One of these, Elder Paul Palmer, gathered a company in North Carolina and, in 1727, organized a church at Perquimans, in Chowan County. The principal element appears to have been Arminian, in sympathy with certain communities in Virginia which had received ministerial assistance from the General Baptists of England. There was no thought, however, of organizing a separate denomination, the object being primarily to provide a church home for the community, a place for the administration of the ordinances, and for the teaching of Christian ethics.

Under the labors of Elder Palmer and other ministers whom he ordained, additional churches were organized, which grew rapidly, considering the sparsely settled country, and an organization was formed, called a yearly meeting, including 16 churches, 16 ministers, and probably 1,000 communicants, in 1752. As the Philadelphia Association of Calvinistic Baptists increased in strength, a considerable number of these Arminian churches were won over to that confession, so that only four remained undivided. These, however, rallied, reorganized, and, being later reinforced by Free Will Baptists from the North, especially from Maine, regained most of the lost ground.

In the early part of their history they do not appear to have had a distinctive name. They were afterward called "Free Will Baptists," and most of them became known later as "Original Free Will Baptists." They were so listed in the report on religious bodies, census of 1890, but have since preferred to drop the term "Original" and be called simply "Free Will Baptists."

In 1836 they were represented by delegates in a General Conference of Free Will Baptists throughout the United States, but after the Civil War they held their own conferences. In recent years they have drawn to themselves a number of churches of similar faith throughout the Southern States, and have increased greatly in strength. They hold essentially the same doctrines as the Free Baptist churches of the North, now a part of the Northern Baptist Convention, have the same form of ecclesiastical polity, and are to some degree identified with the same interests, missionary and educational.

As the movement for the union of the Free Baptist churches with the Northern Baptist Convention developed, some who did not care to join in that movement affiliated with the Free Will Baptists.

Doctrine. The Free Will Baptists accept the five points of Arminianism as opposed to the five points of Calvinism, and in a confession of faith of 18 articles declare that Christ "freely gave himself a ransom for all, tasting death for every man"; that "God wants all to come to repentance"; and that "all men, at one time or another, are found in such capacity as that, through the grace of God, they may be eternally saved."

Believers' baptism is considered the only true principle, and immersion the only correct form; but no distinction is made in the invitation to the Lord's Supper, and Free Will Baptists uniformly practice open communion. They further believe in foot washing and anointing the sick with oil.

Organization. In polity the Free Will Baptists are distinctly congregational. [EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 200,000 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 252).]

196. Baptists—National Primitive Baptist Convention of the U.S.A. (formerly known as Colored Primitive Baptists)

SOURCE: CRB 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 233.

History. The history of the Colored Primitive Baptists is the same as that of the white Primitive Baptists up to the time of the Civil War. During slave times the colored Primitive Baptists had full membership in the white churches, although seats were arranged for them in a separate part of the house. Before the war some of the colored members of the churches were engaged in the work of the ministry, many of them being considered very able defenders and exponents of the doctrine of the Bible. Such men were sometimes bought from their owners and set free to go out and preach where they felt it was the Lord's will for them to go.

After the Negroes were freed, many of them desiring to be set apart into churches of their own, the white Primitive Baptists granted them letters certifying that they were in full fellowship and good standing; white preachers organized them into separate churches, ordained their preachers and deacons, and set them up in proper order, throughout the South; and thus, gradually, the colored Primitive Baptists became a separate denomination.

Doctrine and Organization. The doctrinal principles and the polity of the Colored Primitive Baptists are precisely the same as those of the white Primitive Baptists. Each local church is an independent body and has control of its own affairs, receiving and disciplining its own members; there is no appeal to a higher court.

About the year 1900 a "progressive" move was introduced among the Colored Primitive Baptists, and a large number of them began the organization of aid societies, conventions, and Sunday schools, some of these organizations being based on the payment of money—things which the Primitive Baptists have not engaged in and which they have always protested against.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1957), 80,983, (YAC, 1961, p. 253).]

197. Baptists—Negro Baptists

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 152, 153.

[p. 152] *History. The day of darkness.*—Although the first African slaves were brought to the Colonies in 1619, a long span of 154 years passed before we have an account of the first Negro Baptist Church. This was due to the fact that those who were the first purchasers of the Africans considered themselves as guardians of these heathen and hence, on becoming Christians, their numbers were added to the white churches. In time it became a question whether one Christian should enslave another. The step between guardianship and master was short and was soon taken. The results were written into the most inhuman laws ever promulgated by a civilized people. Later, there came a time when it was unlawful for Negroes to become Christians; when it was unlawful to build meeting houses for them; 150 long and cruel years of enslavement were meted out to these people. In the meantime, the spirit of abolition, born in the hearts of good men among the colonists, continued to grow and culminated in the Emancipation Proclamation issued by Abraham Lincoln, September 22, 1862. The proclamation went into effect January 1, 1863, which gave the emancipated people an opportunity to serve and worship God without interference.

A new day.—Hardly had the smoke of the Civil War lifted from a hundred battlefields when sympathetic friends, men and women, through the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, the Freedmen's Aid Society, the American Missionary Association, and kindred organizations, sent preachers and teachers to the 4,500,000 freedmen in all parts of the Southland.

The chance given through the instructions of those devoted friends, from pulpit and schoolroom, did much to make American Negroes today the most advanced group of Negroes in the world. Many of the wisest and best laymen in the group were and are members of Baptist churches; among these are: W. H. Williams, historian; Dr. Booker T. Washington, founder of Tuskegee Institute; Dr. R. R. Moton, principal emeritus of Tuskegee Institute; Mrs. Mary Talbert, who saved Anacostia, the home of Frederick Douglass, as a shrine for the race; John Mitchell, Jr., the fighting editor; Mrs. Maggie L. Walker, the only woman banker of the Negro race; Carter G. Woodson, eminent historian; Miss Nannie H. Burroughs, educator and foundress of the National Trade and

Professional School for Women and Girls; C. C. Spaulding, the insurance wizard; Miss Jennie Porter, great organizer and teacher; T. C. Windham, contractor and builder; Dr. A. M. Townsend, financial genius; W. H. Wright, great insurance man and banker; Dr. John Hope, educator; with scores of other prominent and influential men and women.

Revival period.—From 1862 to 1890 has fittingly been called the revival period in the religious life of the Negro people. They organized churches by the thousands, baptized converts by the hundreds of thousands, so that within the brief interval of 15 years after the emancipation, approximately 1,000,000 former slaves and their children had been gathered into Baptist churches alone... [The baptized members,] each influencing presumably an average of 3 persons, have had a tremendous power over a large percentage of the race group of more than 12,000,000 souls.

The National Baptist Convention.—The first inception of the present National Baptist Convention was born in Montgomery, Ala., November 24, 1880, when 59 delegates reported and 9 States were represented. Rev. W. H. McAlpine was chosen as the first president. The Foreign Mission Baptist Convention of the United States of America was organized by this body. The American National Baptist Convention was organized in St. Louis, in 1886; the American National Educational Baptist Convention was organized in the District of Columbia in 1893. In 1895 all of these bodies united at Atlanta, Ga., and organized the [p. 153] National Baptist Convention of the United States of America. It was incorporated in 1915 under the laws of the District of Columbia. They definitely systematized the work to be carried on by boards selected by the parent body...

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrine and polity the Negro Baptists are in close accord with the Northern and Southern Conventions. They represent the more strictly Calvinistic type in doctrine and in polity, "tell it to the Church," and refer the settlement of any difficulties that may arise to an ecclesiastical council. Their churches unite in associations, generally along State lines, for the discussion of topics relating to church life, the regulation of difficulties, the collection of statistics, and the presentation of annual reports. These meetings are consultative and advisory rather than authoritative.

In addition to the county and district associations there are State conventions which are held for the consideration of the distinctively missionary side of church life and not infrequently extend beyond State lines.

The lack of close ecclesiastical relations, characteristic of all Baptist bodies, is emphasized in the Negro Baptist churches, with the result that it has been and is very difficult to obtain satisfactory statistics of the denomination...

No accurate or definite statement of activities of the National Baptist Convention of America has been furnished for 1936. The report furnished is for the National Baptist Convention (incorporated), organized in 1915; its agencies for propagating its work are modeled in every detail after the National Baptist Convention of the United States of America.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership: National Baptist Convention of America, 2,668,799 (1956); National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., 5,000,000 (1958). See *YAC*, 1961, p. 252.

There seems to be some discrepancy between the last paragraph and the statement on the present status of the two conventions in *YAC* lists first (p. 21) the National Baptist Convention of America, organized 1880; then the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc. (the one incorporated in 1915?), which is described, rather confusingly, as the "older and parent convention of Negro Baptists," to be distinguished from the National Baptist Convention of America, known as the "unincorporated" body. It is not clear how a church incorporated in 1915 can be the parent of the body organized in 1880. Perhaps there is a conflict

of claims of priority. In any case, these are the two bodies now existing. For other Negro Baptists, see Baptists—National Primitive Baptist Convention of the U.S.A.]

198. Baptists—Primitive Baptists

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 224, 225.

[p. 224] *History*. With the development of organized church life shown in the formation of benevolent and particularly of missionary societies, of Sunday schools and similar organizations, during the early part of the nineteenth century, there developed also considerable opposition to such new ideas. The more independent church associations were based on the principle that the Scriptures are the sole and sufficient authority for everything connected with the religious life. The position taken was, in brief, that there were no missionary societies in the apostles' days, and therefore there should be none today. Apart from this, however, there seemed to many to be inherent in these societies a centralization of authority which was not at all in accord with the spirit of the gospel. Sunday schools also were considered unauthorized of God, as was everything connected with church life that was not included in the clearly presented statement of the New Testament writers. These views appeared particularly in some of the Baptist bodies, and occasioned what became known as the "antimission movement."

Apparently the first definite announcement of this position was made by the Kehukee Baptist Association of North Carolina, formed in 1765, at its meeting with the Kehukee Church in Halifax County in 1827, although similar views were expressed by a Georgia association in 1826. The Kehukee Association unanimously condemned all "modern, money-based, so-called benevolent societies," as contrary to the teaching and practice of Christ and His apostles, and, furthermore, announced that it could no longer fellowship with churches which indorsed such societies. In 1832 a similar course was adopted by the Country Line Association, at its session with Deep Creek Church in Alamance (then Orange) County, N. C., and by a "Convention of the Middle States" at Black Rock Church, Baltimore County, Md. Other Baptist associations in the North, South, East, and West, during the next 10 years, took similar action. In 1835 the Chemung Association, including churches in New York and Pennsylvania, adopted a resolution declaring that as a number of associations with which it had been in correspondence had "departed from the simplicity of the doctrine and practice of the gospel of Christ, *** uniting themselves with the world and what are falsely called benevolent societies founded upon a money basis," and preaching a gospel "differing from the gospel of Christ," it would not continue in fellowship with them, and urged all Baptists who could not approve prove the new ideas to come out and be separate from those holding them.

The various Primitive Baptist associations have never organized as a denomination and have no State conventions or general bodies of any kind. For the purpose of selfinterpretation, each association adopted the custom of printing in its annual minutes a statement of its articles of faith, constitution, and rules of order. This presentation was examined carefully by every other association, and, if it was approved, fellowship was accorded by sending to its meetings messengers or letters reporting on the general state of the churches. Any association that did not meet with approval was simply dropped from fellowship. The result was that, while there are certain links binding the different associations together, they are easily broken, and the lack of any central body or even of any uniform statement of belief serves to prevent united action. Another factor in the situation has been the difficulty of intercommunication in many parts of the South. As groups of associations developed in North and South Carolina and Georgia, they drew together, as did those in western Tennessee, northern Mississippi and Alabama, and Missouri, while those in Texas had little intercourse with any of the others. Occasional fraternal visits were made through all of these sections, and a quasi union or fellowship was kept up, but this has not been sufficient to secure what might be called denominational individually or growth. This is apparent in the variety of names, some friendly and some derisive, which have been applied to them, such as "Primitive," "Old School," "Regular," "Antimission," and "Hard Shell." In general, the term "Primitive" has been the one most widely used and accepted.

Doctrine. In matters of doctrine the Primitive Baptists are strongly Calvinistic. Some of their minutes have 11 articles of faith, some less, some more. They declare that by Adam's fall or transgression all his posterity became sinners in the sight [p. 225] of God; that the corruption of human nature is total; that man cannot, by his own free will and ability, reinstate himself in the favor of God; that God elected or chose His people in Christ before the foundation of the world; that sinners are justified only by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them; that the saints will all be preserved and will persevere in grace unto heavenly glory, and that not one of them will be finally lost; that baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances of the gospel in the church to the end of time; that the institutions of the day (church societies) are the inventions of men, and are not to be fellowshiped; that Christ will come a second time, in person or bodily presence to the world, and will raise all the dead, judge the human race, send the wicked to everlasting punishment, and welcome the righteous to everlasting happiness. They also hold uncompromisingly to the full verbal inspiration of the Old and New Testament Scriptures.

Some Primitive Baptists maintain, as formulated in the London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689, that God eternally decreed or predestinated all things, yet in such a manner that He does not compel anyone to sin, and that He does not approve or fellowship sin. The great majority of them, however, maintain that, while God foreknew all things, and while He foreordained to suffer, or not prevent sin, His active and efficient predestination is limited to the eternal salvation of all his people, and everything necessary thereunto; and all Primitive Baptists believe that every sane human being is accountable for all his thoughts, words, and actions.

Immersion of believers is the only form of baptism which they acknowledge, and they insist that this is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper. They hold that no minister has any right to administer the ordinances unless he has been called of God, come under the laying on of hands by a presbytery, and is in fellowship with the church of which he is a member; and that he has no right to permit any clergyman who has not these qualifications to assist in the administering of these ordinances. In some sections the Primitive Baptists believe that washing the saints' feet should be practiced in the church, usually in connection with the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Of late years a group of churches in Georgia have used organs in public worship, but most of the churches are earnestly opposed to the use of instrumental music of any kind in church services. Sunday schools and secret societies are unauthorized. These are claimed not to be in accordance with the teachings of the Bible.

Organization. In polity the Primitive Baptists are congregational in that they believe that each church should govern itself according to the laws of Christ as found in the New Testament, and that no minister, association, or convention has any authority.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1950), 72,000 (YAC, 1961, p. 253).]

199. Baptists—Seventh Day Baptist

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 163-165.

[p. 163] *History*. From the earliest periods of the Christian church there have been those who claimed, in respect to the Sabbath, that Christ simply discarded the false restrictions with which the Pharisees had burdened and perverted the Sabbath, but that otherwise He preserved it in its full significance. Accordingly, they have held that loyalty to the law of God and to the ordinances and example of Christ required continuance of the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath. Although the Apostolic church and some branches of it in every period since Christ have observed the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and practiced immersion, Seventh Day Baptists do not claim an unbroken succession in the matter of church organization before the Reformation.

At the time of the Reformation, when the Bible was accepted as the supreme authority on all questions of faith and conduct, the question of the Sabbath again came to the front, and a considerable number forsook the observance of Sunday and accepted the seventh day as the Sabbath.

The date at which the observance of the Sabbath was introduced into Great Britain is somewhat uncertain. Nicholas Bounde's book, the first book on the sabbath question to be published in the English language, appeared in 1595, only to be suppressed 4 years later. During the next century, numerous other writers on this subject flourished.

There appears to be evidence that, in all, upwards of 30 Seventh Day Baptist churches have been established in Great Britain and Ireland. The most important of these are the Mill Yard, and the Pinner's Hall churches, both of London, England.

The Seventh Day Baptist Church of Mill Yard, Goodman's Fields, London, probably had its origin in 1617, and may be said to have been founded by John Trask and his wife—both school teachers—who were imprisoned for their views upon the Sabbath. The membership roll of this church contains, among its multitude of names, those of the following: Dr. Peter Chamberlen, royal physician to three kings and queens of England; John James, the martyr; Nathaniel Bailey, the compiler of Bailey's Dictionary (upon which Johnson based his famous dictionary), as well as a prolific editor of classical text books; William Tempest, F. R. S., barrister and poet; William Henry Black, archeologist; and others.

The Seventh Day Baptist Church of Pinner's Hall, Broad Street, London, was organized March 5, 1676, at his home, by Rev. Francis Bampfield, Speaker of the House of Commons, under [p. 164] Richard Cromwell, was also a Seventh Day Baptist; and the four generations of famous preachers by the name of Stennett, two of whom were Rev. Joseph Stennett, 2d, D. D., and Rev. Samuel Stennett, D. D.

In 1664 Stephen Mumford, a Seventh Day Baptist, came from London and settled at Newport, R. I. His observance of the Sabbath soon attracted attention, and several members of the Newport church adopted his views and practices, though they did not change their church relation until December 23, 1671 (Old Style), when they organized the first Seventh Day Baptist Church in America. At first this church was composed of those of like faith and practice throughout southern Rhode Island, but in a few years there were groups in various other parts of the colony, as well as in Massachusetts and Connecticut, who joined the church. Seventh Day Baptists in Rhode Island were colaborers with both Roger Williams and Dr. John Clark in establishing the colony on the principles of civil and religious liberty. In doing this they suffered imprisonment and other forms of persecution. They also joined with the Baptists in founding and supporting Brown University; and when the struggle with the mother country came they were among the foremost in the colony in the struggle with the mother country came they were among the foremost in the colony in the struggle that secured independence and established the Union.

Some 13 years after the organization of the Newport church, or about 1684, Abel Noble came to America and settled a few miles distant from Philadelphia. Subsequently he became a Seventh Day Baptist, through contact with Rev. William Gillette, M. D., a Seventh Day Baptist clergyman from New England. Abel Noble presented the claims of the Sabbath to his Keithian Baptist neighbors, with the result that some half dozen Seventh Day Baptist churches were organized in and near Philadelphia about the year 1700. Soon after this, or in 1705, Edmund Dunham, who formerly was a licensed preacher in the Baptist church, led in organizing a Seventh Day Baptist church in Piscataway, Middlesex County, N. J.

Under the influence of churches in these three centers (Newport, R. I., Philadelphia, Pa., and Piscataway, N. J.), and fostered by them, Seventh Day Baptist churches have been organized in many parts of the United States, and in China, India, Java, Germany, the Netherlands, Africa, South America, and Jamaica, British West Indies. There are 10 or more other denominations in the United States observing the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, all of which have received their Sabbath teaching from Seventh Day Baptists. Chief among these communions are the German Seventh Day Baptists, founded at Ephrata, Pa., in 1728, and the Seventh Day Adventists, whose organization grew out of the Millerite movement in the middle of the last century.

Doctrine. In doctrine Seventh Day Baptists are evangelical and, except for the Sabbath, are in harmony with other Baptists, particularly those of the Northern Convention and Southern Convention. They stand with the Baptists for salvation through personal faith in Christ, believers' baptism on confession of faith, soul liberty, civil liberty, independence of the local church with Christ as its sole head, the Bible in the hands of all men, and the right of everyone to interpret its teachings for himself. They believe that there are only two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, and that the seventh day of the week should be observed as the Sabbath.

Originally Seventh Day Baptists were restricted communionists and invitations to the Lord's Supper were given "to members of churches in sister relation"; but gradually this has changed, and by common consent invitations are now generally given to Christians of all churches. Neither do Seventh Day Baptists forbid their members to partake of the communion in other churches, the matter being left to the private judgment of each individual. Church membership is granted, however, only to those who have been immersed.

Seventh Day Baptists believe that the seventh day of the week should be observed as the Sabbath, not alone because its observance began with the history of man, was held sacred by the patriarchs and prophets, and commanded from Sinai, but primarily because it was observed and held sacred by Christ and the Apostolic Church. They (Seventh Day Baptists) believe Christ to be the final sanction for the Sabbath.

While Seventh Day Baptists for more than 300 years have held firmly to these doctrines they have always believed Christ would have them be friendly with other Christians and cooperate with them in every good work. Their pastors have [p. 165]

exchanged with pastors of other denominations, their ministers have served as pastors of Baptist churches, in their associations and the General Conferences they have interchanged delegates, and in more recent years they have belonged to the National Bible School organizations, the United Society of Christian Endeavor, the Foreign Missions Conference, the Layman's Missionary Movement, the Federal Council of Churches, the Faith and Order Movement, and other kindred efforts looking toward united work on the part of Christ's followers.

Organization. Since the policy of Seventh Day Baptist churches is that of a pure democracy, that fact determines the nature of the organizations among them, as well as the form of the government of the church itself. Each local church is independent in its own affairs, and all union for denominational work is voluntary. For administrative purposes chiefly, the churches are organized into associations and a General Conference, which, however, have only advisory powers. The General Conference was organized in 1802 and grew out of a yearly meeting established in 1684.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1957), 5,963 (YAC, 1961, p. 253)].

200. Baptists—Southern Baptist Convention

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 140, 141.

[p. 140] *History*. At the time of the formation of the Triennial Convention in 1814 the Baptist population was chiefly in New England and the middle and southern seaboard States, and the center of executive administration was located first at Philadelphia and subsequently at Boston. With the growth of migration to the South and the Southwest, the number of churches in those sections of the country greatly increased, and it became difficult to associate in a single advisory council more than a small percentage of the Baptist churches in the United States, especially as means of transportation were deficient and expensive. At the same time the question of slavery occasioned much discussion between the two sections, which was brought to a focus by the impression in the Southern States that the foreign mission society of the denomination, which had its headquarters in Boston, was so thoroughly antislavery that it would not accept a slaveholder as a missionary. A letter addressed direct to that organization by the Alabama State Convention, asking for information, brought a courteous reply to the effect that while the board refused to recognize the claim of anyone, slaveholder or nonslaveholder, to appointment, "one thing was certain, they could never be a party to any arrangement which would imply approbation of slavery."

This decision led to formal withdrawal of the various Southern State conventions and auxiliary foreign mission societies and to the organization at Augusta, Ga., in May 1845, of the Southern Baptist Convention. About 300 churches were represented by delegates from Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Kentucky, the largest number of Baptist churches in the South at that period being in Virginia. In all the discussions and in the final act of organization, there was very little bitterness, the prevalent conviction being that those of kindred thought would work more effectively together, and that, in view of the sharp differences between the two sections, it was wiser that separate organizations should exist. The specific purpose of the convention, as plainly set forth, was to carry out the benevolent purposes of those composing it; to elicit, combine, and direct the energies of the denomination for the propagation of the Gospel; and to cooperate for the promotion of foreign and domestic missions and other important objects, while respecting the independence and equal rights of the local churches.

Previous to the Civil War the convention met biennially; since that time, for the most part, it has met annually. At first, its efforts were largely given over to foreign missions, under the direction of the Foreign Mission Board at Richmond, Va., and to home ("domestic") missions under the direction of the Home Mission Board located first at Marion, Ala., and later at Atlanta, Ga., although a number of the cooperating State Conventions were fostering schools and colleges of various types. The Home Mission board, from the first, moreover, gave its most earnest consideration and its largest help to the mission work carried on in the several States, notably in the States where Baptists were weak. From 1845 onward, therefore, the Southern Baptist Convention fostered foreign missions, home missions, and State missions…

[p. 141] Up to 1860 the missionary work of the convention was carried forward with marked enthusiasm and success. Every department of denominational life was quickened by the increased sense of responsibility and the increased confidence that sprang from direct control. Parallel with this was the growth in numbers and liberality of the denomination, which was strengthened by the standing conflict with the anti-missionary spirit rife throughout the South, and manifest more particularly among the Primitive or "Hardshell," the United, and Regular Baptists. The denomination suffered severely during the Civil War, but since that time has shown great prosperity.

As was inevitable, emancipation brought about great changes in racial conditions, and, whereas before the war the Negro Baptists were, in large part, identified with the white churches, after the war they formed their own churches, associations, and State conventions, and, later, the National Baptists Convention. The first Negro association to be formed under the new regime was one in Louisiana in 1865, and it was soon followed by others in North Carolina, Alabama, Virginia, Arkansas, and Kentucky. An indication of the development of the Southern convention is found in the fact that, whereas in 1845 the membership of the churches identified with it was 352,950, of whom 222,950 were white and 130,000 Negro, the report for 1890 showed a membership of 1,280,066, consisting of whites alone and by 1935 had become the leading non-Catholic religious body in America, reporting a total of 4,389,417 members...

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrine the Southern Baptist churches are in harmony with those of the North, although in general they are more strictly Calvinistic, and the New Hampshire Confession of Faith is more firmly held than in the Northern churches. In polity, likewise, there is no essential difference. The Northern and Southern churches interchange membership and ministry on terms of perfect equality, and their separation is purely administrative in character, not doctrinal or ecclesiastical.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 9,485,276 (YAC, 1961, p. 253).]

201. Beast, First, of Revelation 13—Note in Douay Bible

SOURCE: Douay Bible (New York: Benziger, [1914]), Note on Rev. 13:1. [See FRS No. 59.]

Chap. XIII, Ver. 1. *A beast*. This first beast with seven heads and ten horns, is probably the whole company of infidels, enemies and persecutors of the people of God, from the beginning to the end of the world. The seven heads are seven kings, that is, seven principal kingdoms or empires, which have exercised, or shall exercise, tyrannical power over the people of God: of these, five were then fallen, *viz.:*—the Egyptian, Assyrian, Chaldean, Persian, and Grecian monarchies: one was present, *viz.*, and chiefest was to come *viz.*, the great Antichrist and his empire. The ten horns may be understood of ten lesser persecutors.

202. Beast, Number of—Note in Douay Bible

SOURCE: Douay Bible (New York: Benziger, [1914]), Note on Rev. 13:18. [See FRS No. 59.]

Ver. 18. Six hundred sixty-six. The numeral letters of his name shall make up this number.

203. Beast, Second, of Revelation 13, John Wesley's placement of, in Asia

SOURCE: John Wesley, Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament (reprint; London: The Epworth Press, 1952), p. 1010, comment on Rev. 13:11.

And I saw another wild beast—So he is once termed, to show his fierceness 11 and strength; but in all other places, 'the false prophet.' He comes to confirm the kingdom of the first beast. Coming up—After the other had long exercised his authority. Out of the earth—Out of Asia. But he is not vet come, though he cannot be far off; for he is to appear at the end of the forty-two months of the first beast.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This interpretation, from a book first published in 1755, anticipates the rise of this beast after the 42 months, but it should be noted that it expects the rise in Asia.]

204. Belshazzar, Associated With His Father Nabonidus in Oaths SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, Nabonidus and Belshazzar (Yale Oriental Series, Researches, Vol. 15 New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 96, 97.

[p. 96] Cuneiform texts dated in the twelfth year of Nabonidus record oath formulas which are unusual in that Belshazzar is associated with his father on terms of approximate equality. Pinches was the first to publish such an oath formula, the wording of which is as follows [transliterated cuneiform text omitted]: ...

¹Ishi-Amurru, the son of Nûranu, by the gods Bêl, ²Nabû, the Bêltu of Erech and Nanâ, the decrees of ³of Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, and Belshazzar, ^{4a}the son of the king, took oath as follows.

Two texts in the Yale Babylonian Collection, also dated in the twelfth year of Nabonidus' reign, contain similar oaths...

These three passages show conclusively that the Babylonian oath formula in the twelfth year of the reign of Nabonidus placed Belshazzar on an equality with his father...

[p. 97] From the time of Hammurabi it was the custom of Babylonians to swear by the gods and the reigning king.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines of the original cuneiform text.]

205. Belshazzar, Called Eldest Son of Nabonidus

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, Nabonidus and Belshazzar (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 93-95.

[p. 93] Four cylinders found in the ziggurat of Ur contain the following prayer of

Nabonidus [transliterated cuneiform text omitted]: ... ¹⁹As for me, Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, ^{20,21}save me from sinning against thy great divinity and ^{22,} ²³grant life unto distant days as a gift. ²⁴Furthermore, as for Belshazzar, ²⁵the first son ²⁶proceeding from my loins, [p. 94] ^{27, 28}place in his heart fear of thy great divinity and ^{29, 30}let him not turn to sinning; ³¹let him be satisfied with fulness of life.

A variant of the above text occurs twice in a large cylinder of Nabonidus found at Ur, as the following passage indicates [transliteration omitted]: ...

²³[As for me], Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, ^{24, 25}[the venerator of] thy great divinity, may I be satisfied with fulness of life, ^{26, 27}[and as for] Belshazzar, the first son proceeding from my loins, lengthen his days; let him not turn to sinning.

Nabonidus, in supplicating the moon god of the temple at Ur in the earnest petitions given above, places Belshazzar in close association with himself. Such association of a royal father and his son in religious entreaty is rare in cuneiform literature. One other

instance can be mentioned. This is the association of Cambyses with Cyrus, his father, in the inscription of the latter known as the *Cyrus Cylinder*...

[p. 95] A similar association of Belshazzar with Nabonidus suggests that an analogous political elevation had come to the former and that Belshazzar had some share in ruling the Babylonian empire.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines of the original cuneiform text.]

206. Belshazzar—Father's Long Absence From Babylon

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 111–113.

[p. 111] Of supreme importance is the fact that the *Nabonidus Chronicle* records that Nabonidus was in a city called Têmâ in the seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh years of his reign. The exact statements are as follows [transliterated cuneiform text omitted]: ...

In the seventh year the king (was) in the city of Těmâ. The son of the king, the princes (and) his troops (were) in the land of Akkad...

In the ninth year of Nabonidus, the king, (was in) the city of Têmâ. The son of the king, the princes and the troops (were) in the land of Akkad...

[p. 112] In the tenth year the king (was) in the city of Têmâ. The son of the king, the princes and his troops (were) in the land of Akkad...

In the eleventh year the king (was) in the city of Têmâ. The son of the king, the princes and his army (were) in the land of Akkad...

Each of the above initial statements for the seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh years of the reign of Nabonidus is supplemented by the following comment: [transliteration omitted]: ...

The king for the month Nisan did not come to Babylon; Nabû did not come to Babylon; Bêl did not go forth (from Esagila); the New Year's festival ceased (*i.e.* was not celebrated).

The passages of the *Nabonidus Chronicle* quoted above indicate that Nabonidus was in city of Têmâ during the years mentioned and that the son of the king, *i.e.* Belshazzar, was with the princes and [p. 113] troops in the land of Akkad. The non-observance of the New Year's festival was a natural result of Nabonidus' prolonged sojourn at a great distance from Babylon.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines as they appear in the original cuneiform text.]

207. Belshazzar, Kingship of, With His Father

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 105–107.

[p. 105] The remarkable inscription published by Sidney Smith under the title *A Persian Verse Account of Nabonidus* [p. 106] ... indicates that affairs in Babylonia were entrusted to Belshazzar, in order that Nabonidus might proceed against Têm. The campaign is described with graphic details...

campaign is described with graphic details... ¹⁸He entrusted a camp to his eldest, firstborn son; ¹⁹the troops of the land he sent with him. ²⁰He freed his hand; he entrusted the kingship to him. ²¹Then he himself undertook a distant campaign; ²²the power of the land of Akkad advanced with him; ²³towards $T \Box mf$ in the midst of the Westland [p. 170] he set his face. ²⁴He undertook a distant campaign on a road not within reach of old. ²⁵He slew the prince of $T \Box mf$ with the [sword]; ²⁶ the dwellers in his city (and) country, all of them they slaughtered. ²⁷Then he himself established his dwelling [in Têmâ]; the power of the land of Akkad... That city he made and glorious; he made ...; ²⁹they made it like the palace of Babylon...

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines of the original cuneiform text.]

208. Belshazzar, Kingship of, With His Father Nabonidus

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 134, 135.

[p. 134] Inscriptions of varied type have been adduced as proof that Belshazzar was an administrator of government in Babylonia during Nabonidus' absence in Arabia. The historical texts quoted are of fundamental importance, since the two inscriptions available for interpretation, viz., *A Persian Verse Account of Nabonidus* and the *Nabonidus Chronicle*, contain statements which are not contradictory, but which lead to the same conclusion. One of the records is a descriptive account; the other is an annalistic chronicle. This difference in their character as literature adds significance to the fact that they supplement and corroborate one another so adequately. The former indicates that Nabonidus conquered Têmâ of his reign; the latter shows that Nabonidus was in the Westland soon after he became king and that he was at Têmâ in the seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh years of his reign. Each inscription, unsupported by the other, Belshazzar's administrative position in Babylonia during the period when Nabonidus was interested in Têmâ. Their combined testimony is authentic evidence of the highest value.

Another type of Neo-Babylonian literature, viz., records of business transactions dated in the reign of Nabonidus, have been found to reveal the same historical situation. The validity of the contents of contract tablets is unquestioned. Coming from ancient archives, these documents are genuine and reliable. Each tablet represents a [p. 135] transaction which occurred at a certain time and place. The interested persons are mentioned by name, temple officials often participating in the agreement which is recorded. These considerations emphasize the worth of the two texts which show that there was contact by means of camel transportation between Erech and Têmâ during the reign of Nabonidus. A Neo-Babylonian sphere of influence in the heart of Arabia is indicated. The inscription which refers to the fact that food for the king was taken to Têmâ in the tenth year of Nabonidus is direct corroboration of the information conveyed by the *Nabonidus Chronicle*. Data presented by the two leases of land, one from the king himself in the first year of Nabonidus reign and one from Belshazzar in the eleventh year of his father's reign, may be regarded as throwing a great deal of light upon the period. Belshazzar is portrayed as exercising a jurisdiction which was Nabonidus' prerogative before he went to Têmâ.

209. Belshazzar, Kingship of, With Nabonidus for Some Years SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), p. 193.

A cuneiform text states that Nabonidus empowered Belshazzar with 'the kingship' in the third year of his reign. All accessible cuneiform documents capable of throwing light upon the situation indicate that Belshazzar occupied this high position until the fourteenth year of Nabonidus' reign and the probability is that he functioned as co-regent until the end of the reign. There is no room for doubt that Belshazzar ruled in the kingdom next to Nabonidus. The writer of the fifth chapter of Daniel comports with cuneiform data in picturing the chief character of his narrative as having enjoyed kingly dignity.

210. Belshazzar, Last Feast of—Arnold's Descriptive Poem SOURCE: Edwin Arnold, "The Feast of Belshazzar," *Poems* (Boston: Roberts Brothers), pp. 160–170. [p. 160] High on a throne of ivory and gold, From crown to footstool clad in purple fold, Lord of the east from sea to distant sea The king Belshazzar feasteth royally—... Vessels of silver, cups of crusted gold Blush with a brighter red than all they hold; ... [p. 161] And bright and brighter at the festal board The flagons bubble and the wines are poured; ...

Whence came the anxious eye, the altered tone, The dull presentiment no heart would own, That ever changed the smiling to a sigh Sudden as sea-bird flashing from the sky:— It is not that they know the spoiler waits Harnessed for battle at the brazen gates...

[p. 162] The king hath felt it and the heart Heaved the broad purple of his belted breast;
Sudden he speaks—"What! doth the beaded juice "Savor like hyssop that ye scorn its use?
"Wear ye so pitiful and sad a soul "That tramp of foeman scares ye from the bowl? ...
[p. 163] "No—let them batter till the brazen bars "Ring merry mocking of their idle wars— "Their fall is fated for to-morrow's sun,
"The lion rouses when his feast is done:—
"Crown me a cup—and fill the bowls we brought "From Judah's temple when the fight was fought— "Drink, till the merry madness fill the soul
"To Salem's conqueror in Salem's bowl..."

His eager lips are on the jewelled brink, Hath the cup poison that he doubts to drink? Is there a spell upon the sparkling gold, That so his fevered fingers quit their hold? Whom sees he where he gazes? what is there Freezing his vision into fearful stare? Follow his lifted arm and lighted eye And watch with them the wondrous mystery.—

[p. 164] There cometh forth a hand—upon the stone, Graving the symbols of a speech unknown;
Fingers like mortal fingers—leaving there
The blank wall flashing characters of fear;—
And still it glideth silently and slow,
And still beneath the spectral letters grow—
Now the scroll endeth—now the seal is set—
The hand is gone—the record tarries yet.—

As one who waits the warrant of his death, With pale lips parted and with bridled breath— They watch the sign and dare not turn to seek Their fear reflected in their fellows' cheek— But stand as statues where the life is none, Half the jest uttered—half the laughter done...

With wand of ebony and sable stole Chaldaea's wisest scan the spectral scroll[p. 165] Strong in the lessons of a lying art
Each comes to gaze, but gazes to depart—
And still for mystic sign and muttered spell
The graven letters guard their secret well—
Gleam they for warning—glare they to condemn—
God speaketh,—but he speaketh not for them...

[p. 166] So in the silence of that awful hour When baffled magic mourned its parted power— When kings were pale and satraps shook for fear, A woman speaketh—and the wisest hear;— She—the high daughter of a thousand thrones Telling with trembling lip and timid tones Of him the Captive, in the feast forgot, Who readeth visions—him, whose wondrous lot Sends him to lighten doubt and lessen gloom, And gaze undazzled on the days to come— Daniel the Hebrew, such his name and race, Held by a monarch highest in his grace, He may declare—Oh!—bid them quickly send, So may the mystery have happy end! ...

[p. 167] So through the hall the Prophet passed along,
So from before him fell the festal throng.
By broken wassail-cup, and wine o'erthrown
Pressed he still onward for the monarch's throne.
His spirit failed him not—his quiet eye
Lost not its light for earthly majesty;
His lip was steady and his accent clear,
"The king hath needed me, and I am here."—

"Art thou the Prophet? read me yonder scroll "Whose undeciphered horror daunts my soul— "There shall be guerdon for the grateful task, "Fitted for me to give, for thee to ask— "A chain to deck thee—and a robe to grace, "Thine the third throne and thou the third in place." ...

[p. 168]"Keep for thyself the guerdon and the gold—
"What God hath graved, God's prophet must unfold…
[p. 169]"Hear what he sayeth now, 'Thy race is run, "The years are numbered and the days are done, "Thy soul hath mounted in the scale of fate, "The Lord hath weighed thee and thou lackest weight; "Now in thy palace porch the spoilers stand, "To seize thy sceptre, to divide thy land.""

[p. 170] He ended—and his passing foot was heard, But none made answer, not a lip was stirred— Mute the free tongue and bent the fearless brow,— The mystic letters had their meaning now! Soon came there other sound—the clash of steel, The heavy ringing of the iron heel— The curse in dying, and the cry for life, The bloody voices of the battle strife.—

That night they slew him on his father's throne, The deed unnoticed and the hand unknown; Crownless and sceptreless Belshazzar lay, A robe of purple, round a form of clay.

211. Belshazzar, Last Feast of—Palace Banquet Hall

SOURCE: Robert Koldewey, *The Excavations at Babylon*, trans. by Agnes S. Johns (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1914), pp. 103, 104. Used by permission.

[p. 103] To the south lies the largest chamber of the Citadel, the throneroom of the Babylonian kings. It is so clearly marked out for this purpose that no reasonable doubt can be felt as to its having been used as their principal audience chamber. If any one should desire to localise the scene of Belshazzar's eventual banquet, he can surely place it with complete accuracy in this immense room. It is 17 metres broad and 52 metres long. The walls on the longest side [p. 104] are 6 metres thick, considerably in excess of those at the ends, and lead us to suppose that they supported a barrel-vaulting, of which, however, there is no proof. A great central door and two equally important side doors open upon the court. Immediately opposite the main door in the back wall there is a doubly recessed niche in which doubtless the throne stood, so that the king could be visible to those who stood in the court, an arrangement similar to that of the Ninmach temple, where the temple statue could be clearly seen from the court. The pavement does not consist in the usual manner of a single layer of brick, but of at least six, which were laid in asphalt and thus formed a homogeneous solid platform which rested on a projecting ledge built out from the walls. As we have already seen from the east gate, the walls of these chambers were washed over with white gypsum.

The facade of the court was very strikingly decorated with richly ornamented enamelled tiles (*M.D.O.-G.* No. 13). On a dark blue ground are yellow columns with bright blue capitals, placed near together and connected by a series of palmettos. The capitals with the bold curves of their double volutes remind us of the forms long known to us in Cyprus... Above was a frieze of white double palmettos, bordered below by a band of squares, alternately yellow, black, and white. The various colours of the decoration were effectively heightened on the dark background by means of white borders.

212. Belshazzar—Relationship to Nebuchadnezzar

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 38, 43, 59, 60–63, 70.

[p. 38] After explaining the achievements of Nitocris, Herodotus ... affirms (*a*) that Cyrus undertook an expedition against the son of Nitocris, (*b*) that the husband of Nitocris was Labynetus, *i.e.* Nabonidus, and (*c*) that the son of 'that woman' possessed the name of his father as well as the sovereign power of Babylonia... [p. 43] Heretofore critical students of Herodotus' account [i. 188] have favored the view that he really looked upon Nitocris as the wife of Nebuchadnezzar and the mother of Nabonidus. There is very little that can be used in defense of this interpretation. Enough evidence has been presented to make it apparent (*a*) that the Labynetus of Herodotus was Nabonidus, that Nitocris was the wife of Nabonidus, and (*c*) that their son was a man of authority in the

kingdom... [p. 59] [Many facts] indicate the probability as well as the possibility that Nebuchadrezzar wedded an Egyptian princess. [p. 60] ... That a daughter of Nebuchadrezzar by his Egyptian consort should have been named Nitocris is entirely believable, and that this daughter should have become the spouse of Nabonidus may be looked upon as a normal incident in the course of events.

The view that Nabonidus was connected with the family of Nebuchadrezzar by marriage is supported by a reasonable interpretation of data derived from ancient documents, as the following summary reveals:

(*a*) It is an established fact that Nabonidus married long enough before he became king to have a son old enough to be entrusted with the kingship in the third year (553 B.C.) of his reign. In addition to this, there is evidence that Belshazzar was mature enough in the accession year (560 B.C.) of Neriglissar to perform the functions of a chief officer of the king. Therefore it is very probable that Nabonidus was no longer unmarried in 585 B.C., when he acted as a mediator between the Lydians and the Medes. If Nitocris, his wife, was a daughter of Nebuchadrezzar, his appointment as a peace envoy to act with the Syennesis of Cilicia finds a ready explanation. A most suggestive parallel exists in the part played by Neriglissar, a son-in-law of Nebuchadrezzar, at Jerusalem in 586 B.C.

[p. 61] (b) If the wife of Nabonidus was a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, one would expect the firstborn son of this union to be given responsibility in a position of prominence as soon as he was old enough to assume it. A grandson of Nebuchadrezzar would rise quickly to a post of authority. The reference [in a Babylonian record] to a Belshazzar who served as a chief officer of the king before Nabonidus ascended the throne supplies this link in the chain of evidence...

[p. 62] (e) Belshazzar was made coregent in the third year of Nabonidus' reign. His early exaltation to kingly rank may be best explained on the assumption that he was Nebuchadrezzar's grandson through Nitocris, his mother. With the blood of the kings of the Neo-Babylonian dynasty in his veins, he could inspire an allegiance equal to that which was shown his father, who as actual king was not debarred from his supreme position until Cyrus captured Babylon in 539 B.C. ...

[p. 63] (*h*) In the time of Darius the Great two persons, viz., Nidintu-Bêl, the Babylonian, and Arahu, the Armenian, pretended to be Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabonidus, for the purpose of stirring up revolt against the Persian king. This indicates that Nabonidus must have had a son who was called Nebuchadrezzar, or else such claims could not have been made. What is more natural than that a son of Nabonidus should have been called Nebuchadrezzar if Nitocris, the mother, was a daughter of Nebuchadrezzar, the famous Neo-Babylonian king? ...

The foregoing discussion has drawn two highly-probable deductions from this passage [Herodotus i. 188], viz., (*a*) that Nitocris was the wife of Labynetus (Nabonidus), and (*b*) that Nitocris was the daughter of Nebuchadrezzar by an Egyptian wife...

[p. 70] Whether the consort of Nabonidus was actually the daughter of an Egyptian princess married to Nebuchadrezzar will be decided as the work of cuneiform decipherment proceeds. The theory submitted has resulted from the subjection of data now at hand to a consistent analysis. Future discoveries will verify or refute the hypothetical solution which has been presented.

213. Belshazzar, "Second Ruler"

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 136, 137,

[p. 136] The different types of cuneiform literature, which deal in any way with the question of Belshazzar's participation in governmental administration during Nabonidus' absence in Arabia, are in complete agreement. It should be noted, however, that no cuneiform text applies the term *šarru* to Belshazzar. His title remains *mâr šarri*, 'the son

of the king.' The title *šarru*, 'king,' is ascribed to Nabonidus as the real sovereign. A text in the Yale Babylonian Collection indicates that Belshazzar was subject to the commands of Nabonidus...

 $[p. 137]^1$ The seed field of the god B \Box l, which in the month Nisan of the seventh year of Nabonidus, ²the king of Babylon, Belshazzar, the son of the king, ³at the command of the king divided for the tax-masters.

It is specifically stated in the *Nabonidus Chronicle* that Nabonidus was in Têmâ in the seventh year of his reign and that he did not come to Babylon for the festival in the month of Nisan. Hence the passage just quoted shows that Nabonidus while in Têmâ issued a command to Belshazzar in Babylonia and that this command was carried out. It is very evident that Nabonidus, although absent from Babylonia, did not relinquish his position as first ruler in the empire. All the fully-dated documents of his reign specify him as king. Furthermore, when Nabonidus and Belshazzar are mentioned together, precedence is never given to the latter. This detracts in no wise, however, from the royal rôle played by

Belshazzar. Nabonidus himself states that he entrusted *šarrûiam*, 'the kingship', or 'the kingdom,' to his eldest son. Belshazzar was undoubtedly the second ruler in the land. [EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines of the original cuneiform text.]

214. Beverages—Cocoa, Theobromine Content of

SOURCE: Robert G. Martinek and Walter Wolman, "Xanthines, Tannins, and Sodium in Coffee, Tea, and Cocoa," *JAMA*, 158 (July 23, 1955), 1030. Copyright 1955 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

Analyses indicate that there is over twice as much xanthine (theobromine) present in a cup of cocoa ... as there is xanthine (caffeine) in coffee or tea.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Theobromine is closely related to caffeine.]

215. Beverages—Coffee, Caffeine and Other Substances in

SOURCE: Arthur Grollman, *Pharmacology and Therapeutics* (4th ed., rev.), p. 219. Copyright 1960 by Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The coffee bean contains about 1 to 2 per cent caffeine, and a cup of coffee is equivalent to 0.1 to 0.2 gram of caffeine along with some volatile substances, such as

furfuralcohol, produced by the roasting; these have been called *Coffeon* and resemble in their action the volatile oils.

216. Beverages—Coffee—Caffeine Habituation Possible

SOURCE: Victor A. Drill, ed., *Pharmacology in Medicine* (2d ed.), part 6, chap. 23, p. 304. Copyright 1958 by the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The problem arises whether or not caffeine produces a habituation or addiction following continued use. Defining habituation as the mental craving for a drug on withdrawal and addiction as mental and physical dependence manifested by physical signs as well as mental on withdrawal, there can be no doubt that habituation takes place. If an individual does not receive his moming cup of coffee, he has a mental desire which leads to irritation and nervousness. In some individuals a definite pattern of headache follows withdrawal of the morning cup of coffee.

217. Beverages—Coffee Compared With Other Drinks, as to Acid Effect

SOURCE: J. A. Roth and others, "Caffeine and 'Peptic' Ulcer," *JAMA*, 126 (Nov. 25, 1944), 818, 819. Copyright 1944 by American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

[p. 818] Comparing the total output of free acid from each of the beverages with that from coffee for a period of seventy minutes, the average response to tea was 60 per cent, to "Postum" 59.3 per cent, to coffee with sugar and cream 59.7 per cent, to "Sanka" 75.3 per cent and to "Coca Cola" 89.5 per cent of the response to coffee. Although "Sanka" contains relatively little caffeine, it provokes [p. 819] considerable stimulation of gastric secretion, presumably because of its content of other secretagogues... We have confirmed the report that a so-called decaffeinated coffee preparation stimulated gastric secretion in patients with hyperchlorhydria and "peptic" ulcer about the same as coffee...

The ulcer patients have consistently shown a prolonged secretory response to the coffee test meal, maintaining a high level of acidity at the termination of the test. However, in the few instances in which it was tried a coffee substitute which contains no caffeine did not provoke a hypercontinuous secretion of gastric juice.

218. Beverages—Coffee, Decaffeinated, Impossible to Extract All Caffeine From

SOURCE: Robert G. Martinek and Walter Wolman, "Xanthines, Tannins, and Sodium in Coffee, Tea, and Coca," *JAMA*, 158 (July 23, 1955), 1030. Copyright 1955 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

Instant coffee is prepared by extracting ground roasted coffee with water. The powdered soluble coffee remains after evaporation of the water from this extract. Decaffeinated coffees are generally prepared by steaming the green beans under pressure to soften them and by dissolving and extracting the caffeine with such organic solvents as benzene, chloroform, or alcohol. The residual solvent in the bean is then removed by resteaming before the roasting process. As yet it has not been possible to extract all the caffeine in commercially prepared coffee. During the roasting process, previously colorless tannins in the coffee bean are oxidized to colored products.

219. Beverages—Coffee Drinking Classified With Other Drug Habits SOURCE: Editorial, "Minor Vices," *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 250 (May 13, 1954), 845. Copyright 1954 by the Massachusetts Medical Society, Boston. Used by permission.

It is reasonable to classify the coffee-drinking, or caffeine, "habit" with the other drug habits—opiates, alcohol, barbiturates and nicotine.

220. Beverages—Coffee, Effects of

SOURCE: [Milton Arlanden Bridges], *Bridges' Dietetics for the Clinician*, 5th ed., rev. and ed. by Harry J. Johnson, p. 191. Copyright 1949 by Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

According to Voit (1936) a reduction of 23 per cent in target efficiency was observed in 10 soldiers subjected to six thousand tests following the ingestion of coffee. Caffeinefree coffee did not diminish their accuracy, although it produced the same psychic and euphoristic effects as the caffeinated beverage.

221. Beverages—Coffee Not a Food

SOURCE: William Veale Thorpe, *Biochemistry for Medical Students* (6th ed.; Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1956), p. 463. Used by permission of J. B. Lippincott Company and J. & A. Churchill, Ltd., London.

Coffee is the roasted seed of the cherry-like fruit of *Caffaea arabica*. The aroma is due to an oil, **caffeol**, formed when the beans are roasted. Like tea, the infusion, although containing more solids, is of little calorific value and contains caffeine and tannic acid in amounts of the same order as in tea infusion. Neither tea nor coffee, unless they are taken with milk and sugar, can be regarded as foods. Their value is largely due to the

pharmacological properties of caffeine. Coffee is frequently mixed with the caffeine-free roasted root of the wild endive, *chicory*.

222. Beverages—Coffee, Origin and History of

SOURCE: Morris B. Jacobs, ed., *The Chemistry and Technology of Food and Food Products*, Vol. 2 (2d ed., rev.; 1951), p. 1656. Copyright 1951 by Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

Coffee was first mentioned in literature by Rhazes, an Arabian physician, about A.D. 900. It was first a food, then a wine, a medicine, and finally a beverage. Its use as a beverage dates back 700 years...

The coffee tree is indigenous to Ethiopia. From there its propagation spread to Arabia in the seventeenth century and then to India, Ceylon, and Java, and in the eighteenth century it was introduced into Martinique, Surinam, Brazil, the Philippines and Mexico. Its most recent development has been in Indochina in 1887 and British East Africa in 1901.

The beverage was introduced from Arabia into Turkey, where the coffee house began in 1554, to Venice in 1615, to France in 1644, to England and Vienna in 1650, and to North America in 1668.

223. Beverages—Coffee Plant, Description of

SOURCE: Artemas Ward, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Food* (1929 ed.), p. 131. Copyright 1923 by The Baker & Taylor Company, New York. Used by permission of Peter Smith, Gloucester, Mass., publisher.

The coffee-shrub is an evergreen plant which in its native growth may become a slender tree of ten to twenty feet in height... Under cultivation the shrub is kept in a condition of short, close growth, from four to six feet high, so as to increase the crop and to facilitate picking... The fruit, which quickly follows the flower, is a fleshy berry...

The flesh, or pulp, of the fruit, sweet and agreeable in flavor ..., encloses two seeds, or beans... These seeds constitute the raw coffee of commerce. They are generally oval, rounded on one side and flat on the other where they rest together...

The bulk of the coffee found in the world's markets is of varieties of the Arabian coffee-plant (*Coffea arabica*).

224. Beverages—Coffee Plant, Description of

SOURCE: Morris B. Jacobs, ed., *The Chemistry and Technology of Food and Food Products*, Vol. 2 (2d ed., rev.; 1951), pp. 1659, 1660. Copyright 1951 by Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1659] The coffee tree is a small tree or large shrub growing to a height of 12 to 20

ft., and belonging to the madder family (*Rubiaceae*)... The plant produces waxy white flowers which spring from the axils of the leaves, these flowers giving place to the fruit or berry, which is about the size and appearance of a small cherry, and develops a red or crimson color as it ripens...

[p. 1660] The species of the coffee plants most cultivated for its berries is *Coffea arabica*.

225. Beverages—Cola Drinks, Caffeine Present in

SOURCE: Editorial, "Minor Vices," *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 250 (May 13, 1954), 846. Copyright 1954 by the Massachusetts Medical Society, Boston. Used by permission.

It is pertinent to recall that the popular "cola" drinks get their appeal from their caffeine content; should not "cola" addiction also be classed as drug addiction? There are tea addicts, too... Perhaps, after all, food addiction is the most devastating of the minor

vices. As Masefield so tersely phrased it, "A carelessness of life and beauty marks the glutton, the idler, and the fool."

226. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving SOURCE: R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, Vol. 3, p. 124. Copyright 1955 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands. Used by permission.

We should also mention a side-line of viticulture. In the period we are discussing [500 B.C.–A.D. 1500] sugar was either unknown or an imported luxury. Hence honey was its substitute but as supplies were rather short, grape-juice was used as a substitute and often called so (mellis vice)... Must [grape juice] could be kept a year, the Romans filled it in jars, shut and sealed them tightly and immersed them in cold river or seawater, thus stopping fermentation. It could be evaporated in lead-lined vessels and used as a sweetening ingredient. Reduced to half its volume it was called "defrutum", to 2/3 [rather, to 1/3; see No. 229] "sapa". Quite an appreciable percentage of the must of the vineyards was turned into "defrutum" and "sapa". We even now of factories of this substitute honey, some was imported from Syria. It was used to preserve olives and all kinds of food.

227. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (Boiled Down, Lasts Up to a Year)

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* xiv. 24 121; translated by H. Rackham. Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), pp. 265, 267. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 265] Moreover, medicaments for this purpose are also made from the must itself: it is boiled down so as to become sweeter in proportion to its strength, and it is said that must so treated does not last beyond a year's time. In some places they boil the must down into what is called sapa, [p. 267] and pour this into their wines to overcome their harshness. Still both in the case of this kind of wine and in all others they supply the vessels themselves with coatings of pitch.

228. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (Boiled Down, May Keep for a Year)

SOURCE: Columella *On Agriculture* xii. 19. 3, 5; 20. 1, 3; 21. 1; translated by E. S. Forster and Edward H. Heffner, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), pp. 229, 231, 233, 235, 237. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 229] We shall pick the ripest possible grapes, and when they have been trodden, we shall carry from the vat to the boiling-vessels as much as we require of the [p. 231] must which has flowed from them before the pedicles of the grapes are removed from the winepress, and we shall heat the furnace at first with a gentle fire and with only very small pieces of wood, which the country people call *cremia* (brushwood), so that the must may boil in a leisurely manner... Next, when the vessel can stand a fiercer fire, that is, when the must, being partly boiled away, is in a state of internal seething, stems of trees and larger pieces of wood should be put underneath...

[p. 233] XX. Furthermore, boiled-down must, though carefully made, is, like wine, apt to go sour. This being so, let us be mindful to preserve our wine with boiled-down must of a year old, the soundness of which has been already tested... The more the must is boiled down,—provided it be not burnt—the better and the thicker it becomes. Of this boiled-down must, when it has been thus treated, it is enough if one *sextarious* is mixed with one *amphora* of wine. When you have boiled ninety *amphorae* of must in the

boiling-cauldron to such an extent that only a little of the whole remains (which means that it has been boiled down to a third), [p. 235] then, and not before, add the preservatives [pitch, resin, herbs, and spices]...

[p. 237] XXI. Must of the sweetest possible flavour will be boiled down to a third of

its original volume and when boiled down, as I have said above, is called *defrutum*. When it has cooled down, it is transferred to vessels and put in store that use may be made of it after a year. But it can also be added to wine nine days after it has cooled; but it is better if it has remained undisturbed for a year.

229. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (by Boiling Down)

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* xiv. 11. 80–82; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 241. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Siraeum, by some called hepsema and in our country sapa, is a product of art, not of nature, made by boiling down must to a third of its quantity; must boiled down to only one-half is called defrutum. All these wines have been devised for adulterating with honey; but the wines previously mentioned are the product of the grape and of the soil. Next after the raisin-wine of Crete those of Cilicia and of Africa are held in esteem. Raisin-wine is known to be made in Italy and in the neighbouring provinces from the grape called by the Greeks psithia and by us 'muscatel,' and also scripula, the grapes being left on the vine longer than usual to ripen in the sun, or else being ripened in boiling oil. Some people make this wine from any sweet white grape that ripens early, drying them in the sun till little more than half their weight remains, and then they beat them and gently press out the juice.

230. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (by Cooling, Kept for a Year)

SOURCE: Columella *On Agriculture* xii. 29; translated by E. S. Forster and Edward H. Heffner, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 255. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

XXIX. That must may remain always as sweet as though it were fresh, do as follows. Before the grape-skins are put under the press, take from the vat some of the freshest possible must and put it in a new wine-jar; then daub it over and cover it carefully with pitch, that thus no water may be able to get in. Then sink the whole flagon in a pool of cold, fresh water so that no part of it is above the surface. Then after forty days take it out of the water. The must will then keep sweet for as much as a year.

231. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (in Sealed Casks Under Water)

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History*, xiv. 11. 83; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), pp. 241, 243. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 241] Between the sirops and real wine is the liquor that the Greeks call aigleucos—this is our 'permanent must.' Care is needed for its production, as it must not

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

be allowed to 'boil'—that is the word they use to denote [fermentation, or] the passage of must into wine. Consequently, as soon as the must is taken from the vat and put into [p. 243] casks, they plunge the casks in water till midwinter passes and regular cold weather sets in.

232. Beverages—Tea and Coffee—Effects of Excessive Consumption SOURCE: Torald H. Sollman, *A Manual of Pharmacology* (8th ed.), p. 269. Copyright 1957 by W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission of the publisher and the author.

The effects of excessive coffee consumption differ only in details from tea. Both interfere with digestion, the coffee through the irritant effects of its volatile oil, the tea through the coagulant action of the tannic acid. The caffeine itself probably contributes to the digestive derangement through its vasodilator action. This may account for the common tendency to hemorrhoids.

233. Beverages—Tea and Coffee, Effects of, on Central Nervous System SOURCE: William T. Salter, *A Textbook of Pharmacology*, p. 242. Copyright 1952 by W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The chief problem with the methyl xanthine beverages, of course, is the possible chronic effect on the central nervous system. Excessive and prolonged use of these drugs clearly may lead to increased irritability, loss of sleep, palpitation of the heart and even muscular tremors. Such effects are due to chronic mild intoxication with caffeine. Tea contains over twice as much caffeine as coffee but as it is ordinarily brewed there is approximately the same amount of caffeine present in the ordinary cup of tea as in a cup of coffee, i.e., 150 mg. In both cases, the nervous effects are due primarily to caffeine. Certain widely used soft drinks, especially popular in the southern United States, also contain as much caffeine as ordinary coffee.

234. Beverages—Tea and Coffee, Effects of, on Gastric Digestion SOURCE: Arthur Grollman, *Pharmacology and Therapeutics* (4th ed., rev.), p. 219. Copyright 1960 by Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The wakefulness and the relief from fatigue which are produced by tea and coffee are undoubtedly due to the caffeine contained in them. On the other hand, the feeling of wellbeing and comfort produced by coffee after a full meal is similar to the carminative effects of the volatile oils and appears to be due to the local action in the stomach of the volatile constituents of coffee. There is a widespread belief that excessive tea-drinking disturbs gastric digestion and this has generally been attributed to the tannic acid contained in it. It is not unlikely that the caffeine and theophylline may also play a part in this gastric action by causing irritation of the mucous membrane. Excessive consumption of tea or coffee may produce, in addition to digestive disturbances, increased nervous excitability, tremor, palpitation and insomnia, effects directly due to the caffeine content to these beverages.

235. Beverages—Tea and Radioactivity

SOURCE: "Some Foods Are 'Hot," *Chemical and Engineering News*, 36 (Oct. 27, 1958), 38. Copyright 1958 by the American Chemical Society. Used by permission.

Tea harvested in 1956 and 1957 showed radioactivity that averaged 30 times greater than samples harvested before 1945.

236. Beverages—Tea, Caffeine and Other Substances in

SOURCE: Arthur Grollman, *Pharmacology and Therapeutics* (4th ed., rev.), p. 219. Copyright 1960 by Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Tea leaves contain more caffeine than the coffee bean, but since a relatively smaller quantity of the leaves are used in preparing tea, this beverage contains slightly less caffeine than does coffee. In green tea there is a considerable quantity of a volatile oil which also passes into the infusion, and the flavor of black tea also arises from volatile

substances (*Theon*). Both black and green tea contain about 7 per cent of tannic acid, but this is only extracted slowly; however, the bitter taste in tea that has been prepared too long is due to the tannic acid.

237. Beverages—Tea, Caffeine and Tannic Acid in

SOURCE: William Veale Thorpe, *Biochemistry for Medical Students* (6th ed.; Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1956), p. 463. Used by permission of J. B. Lippincott Company and J. & A. Churchill, Ltd., London.

The black tea ordinarily sold consists of the leaves of young shoots of the tea plant which have been fermented and dried by heat. In green tea the fermentation is omitted. The infusion consumed is of negligible calorific value. Its chief interest lies in two constituents, a stimulant and diuretic, **caffeine**, and an astringent, **tannic acid**. The former, which is present to the extent of 2%–4% in the dry tea, is readily soluble and is quickly extracted when tea is made. The latter (5%–15%) is less soluble and only passes into the infusion slowly; this accounts, in part, for the increased bitterness of the liquid which has stood over the leaves for some time. A cup of strong tea contains about 0.1 g. (11/2 grains) of caffeine. Strong tea, largely owing to the tannic acid, retards gastric digestion.

238. Beverages—Tea, Caffeine and Tannin in

SOURCE: Robert G. Martinek and Walter Wolman, "Xanthines, Tannins, and Sodium in Coffee, Tea, and Coca," *JAMA*, 158 (July 23, 1955), 1030. Copyright 1955 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

The potential caffeine content per cup prepared from bulk black tea is comparable to that from regular ground bean coffee, although, if prepared according to the label, about 65% of the leaf's caffeine is extracted... There is about three-quarters the amount of caffeine in green tea as in black tea. In general, the tannin content of tea is roughly four times that of coffee. The lower amounts of caffeine and tannins per cup obtained with tea bags are simply the result of the smaller amounts of tea used in each bag, as compared with the amounts recommended for use on the label of the bulk teas.

239. Beverages—Tea, Two General Classes of

SOURCE: Robert G. Martinek and Walter Wolman, "Xanthines, Tannins, and Sodium in Coffee, Tea, and Cocoa," *JAMA*, 158 (July 23, 1955), 1030. Copyright 1955 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

Teas are classified into two general classes, black tea and green tea. The differences arise from the treatment applied to the leaf. Black tea is a fermented product. The fermentation process (oxidation) reduces the astringency of the leaf and changes the color, aroma, flavor, strength, and body of its liquor. Upon fermentation of the tea the colorless tannis turn red or brown, which gives the tea its characteristic color. Green tea is a preparation in which the fermentation process has been arrested by steaming the green leaf and then drying it. The tannins in green teas are in their colorless state, and the lack of formation of the red or brown tannins is considered one measure of a good green tea. Of the xanthines in tea, theobromine and theophylline are present only in trace amounts. The predominant xanthine is caffeine.

240. Beverages—Tea, Various Facts Concerning

SOURCE: Artemas Ward, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Food* (1929 ed.), p. 512. Copyright 1923 by The Baker & Taylor Company, New York. Used by permission of Peter Smith, Gloucester, Mass., publisher.

China is generally acknowledged as the birthplace of the tea industry...

Tea was brought to Europe early in the sixteenth century, the Dutch East India Company introducing it into Holland. The first authenticated mention of it in England is in the year 1657—at which time it was considered a very rare luxury. It was known as early as 1680 in the American colonies...

The tea-shrub is an evergreen somewhat similar in appearance to the camellia, to which it is botanically related.

241. Beverages—Tea, Various Facts Concerning

SOURCE: Morris B. Jacobs, ed., *The Chemistry and Technology of Food and Food Products*, Vol. 2 (2d ed., rev.; 1951), pp. 1683, 1685–1687, 1689. Copyright 1951 by Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1683] Tea, although commonly associated with coffee in the food trade as well as in the public mind, is in reality a product of quite different character. Both have one important characteristic in common—that they produce or synthesize caffeine during the vital activity of the plant... The plants themselves are, however, of different families, and the parts of the plants which are commercially important are different—the seeds in the case of coffee and the young leaves in the case of tea. Both are natives of the Eastern Hemisphere...

[p. 1685] Normally, world tea production totals around 2,000,000,000 lbs. annually... Prior to World War II China was the greatest tea-producing area...

[p. 1686] The importing countries consuming the most tea are the United Kingdom, and the United States, Australia, and Canada, in that order...

[p. 1687] In Ceylon, a tea plucker, using both hands, plucks about 30,000 shoots a day. Approximately 3200 shoots are needed to make one pound of manufactured tea...

[p. 1689] *Black and Green* teas result from different manufacturing processes applied to the same kind of leaf... Green tea is manufactured by steaming without fermentation in a perforated cylinder or boiler, thus retaining some of the green color. Black tea is allowed to ferment after being rolled and before firing. In the case of black tea the process of fermentation, or oxidation, reduces the astringency of the leaf and, it is claimed, develops the color and aroma of the liquor.

242. Beverages—Wine—A First-Century Roman Tirade Against Drunkenness

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* xiv. 28. 137, 139–142; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 227, 279, 281. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 227] There is no department of man's life on which more labour is spent—as if nature had not given us the most healthy of beverages to drink, water, which all other animals make use of, whereas we compel even our beasts of burden to drink wine! and so much toil and labour and outlay is paid as the price of a thing that perverts men's minds and produces madness, having caused the commission of thousands of crimes, and being so attractive that a large part of mankind knows of nothing else worth living for! ... The most cautious of these topers we see getting themselves boiled in hot baths and being carried out of the bathroom unconscious, and others actually unable to wait to get to the dinner table, no, not even to put their clothes on, but straight away on the spot, while still naked and panting, they snatch up huge [p. 279] vessels as if to show off their strength, and pour down the whole of the contents... Then again, think of the drinking matches! think of the vessels engraved with scenes of adultery, as though tippling were not enough by itself to give lessons in licentiousness! ... Then it is that greedy eyes bid a price for a married woman, and their heavy glances betray it to her husband; then it is that the secrets of the heart are published abroad: some men specify the provisions of their wills, others let out facts of fatal import, and do not keep to themselves words that will come back to them through a slit in their throat—how many men having lost their lives in that way! and truth has come to be proverbially credited to wine. Meantime, even should all turn out for the best, drunkards never see the rising sun, and so shorten their lives. Tippling brings a pale face and hanging cheeks, [p. 281] sore eyes, shaky hands that spill the contents of vessels when they are full, and the condign punishment of haunted sleep and restless nights, and the crowning reward of drunkenness, monstrous licentiousness and delight in iniquity. Next day the breath reeks of the wine-cask, and everything is forgotten—the memory is dead. This is what they call 'snatching life as it comes!' when, whereas other men daily lose their yesterdays, these people lose tomorrow also.

243. Beverages—Wine, Artificial—Ancient Methods of Preparing "Weak Wine"

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* xiv. 97. 100; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 253. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

XIX. The first of the artificial wines, which is called weak wine, is made from real wine in the following manner: ten quarts of white must and half that quantity of water are kept boiling till a considerable amount of the water is boiled away. Other people put in five quarts of sea-water and the same amount of rain-water and leave the mixture in the sun for 40 days to evaporate. This drink is given to invalids for whom it is feared that wine may be harmful.

244. Beverages—Wine, Unfermented, From Raisins (Ancient Method of Making)

SOURCE: Palladius, On Agriculture, bk. 11, sec. 19, trans. by T. Owen (London: J. White, 1807), p. 296.

Passum [raisin wine] will now be made before the vintage, which the Africans are always used to make rich and pleasant, and which, if you see instead of honey, you may keep yourself free from inflation. The dried grapes therefore are picked, and being confined in frails [another translation says baskets] of a loose texture, they are first smartly beaten with rods; then, when the grapes are rendered soft by this operation, the frail is put under the press; hence the passum is what flowed from it; and it is kept preserved in a vessel in the same manner as honey.

245. Bible, Authority of, From God Alone

SOURCE: Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 1, "Of the Holy Scripture," secs. 4, 5, in *A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards*, ed. by James Benjamin Green (1958), p. 17, col. 1. Copyright 1951 by John Knox Press, Richmond, Va. Used by permission.

- Sec. 4. The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God...
- Sec. 5. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church to an high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man's

salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.

246. Bible, Baptist Confession (New Hampshire, 1833) on

SOURCE: The New Hampshire Baptist Confession, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 742.

We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true centre of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried.

[Schaff's introductory note, p. 742: This Confession was drawn up by the Rev. John Newton Brown, D. D., of New Hampshire (b. 1803, d. 1868), about 1833, and has been adopted by the New Hampshire Convention, and widely accepted by Baptists, especially in the Northern and Western States, as a clear and concise statement of their faith, in harmony with the doctrines of older confessions, but expressed in milder form.]

247. Bible, Both Human and Divine SOURCE: Bernhard W. Anderson, *Rediscovering the Bible* (New York: Association Press), pp. 6–11.

Copyright 1951 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission. [p. 6] From one point of view of the Bible is a very human book. The word "bible," derived from a Greek plural word meaning "booklets" is descriptive of its diverse.

derived from a Greek plural word meaning "booklets," is descriptive of its diverse character. Here is a *library* of sacred writings...

[p. 7] In this library the human situation is presented with the utmost realism. Nothing human is alien to its range of interest. Stories about murder, rape, trickery, war, religious persecution, and church jealousies are mingled with accounts of divine action, heavenly visions, ventures of faith, and hymns of hope...

[p. 8] The Bible gives an uncensored description of the human situation. The picture of human life is not "touched up" to make it appear better than it is. Many of the biblical stories verify a central truth of the biblical revelation, namely, that man is a sinner who often attempts to justify himself in his sin by means of his religion. In one sense a more human library has never been written...

[p. 9] The uniqueness of the Bible, however, cannot be understood adequately by treating it merely as a human book. The Bible was never designed to be read as great literature, sober history, naive philosophy, or primitive science. Men remembered stories, treasured traditions, and wrote in various forms of literature because of one inescapable conviction: They had been confronted by God in events which had taken place in their history. Though hidden from mortal sight in light unapproachable, the holy God had revealed himself to mankind. He had taken the initiative to establish a relationship with his people. He had spoken his Word of judgment and of mercy. "In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son." These opening words of the Letter to the Hebrews strike the keynote of the Bible. It is this central conviction which gives the Bible, both Old and New Testaments, the status of sacred scripture in the Christian Church.

This faith is a stumbling block to the modern mind... [p. 10] As a consequence, some people have dismissed the theology of the Bible as a poetic or mythical embellishment of men's maturing awareness of the distinction between right and wrong. Others have treated it as elementary philosophy, the first efforts of the Hebrews reflectively to understand Reality. These approaches to the meaning of human existence may be adequate outside the Bible. But the men of the Bible say something very different. It is their claim that God himself has spoken with a decisiveness, a once-for-all-ness. They do not tell us about searching for moral values, or attempting to reach a more satisfying philosophy by standing a bit taller on their intellectual tiptoes. Rather, they bear witness to their encounter with God in the midst of crucial events of history, their engagement with him in moments of historical crisis. And, above all, this revelation was not peripheral or incidental to their message; it was the vantage point from which they viewed everything else—politics, social injustice, and war; past, present, and future. They do not argue this faith; they proclaim it with confessional language: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise."

The subject matter of the Bible, then, is God's self-revelation to men. Because of this stupendous theme, traditional Christianity has described the Bible as the "Word of God" and has insisted upon the divine authorship of Scripture. Says a New Testament writer: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," that is, as the Greek word suggests, it is "God-breathed" or "filled with the breath of God" (II Timothy 3:16). However seriously one may take the human dimension of Scripture, he cannot easily disregard the central claim of the [p. 11] Bible itself to be the record and witness of revelatory events in which God has spoken. This is sacred scripture because the Holy Spirit breathes through the ancient words and reveals to men in every age the Word of truth.

248. Bible, Canon Law on the Publication of SOURCE: "General Rules From the Codex of Canon Law," in *Index of Prohibited Books*, revised and published by and a of the Universe Parks of Canon Law," in *Index of Prohibited Books*, revised and

published by order of His Holiness Pope Pius XI (new ed.; [Vatican City]: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1930), pp. xiv, xv, xvii. Used by permission.

[p. xiv] Can. 1385. § 1. Without previous ecclesiastical censorship the following works may not be published even by laymen:

1) Editions of Holy Scripture, or notes, or commentaries on the same...

[p. xv] Can. 1391. Versions of Holy Scripture may not lawfully be published in the vernacular, unless approved by the Holy See, or published under the supervision of the bishops and with notes taken particularly from the works of the Fathers of the Church and of learned Catholic writers...

[p. xvii] Can. 1398. § 1. The condemnation of a book entails the prohibition, without especial permission, either to publish, to read, to keep, to sell, to translate it, or in any way to pass it on to others...

Can. 1399. The prohibition of the following works is implicitly contained in the general law of prohibition:

1) Editions of the original text or of ancient Catholic versions of Holy Scripture, even those of the Eastern Church, emanating from any non-Catholic source; translations of Holy Scripture into any language, made, or published by non-Catholics are likewise prohibited. [See Nos. 275–277.]

249. Bible, Canon of, Catholic Claims Concerning

SOURCE: John Adam Moehler, *Symbolism*, trans. by James Burton Robertson (5th ed.; London: Gibbings & Company, 1906), pp. 292, 293.

[p. 292] Tradition we have hitherto described as the consciousness of the Church, as the living word of faith, according to which the Scriptures are to be interpreted, and to be understood. The doctrine of tradition contains, in this sense, nothing else than the doctrine of Scripture; both, as to their contents, are one and the same. But, moreover, it is asserted by the Catholic Church, that many things have been delivered to her by the apostles, which Holy Writ either doth [p. 293] not at all comprise, or at most, but alludes to. This assertion of the Church is of the greatest moment, and partially indeed, includes the foundations of the whole system. Among these oral traditions must be included the doctrine of the canonicity, and the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures; for, in no part of the Bible do we find the books belonging to it designated; and were such a catalogue contained in it, its authority must first be made matter of inquiry. In like manner, the testimony as to the inspiration of the biblical writings is obtained only through the Church. It is from this point we first discern, in all its magnitude, the vast importance of the doctrine of Church authority, and can form a notion of the infinite multitude of things involved in that doctrine.

250. Bible, Canon of—Old Testament, According to Josephus SOURCE: Josephus *Against Apion* i. 38–43; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 179, 181. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 179] We do not possess myriads of inconsistent books, conflicting with each other. Our books, those which are justly accredited, are but two and twenty, and contain the record of all time.

Of these, five are the books of Moses, comprising the laws and the traditional history from the birth of man down to the death of the lawgiver. This period falls only a little short of three thousand years [see editors' note below]. From the death of Moses until Artaxerxes, who succeeded Xerxes as king of Persia, the prophets subsequent to Moses wrote the history of the events of their own times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life.

From Artaxerxes to our own time the complete history has been written, but has not been deemed worthy of equal credit with the earlier records, because of the failure of the exact succession of the prophets.

We have given practical proof of our reverence for our own Scriptures. For, although such long ages have now passed, no one has ventured either to add, [p. 181] or to remove, or to alter a syllable; and it is an instinct with every Jew, from the day of his birth, to regard them as the decrees of God, to abide by them, and, if need be, cheerfully to die for them. Time and again ere now the sight has been witnessed of prisoners enduring tortures and death in every form in the theatres, rather than utter a single word against the laws and the allied documents.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The chronological data of Josephus are not all clear and consistent.]

251. Bible, Central in Prostestant Worship

SOURCE: T. Valentine Parker, *American Protestantism: An Appraisal*, pp. 132, 133. Copyright 1956 by Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 132] The altar is appropriately of primary significance in the Roman Catholic church because in that church worship is centered in the mass. The bread and the wine are believed to be actually transformed by the priest into the body and blood of the Lord Jesus. So in a [p. 133] literal sense He is there as the sacrifice renewed day by day through the power conferred upon the priest. Protestantism holds a totally different belief.

In fact the controversy over the Catholic theory of transubstantiation has been one of the most uncompromising of all questions in dispute... Historically the Bible supplanted the altar in the Protestant conception. Views of the Bible have changed with a host of Christians as we know. But ... it has not therefore been relegated to secondary rank... The pulpit that formerly and without question was the center of vision in the free churches invariably displayed a Bible. All that the cross symbolizes is likewise and primarily symbolized in that Bible. The worshipper looking up at the pulpit sees it not as a reminder of ungoverned and perhaps presumptuous oratory but as a proclamation of the prophetic spirit of the truths related in the Book.

252. Bible, Clearness of (Luther on)

SOURCE: Martin Luther, "Auslegung des 37. Psalms Davids ("Exposition of the 37th Psalm of David")," comment on Ps. 37:40, in his *Sämmtliche Schriften*, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, Vol. 5 (St. Louis:

Concordia, 1896), cols. 334, 335, 337, 338. German.

[col. 334] If any of them [the papists] should dispute with you and say, "You must have the interpretation of the Fathers because the Scripture is obscure," you shall reply, "It is not true." There is on earth no clearer book written than the holy Scripture, which compared with all other books is like the sun compared with all lights. They say such a thing only to lead us out of [col. 335] the Scripture, and to set themselves up as masters over us that we may believe their sermons based on their dreams... [col. 337] Do not permit yourselves to be led away from and out of the Scripture, no matter how hard they [the papists] may try. For if you step out of it you are lost, then they lead you wherever they wish. But if you stay in it you have won... Be certain, and do not doubt, that there is nothing brighter than the sun, i.e. the Scripture. But if a cloud has come in front of it, there is still [col. 338] nothing else behind it except the same bright sun. In the same way, if there is an obscure passage in the Scripture, do not doubt, for surely the same truth is behind it as that which is clear in another place, and whoever cannot understand the obscure, let him remain in the light.

253. Bible—Conservative Positions Defended

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, (3d ed.), p. 176. Copyright 1935 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

Conservative scholars are, we believe, entirely justified in their vigorous denunciation of all efforts to prove the existence of fraudulent invention and deliberate forgery in the Bible. They are equally within their rights in objecting most emphatically to the introduction of a spurious mythology and a thinly veiled paganism into the Bible.

254. Bible, Contains All Things Necessary to Salvation SOURCE: The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (as revised A.D. 1801), Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 489, 500.

[p. 489] VI. Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite *or* necessary to salvation...

[p. 500] XX. It is not lawful for the church to ordain anything is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another.

255. Bible, Hope and Remedy for a Confused World

SOURCE: Eric M. North, ed., *The Book of a Thousand Tongues* (New York; Harper, 1938), pp. 20, 21. Copyright, 1939, by the American Bible Society. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 20] Undoubtedly multitudes of folk, hearing the storm of controversy and criticism about the Bible a generation and more ago, took refuge in an indifference to which our generation is heir. Over-enthusiasm about the scope of science and the possible achievements of man "on his own" will account for much. There were many misconceived "defenses" of the Bible; when such "defenses" crumbled, many who could not see beyond them thought the Bible had crumbled too. Floods of new knowledge, desperately intricate relationships of industry and commerce in a suddenly contracted world, omnipresent new amusements—all these have swiftly overwhelmed modern men and thus displaced the center of their thought. Religion is for many pushed to the margin or beyond it. Whatever the causes, multitudes in our churches and just outside them regard the Bible with respect and a vague loyalty, but without conviction and fervor.

The attitude toward the Bible is reflected in the experience of the Church. Living in a confused age and assimilated all too much to its secular environment, it has found clear witness to the meaning of the Gospel for our present industrial age very difficult to bear...

[p. 21] In this situation, in the hesitation and perplexity of the church and the overwhelming confusion in the world, the hope and the remedy lie in the Bible itself. For out of the years of criticism the Bible and the Christian faith have emerged stronger than ever before—a new strength of which the congregations in the churches are hardly aware. They are stronger, not because anything has been added to them, but because they have been freed from a vast weight of misconceptions, from methods of interpretation false to their spirit, from confusion as to their historical basis, from entanglement with philosophies never a part of their genius.

With a new clarity and assurance men may be directed to the Bible as the primary and unique witness to God. Herein is shown the experience of men with God, not in a passing voice, not in legend or allegory, but veritable experience held firm before our eyes in letter and print that we may read and reread. Ay, herein God speaks to men through His Son, the world's Redeemer—"I am the Way, the Truth, the Life." Again and again men, with good intention but with an unrealized lack of faith in the power of the Bible to make its own way with men, have applied to it formularies, systems, diagrams of the progress of the soul. But though hampered for a time the Bible constantly breaks through theses shackles, saying, "O my children, can you not learn that the Voice which speaks through me is not the voice of a preceptor to his class, but of a Father to his sons and daughters and that His name is not 'I prescribe' but 'I AM.""

Now the assurance that the Bible is this unique and indispensable witness to God does not come upon men as a reality because someone else says so, no matter how authoritative. It comes only by experience with the Bible. If our generation and the generation to follow are to find in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the one Being worthy of absolute loyalty, if we are to lean our whole weight on Him for the saving that we and the world so desperately need, the only place we and the world can find Him is in the Bible and the one thing we need to do with the Bible is to read it—and read it and read it. Courage to stand off other preoccupations, faith that here is the supreme hope for us, patience with what we may not yet understand, and willingness to do God's will—this and *reading* are all we really need. That is the Bible's way to bring us into the presence of God. It is to open this way that these thousand and more translations have been made and that many more must be made and put into the hands of the people. For if humankind all across the world—the multitude harassed by poverty, ignorance, and war and the few who vainly build their proud houses on wealth and force and the sowing of hate—are to know that the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ is Sovereign Lord of all, they must have this Book.

256. Bible, Ignorance of—Effect

SOURCE: Chrysostom, Homilies on Romans, trans. in NPNF, 1st series, Vol. 11, p. 335.

And so ye also, if ye be willing to apply to the reading of him with a ready mind, will need no other aid. For the word of Christ is true which saith, "Seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." (Matt. vii. 7.) ... From this it is that our countless evils have arisen—from ignorance of the Scriptures; from this it is the plague of heresies has broken out.

257. Bible, Inspiration of, Calvin on

SOURCE: John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (7th American ed., rev.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), Vol. 1, p. 89.

It is true that, if we were inclined to argue the point, many things might be adduced which certainly evince, if there be any God in heaven, that he is Author of the Law, and the Prophecies, and the Gospel. Even though men of learning and deep judgment rise up in opposition, and exert and display all the powers of their minds in this dispute, yet, unless they are wholly lost to all sense of shame, this confession will be extorted from them, that the Scripture exhibits the plainest evidences that it is God who speaks in it, which manifests its doctrine to be divine... If we read it with pure eyes and sound minds, we shall immediately perceive the majesty of God, which will subdue our audacious contradictions, and compel us to obey him.

258. Bible, Inspiration of—Writers Are God's Penmen SOURCE: C. E. Stowe, *Origin and History of the Books of the Bible* (Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Publishing Company, 1867), p. 18.

The Bible is not a specimen of God's skill as a writer, showing us God's mode of thought, giving us God's logic, and God's rhetoric, and God's style of historic narration. How often do we see men seeking out isolated passages of Scripture, and triumphantly saying that such expressions are worthy of God, and could not have proceeded from Him... God has not put himself on trial before us in that way in the Bible, any more that He has in the creation—any more than He has promised that the Bible shall always be printed for us on the best paper, with the best of type, and perfect freedom from typographical errors, and that after it is printed, it shall never be torn, nor soiled, nor any leaf be regularly handsome, men fine forms and beautiful faces, and faultless elocution. It is always to be remembered that the writers of the Bible were 'God's penmen, and not God's pens.'* [Note: * Reply to Essays and Reviews.]

259. Bible, Interpretation of—Catholic Claims of Sole Right to Interpret SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session IV (April 8, 1546), Decree Concerning the Canonical Scriptures, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 83.

No one, relying on his own skill, shall,—in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine,—wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother Church,—whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy

Scriptures,—hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

260. Bible, Interpretation of, Episcopal Article on

SOURCE: Protestant Episcopal Church. The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (as revised A.D. 1801), art. 20, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 500.

It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, ye, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.

261. Bible, Interpretation of—Idiom

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible* (1957 ed.), pp. 45, 46. Published 1955 by The Westminster Press, Used by permission of The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, and Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., London.

[p. 45] The general message of all these passages is 'not sacrifice, but obedience' and by obedience the prophets meant the reflection of the character of God in life and the finding of its source in holy fellowship with Him. Here we may observe that it is characteristic of Hebrew idiom to say 'not this but that', when the meaning is 'that is more important than this.' This characteristic has often been observed, and we are not ordinarily troubled by it. When our Lord said that no one could be His disciple unless he hated his parents and all who were bound to him by natural ties. He meant that loyalty to Him must take precedence over loyalty to one's kindred. We do not for one moment suppose that He who enjoined the love of enemies enjoined the hatred of friends. Though the terms used were ostensibly absolute, we recognize that the meaning was comparative. It is therefore possible that the prophets were really saying that obedience was more important than sacrifice, and that for lack of obedience sacrifice was invalidated. So far as Hosea is concerned, we find that the second part of his statement is translated in comparative terms by translators ancient and modern, who had no axe to grind, but simply sought to give a natural rendering: 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.' The two halves of the verse are parallel, and it is improbable that in the first half sacrifice is absolutely condemned and in the [p. 46] second part comparatively. Both halves express the same thought that sacrifice is not the most important of the demands of God. This thought we find elsewhere in the Bible in such a passage as: 'Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.'

262. Bible, Interpretation of—Its Own Interpreter

SOURCE: Arthur T. Pierson, *Knowing the Scriptures* (New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910), p. 106. To know in what specific sense words and terms are employed by any writer, is to have, so far, keys to unlock his meaning. It pleases the author of Holy Scripture to provide, in the Bible itself, the helps to its understanding and interpretation. If all doors to its secret chambers are not left open, the keys are to be found; and part of the object of leaving some things obscure, instead of obvious, is to incite and invite investigation, to prompt us to patient and prayerful search. Its obscurities awaken curiosity and inquiry, and study is rewarded by finding the clew to what was before a maze of perplexity.

263. Bible—Limitations of Human Language

SOURCE: C. E. Stowe, *Origin and History of the Books of the Bible* (Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Publishing Company, 1867), pp. 17, 18.

[p. 17] Moreover, human minds are unlike in the impressions which they receive from the same word; and it is certain that one man seldom gives to another, of different temperament, education, and habits of thought, by language, exactly the same idea, with the same shape and color, as that which lies in his own mind; yet, if men are honest and right-minded they can come near enough to each other's meaning for all purposes of practical utility.

Here comes in the objection that the Bible can be made to mean everything and anything, all sects build upon it, the most diverse doctrines are derived from it.

This infelicity it shares with everything else that has to be expressed in human language. This is owing to the imperfection, the necessary imperfection of human language, and to the infirmity and the perverse ingenuity also of the human mind. It is not anything peculiar to the Bible. Hear two opposing lawyers argue a point of statute law in its application to a particular case. Hear two opposing politicians make their diverse arguments in reference to the true intent and force of a particular clause in the United States Constitution. Is there not here as wide room for diversity of opinion and opposition of reasoning, as in regard to the meaning of any text of Scripture, or the correctness of any point of theology? Yet these laws and constitutions are made in our own language, and our own time, while the Bible comes to us from a remote age and in foreign tongues. Enough, that the Bible can be understood, if honestly studied, as well as any [p. 18] constitution or any body of statutes can be understood. This much is sufficient for all practical purposes, and it is for practical purposes only that the Bible was given.

264. Bible—Luther on the Word of God SOURCE: Louis L. Snyder, ed., *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), p. 74. Copyright ? 1958 by Rutgers, The State University.

Let us hold it for certain and firmly established that the soul can do without everything, except the Word of God, without which none at all of its wants are provided for. But, having the Word it is rich and wants for nothing; since that is the word of life, of truth, of light, of peace, of justification, of salvation, of joy, of liberty, of wisdom, of virtue, of grace, of glory, and of every good thing. It is on this account that the prophets in a whole psalm (Ps. cxix), and in many other places, sighs for and calls upon the Word of God with so many groaning and words...

But you will ask: "What is this Word, and by what means is it to be used, since there are so many words of God?" I answer, the Apostle Paul (Rom. 1) explains what it is, namely, the Gospel of God, concerning His Son, incarnate, suffering, risen, and glorified through the Spirit, the sanctifier. To preach Christ is to feed the soul, to justify it, to set it free, and to save it, if it believes the preaching. For faith alone [see No. 729] and the efficacious use of the Word of God, bring salvation. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Rom 10:9).

265. Bible, a Monument of Literature

SOURCE: John Richard Green, *History of the English People*, bk. 7, chap. 1, par. 6 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1879), Vol. 3, p. 11.

As a mere literary monument the English version of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English tongue, while its perpetual use made it from the instant of its appearance the standard of our language.

266. Bible, More Than History

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, p. 20. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

The Old Testament is essentially a religious book, and it has its place in the Bible of the Church solely as a religious book.

Many students of the Bible are far too inclined to forget this. It is studied merely as a record of the past, and men try to recapture ancient situations, ancient political, social and religious conditions, and they imagine that if they can somehow hear the accents of the prophets' voices as their first hearers heard them, or understand their words as those hearers understood them, they have reached the goal of Old Testament study. Nothing could be farther from the truth. For there is nothing essentially religious in that. Religion is more than the study of religion, and unless the study of the Bible is a religious exercise, it misses its deepest purpose. This is not to say, of course, that all Bible study should be made the organ of worship, for worship is by no means the whole of religion. But it is to say that in all Bible study the religious quality of the story should be realized, and the religious teaching and message emphasized. For all Bible study should minister to the spirit as well as to the mind, and should bring richer apprehension of divine truth.

267. Bible, New Light From (Robinson's Farewell to the Pilgrim Fathers)

SOURCE: John Robinson, quoted in Edward Winslow, Briefe Narration, in Alexander Young, Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers (Boston: Little and Brown, 1841), pp. 396, 397.

[p. 396] For the wholesome counsel Mr. Robinson gave that part of the church whereof he was pastor at their departure from him to begin the great work of plantation in New England,—amongst other wholesome instructions and exhortations he used these expressions, or to the same purpose:

We are now ere long to part asunder, and the Lord knoweth whether ever he [Robinson] should live to see our faces again. But whether the Lord had appointed it or not, he charged us before God and his blessed angels, to follow him no further than he followed Christ; and if God should reveal any thing to us by any other instrument of his, to be as ready to receive it as ever we were to receive any truth of his ministry; for he was very confident the Lord had more truth and light [p. 397] yet to break forth out of his holy word. He took occasion also miserably to be all the state and condition of the Reformed Churches, who were come to a period in religion, and would go no further than the instruments of their Reformation. As, for example, the Lutherans, they could not be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; for whatever part of God's will he had further imparted and revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it. And so also, saith he, you see the Calvinists, they stick where he left them; a misery much to be lamented; for though they were precious shining lights in their times, yet God had not revealed his whole will to them; and were they now living, saith he, they would be as ready and willing to embrace further light, as that they had received. Here also he put us in mind of our church covenant, at least that part of it whereby we promise and covenant with God and one with another, to receive whatsoever light or truth shall be made known to us from his written word; but withal exhorted us to take heed what we received for truth, and well to examine and compare it and weigh it with other Scriptures of truth before we received it. For, saith he, it is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-christian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.

268. Bible, Not Sole Guide for Protestants

SOURCE: *The Bible, and Authority Only in Catholic Hands* (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1960), pp. 26, 27. [See FRS No. 40.]

[p. 26] CATH.: Is the Bible the rule or guide of Protestants for observing Sunday?

[p. 27] Prot.: No, I believe the "Seventh Day Adventists" are the only ones who know the Bible in the matter of Sabbath observance.

269. Bible—Nothing to Be Added or Subtracted

SOURCE: Basil the Great, De Fide ("Concerning Faith"), trans. in MPG, Vol. 31, Col. 680.

It is a manifest falling from faith and an accusation of arrogance either to set aside anything that has been written or to add anything that has not been written. Our Lord Jesus Christ said, "My sheep hear my voice"; and before this He said, "A stranger they will not follow, but they will flee from him because they know not the voice of the stranger." And the apostle by a human example vehemently forbids the adding or the removing of anything from the inspired Scriptures, in which he says, "A humanly ratified covenant, no one takes from or adds to."

270. Bible—Nothing to Be Added, Subtracted, or Changed SOURCE: The French [Protestant] Confession of Faith (1559), art. 5, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 362.

We believe that the Word contained in these books has proceeded from God... It is not lawful for men, nor even for angels, to add to it, to take away from it, or to change it. Whence it follows that no authority, whether of antiquity, or custom, or numbers, or human wisdom, or judgments, or proclamations, or edicts, or decrees, or councils, or visions, or miracles, should be opposed to these Holy Scriptures.

271. Bible—Old Testament Contains Same Message as New SOURCE: Arthur T. Pierson, *Knowing the Scriptures* (New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910), p. 53.

There is a persistent attempt in some quarters, to depreciate the Old Testament, with a lamentable result that it is comparatively neglected. Yet the New Testament itself unmistakably teaches the organic unity of the two Testaments, and in various ways exhibits their mutual relations.

272. Bible—Old Testament Fulfilled in New

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 21, 22. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 21] Often the significance of an utterance lies in what it shall come to mean, even more than in what it first means. Words are seeds, whose full fruition may take long to mature, and like seeds they can only be understood in the light of what they become... Hence, beyond the understanding of Old Testament teaching as its first hearers or readers understood it, we need to understand the meaning it has come to have in its developing life, the unfolding meaning it has yielded down the years, and oft-times the fuller meaning it may have for us in the light of Christ.

Some years ago the present writer quoted a word from a forgotten source, which has lain for many years in his memory. It was: "Old Testament prophecies run to Christ, as

⁴Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

tidal rivers to the sea, only to feel His reflex influence upon them." That is true of more than prophecies. It is when we read the Old Testament in the light of the New that we perceive its real significance. We must, of course, beware of attributing to those who wrote the Old Testament the understanding which we have gained in the light of the New. [p. 22] That is why a historical sense and outlook are essential for the understanding of the Old Testament. Without it we merely reach confusion, reading back the New Testament into the Old at some points, and being then bewildered by those elements in the Old Testament which cannot be squared with the teaching of the New. We need both a historical and a teleological understanding, appreciating everything in relation to its contemporary situation as a moment in the process of the development, and appreciating it too in relation to the goal of the process.

273. Bible, Only Rule of Faith

SOURCE: Declaration of Faith of the National Council of Congregational Churches, held at Boston, Mass., June 14–24, 1865, par. 1, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 734.

Standing by the rock where the Pilgrims set foot upon these shores, upon the spot where they worshiped God, and among the graves of the early generations, we, Elders and Messengers of the Congregational churches of the United States in National Council assembled—like them acknowledging no rule of faith but the Word of God—do now declare our adherence to the faith and order of the apostolic and primitive churches.

274. Bible, Purpose of

SOURCE: Chrysostom, *Homilies on Timothy*, Homily 9, on 2 Tim. 3:16, 17, trans. in *NPNF*, 1st series, Vol. 13, p. 510.

"For doctrine." For thence [from the Scriptures] we shall know, whether we ought to learn or to be ignorant of anything. And thence we may disprove what is false...

"That the man of God may be perfect." For this is the exhortation of the Scripture given, that the man of God may be rendered perfect by it; without this therefore he cannot be perfect.

275. Bible, Reading of—Catholic Defense for Restrictions

SOURCE: Cardinal Merry del Val, "Foreword," in *Index of Prohibited Books*, revised and published by order of His Holiness Pope Pius XI (new ed.; [Vatican City]: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1930), pp. ix–ix. Used by permission.

[p. ix] What many, indeed, fail to appreciate, and what, moreover, non-Catholics consider a grave abuse—as they put it of the Roman Curia, is the action of the Church in hindering the printing and circulation of Holy Writ in the vernacular. Fundamentally however, this ac- [p. x] cusation is based on calumny. During the first twelve centuries Christians were highly familiar with the text of Holy Scripture, as is evident from the homilies of the Fathers and the sermons of the mediaeval preachers; nor did the ecclesiastical authorities ever intervene to prevent this. It was only in consequence of heretical abuses, introduced particularly by the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the followers of Wyclif, and by Protestants broadly speaking (who with sacrilegious mutilations of Scripture and arbitrary interpretations vainly sought to justify themselves in the eyes of the people; twisting the text of the Bible to support erroneous doctrines condemned by the whole history of the Church) that the Pontiffs and the Councils were obliged on more than one occasion to control and sometimes even forbid the use of the Bible in the vernacular... [See No. 248.]

[p. xi] Those who would put the Scriptures indiscriminately into the hands of the people are the believers always in private interpretation—a fallacy both absurd in itself and pregnant with disastrous consequences. These counterfeit champions of the inspired book hold the Bible to be the sole source of Divine Revelation and cover with abuse and trite sarcasm the Catholic and Roman Church.

276. Bible, Reading of, Catholic Restrictions Concerning

SOURCE: Leo XIII, Apostolic Constitution *Officiorum ac Munerum*, Jan. 25, 1897, art. 1., "Of the Prohibition of Books," chaps. 2, 3, trans. in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903), pp. 412, 413.

[p. 412] CHAPTER II. Of Editions of the Original Text of Holy Scripture and of Versions Not in the Vernacular.

- 5. Editions of the original text and of the ancient Catholic versions of Holy Scripture, as well as those of the Eastern Church, if published by non-Catholics, even though apparently edited in a faithful and complete manner, are allowed only to those engaged in theological and biblical studies, provided also that the dogmas of Catholic faith are not impugned in the prolegomena or annotations.
- 6. In the same manner, and under the same conditions, other versions of the Holy Bible, whether in Latin or in any other dead language, published by non-Catholics, are permitted.

CHAPTER III. Of Vernacular Versions of Holy Scripture.

- 7. As it has been clearly shown by experience that, if the Holy Bible in the vernacular is generally permitted without any distinction, more harm than utility is thereby [p. 413] caused, owing to human temerity: all versions in the vernacular, even by Catholics, are altogether prohibited, unless approved by the Holy See, or published, under the vigilant care of the bishops, with annotations taken from the Fathers of the Church and learned Catholic writers.
- 8. All versions of the Holy Bible, in any vernacular language, made by non-Catholics are prohibited; and especially those published by the Bible societies, which have been more than once condemned by the Roman Pontiffs, because in them the wise laws of the Church concerning the publication of the sacred books are entirely disregarded.

Nevertheless, these versions are permitted to students of theological or biblical science, under the conditions laid down above (No. 5).

277. Bible, Reading of, Catholic Restrictions on English Versions SOURCE: Sir Thomas More, *Dialogue* (bk. 3, chap. 16), in G. G. Coulton, editor and translator, *Life in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928), Vol. 2, pp. 142–144, 146, 147. Used by permission.

[p. 142] "SIR," quoth your Friend ..., "yet for all this can I see no cause why the clergy should keep the Bible out of laymen's hands that can no more but their mother-tongue." "I had weened," quoth I, "that I had proved you plainly that they keep it not from them; for I have showed you that they keep none from them, but such translation as be either not yet approved for good or such as be already reproved for naught, as Wycliffe's was and Tyndale's; for as for other old ones that were before Wycliffe's days, [they] remain lawful, and be in some folk's hands had and read." "Ye say well," quoth he, "but ye, as women say, somewhat it was alway that the cat winked when her eye was out. Surely it is not for naught that the English Bible is in so few men's hands when so many would so fain have it." "That is very truth," quoth I, "for I think that, though the favourers of [p. 143] a sect of heretics be so fervent in the setting forth of their sect, that

they let not to lay their money together and make a purse among them for the printing of an evil-made, or evil-translated book (which though it hap to be forbidden and burned, vet some be sold ere they be spied, and each of them lose but their part) yet I think there will no printer lightly be so hot to put any Bible in print at his own charge, whereof the loss should lie whole in his own neck, and then hang upon a doubtful trial, whether the first copy of his translation was made before Wycliffe's days or since. For, if it were made since, it must be approved before the printing..." "I am sure," quoth your Friend, "ye doubt not but that I am full and whole of your mind in this matter, that the Bible should be in our English tongue. But yet that the clergy is of the contrary, and would not have it so, that appeareth well, in that they suffer it not to be so. And, over that I hear, in every place almost where I find any learned man of them, their minds [are] all set thereon to keep the scripture from us; and they seek out for that part every rotten reason that they can find, and set them forth solemnly to the shew, though five of those reasons be not worth a fig. For they begin as far as our first father Adam, and shew us that his wife and he fell out of Paradise with desire of knowledge and cunning. Now if this would serve, it must from the knowledge and study of scripture drive every man, priest and other, lest it drive all out of Paradise. Then say they that God taught His disciples many things apart, because the people should not hear it, and therefore they would the people should not now be suffered to read all. Yet they say further that it is hard to translate the scripture out of one tongue into another, and specially, they say, into ours, which they call a tongue vulgar and barbarous. But of all things specially they say that scripture is the food of the soul, and that the common people be as infants that must be fed but with milk and pap; and if we have any stronger meat it [p. 144] must be champed afore by the nurse, and so put into the babe's mouth. But methinks, though they make us all infants, they shall find many a shrewd brain among us that can perceive chalk from cheese well enough, and if they would once take us our meat in our own hand we be not so evil toothed but that within a while they shall see us champ it ourselves as well as they. For let them call us young babes an [sic] they will, yet by God they shall ... well find in some of us that an old knave is no child." "Surely," quoth I, "such things as ye speak is the thing that, as I somewhat said before, putteth good folk in fear to suffer the scripture in our English tongue; not for the reading and receiving, but for the busy champing thereof, and for much meddling with such parts thereof as least will agree with their capacities... Finally methinketh that the Constitution Provincial,¹ [Note 1: Abp Arundel's constitution of 1408, forbidding as heretical all unauthorized translations or portions of the Bible, but making no provision for any authorized translation.] of which we spake right now, hath determined this question already; for when the clergy therein agreed that the English Bibles should remain which were translated before Wycliffe's days, they consequently did agree that to have the Bible in English was none hurt. And in that they forbade any new translation to be read till it were approved by the bishops, it appeareth well thereby that their intent was that the bishop should approve it if he found it faultless, and also of reason amend it where it were faulty; but if [i.e., unless] the man were an heretic that made it, or the faults such and so many as it were more easy to make it all new than mend it, as it happed for both points in the translation of Tyndale... [p. 146] The Ordinary, whom God hath in the diocese appointed for the chief physician, to discern between the whole and the sick and between disease and disease, should after his wisdom and discretion appoint everybody their part as he should perceive to be good and wholesome

for them... I say, though the bishop might unto some layman betake and commit with good advice and instruction the whole Bible to read, yet might he to some man well and with reason restrain the reading of some part, and from some busybody the meddling with any part at all, more than he shall hear in sermons set out and declared unto him, and in like wise to take the Bible away from such folk again, as be proved by their blind presumption to abuse the occasion of their profit unto their own hurt and harm. And thus may the bishop order the scripture in our hands, with as good reason as the father doth by his discretion appoint which of his children may for his sadness keep a knife to cut his meat, and which shall for his wantonness have his knife taken from him for cutting of his fingers. And thus am I bold, without prejudice of other men's judgment, to show you my mind in this matter, how the Scripture might without great peril and not without great profit be brought into our tongue and taken to laymen and women both, not yet meaning thereby but that the whole Bible might for my mind be suffered to be spread abroad in English; but, if that were so much doubted that perchance all might thereby be letted, then would I [p. 147] rather have used such moderation as I speak of, or some such other as wiser men can better devise. Howbeit, upon that I read late in the Epistle that the King's Highness translated into English of his own, which His Grace made in Latin, answering to the letter of Luther, my mind giveth me that His Majesty is of his blessed zeal so minded to move this matter unto the prelates of the clergy, among whom I have perceived some of the greatest and of the best of their own minds well inclinable thereto already, that we lay-people shall in this matter, ere long time pass, except the fault be found in ourselves, be well and fully satisfied and content." "In good faith," quoth he, "that will in my mind be very well done; and now am I for my mind in all this matter fully content and satisfied." "Well," quoth I, "then will we to dinner, and the remnant will we finish after dinner." And therewith we went to meat.

278. Bible, Reading of, Catholics' Attitude Toward SOURCE: Geddes MacGregor, *The Bible in the Making* (Philadelphia: Lippincott), pp. 426, 427. Copyright 1959 by Geddes MacGregor. Used by permission.

[p. 426] My principal concern, of course, is with the Bible, and I have tried [p. 427] to show how there is a Biblical revival in the Roman Catholic Church. If you were to discuss this with a Benedictine or a Dominican, I think you would find three plain warnings given about assuming too much from this revival. They would be in the form of definitions of the Roman Catholic attitude to the Bible. First, the Bible cannot be taken as a single unit; it must be regarded as a collection of books, inspired by God but having different parts and showing a development. Second, the Bible is not the norm of faith but it reveals what were the norms of faith of past saints and patriarchs. It tells us of the faith of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, of Elijah and of Moses; it is not the norm of faith for the Church today. Third, the Bible is to be read, and now it is encouraged; but it must not be read as a personal activity. It must be read with the Church. When the Roman Catholic reads the Bible he is not able to read it alone, he reads it "Catholicly" with all his brethren. He must take to his reading of it all the richness that the Spirit has deposited in the Church. Tradition still holds a powerful place in the reading of the Bible.

279. Bible, Reading of, Daily—Benefits

SOURCE: Woodrow Wilson, address (as governor of New Jersey) at the tercentenary celebration of the translation of the Bible into the English language, Denver, Colo., May 7, 1911; printed in Appendix to *The Congressional Record*, Aug. 8, 1912, p. 502.

I have a very simple thing to ask of you. I ask of every man and woman in this audience that from this night on they will realize that part of the destiny of America lies in their daily perusal of this great book of revelations—that if they would see America free and pure they will make their own spirits free and pure by this baptism of the Holy Scripture.

280. Bible, Reading of, Brings Liberty

SOURCE: Woodrow Wilson, address (as governor of New Jersey) at the tercentenary celebration of the translation of the Bible into the English language, Denver, Colo., May 7, 1911; printed in Appendix to *The Congressional Record*, Aug. 8, 1912, p. 500.

Up to the time of the translation of the Bible into English, it was a book for long ages withheld from the perusal of the peoples of other languages and of other tongues, and not a little of the history of liberty lies in the circumstance that the moving sentences of this book were made familiar to the ears and the understanding of those peoples who have led mankind in exhibiting the forms of government and the impulses of reform which have made for freedom and for self-government among mankind.

For this is a book which reveals men unto themselves, not as creatures in bondage, not as men under human authority, not as those bidden to take counsel and command of any human source. It reveals every man to himself as a distinct moral agent, responsible not to men, not even to those men whom he has put over him in authority, but responsible through his own conscience to his Lord and Maker. Whenever a man sees this vision he stands up a free man, whatever may be the government under which he lives, if he sees beyond the circumstances of his own life.

281. Bible, the Religion of Protestants

SOURCE: William Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation* (London: George Bell & Sons, 1888), p. 463.

The BIBLE, I say, the BIBLE only, is the religion of protestants! ... I for my part, after a long and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of "the true way to eternal happiness," do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot but upon this rock only. I see plainly and with mine own eyes, that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age... There is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon. This therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe: this I will profess, according to this I will live, and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me anything out of this book, and require whether I believe it or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this; God hath said so, therefore it is true.

282. Bible—Salvation in Old Testament and New Testament the Same SOURCE: Methodist Articles of Religion, 1784, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 808.

- V. The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation...
- VI. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the

old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

283. Bible, Study of (Pope Gregory the Great)

SOURCE: Pope Gregory the Great, *Epistles*, bk. 4, Letter 31, to Theodorus (physician to the emperor), trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 156 (2d pagination).

What is sacred Scripture but a kind of epistle of Almighty God to His creature? And surely, if your Glory were resident in any other place, and were to receive letters from an earthly emperor, you would not loiter, you would not rest, you would not give sleep to your eyes, till you had learnt what the earthly emperor had written.

The Emperor of Heaven, the Lord of men and angels, has sent thee his epistles for thy life's behoof; and yet, glorious son, thou neglectest to read these epistles ardently. Study then, I beseech thee, and daily meditate on the words of thy Creator. Learn the heart of God in the words of God, that thou mayest sigh more ardently for the things that are eternal.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract would seem to indicate that in the time of Gregory the Great (590–604) the Roman Catholic Church had not hedged about the reading of the Bible with such rules as to discourage any real study of the Scriptures by the laity. The restrictions rose mostly in regard to the question of vernacular translations, after the laity, because of language changes, could no longer read the official Latin version.]

284. Bible, Study of—Methods

SOURCE: Arthur T. Pierson, Knowing the Scriptures (New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910), p. 214.

No investigation of scripture, in its various parts and separate texts, however important, must impair the sense of the supreme value of its united witness. There is not a form of evil doctrine or practice that may not claim apparent sanction and support from isolated passages; but nothing erroneous or vicious can ever find countenance from the Word of God when the whole united testimony of scripture is weighed against it. Partial examination will result in partial views of truth which are necessarily imperfect; only careful comparison will show the complete mind of God.

285. Bible, Study of—Methods (Pope Pius XII, 1943)

SOURCE: Pius XII, Encyclical Letter *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, Sept. 30, 1943 (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943), Part II (Doctrinal), pp. 10–23. [p. 10] DOCTRINAL PART

BIBLICAL STUDIES AT THE PRESENT DAY

11. There is no one who cannot easily perceive that the conditions of biblical studies and their subsidiary sciences have greatly changed within the last fifty years. For, apart from

anything else, when Our Predecessor published the Encyclical Letter Providentissimus

Deus, hardly a single place in Palestine had begun to be explored by means of relevant excavations. Now, however, this kind of investigation is much more frequent and, since more precise methods and technical skill have been developed in the course of actual experience, it gives us information at once more abundant and more accurate. How much light has been derived from these explorations for the more correct and fuller understanding of the Sacred Books all experts know, as well as all those who devote themselves to these studies. The value of these excavations is enhanced by the discovery

from time to time of written documents, which help much towards the knowledge of the languages, letters, events, customs, and forms of worship of most ancient times. And of no less importance is the discovery and investigation, so frequent in our times, of papyri which have contributed so much to the knowledge of letters and institutions, both public and private, especially of the time of Our Saviour.

12. Moreover ancient codices of the Sacred Books have been found and edited with discerning thoroughness; the exegesis of the Fathers of the Church has been more widely and thoroughly examined; in fine the manner of speaking, relating and writing in use among the ancients is made clear by innumerable examples. All these advantages which, not without a special design of Divine Providence, our age has acquired, are as it were an invitation and inducement to interpreters of the Sacred Literature to make diligent use of this light, so abundantly given, to penetrate more deeply, explain more clearly and expound more lucidly the Divine Oracles. If, with the greatest satisfaction of mind, We perceive that these same interpreters have resolutely answered and still continue to answer this call, this is certainly not the last or least of the [p. 11] fruits of the Encyclical

Letter *Providentissimus Deus*, by which Our Predecessor Leo XIII, foreseeing as it were this new development of biblical studies, summoned Catholic exegetes to labor and wisely defined the direction and the method to be followed in that labor.

13. We also, by this Encyclical Letter, desire to insure that the work may not only proceed without interruption, but may also daily become more perfect and fruitful; and to that end We are specially intent on pointing out to all what yet remains to be done, with what spirit the Catholic exegete should undertake, at the present day, so great and noble a work, and to give new incentive and fresh courage to the laborers who toil so strenuously in the vineyard of the Lord.

§ 1—RECOURSE TO ORIGINAL TEXTS

- 14. The Fathers of the Church in their time, especially Augustine, warmly recommended to the Catholic scholar, who undertook the investigation and explanation of the Sacred Scriptures, the study of the ancient languages and recourse to the original texts. However, such was the state of letters in those times, that not many,—and these few but imperfectly—knew the Hebrew language. In the middle ages, when Scholastic Theology was at the height of its vigor, the knowledge of even the Greek language had long since become so rare in the West, that even the greatest Doctors of that time, in their exposition of the Sacred Text, had recourse only to the Latin version, known as the Vulgate.
- 15. On the contrary in this our time, not only the Greek language, which since the humanistic renaissance has been, as it were, restored to new life, is familiar to almost all students of antiquity and letters, but the knowledge of Hebrew also and of other oriental languages has spread far and wide among literary men. Moreover there are now such abundant aids to the study of these languages that the biblical scholar, who by neglecting them would deprive himself of access to the original texts, could in no wise escape the stigma of levity and sloth. For it is the duty of the exegete to lay hold, so to speak, with the greatest care and reverence of the very least expressions which, under the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, have flowed from the pen of the sacred writer, so as to arrive at a deeper and fuller knowledge of his meaning.
- 16. Wherefore let him diligently apply himself so as to acquire daily a greater facility in biblical as well as in other oriental languages and to support his interpretation by the aids which all branches of philology supply. This indeed St. Jerome strove earnestly to

achieve, as [p. 12] far as the science of his time permitted; to this also aspired with untiring zeal and no small fruit not a few of the great exegetes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, although the knowledge of languages then was much less than at the present day. In like manner therefore ought we to explain the original text which, having been written by the inspired author himself, has more authority and greater weight than any even the very best translation, whether ancient or modern; this can be done all the more easily and fruitfully, if to the knowledge of languages be joined a real skill in literary criticism of the same text.

Importance of textual criticism

- 17. The great importance which should be attached to this kind of criticism was aptly pointed out by Augustine, when, among the precepts to be recommended to the student of the Sacred Books, he put in the first place the care to possess a corrected text. "The correction of the codices"—so says this most distinguished Doctor of the Church— "should first of all engage the attention of those who wish to know the Divine Scripture so that the uncorrected may give place to the corrected." In the present day indeed this art, which is called textual criticism and which is used with great and praiseworthy results in the editions of profane writings, is also quite rightly employed in the case of the Sacred Books, because of that very reverence which is due to the Divine Oracles. For its very purpose is to insure that the sacred text be restored, as perfectly as possible, be purified from the corruptions due to the carelessness of the copyists and be freed, as far as may be done, from glosses and omissions, from the interchange and repetition of words and from all other kinds of mistakes, which are wont to make their way gradually into writings handed down through many centuries.
- 18. It is scarcely necessary to observe that this criticism, which some fifty years ago not a few made use of quite arbitrarily and often in such wise that one would say they did so to introduce into the sacred text their own preconceived ideas, today has rules so firmly established and secure, that it has become a most valuable aid to the purer and more accurate editing of the sacred text and that any abuse can easily be discovered. Nor is it necessary here to call to mind—since it is doubtless familiar and evident to all students of Sacred Scripture—to what extent namely the Church has held in honor these studies in textual criticism from the earliest centuries down even to the present day.
- 19. Today therefore, since this branch of science has attained to such [p. 13] high perfection, it is the honorable, though not always easy, task of students of the Bible to procure by every means that as soon as possible may be duly published by Catholics editions of the Sacred Books and of ancient versions, brought out in accordance with these standards, which, that is to say, unite the greatest reverence for the sacred text with an exact observance of all the rules of criticism. And let all know that this prolonged labor is not only necessary for the right understanding of the divinely-given writings, but also is urgently demanded by that piety by which it behooves us to be grateful to the God of all providence, Who from the throne of His majesty has sent these books as so many paternal letters to His own children.

Meaning of Tridentine decree

20. Nor should anyone think that this use of the original texts, in accordance with the methods of criticism, in any way derogates from those decrees so wisely enacted by the Council of Trent concerning the Latin Vulgate. It is historically certain that the Presidents of the Council received a commission, which they duly carried out, to beg, that is, the

Sovereign Pontiff in the name of the Council that he should have corrected, as far as possible, first a Latin, and then a Greek, and Hebrew edition, which eventually would be published for the benefit of the Holy Church of God. If this desire could not then be fully realized owing to the difficulties of the times and other obstacles, at present it can, We earnestly hope, be more perfectly and entirely fulfilled by the united efforts of Catholic scholars.

- 21. And if the Tridentine Synod wished "that all should use as authentic" the Vulgate Latin version, this, as all know, applies only to the Latin Church and to the public use of the same Scriptures; nor does it, doubtless, in any way diminish the authority and value of the original texts. For there was no question then of these texts, but of the Latin versions, which were in circulation at that time, and of these the same Council rightly declared to be preferable that which "had been approved by its long-continued use for so many centuries in the Church." Hence this special authority or as they say, authenticity of the Vulgate was not affirmed by the Council particularly for critical reasons, but rather because of its legitimate use in the Churches throughout so many centuries; by which use indeed the same is shown, in the sense in which the Church has understood and understands it, to be free from any error [p. 14] whatsoever in matters of faith and morals; so that, as the Church herself testifies and affirms, it may be quoted safely and without fear of error in disputations, in lectures and in preaching; and so its authenticity is not specified primarily as critical, but rather as juridical.
- 22. Wherefore this authority of the Vulgate in matters of doctrine by no means prevents nay rather today it almost demands—either the corroboration and confirmation of this same doctrine by the original texts or the having recourse on any and every occasion to the aid of these same texts, by which the correct meaning of the Sacred Letters is everywhere daily made more clear and evident. Nor is it forbidden by the decree of the Council of Trent to make translations into the vulgar tongue, even directly from the original texts themselves, for the use and benefit of the faithful and for the better understanding of the divine word, as We know to have been already done in a laudable manner in many countries with the approval of the Ecclesiastical authority. § 2—INTERPRETATION OF SACRED BOOKS
- 23. Being thoroughly prepared by the knowledge of the ancient languages and by the aids afforded by the art of criticism, let the Catholic exegete undertake the task, of all those imposed on him the greatest, that namely of discovering and expounding the genuine meaning of the Sacred Books. In the performance of this task let the interpreters bear in mind that their foremost and greatest endeavor should be to discern and define clearly that sense of the biblical words which is called literal. Aided by the context and by comparison with similar passages, let them therefore by means of their knowledge of languages search out with all diligence the literal meaning of the words; all these helps indeed are wont to be pressed into service in the explanation also of profane writers, so that the mind of the author may be made abundantly clear.
- 24. The commentators of the Sacred Letters, mindful of the fact that here there is question of a divinely inspired text, the care and interpretation of which have been confided to the Church by God Himself, should no less diligently take into account the explanations and declarations of the teaching authority of the Church, as likewise the interpretation given by the Holy Fathers, and even "the analogy of faith" as Leo XIII most wisely observed in the Encyclical Letter *Providentissimus Deus*. With special zeal should they apply

themselves, not only to expounding exclusively these matters which belong to the historical, archeological, philological and other auxiliary sciences—as, to Our regret, is done in certain [p. 15] commentaries,—but, having duly referred to these, in so far as they may aid the exegesis, they should set forth in particular the theological doctrine in faith and morals of the individual books or texts so that their exposition may not only aid the professors of theology in their explanations and proofs of the dogmas of faith, but may also be of assistance to priests in their presentation of Christian doctrine to the people, and in fine may help all the faithful to lead a life that is holy and worthy of a Christian.

Right use of spiritual sense

- 25. By making such an exposition, which is above all, as We have said, theological, they will efficaciously reduce to silence those who affirming that they scarcely ever find anything in biblical commentaries to raise their hearts to God, to nourish their souls or promote their interior life, repeatedly urge that we should have recourse to a certain spiritual and, as they say, mystical interpretation. With what little reason they thus speak is shown by the experience of many, who, assiduously considering and meditating the word of God, advanced in perfection and were moved to an intense love for God; and this same truth is clearly proved by the constant tradition of the Church and the precepts of the greatest Doctors. Doubtless all spiritual sense is not excluded from the Sacred Scripture.
- 26. For what was said and done in the Old Testament was ordained and disposed by God with such consummate wisdom, that things past prefigured in a spiritual way those that were to come under the new dispensation of grace. Wherefore the exegete, just as he must search out and expound the literal meaning of the words, intended and expressed by the sacred writer, so also must he do likewise for the spiritual sense, provided it is clearly intended by God. For God alone could have known this spiritual meaning and have revealed it to us. Now Our Divine Saviour Himself points out to us and teaches us this same sense in the Holy Gospel; the Apostles also, following the example of the Master, profess it in their spoken and written words; the unchanging tradition of the Church approves it; finally the most ancient usage of the liturgy proclaims it, wherever may be rightly applied the well-known principle: "The rule of prayer is the rule of faith."
- Let Catholic exegetes then disclose and expound this spiritual significance, intended 27. and ordained by God, with that care which the dignity of the divine word demands; but let them scrupulously refrain from proposing as the genuine meaning of Sacred Scripture other figurative senses. It may indeed be useful, especially in preaching, to illus- [p. 16] trate and present the matters of faith and morals by a broader use of the Sacred Text in the figurative sense, provided this be done with moderation and restraint; it should, however, never be forgotten that this use of the Sacred Scripture is, as it were, extrinsic to it and accidental, and that, especially in these days, it is not free from danger, since the faithful, in particular those who are well-informed in the sciences sacred and profane, wish to know what God has told us in the Sacred Letters rather than what an ingenious orator or writer may suggest by a clever use of the words of Scripture. Nor does "the word of God, living and effectual and more piercing than any two-edged sword and reaching unto the division of the soul and the spirit, of the joints also and the marrow, and a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart" need artificial devices and human adaptation to move and impress souls; for the Sacred Pages, written under the inspiration

of the Spirit of God, are of themselves rich in original meaning; endowed with a divine power, they have their own value; adorned with heavenly beauty, they radiate of themselves light and splendor, provided they are so fully and accurately explained by the interpreter, that all the treasures of wisdom and prudence, therein contained, are brought to light.

Study of Holy Fathers

- 28. In the accomplishment of this task the Catholic exegete will find invaluable help in an assiduous study of those works, in which the Holy Fathers, the Doctors of the Church and the renowned interpreters of past ages have explained the Sacred Books. For, although sometimes less instructed in profane learning and in the knowledge of languages than the scripture scholars of our time, nevertheless by reason of the office assigned to them by God in the Church, they are distinguished by a certain subtle insight into heavenly things and by a marvelous keenness of intellect, which enables them to penetrate to the very innermost meaning of the divine word and bring to light all that can help to elucidate the teaching of Christ and promote holiness of life.
- 29. It is indeed regrettable that such precious treasures of Christian antiquity are almost unknown to many writers of the present day, and that students of the history of exegesis have not yet accomplished all that seems necessary for the due investigation and appreciation of so momentous a subject. Would that many, by seeking out the authors of the Catholic interpretation of Scripture and diligently studying their works and drawing thence the almost inexhaustible riches therein stored [p. 17] up, might contribute largely to this end, so that it might be daily more apparent to what extent those authors understood and made known the divine teaching of the Sacred Books, and that the interpreters of today might thence take example and seek suitable arguments.
- 30. For thus at long last will be brought about the happy and fruitful union between the doctrine and spiritual sweetness of expression of the ancient authors and the greater erudition and maturer knowledge of the modern, having as its result new progress in the never fully explored and inexhaustible field of the Divine Letters. § 3—SPECIAL TASKS OF INTERPRETERS
- 31. Moreover we may rightly and deservedly hope that our times also can contribute something towards the deeper and more accurate interpretation of Sacred Scripture. For not a few things, especially in matters pertaining to history, were scarcely at all or not fully explained by the commentators of past ages, since they lacked almost all the information which was needed for their clearer exposition. How difficult for the Fathers themselves, and indeed well nigh unintelligible, were certain passages is shown, among other things, by the oft-repeated efforts of many of them to explain the first chapters of Genesis; likewise by the reiterated attempts of St. Jerome so to translate the Psalms that the literal sense, that, namely, which is expressed by the words themselves, might be clearly revealed.
- 32. There are, in fine, other books or texts, which contain difficulties brought to light only in quite recent times, since a more profound knowledge of antiquity has given rise to new questions, on the basis of which the point at issue may be more appropriately examined. Quite wrongly therefore do some pretend, not rightly understanding the conditions of biblical study, that nothing remains to be added by the Catholic exegete of our time to what Christian antiquity has produced; since, on the contrary, these our times have brought to light so many things, which call for a fresh investigation and a new

examination, and which stimulate not a little the practical zeal of the present-day interpreter.

Character of sacred writer

- 33. As in our age indeed new questions and new difficulties are multiplied, so, by God's favor, new means and aids to exegesis are also provided. Among these it is worthy of special mention that Catholic theologians, following the teaching of the Holy Fathers and especially of the Angelic and Common Doctor, have examined and explained the nature and effects of biblical inspiration more exactly and more fully [p. 18] than was wont to be done in previous ages. For having begun by expounding minutely the principle that the inspired writer, in composing the sacred book, is the living and reasonable instrument of the Holy Spirit, they rightly observe that, impelled by the divine motion, he so uses his faculties and powers, that from the book composed by him all may easily infer "the special character of each one and, as it were, his personal traits." Let the interpreter then, with all care and without neglecting any light derived from recent research, endeavor to determine the peculiar character and circumstances of the sacred writer, the age in which he lived, the sources written or oral to which he had recourse and the forms of expression he employed.
- 34. Thus can he the better understand who was the inspired author, and what he wishes to express by his writings. There is no one indeed but knows that the supreme rule of interpretation is to discover and define what the writer intended to express, as St. Athanasius excellently observes: "Here, as indeed is expedient in all other passages of Sacred Scripture, it should be noted, on what occasion the Apostle spoke; we should carefully and faithfully observe to whom and why he wrote, lest, being ignorant of these points, or confounding one with another, we miss the real meaning of the author."

Importance of mode of writing

- 35. What is the literal sense of a passage is not always as obvious in the speeches and writings of the ancient authors of the East, as it is in the works of the writers of our own time. For what they wished to express is not to be determined by the rules of grammar and philology alone, nor solely by the context; the interpreter must, as it were, go back wholly in spirit to those remote centuries of the East and with the aid of history, archaeology, enthnology [*sic*] and other sciences, accurately determine what modes of writing, so to speak, the authors of that ancient period would be likely to use, and in fact did use.
- 36. For the ancient peoples of the East, in order to express their ideas, did not always employ those forms or kinds of speech, which we use today; but rather those used by the men of their times and countries. What those exactly were the commentator cannot determine as it were in advance, but only after a careful examination of the ancient literature of the East. The investigation, carried out, on this point, during the past [p. 19] forty or fifty years with greater care and diligence than ever before, has more clearly shown what forms of expression were used in those far off times, whether in poetic description or in the formulation of laws and and [*sic*] rules of life or in recording the facts and events of history. The same inquiry has also clearly shown the special preeminence of the people of Israel among all the other ancient nations of the East in their mode of compiling history, both by reason of its antiquity and by reason of the faithful record of the events; qualities which may well be attributed to the gift of divine inspiration and to the peculiar religious purpose of biblical history.

- 37. Nevertheless no one, who has a correct idea of biblical inspiration, will be surprised to find, even in the Sacred Writers, as in other ancient authors, certain fixed ways of expounding and narrating, certain definite idioms, especially of a kind peculiar to the Semitic tongues, so-called approximations, and certain hyperbolical modes of expression, nay, at times, even paradoxical, which help to impress the ideas more deeply on the mind. For of the modes of expression which, among ancient peoples, and especially those of the East, human language used to express its thought, none is excluded from the Sacred Books, provided the way of speaking adopted in no wise contradicts the holiness and truth of God, as, with his customary wisdom, the Angelic Doctor already observed in these words: "In Scripture divine things are presented to us in the manner which is in common use amongst men." For as the substantial Word of God became like to men in all things, "except sin," so the words of God, expressed in human language, are made like to human speech in every respect, except error. In this consists that "condescension" of the God of providence, which St. John Chrysostom extolled with the highest praise and repeatedly declared to be found in the Sacred Books.
- 38 Hence the Catholic commentator, in order to comply with the present needs of biblical studies, in explaining the Sacred Scripture and in demonstrating and proving its immunity from all error, should also make a prudent use of this means, determine, that is, to what extent the manner of expression or the literary mode adopted by the sacred writer may lead to a correct and genuine interpretation; and let him be convinced that this part of his office cannot be neglected without serious detriment to Catholic exegesis. Not infrequently—to mention only one [p. 20] instance—when some persons reproachfully charge the Sacred Writers with some historical error or inaccuracy in the recording of facts, on closer examination it turns out to be nothing else than those customary modes of expression and narration peculiar to the ancients, which used to be employed in the mutual dealings of social life and which in fact were sanctioned by common usage.
- 39. When then such modes of expression are met with in the sacred text, which, being meant for men, is couched in human language, justice demands that they be no more taxed with error than when they occur in the ordinary intercourse of daily life. By this knowledge and exact appreciation of the modes of speaking and writing in use among the ancients can be solved many difficulties, which are raised against the veracity and historical value of the Divine Scriptures, and no less efficaciously does this study contribute to a fuller and more luminous understanding of the mind of the Sacred Writer.

Studies of biblical antiquities

- Let those who cultivate biblical studies turn their attention with all due diligence 40. towards this point and let them neglect none of those discoveries, whether in the domain of archaeology or in ancient history or literature, which serve to make better known the mentality of the ancient writers, as well as their manner and art of reasoning, narrating and writing. In this connection Catholic laymen also should consider that they will not only further profane science, but moreover will render a conspicuous service to the Christian cause if they devote themselves with all due diligence and application to the exploration and investigation of the monuments of antiquity and contribute, according to their abilities, to the solution of questions hitherto obscure.
- For all human knowledge, even the non-sacred, has indeed its own proper dignity and 41. excellence, being a finite participation of the infinite knowledge of God, but it acquires a

new and higher dignity and, as it were, a consecration, when it is employed to cast a brighter light upon the things of God.

§ 4—WAY OF TREATING MORE DIFFICULT QUESTIONS

- 42. The progressive exploration of the antiquities of the East, mentioned above, the more accurate examination of the original text itself, the more extensive and exact knowledge of languages both biblical and oriental, have with the help of God, happily provided the solution of not a few of those questions, which, in the time of Our Predecessor Leo XIII of immortal memory, were raised by critics outside or hostile [p. 21] to the Church against the authenticity, antiquity, integrity and historical value of the Sacred Books. For Catholic exegetes, by a right use of those same scientific arms, not infrequently abused by the adversaries, proposed such interpretations, which are in harmony with Catholic doctrine and the genuine current of tradition, and at the same time are seen to have proved equal to the difficulties, either raised by new explorations and discoveries, or bequeathed by antiquity for solution in our time.
- 43. Thus has it come about that confidence in the authority and historical value of the Bible, somewhat shaken in the case of some by so many attacks, today among Catholics is completely restored; moreover there are not wanting even non-Catholic writers, who by serious and calm inquiry have been led to abandon modern opinion and to return, at least in some points, to the more ancient ideas. This change is due in great part to the untiring labor, by which Catholic commentators of the Sacred Letters, in no way deterred by difficulties and obstacles of all kinds, strove with all their strength to make suitable use of what learned men of the present day, by their investigations in the domain of archaeology or history or philology, have made available for the solution of new questions.

Difficulties not yet solved

- 44. Nevertheless no one will be surprised, if all difficulties are not yet solved and overcome; but that even today serious problems greatly exercise the minds of Catholic exegetes. We should not lose courage on this account; nor should we forget that in the human sciences the same happens as in the natural world; that is to say, new beginnings grow little by little and fruits are gathered only after many labors. Thus it has happened that certain disputed points, which in the past remained unsolved and in suspense, in our days, with the progress of studies, have found a satisfactory solution. Hence there are grounds for hope that those also will by constant effort be at last made clear, which now seem most complicated and difficult.
- 45. And if the wished-for solution be slow in coming or does not satisfy us, since perhaps a successful conclusion may be reserved to posterity, let us not wax impatient thereat, seeing that in us also is rightly verified what the Fathers, and especially Augustine, observed in their time viz: God wished difficulties to be scattered through the Sacred Books inspired by Him, in order that we might be urged to read and [p. 22] scrutinize them more intently, and, experiencing in a salutary manner our own limitations, we might be exercised in due submission of mind. No wonder if of one or other question no solution wholly satisfactory will ever be found, since sometimes we have to do with matters obscure in themselves and too remote from our times and our experience; and since exegesis also, like all other most important sciences, has its secrets, which, impenetrable to our minds, by no efforts whatsoever can be unravelled.

Definite solutions sought

- 46. But this state of things is no reason why the Catholic commentator, inspired by an active and ardent love of his subject and sincerely devoted to Holy Mother Church, should in any way be deterred from grappling again and again with these difficult problems, hitherto unsolved, not only that he may refute the objections of the adversaries, but also may attempt to find a satisfactory solution, which will be in full accord with the doctrine of the Church, in particular with the traditional teaching regarding the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture, and which will at the same time satisfy the indubitable conclusions of profane sciences.
- 47. Let all the other sons of the Church bear in mind that the efforts of these resolute laborers in the vineyard of the Lord should be judged not only with equity and justice, but also with the greatest charity; all moreover should abhor that intemperate zeal which imagines that whatever is new should for that very reason be opposed or suspected. Let them bear in mind above all that in the rules and laws promulgated by the Church there is question of doctrine regarding faith and morals; and that in the immense matter contained in the Sacred Books—legislative, historical, sapiential and prophetical—there are but few texts whose sense has been defined by the authority of the Church, nor are those more numerous about which the teaching of the Holy Fathers is unanimous. There remain therefore many things, and of the greatest importance, in the discussion and exposition of which the skill and genius of Catholic commentators may and ought to be freely exercised, so that each may contribute his part to the advantage of all, to the continued progress of the sacred doctrine and to the defense and honor of the Church.
- 48. This true liberty of the children of God, which adheres faithfully to the teaching of the Church and accepts and uses gratefully the contributions of profane science, this liberty, upheld and sustained in every way by the confidence of all, is the condition and source of all lasting fruit and of all solid progress in Catholic doctrine, as Our Predecessor of happy [p. 23] memory Leo XIII rightly observes, when he says: "Unless harmony of mind be maintained and principles safeguarded, no progress can be expected in this matter from the varied studies of many."

286. Bible, Sufficiency of, as Rule of Faith SOURCE: The Belgic Confession, A.D. 1561 (rev. 1619), art. 7, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 387, 388.

[p. 387] Art. VII. We believe that these Holy Scriptures fully contain the will of God, and that whatsoever man ought to [p. 388] believe unto salvation, is sufficiently taught therein.

287. Bible, Sufficiency of, for Salvation

SOURCE: The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), chap. 1, "Of the Holy Scripture," secs. 6, 9, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 603, 605.

[p. 603] VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men...

[p. 605] IX. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The last sentence reads "it may be searched" in the present revised form in A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards, ed. by James Benjamin Green (1958), p. 19.]

288. Bible, Sufficient and Infallible Guide

SOURCE: Confession of the Free-will Baptists (1834, 1868), chap. 1, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 749.

[Introductory note:] This confession was adopted and issues by the General Conference of the Freewill Baptists of America in 1834, revised in 1848, and again in 1865, and 1868. The text is taken from the *Treatise on the Faith and Practice of the Free-will Baptists, written under the direction of the General Conference* Dover, N. H.

These are the Old and New Testaments; they were written by holy men, inspired by the Holy Spirit, and contain God's revealed will to man. They are a sufficient and infallible guide in religious faith and practice.

289. Bible, Understandable to All

SOURCE: The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), chap. 1, "Of the Holy Scripture," sec. 7, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 604.

VII. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.

290. Bible, Unity of

SOURCE: Marcus Dods, The Bible: Its Origin and Nature (New York: Scribner, 1912), p. 18.

On the whole the unity of Scripture has been universally recognized. Moreover, this unity is obviously not designed and artificial; it is not even conscious; the writers of the several parts had no intention to contribute nor any idea that they were contributing to one whole... And yet when these various writings are drawn together, their unity becomes apparent.

291. Bible, Unity of, Wesley on

SOURCE: John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament* (reprint; London: The Epworth Press, 1952), pp. 8, 9.

[p. 8] Concerning the Scriptures in general, it may be observed, the word of the living God, which directed the first patriarchs also, was, in the time of *Moses*, committed to writing. To this were added, in several succeeding generations, the inspired writings of the other prophets. Afterward, what the Son of God preached, and the Holy Ghost spake by the apostles, [p. 9] the apostles and evangelists wrote... Every part thereof is worthy of God: and all together are one entire body.

292. Bible—Universality Its Message

SOURCE: Eric M. North, ed., *The Book of a Thousand Tongues* (New York: Harper, 1938), p. 10. Copyright 1939 by the American Bible Society. Used by permission.

Third, there is in the event here celebrated a demonstration of the universal character of the ministry of the Bible and of its message to humanity. To be sure, the Scriptures have not been translated into these thousand tongues because the people who spoke all these tongues demanded it. But they have been translated because Syrians and Goths, Armenians and Ethiopians, Slavs, Spaniards, Saxons, Poles, Germans, Scandinavians, Britishers, Americans, and men and women of many other nations, finding that this foreign Hebrew and Greek Book spoke to them as no other book spoke—ay more, had the very message of life for them—determined that their own people should have it and that other peoples ought to have it, too. "Among all the links which bind together the scattered branches of the English-speaking race, one of the very strongest is their common possession of a book not a single line of which was written, or a single thought conceived, by an Englishman,"² [Note 2: Baikie, *The English Bible and Its Story*, 7.]

293. Bible, Use of, in Instruction of "Faithful" (Pope Pius XII, 1943) SOURCE: Pius XII, Letter *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, Sept. 30, 1943 (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943), Part II (Doctrinal), sec. 5, pp. 23, 24.

[P. 23] § 5—USE OF SCRIPTURE IN INSTRUCTION OF FAITHFUL

- 49. Whosoever considers the immense labors undertaken taken by Catholic exegetes during well nigh two thousand years, so that the word of God, imparted to men through the Sacred Letters, might daily be more deeply and fully understood and more intensely loved, will easily be convinced that it is the serious duty of the faithful, and especially of priests, to make free and holy use of this treasure, accumulated throughout so many centuries by the greatest intellects. For the Sacred Books were not given by God to men to satisfy their curiosity or to provide them with material for study and research, but, as the Apostle observes, in order that these Divine Oracles might "instruct us to salvation, by the faith which is in Christ Jesus" and "that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work."
- 50. Let priest therefore, who are bound by their office to procure the eternal salvation of the faithful, after they have themselves by diligent study perused the sacred pages and made them their own by prayer and meditations assiduously distribute the heavenly treasures of the divine word by sermons, homilies and exhortations; let them confirm the Christian doctrine by sentences from the Sacred Books and illustrate it by outstanding examples from sacred history and in particular from the Gospel of Christ Our Lord; and—avoiding with the greatest care those purely arbitrary and far-fetched adaptations, which are not a use, but rather an abuse of the divine word—let them set forth all this with such eloquence, lucidity and clearness that the faithful may not only be moved and inflamed to reform their lives, but may also conceive in their hearts the greatest veneration for the Sacred Scripture.
- 51. The same veneration the Bishops should endeavor daily to the increase and perfect among the faithful committed to their care, encouraging all those initiatives by which men, filled with apostolic zeal, laudably strive to excite and foster among Catholics a greater knowledge of and love for the Sacred Books. Let them favor therefore and lend help to those pious associations whose aim it is to spread copies of the Sacred Letters, especially of the Gospels, among the faithful, and to procure by every means that in Christian families the same be read daily with piety [p. 24] and devotion; let them efficaciously recommend by word and example, whenever the liturgical laws permit, the Sacred Scriptures translated, with the approval of the Ecclesiastical authority, into modern languages; let them themselves give public conferences or dissertations on biblical subjects, or see that they are given by other public orators well versed in the matter.
- 52. Let the ministers of the Sanctuary support in every way possible and diffuse in fitting manner among all classes of the faithful the periodicals which so laudably and with such heartening results are published from time to time in various parts of the world, whether to treat and expose in a scientific manner biblical questions, or to adapt the fruits of these investigations to the sacred ministry, or to benefit the faithful. Let the ministers of the Sanctuary be convinced that all this, and whatsoever else an apostolic zeal and a sincere love of the divine word may find suitable to this high purpose, will be an efficacious help to the cure of souls.

294. Bible Criticism—Albright's Retreat From Extreme Radicalism SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "In Memoriam" [of M. G. Kyle], *BASOR*, 51 (September, 1933), 5, 6. Used by permission.

[p. 5] The writer used to meet Dr. Kyle occasionally, before coming to Palestine in 1919, at learned society meetings. In those days, the fact that we were apparently at antipodes with regard to most crucial biblical and oriental problems seemed to preclude all real friendship. In the spring of 1921 Dr. Kyle came to Jerusalem with his family for a stay of several weeks as lecturer in the School, during the writer's year as acting director. The acquaintance then developed soon ripened into friendship...

[p. 6] We seldom or never debated biblical questions, but there can be no doubt that our constant association with the ever-recurring opportunity for comparing biblical and archaeological data has led to increasing convergence between our views, once so far apart. To the last, however, Dr. Kyle remained staunchly conservative on most of his basic positions, while the writer has gradually changed from the extreme radicalism of 1919 to a standpoint which can neither be called conservative nor radical, in the usual sense of the terms.

295. Bible Criticism, as Defined by a Conservative

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 44, 45, footnote 3. Copyright, 1952, by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 44] It is unfortunate that the very word "critical" has come to be identified with only one branch of biblical and theological studies: the liberal and rationalistic wing. This use of the word is so fixed in our thinking that Webster's dictionary defines biblical criticism as follows: "Designating, or pertaining to, that school of Bible students who treat the received text with greater freedom than the Traditionalists do, discussing its sources and history and departing in many places from the traditional conclusion." This is the common but nevertheless inaccurate limitation of the term. In fact, again to quote the dictionary, criticism properly speaking is "the scient[i]fic investigation of the origin, text, composition, character, history, etc., of literary documents, especially the Bible." The present writer would deny that scientific study of the Scriptures necessarily leads to the usually accepted "critical" positions. It is more accurate to speak of "liberal" criticism and "conservative" criticism, indicating by the two terms the philosophical assumptions which underly [*sic*] the study of the Scriptures. No man is free from philosophical presuppositions. One man may derive his assumptions from modern philosophical positions, another by inductive experience and study of the Bible itself. One position is in reality no more nor less "scientific" than the other, unless "scientific" be defined as the framework of philosophical assumptions within which a man to be a "scientist" must work. In that case, "scientist" refers not to the *method* of study but to the *assumptions* underlying the study; and this is the very point at issue. In some liberal quarters, especially in England, there is a growing recognition that "theology" and "history" cannot be kept separate in biblical study, but that [p. 45] the operation of the supernatural in biblical history must be admitted. This constitutes, for the historian, "The Riddle of the New Testament." (Cf. the book by this name written by Edwyn Hoskyns and Noel Davey, London: Faber and Faber, 1947; first published in 1931). The question which must be faced is the extent to which this supernatural element was operative. The thorough conservative feels that it extended to the very writing of the biblical record, and that inspiration is but the extension of the same supernatural factor which must be recognized in the person of Jesus and the rise of the Church.

We would urge that "criticism" be understood to mean the careful study of the Bible which deals with all problems by the scientific, historical method, including philology, history, exegesis, and doctrine; and the phrases "conservative criticism" and "liberal criticism" be permitted to designate the critical approach based on the assumptions of biblical orthodoxy on the one hand and of liberalism on the other. There will of course be many gradations between the two positions. While it is true that many conservatives have ignored the works of liberal critics, it must also be pointed out that liberal criticism has all too often ignored the works of conservative critics. One may search the bibliographies of many modern liberal books on the New Testament and find no mention of scholars like Theodor Zahn or J. G. Machen.

5

296. Bible Criticism—a Changing Trend From Criticism to Modern Conservatism

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible* (3d ed.), pp. 129, 130. Copyright 1935 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 129] The orthodox critical attitude toward the traditions of the Patriarchs was summed up by the gifted founder of this school, Julius Wellhausen, in the following words: 'From the patriarchal narratives it is impossible to obtain any historical information with regard to the Patriarchs; we can only learn something about the time in which the stories about them were first told by the Israelite people. This later period, with all its essential and superficial characteristics, was unintentionally projected back into hoary antiquity, and is reflected here like a transfigured mirage.' ... Practically all of the Old Testament scholars of standing in Europe and America held these or similar views until very recently. Now, however, the situation is changing with the greatest rapidity, since the theory of Wellhausen will not bear the test of archaeological examination. The opposition to this theory began in the camp of Assyriology, where the gauntlet was thrown by Sayce, Hommel, and [p. 130] Winckler, but the methods employed by these scholars were so fanciful, and the knowledge of ancient Palestine (apart from the Bible) which then existed was so slight, that they were not taken seriously by their antagonists.

297. Bible Criticism, Changing Trend Manifest in SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, "H. H. Rowley and the New Trend in Biblical Studies," in *Inspiration and Interpretation,* ed. by John F. Walvoord, pp. 189,191. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 189] In open reaction against a mere intellectual and scientific approach, practically divorced from a spiritual understanding of content, which to a large degree has characterized the modern critical study of the Scriptures and stigmatized it with spiritual barrenness, the new movement is an attempt to synthesize the various elements which from the critical standpoint enter into a complete comprehension of these ancient Oracles—the divine as well as the human, the spiritual as well as the scientific, the practical as well as the theoretical, and the religiously relevant as well as the technical.

The task to which the new criticism thus sets itself involves the problem of integrating the alleged findings of modern critical scholarship into a reverent, believing approach to the Bible that will not eventuate, as has heretofore largely been the case, in

⁵Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

virtual abandonment of the Sacred Scriptures as the authoritative basis of religious faith, with resultant spiritual bankruptcy. To this end, as Otto Baab has pointed out, "biblical scholars are beginning to evaluate their work, not simply on the basis of the advancement of technical knowledge, but likewise in the light of the religious consequences." ...

[p. 191] The task ... of attempting to harmonize the alleged discoveries of modern critical scholarship with the new constructive approach to the Bible as a spiritual Book demanding a "spiritual" as well as an "intellectual understanding" to its full comprehension is extremely difficult. It may well be that in accepting "substantially the work of Biblical criticism" any imagined harmonization effected between the Bible as a trustworthy guide to faith and practice and the alleged findings of modern criticism will have to be made almost totally at the expense of accepting the Bible as reliable. However, the shifting history of many of the higher critical views, such as the various documentary theories of the Pentateuch, together with the high degree of subjectivity which characterizes them and the questionable assumptions which underlie many of them, well warrant firm skepticism on the part of the conservative scholar toward many of the alleged "findings" of modern Biblical criticism, no matter how widely they are embraced or how loudly they are hailed as "assured results," especially when they compel him to lower his attitude toward the inspiration and trustworthiness of the Bible. So it is that G. Ch. Aalders says, "... we feel the more obliged to put forth all our efforts in a real scholarly research of the Old Testament which does not in the least detract from its divine authority."

298. Bible Criticism—Conservative Views, Tendency Toward SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, editor's Introduction, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. xvii, xviii. Used by permission.

[p. xvii] In general, it may be said that there has been a tendency towards more conservative views on many questions than were common at the opening of our period. These more conservative views are not shared by all scholars, though they are [p. xviii] widespread, and any assessment of the position today is bound to give prominence to them. They are hailed sometimes as evidence of the failure of critical scholarship, and as the justification of the older conservatism that has been mentioned. This is quite inaccurate and misleading. For they are reached by the critical method, and hence must be accounted among its fruits. On the other hand, their conservatism is both other and firmer than the older conservatism, just because it is critically, and not dogmatically, based, and because it is built squarely on the evidence, instead of merely using the evidence as a support where it is convenient, and explaining it away where it is not.

299. Bible Criticism—Daniel, Early Date of, Defended SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 296. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

One of Nebuchadnezzar's records recalls his boast mentioned in Daniel 4:30: "The fortifications of Esagila and Babylon I strengthened and established the name of my reign forever." ²⁵ [Note 25: J. P. Free, *Archeology and Bible History* (Wheaton, Ill., 1950), p. 228.]

Daniel's allusion to Nebuchadnezzar's building activities is important in reference to the common critical view of the book, which gives it a Maccabean date (c. 167 B.C.). But the problem is, How did the supposed late writer of the book know that the glories of Babylon were due to Nebuchadnezzar's building operations? R. H. Pfeiffer, though defending the critical view, confesses that "we shall presumably never know."²⁶ [Note

26: Pfeiffer, *Old Testament Introduction* (New York, 1941), pp. 758f.] But if one accepts the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, in this instance notably supported by archeology, the critics' problem vanishes.

300. Bible Criticism—Date for Songs of Deborah and Miriam SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 543, 544. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

[p. 543] With this new independent criterion for dating it becomes possible to push back the dates generally accepted for many early Hebrew poems. The son of Deborah (Judg. 5) has always been dated early by the great majority of scholars, but most emendations of its text by textual critics must now be discarded. However, the Song of Miriam (or of Moses, Exod. 15), which resembles the Song of Deborah so closely in style and meter that they should never have been far separated in time, has usually been dated after the building of the Temple of Solomon, or even after the Exile. The key reason for such a late date has been verse 17, with its reference to "the mountain of thine inheritance, O Yahweh," which has quite naturally been referred to Mount Zion and the Temple. However, we have the very same expression used in the Canaanite Baal Epic, where Baal speaks of "the mountain of mine inheritance," referring to the partly terrestrial, partly celestial mountain where he resides in the far north. Biblical scholars had inferred long before the discovery of the Canaanite literature that ancient phraseology which applied originally to the cosmic mountain in the far north had been utilized in poetic descriptions of Zion. It now becomes absurd to use the verse as an argument for such an improbably late date of the Song of Miriam. This beautiful triumphal hymn, which may rightfully be termed the national anthem of ancient Israel, must now be pushed back to Israelite beginnings, substantially per- [p. 544] haps to the time of Moses in the thirteenth century B.C. The Oracles of Balaam (Num. 22-24) also go back to the thirteenth century B.C., or perhaps in part to the following century. Similarly, the Blessings of Jacob (Gen. 49) and of Moses (Deut. 33) cannot be later than the eleventh century B.C.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Albright places Moses and the Exodus in the thirteenth century B.C. However, acceptance of 1 Kings 6:1 as a literal statement of the interval between the Exodus and the beginning of the building of Solomon's Temple requires an Exodus date considerably earlier than that—approximately in mid-fifteenth century. See No. 723.]

301. Bible Criticism—Epistles Prove Genuineness of Christian Experience

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 9–12. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 9] It might be argued, and indeed has been argued, that the Man Jesus did exist but that some years after His death, perhaps after a generation or so, His followers wrote romantic and idealistic accounts of His life. Again, it is possible to argue that Luke's second book, the Acts of the Apostles, is something of an idealization of the beginnings of the Christian Church. But even if these contentions are true, if both the Gospels and the Acts were propaganda for the Christian sect and therefore not to be wholly relied upon as unbiased history, the critics of Christianity have still to explain the incontrovertible evidence of the "Epistles" or Letters. With one or two minor exceptions these are universally accepted as authentic, and it seems to me that Christians today do not always realize how valuable they are as evidence for the [p. 10] proof of the Faith.

For here we have no self-conscious documents, but vivid human letters, often bearing strong evidence of the emotion under which they were written...

Now if we were to compile a history of any place or nation, one of our most valuable discoveries would be a packet of letters reflecting the life of a certain part of that history. Newspapers, broadsheets, pamphlets, and any other printed matter would have their value of course; but because they were written for the public eye, and probably to prove a particular point, we should be very wary of [p, 11] accepting them as unbiased evidence. But that would not be true of a bundle of private letters, simply because they were not being written for the public at all, and the writer had no particular ax to grind. They would in all probability reflect most accurately the customs, habits, and thoughts of the times in which they were written. Now if this is true in the field of purely secular history, it is just as true, though of far deeper significance, when we study historically the beginnings of Christianity. What the Letters say and what the Letters imply, the newquality life revealed by these human unselfconscious documents, give us, to my mind, our most valuable Christian evidence. What impression is left upon our minds, or, if I may again be personal, what impression is left upon my mind after spending some years in translating these letters? Above all, I think, that men and women are being changed: the timid become brave; the filthy-minded become pure in heart; the mean and selfish become loving and generous. It is quite plain that the writers of these letters took it as a matter of course, as a matter of observed experience, that if men and women were open to the Spirit of God, then they could be and were transformed. The resources of God are not referred to as vague pieties, but as readily available spiritual power. Quite clearly a positive torrent of love and wisdom, sanity and courage has already flooded human life, and is always ready to flow wherever human hearts are open.

Now critics of Christianity have somehow got to explain this if they are to have a leg to stand on. Let them read these Letters for themselves and attempt to explain these transformations of character. No one had anything to gain in those days from being a Christian; indeed, there was a strong chance that the Christian would lose security and property and even life itself. Yet, reflected in the [p. 12] pages of these Letters, both men and women are exhibiting superb courage and are growing, as naturally as fruit upon a tree, those qualities of the spirit of which the world is so lamentably short. To my mind we are forced to the conclusion that something is at work here far above and beyond normal human experience, which can only be explained if we accept what the New Testament itself claims, that is, that ordinary men and women had become, through the power of Christ, sons and daughters of God.

302. Bible Criticism—Esther, Book of, Accuracy Corroborated SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 308. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The Book of Esther opens in the third year of Ahasuerus' reign (Esth. 1:3), but Esther was not made queen till his seventh year of rule (Esth. 2:16), evidently after the king had returned from Greece (479 B.C.), when Herodotus specifically relates that he paid attention to his harem.¹⁹ [Note 19: IX, 108.] However, because the events of the story and the characters, except the King Ahasuerus, are as yet unknown from secular history, numerous critics deny the historicity of the book, except as history may be woven into fiction. A. Bentzen, for example, calls it a "historical novel."

Although it is true that archeology as yet cannot prove the actual historicity of the book, it supplies ample illustrative evidence pointing to its genuineness. There is a

notable absence in it of Hellenistic coloring or of Greek words, suggesting a date at least before the late fourth century B.C. A. Bentzen, despite his contention that the book is nothing more than historical fiction, is forced to confess that "the story teller knows something of the administration of the Persian kingdom, and especially of the construction of the palace at Shushan." ²¹ [Note 21: Aage Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Copenhagen, 1948), Vol. II, p. 192.]

It is now well-known from excavations that "Shushan the Palace" (Esth. 1:2) refers to the acropolis of the Elamite city of Susa, on which site magnificent ruins remain of the splendor of the Persian kings. The French excavators between 1880–1890 uncovered Xerxes' splendid royal residence covering two and a half acres... In fact, "there is no event described in the Old Testament whose structural surroundings can be so vividly and accurately restored from actual excavations as 'Shushan the Palace.'"²³ [Note 23: Ira Price, *The Monuments and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, 1925), p. 408.]

303. Bible Criticism—Ezekiel and Chronicles

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "King Joiachin in Exile," *BA*, 5 (December, 1942), 53, 54. Used by permission.

[p. 53] Every pertinent recent find has increased the evidence both for the early date of the Book of Chronicles (about 400 B.C. or a little later) and for the care with which the Chronicler excerpted and compiled from older books, documents and oral traditions which were at his disposal.

Another by-product of Weidner's discoveries is new evidence for the [p. 54] authenticity of the Book of Ezekiel, sometimes held by recent writers to be a late fiction, or at least historically unreliable...

The new documentation brings other confirmations of the authenticity of the Book of Ezekiel—small but none the less significant, especially when added to the accumulated mass of archaeological illustrations of Ezekiel.

304. Bible Criticism—Ezekiel's Authenticity Vindicated

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 546. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

Incidentally, Torrey asserted that no Jewish *gardeners* can possibly have been taken as captives to Babylon—but we have in these same ration lists [in Babylonian records (see No. 1101)] among other captive Jews, a Jewish *gardener*! The attempt by Torrey and Irwin to show that there was no Jewish dispersion in Babylonia to which Ezekiel can have preached—assuming that he existed at all—has collapsed entirely. That neither language nor content of the Book of Ezekiel fits any period or place outside of the early sixth century B.C. and Babylonia, has been proved in detail by C. G. Howie (1950).

305. Bible Criticism—Ezra, Book of, Authenticity Vindicated by Contemporary Documents

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archaeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 546, 547. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

[p. 546] If we turn to the Book of Ezra, recent discoveries have vindicated the authenticity of its official documents in the most striking way. Here again Torrey and others have insisted that the language of the book is late, dating from the third century B.C., after Alexander the Great. The publication of the fifth-century Elephantine Papyri (1904–1911) from a Jewish colony near Assuan in upper Egypt had already made Torrey's position difficult, but subsequent discoveries by Mittwoch, Eilers, and others

have dealt it the coup de grâce. For example, Torrey insisted that certain words, among

them *pithgama*, "matter, affair," were of Greek origin and could not, therefore, have been taken into biblical Aramaic before 330 B.C. In the last twenty years these very same words have turned [p. 547] up in Egyptian Aramaic and Babylonian cuneiform documents from the late fifth century, that is, from the very time of Ezra! The forced Greek etymologies which he proposed are now mere curiosities. The great ancient historian, Eduard Meyer, fifty-five years ago insisted on the substantial authenticity of the Persian decrees and official letters preserved in Ezra; during the past twenty years strong additional evidence for them has been published by H. H. Schaeder and Elias Bickerman.

306. Bible Criticism—Ezra, Book of, Papyri Throw Light on SOURCE: Merril F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 307. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The most valuable single result of the papyri finds in Egypt, besides shedding a great deal of light on matters of detail, is to demonstrate that the Aramaic employed in Ezra is characteristic of the fifth century B.C. and that the letters recorded in the fourth chapter of Ezra show the same general style and are written in the same language as the Elephantine papyri and other more recently discovered letters of the same period.

307. Bible Criticism—Genesis, Evidences for Antiquity of

SOURCE: p. J. Wiseman, New Discoveries in Babylonia About Genesis (7th ed.; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1958), p. 58. Used by permission.

Every part of the book of Genesis furnishes evidence that it was compiled in the present form by Moses and that the documents from which he compiled it were written much earlier. The various lines of evidence may be summarised as follows:—

- (1) The presence of Babylonian words in the first eleven chapters.
- (2) The presence of Egyptian words in the last fourteen chapters.
- (3) Reference to towns which had either ceased to exist, or whose original names were already so ancient in the time of Moses, that as compiler of the book, he had to insert the new names, so that they could be identified by the Hebrews living in his day.
- (4) The narratives reveal such familiarity with the circumstances and details of the events recorded, as to indicate that they were written by persons concerned with those events.
- (5) Evidences that the narratives were originally written on tablets and in an ancient script.

308. Bible Criticism—Genesis, Jesus' Attitude on

SOURCE: p. J. Wiseman, *New Discoveries in Babylonia About Genesis* (7th ed.; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1958), pp. 131, 132. Used by permission.

[p. 131] "Higher Critics" are unanimous that there is one Person whose witness about Genesis always tells against them. They realize that their theories collapse hopelessly unless the value of His testimony regarding Genesis is discredited. There is no attempt to question the kind of evidence our Lord Jesus Christ gives; they admit that His statements are opposed to their own, so two theories have been invented which result in refusing to admit Him as a reliable witness... The effect of the first theory is to deny His truthfulness, and of the second, His knowledge. The first implies that even if He believed the Book of Genesis to be a literary patchwork by unknown authors who lived long after the time of Moses, He would speak to the people in such a manner as to lead them to believe that Moses wrote it. In other words they allege that He accommodated Himself to the errors He found around Him. It is sufficient to say that He spent His public ministry cutting clean across the prevailing ideas and errors of His time; there is not the slightest

evidence whatever for the theory. It implies that Christ knew that Moses had little or nothing to do with the early books of the Old Testament, that, for instance, such a Flood as described therein had never occurred, but they say He accommodated His speech to the ideas of the people who believed in the narratives of Genesis. Yet the astounding thing is that these very critics often say that when preaching or writing about Genesis they themselves cannot be absolutely honest unless [p. 132] they indicate that they have no belief in the literal fact or accuracy of these records. This surely implies that they feel they themselves must maintain a higher degree of honesty than they attribute to the Lord. Many of these men would shudder to so represent themselves, because they do not wish to take their critical principles to their logical conclusion.

The second or "Kenosis theory," in effect asserts that our Lord did not know as much as the modern critic does about the Book of Genesis. A critical Bible dictionary of the moderate school may be cited here: "Both Christ and His Apostles or writers of the New Testament held the current Jewish notions respecting the Divine authority and revelation of the Old Testament" (Hastings, Vol. III., p. 601). This dictionary maintains that these "current Jewish notions" were wholly unreliable. The consequence of this is, that the reliability of Christ is more insidiously undermined. They say that He may be relied upon for religious facts, but that His references to authorship or to certain narratives of the Old Testament cannot be relied on. On the other hand He said, "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things?"

We find that our Lord Jesus Christ put His Seal on the Book of Genesis; the earlier chapters of it are most particularly, though incidentally, referred to by Him. He quotes from the second chapter, and also refers to the Creation account, to the Fall, to Satan, Abel, Noah, the Flood, to Lot and the destruction of Sodom. We find that general or specific attestations are made to Genesis, chapter i, ii, iii, iv, v, vi to ix, and xi, as well as to incidents in the lives of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as recorded in the other chapters.

309. Bible Criticism—Genesis 10 (Table of Nations) Accurate SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 70, 71. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 70] It [the tenth chapter of Genesis] stands absolutely alone in ancient literature, without a remote parallel even among the Greeks, where we find the closest approach to a distribution of peoples in genealogical framework...

[p. 71] In view of the inextricable confusion of racial and national strains in the ancient Near East it would be quite impossible to draw up a simple scheme which would satisfy all scholars; no one system could satisfy all the claims made on the basis of ethnic predominance, ethnographic diffusion, language, physical type, culture, historical tradition. The Table of Nations remains an astonishingly accurate document.

310. Bible Criticism—Influence of Environment on Faith of Israel Refuted

SOURCE: George Ernest Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment* (Chicago: Regnery, 1950), pp. 12–14, 20–23. Used by permission of Alec R. Allenson, Inc., Naperville, Ill., present publishers.

[p. 12] How far can the study of the environment of Israel, for example, be used to explain the faith of Israel? Specifically, has the God of Israel evolved from the gods of the nations, or Israelite monotheism from pagan polytheism?

During the past century our preoccupation with the idea of development has led us to answer this last question in the affirmative... From animism Israel was thought to have evolved through polytheism and henotheism to monotheism. Israel and her environment

were understood to coalesce in large measure before the days of the prophets; only gradually thereafter did she free herself from its influence. Environment and growth are here used as the chief clues for the understanding of the real meaning of Israel's achievement. Are they sufficient, or has the measure of truth which they contain blinded us to other factors which they cannot explain?

In the first place, it is increasingly realized to-day that the attempt to make of the Old Testament a source book for the evolution of religion from very primitive to highly advanced concepts has been made possible only by means of a radical misinterpretation of the literature...

[p. 13] In the second place, we cannot assume that a mere description of an evolutionary process provides the explanation for matters which belong to the realm of religious faith. The development of ideas is not a theme in which Biblical writers show much interest, nor is it one which can create a community of faith, a people of God. How did Israel become a nation with such faith in its God that its very existence was conceived to be a miracle of grace? The prophets did not invent this remarkable conception since it existed before them. Sociological study cannot explain it, since the change in material status from nomadic to agricultural life could effect no such religious innovation. Nor can the environment provide the answer, since the Old Testament bears eloquent witness to the fact that Canaanite religion was the most dangerous and disintegrative factor which the faith of Israel had to face. Israel's knowledge [p. 14] of her election by God must be traced to a theological reflection on the meaning of the Exodus from Egypt. It is a primary datum in Old Testament theology, and it belongs to a realm of religious faith which cannot be described or understood by the criteria of growth...

[p. 20] The power of Yahweh the God of Israel was known because he had chosen this people for himself, because he had humbled Pharaoh and delivered Israel from slavery, had formed a dis- [p. 21] pirited people into a nation and given them a law and an 'inheritance' of land. Israel had been in bondage, but was now freed. No abstract words were needed to describe God's being; it was sufficient to identify him with a simple historical statement: he was the God who had brought Israel out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage (Ex. 20.2)...

[p. 22] So great was he that the Israelite acknowledged his Lordship over every phenomenon that his experience encountered. No [p. 23] one aspect of nature was more characteristic of Yahweh than another; he was Lord both of the natural and the historical event, 'the God of heaven and the God of the earth' (Gen. 24.3). He therefore transcended nature, as he transcended history.

It was not that Israelite leaders necessarily reasoned all this out in a speculative way. The experience of their people led them to know it almost intuitively. They recognized their God in the first instance as authoritative and decisive power. And the point where that power was apprehended led them to an entirely different faith from that of the polytheist. The problem of life was seen, not as an integration with the forces of nature, but as an adjustment to the will of the God who had chosen them.

311. Bible Criticism—Joshua and Judges Confirmed SOURCE: John Garstang, *The Foundations of Bible History; Joshua, Judges* (New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931), pp. vii, viii. Used by permission of Harper & Brothers, New York.

[p. vii] Every identified site mentioned in the ... Books of Joshua and Judges was revisited; while three selected cities, Jericho, Ai and Hazor, were examined more

thoroughly with the spade. The impression now became positive. No radical flaw was found at all in the topography and archaeology of these documents...

[p. viii] The results of piecing together the threads of evidence in this way will probably astonish many readers; and it has convinced the writer, after years of study, that not only were these records in general founded upon fact, but they must have been derived from earlier writings, almost contemporary with the events described, so detailed and reliable is their information.

312. Bible Criticism—Monotheism of Israel

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 544, 545. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

[p. 544] The days when Yahweh was thought to have won a victory over Baal because he was chief god of a whole tribe, whereas Baal was merely a term designating a host of local deities, each ruling only in a single town and its vicinity, are over. We now know that the followers of Yahweh and of [p. 545] Baal both considered their own gods as cosmic in power; the main difference between them was that Baal was storm-god, head of a whole pantheon of deities, while Yahweh was sole God of the entire known universe, with no pantheon. The gods of Baal's pantheon included relatives and even foes; neither the gods nor the world were in general his creation. Yahweh, on the other hand, was creator of all that existed. This is not the place to describe the total breakdown of Wellhausenism under the impact of our new knowledge of antiquity; suffice it to say that no arguments have been brought against early Israelite monotheism that would not apply equally well (with appropriate changes in specific evidence) to post-exilic Judaism. Nothing can alter the now certain fact that the gulf between the religions of Israel and of Canaan was a great as the resemblance between their material cultures and their poetic literatures.

313. Bible Criticism—New Testament Written Earlier Than the Critics Have Thought

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), p. 136. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

We can already say emphatically that there is no longer any solid basis for dating *any* book of the New Testament after about A.D. 80, two full generations before the date between 130 and 150 given by the more radical New Testament critics of today.

314. Bible Criticism—Old Testament Borrowings From Heathen Neighbors, Exaggerated Views

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, p. 17. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

At the beginning of the present century there was a school which over-emphasized

the Babylonian connexions, and the Babel-und-Bibel controversy raged fiercely.

Everything in the Old Testament was interpreted in terms of things Babylonian, or treated as a borrowing from Babylon, and all spiritual originality was denied to Israel, or at least minimized. More recently, with the fuller knowledge we have of Canaanite life and culture, there is a tendency to read everything in the Old Testament in terms of the primitive origins of Israelite life. While both of these emphases have been mistaken, it should not surprise us that new knowledge should assume a disproportionate importance.

315. Bible Criticism, Old Testament—Mythology Not the Source of Biblical Accounts

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *What Mean These Stones*? p. 285. Copyright 1941 by American Schools of Oriental Research, Ithaca, New York. Used by permission.

There is little reason to believe that the Hebrews derived their ideas directly from the Babylonians, but that both Babylonian and Hebrew accounts [of Creation and the Flood] go back ultimately to a common origin can hardly be questioned. Those for whom the account in the Bible is a record of actual events are free to say that the inspired Hebrew narrative preserves the true story of what happened, while the Babylonian story is a corrupt and degenerate version.

Echoes of other mythological conceptions, like the seat of God in the recesses of the north (Psalm 48:2; Isaiah 14:13; Ezekiel 1:4), are heard in the Bible. Here too there are notable parallels in the Ras Shamrah poems (§ 181). In view of the antiquity of these poems it is a striking fact that the allusions in the Old Testament are all in late and poetic books, in which the highest religious conceptions are expressed (RB 1937, p. 548). They do not, therefore, show a contamination of Hebrew faith by Canaanite influence, but rather a stage in the development of Old Testament religion in which primitive pagan ideas could be used without fear of misunderstanding. Such allusions to early myths are comparable in significance to the Puritan Milton's allusions to classical mythology.

316. Bible Criticism—Old Testament—Probable Source of Borrowings SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 39, 40. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 39] There are a number of passages in Hebrew poetic literature which suggest, not direct borrowing, but the influence of certain literary forms. It is not possible to do more here than indicate some of the more striking parallels in style...

[p. 40] In Psalm 74, 3–9 there is a vivid description of the destruction of the temple which presents remarkably close parallels with the descriptions of the ruin wrought in the temples of Tammuz by the underworld powers. The rather difficult verse 5, "they made themselves known as men that lifted up axes upon a thicket of trees", may find an explanation in the description of the enemy in the Tammuz liturgies as breaking through the enclosure of sacred cedars...

This line of comparison might be pursued considerably further, but its general effect is to suggest that the early and wide-spread prevalence of these liturgies in Mesopotamia and the lands subject to its cultural influence provided a stock of poetic forms and imagery available for use when an appropriate occasion called for them. It is not suggested that Hebrew prophets, or the composers of canticles for sacred occasions, borrowed directly from Mesopotamian sources, but that they made use of ancient poetic forms and metaphors where they could be adapted to the expression of the new religious ideas growing out of their own religious experience.

317. Bible Criticism—Old Testament—Supposed Borrowings From Babylonian Sources Disproved

SOURCE: Leonard W. King, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Vol. 2 (London: Chatto & Windus, 1919), pp. 289, 290, 304, 305, 311, 312, 314. Used by permission.

[p. 289] during the Persian and Hellenistic periods Babylon exerted an influence upon contemporary races of which we may trace some survivals in the civilization of the modern world... During far earlier periods, the civilization of Babylon had penetrated throughout a great part of Western part of Western Asia... Since the religious element

dominated her own activities in a greater measure than was the case with most other races of antiquity, it has been urged that many features in Hebrew religion and in Greek mythology can only be rightly explained by Babylonian beliefs in which they had their origin. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine a theory of Babylon's external influence, which has been propagated by a school of writers [around 1900] and has determined the direction of much recent research.

[p. 290] It is scarcely necessary to insist on the manner in which material drawn from Babylonian and Assyrian sources has helped to elucidate points in the political and religious history of Israel. Scarcely less striking, though not so numerous, are the echoes from Babylonian legends which have long been recognized as existing in Greek mythology. The best known example of direct borrowing is undoubtedly the myth of Adonis and Aphrodite, the main features of which correspond closely to the Babylonian legend of Tammuz and Ishtar. In this case not only the myth, but the accompanying festival and rites were also borrowed, passing to Greece by way of Byblos on the Syrian coast and Paphos in Cyprus, both centres of Astarte worship...

[p. 304] It is claimed that the Biblical narratives relating to the earlier history of the Hebrews have in particular been influenced by the Babylonian myths of the universe, and that a great number of passages have in consequence an astral significance... The Descent of the goddess Ishtar into the Underworld in search of her youthful husband Tammuz... in its Babylonian form is unquestionably a nature-myth. There can be little doubt that in thy myth Tammuz represents the vegetation of spring; this, after being parched up by the summer-heat, is absent from the earth during the winter months, until restored by the goddess of fertility. There is also no doubt that the cult of Tammuz eventually spread into Palestine, for Ezekiel in a vision saw women at the north gate of the temple at Jerusalem weeping for Tammuz...

[p. 305] It is suggested that the story of Abraham's journey with his wife Sarah into Egypt may have been written, by a parallel system of allegory, in terms reflecting a descent into the underworld and a rescue from it... The pit into which Joseph is thrown by his brethren and the prison into which Potiphar casts him also represent the underworld; and his two fellow-prisoners, the chief baker and the chief butler, are two minor deities in Marduk's household...

[p. 311] Babylon was, indeed, the mother of astronomy no less than of astrology, and classical antiquity was indebted to her in no small measure; but, strictly speaking, her scientific observations do not date from a very early period. It is true we have evidence that, as early as the close of the third millennium, the [p. 312] astronomers recorded observations of the planet Venus, and there is also a fragment of an early text which shows that they attempted to measure approximately the positions of the fixed stars. But their art of measuring remained for a long time primitive, and it was only the later Babylonians, of the period from the sixth to the first century B.C., who were enabled to fix with sufficient accuracy the movements of the planets, especially those of the moon...

[p. 314] [The evidence] is surely decisive against any wholesale adoption of astral mythology from Babylon on the part of the writers or redactors of the old Testament whether in pre-Exilic or in post-Exilic times. But it is quite compatible with the view that some of the imagery, and even certain lines of thought, occurring in the poetical and prophetic books of the Hebrews, betray a Babylonian colouring and may find their explanation in the cuneiform literature. There can be no doubt that the Babylonian texts

have afforded invaluable assistance in the effort to trace the working of the oriental mind in antiquity.

318. Bible Criticism—Outmoded Critical View of Belshazzar SOURCE: F. W. Farrar, *The Book of Daniel (The Expositor's Bible;* New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1895), p. 54.

When we reach the fifth chapter, we are faced by a new king, Belshazzar, who is somewhat emphatically called the son of Nebuchadrezzar. History knows of no such king. The prince of whom it *does* know was never king, and was a son, not of Nebuchadrezzar, but of the usurper Nabunaid...

But if we follow Herodotus, this Belshazzar never came to the throne; and according to Berossus he was conquered in Borsippa.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: A Babylonian tablet found in 1923 proves that the statements made by these historians concerning Belshazzar are erroneous, and that the Biblical account concerning his kingship is correct. See Nos. 207–209.]

319. Bible Criticism—Outmoded Critical View of Belshazzar (Supposedly Confused with Antiochus Epiphanes)

SOURCE: F. W. Farrar, "The Book of Daniel," part 2, chap. 15, "The Fiery Inscription," in *An Exposition of the Bible* by Marcus Dods and others, Vol. 4: Jeremiah–St. Mark (Hartford, Conn.: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1910), p. 403.

To read it aright, and duly estimate its grandeur, we must relegate to the conclusion of thy story all worrying questions, ... as to whom the writer intended by Belshazzar, or whom by Darius the Mede... To those who, with the present writer, are convinced, by evidence from every quarter—from philology, history, the testimony of the inscriptions, and the manifold results obtained by the Higher Criticism—that the Book of Daniel is the work of some holy and highly gifted "Chasid"in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes [175–163 B.C.], it becomes clear that the story of Belshazzar, whatever dim fragments of Babylonian tradition it may enshrine, is really suggested by the profanity of Antiochus Epiphanes in carrying off, and doubtless subjecting to profane usage, many of the sacred vessels of the Temple of Jerusalem.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This 1910 statement was rendered completely out of date by the discovery of ancient Babylonian records mentioning the name of Belshazzar or otherwise referring to him as the king's eldest on and coregent. See Belshazzar.]

320. Bible Criticism—Outmoded Critical View of Hittites

SOURCE: Francis William Newman, A History of the Hebrew Monarchy (2d ed.; London: John Chapman, 1853), pp. 178, 179.

[p. 178] We now enter on a yet more perplexing narrative, in which the unhistorical tone is far too manifest to allow of our easy belief in it; although it is impossible to doubt that there was a real event at bottom which deeply affected the national feelings. This event is the siege of Samaria by the king of Syria...

[p. 179] [The Bible] says, therefore, nothing incredible in assigning a *night-panic* as the reason for the sudden disappearance of the Syrians; but the particular ground of alarm ² attributed to them does not exhibit the writer's acquaintance with the times in a very favourable light.

[Note 2:] The Syrians are stated to dread an attack from the kings of the Hittites and of the Egyptians. No Hittite kings can have compared in power with the king of Judah, the real and nearer ally, who is not named at all; and the kings of Egypt (if there were really more than one) were at a weary distance, with a desart [*sic*] between.

In the whole narrative, from 2 Kings, vi.8 to vii.6, the title "king of Israel" occurs twenty-two times, yet his name never slips out, nor that of the lord who is trampled to death; nor is there a single mark of acquaintance with the contemporaneous history.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Discoveries shedding light on the ancient Hittite Empire have shown that the adjective "unhistorical," applied by this author of a century ago to the Biblical narrative belongs instead to the critical author's erroneous conclusions. See No. 321n.]

321. Bible Criticism—Outmoded Critical View of Hittites

SOURCE: T. K. Cheyne, "Hittites," *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, 9th ed. Vol. 12 (New York: Scribner, 1881), p. 25.

Some confusion has been caused in the treatment of the history of the Hittites by the uncritical use of the Old Testament. It is true that the Khittim or Hittites are repeatedly mentioned among the tribes which inhabited Canaan before the Israelites ..., but the lists of these pre-Israelitish populations cannot be taken as strictly historical documents... It is obvious that narratives written, or (as all will agree) edited, so long after the events referred to cannot be taken as of equal authority with Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions... It is not surprising that at least two eminent Egyptologists (Chabas, Ebers) should absolutely deny the identity of the Khita and the Khittim.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The same author says in another *Britannica* article ("Canaanites," Vol. 4, p. 763) that in the Bible the Hittites seem "to have been included among the Canaanites by mistake." Though mentioned frequently in the Bible, nothing was known of the Hittites from secular sources until late in the nineteenth century. It has been said that the resurrection of their history, culture, religion, and language is one of the sagas of modern archaeology. Their capital, called Khattushash was located in central Asia Minor, See *SDADic*, "Hittites."]

322. Bible Criticism — Patriarchal Period, Scholars' Opinion on,

Changed by Archeology

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period* (reprint; Pittsburgh: Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania), p. 3. Copyright 1949 by Louis Finkelstein. Used by permission.

Eminent names among the scholars can be cited for regarding every item of Gen. 11– 50 as reflecting late invention, or at least retrojection of events and conditions under the Monarchy into the remote past, about which nothing was thought to have been really known to the writers of later days.

The archaeological discoveries of the past generation have changed all this. Aside from a few die-hards among older scholars, there is scarcely a single biblical historian who has not been impressed by the rapid accumulation of data supporting the substantial historicity of patriarchal tradition.

323. Bible Criticism—Patriarchal Stories Vindicated as Historical by Nuzi Finds

SOURCE: W. F. Alright, *The Biblical Period* (reprint; Pittsburgh: Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania), p. 6. Copyright 1949 by Louis Finkelstein. Used by permission.

When we add the fact that our present knowledge of social institutions and customs in another part of northern Mesopotamia in the fifteenth century (Nuzu) has brilliantly illuminated many details in the patriarchal stories which do not fit into the post-Mosaic tradition at all, our case, for the substantial historicity of the tradition of the Patriarchs is clinched... Nor can we accept every picturesque detail as it stands in our present narrative. But as a whole the picture in Genesis is historical, and there is no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the biographical details and the sketches of personality which make the Patriarchs come alive with a vividness unknown to a single extrabiblical character in the whole vase literature of the ancient Near East.

324. Bible Criticism—Psalms, Evidence of Early Date

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archaeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 543, 544, Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

[p. 543] We also have a great many close parallels in grammar. It is remarkable how many apparent anomalies in early Hebrew verse, which have been explained away or emended by scholars, turn out to be accurate reflections of Canaanite grammatical peculiarities which were forgotten long before the time of the Masoretes, who vocalized the consonantal Hebrew text of the Bible in the seventh to ninth centuries A.D. These grammatical peculiarities grow fewer and fewer in later Hebrew verse and are scarcely to be found at all in our latest biblical poetry...

[p. 544] In harmony with the earlier date which must be assigned to Pentateuchal poetry, we must date many of the Psalms back to early Israelite times... This Psalm [68] has often been attributed to the Maccabean period (second century B.C.), in spite of the fact that the Jewish scholars who translated it into Greek in the same century did not understand it any better than the Masoretes a thousand years later. This is typical of the utter absurdity of much so called "critical" work in the biblical field. A rapidly increasing number of scholars today deny any Maccabean Psalms and doubt whether any part of the Psalter is later than the fourth or even fifth century B.C.

325. Bible Text—Accuracy in Copying Proved by Dead Sea Scrolls SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Coloquium, [1955]), pp. 127–129, 133. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 127] The first surprise that confronted scholars was the extraordinary closeness of most of the biblical scrolls to the Masoretic text, fixed by Jewish scholars and provided by them with vowel points in the eighth and ninth centuries A.D. The first Isaiah scroll seldom departs in essentials from the printed Hebrew Bible, though there are innumerable variations from the latter in spelling...

[p. 128] Many apparent differences between the text of the complete Isaiah MSS and the extant Hebrew Bible are, however, simply due to careless copying on the part of our Qumran scribes or their precursors. Nearly all other Hebrew biblical MSS from Qumran are very accurately copied and scarcely differ at all from the consonantal text of our Masoretic Bible. This fact proves conclusively that we must treat the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible with the utmost respect and that the free emending of difficult passages in which modern critical scholars have indulged, cannot be tolerated any longer.

However, other resensions of the Hebrew text of some biblical books were in circulation in the last two centuries B.C. ... [p. 129] Fragments of Hebrew recensions of Exodus and Deuteronomy have also been found to show closer relation to LXX than to the Hebrew text of our Bible. Since the Pentateuch was put into Greek before the middle of the third century B.C., this means that the Hebrew MS from which it was translated, goes back to a recension which diverged still earlier from the source of our Masoretic text. This divergent recension was still copied in the first century B.C., but by the second century A.D. we have reason to believe that it had disappeared from use. Where the two recensions agree, we must now reckon with a common ancestor going back into the Persian period, if not even earlier. Under such circumstances emendations become doubly precarious...

[p. 133] There has been further confirmation [since the above was written] of my view that we can trace the Masoretic text of the earlier books of the Hebrew Bible back to

the form in which they were edited during the Babylonian Exile. After the Exile these carefully fixed texts were brought back to Palestine, where they continued to be copied with extraordinary faithfulness to the old consonantal text.

326. Bible Text—Antiquity of Masosretic Text

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery," BASOR, 118 (April, 1950), p. 6.

It cannot be insisted too strongly that the Isaiah Scroll proves the great antiquity of the text of the Masoretic Book, warning us against the light-hearted emendation in which we used to indulge.¹ [Note 1: This stricture applies equally to the writer, who reacted against the excesses of Duhm and Haupt (his teacher), but who still emended the text much too light-heartedly. Elsewhere in this number he calls attention to the correctness of

the consonantal text of Num. 22:5, where 'MW = 'Amau has been emended by virtually all scholars.]

327. Bible Text—Change in Attitude in Text Criticism Attributed to Archeological Discoveries

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, "H. H. Rowley and the New Trend in Biblical Studies," in *Inspiration and Interpretation*, ed. by John F. Walvoord, p. 198. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 198] Is Professor Rowley's contention [in 1944] "that the Bible now in our hands cannot be relied on to give the authentic word of God" really true? It was certainly *thought* to be true a generation ago, as Professor Rowley himself points out: [see No. 328]...

Doubtless the climate must have changed considerably also since 1944... What effected the change? Archeology once again came to the aid of sober scholarship to act as a purge on radical criticism—this time in which [i.e., what] is unquestionably "the most important discovery ever made in Old Testament manuscripts"—the recovery of the Isaiah Scroll in 1947, dating from the second century B.C.

328. Bible Text—Critical View of Untrustworthiness of the Old Testament Text Formerly Held

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, editor's Introduction, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. xv. Used by permission.

Towards the text of the Old Testament, as represented by the Massoretic Hebrew, there was a rooted suspicion, and commentators vied with one another in the ingenuity with which it was emended. Where any version could be invoked in favour of a change its support was welcomed, but where no version could be laid under contribution it mattered little. Any guess was to be preferred to a text which was assumed to be untrustworthy. That this is an overstatement, and in some degree a caricature, is doubtless true; yet there was a very substantial justification for it, and the innumerable emendations that filled every commentary may be appealed to in evidence.¹ [Note 1: In Gunkel's *Die Psalmen* (H.K.), 1926, more than 250 new emendations were proposed, in addition to very large numbers of others that were adopted.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: This habit of "light-hearted emendation," as Albright calls it, is no longer so freely indulged in. This change has been brought about largely by the archeological discoveries of recent decades. For the change in attitude, see Nos. 327, 329.]

329. Bible Text—Days of Reckless Emendations Past

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Old Testament and the Archaeology of Palestine," in H. H. Rowley, ed., *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 25. Used by permission.

One thing is certain: the days when Duhm and his imitators could recklessly emend the Hebrew text of the poetic books of the Bible are gone for ever; so also is the time

when Wutz felt free to reinterpret the original Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX to suit himself. We may rest assured that the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, though not infallible, has been preserved with an accuracy perhaps unparalleled in any other Near Eastern literature... The flood of light now being shed on biblical Hebrew poetry of all periods by Ugaritic literature guarantees the relative antiquity of its composition as well as the astonishing accuracy of its transmission.

330. Bible Text—Dead Sea Fragment of Leviticus Agrees Almost Entirely With Masoretic Text

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 319. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

The fragments of Leviticus in the old Hebrew script which were found in the first cave in 1949 gave us, as Birnbaum remarked, our oldest witness to the text of any part of the Bible. It is therefore significant that they agree almost entirely with the Masoretic text of Leviticus.

331. Bible Text—Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll Agrees With Masoretic Text SOURCE: Millar Burrows, "Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript," *BASOR*, 111 (1948), pp. 16, 17. Used by permission.

[p. 16] With the exception of ... relatively unimportant omissions to be noted below, the whole book is here, and it is substantially the book preserved in the Masoretic text. Differing notably in orthography and somewhat in morphology, it agrees with the Masoretic text to a remarkable degree [p. 17] in wording. Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition.

There are minor omissions, but nothing comparable with those found in the Septuagint of some of the books of the Old Testament.

332. Bible Text—Dead Sea Scrolls Agree With Masoretic

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," *BASOR* 140 (December, 1955), 28. Used by permission.

The greatest textual surprise of the Qumran finds has probably been the fact that most of the scrolls and fragments present a consonantal text which is virtually indistinguishable from the text of corresponding passages in our Massoretic Bible.

333. Bible Text—Dead Sea Scrolls Prove Early Stabilization of Old Testament Text

SOURCE: Frank M. Cross, Jr., "The Scrolls and the Old Testament," *The Christian Century*, 72 (Aug. 10, 1955), 920. Copyright 1955 Christian Century Foundation. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

Scholars have assumed, quite understandably, that this evidence permits generalization. Not only in Isaiah but in other prophetic books, indeed in the entire Old Testament, we must now assume that the Old Testament text was stabilized early and that late recessional activities were only of slight effect. This conclusion, of course, powerfully supports textual scholars of conservative persuasion.

334. Bible Text—Essential Truth Preserved Unchanged

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), pp. 320, 321. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

[p. 320] The general reader and student of the Bible may be satisfied to note that nothing in all this changes our understanding of the religious teachings of the Bible. We

did not need the Dead Sea Scrolls to show us that the text has not come down to us through the centuries unchanged. Interpretations depending upon the exact words of a verse must be examined in the light of all we know about the history of the text. The essential truth and the will of God revealed in the Bible, however, have been preserved unchanged through all the vicissitudes in the transmission of the text. Even when mistaken interpretations were [p. 321] propounded, as in the commentary on Habakkuk and the fragments of other commentaries, only slight changes in minor details were made in the text itself.

335. Bible Text—Manuscript Situation Before Finding of Dead Sea Scrolls

SOURCE: Frederick Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (4th ed., rev.; London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1939), pp. 42, 48. Used by permission.

[p. 42] How well are we provided with manuscripts of the Hebrew Old Testament? It is generally rather a shock when one first learns that the oldest extant MSS are no earlier than the ninth century after Christ. Over a thousand years separate our earliest Hebrew manuscripts from the date at which the latest of the books contained in them was originally written. It is a disquieting thought, when one reflects how much a text may be corrupted or mutilated in the course of transmission by manuscript over a long period of time...

[p. 48] There is, indeed, no probability that we shall ever find manuscripts of the Hebrew text going back to a period before the formation of the text which we know as Massoretic. We can only arrive at an idea of it by a study of the earliest translations made from it.

336. Bible Text—Masoretic Surprisingly Unchanged in 1,000 Years SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 304. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

It is a matter for wonder that through something like a thousand years the text underwent so little alteration. As I said in my first article on the scroll, "Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition."

337. Bible Text—Masoretic Text Is Old and in the Main Authentic SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 314. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

Much more might be added about the St. Mark's Isaiah scroll, but what has been said may suffice to indicate its importance for establishing the best possible text of the Old Testament. By and large it confirms the antiquity and authenticity of the Masoretic text. Where it departs from the traditional text, the latter is usually preferable.

338. Bible Text—Masoretic Text of Isaiah Reveals Language Near Time of Isaiah

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 109. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

The book of Isaiah certainly comes from a time several centuries before the earliest date to which this manuscript can be assigned on any grounds. Most of the differences between the scroll and the Masoretic text consist of changes in spelling and in the grammatical forms of words. In these respects, with some notable exceptions, the Masoretic text has preserved a form of the Hebrew language closer to the dialect of Jerusalem as it was spoken in the time of Isaiah than the language of the scroll is. In other

words, the text of the scroll has more changes in grammar and spelling from the original language of Isaiah than the Masoretic text has.

339. Bible Text—Masoretic Text Upheld

SOURCE: John Bright, review of Bleddyn J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (1951), in *Interpretation*, 6 (Jan., 1952), 116, 117. Used by permission.

[p. 116] One may mention the discovery of the Cairo Genizah ..., now more recently, the sensational Dead Sea Scrolls—to single out only a few. The upshot has been in general, at once a new awareness of the complexity of the Masoretic tradition, and a new confidence in its fundamental tenacity. On the other hand, one must recall that the most of the Old Testament commentaries presently in use were written a generation or more ago when an older fashion in textual criticism prevailed. Great reliance was [p. 117] placed upon the Septuagint. It was thought that, in most cases where the two disagreed, the Hebrew text could be restored on the basis of the Greek. The result was an extensive emendation which amounted in places to the virtual rewriting of the Hebrew text—a process which is now seen to have been premature, to say the least. The user of these commentaries must learn to preserve a critical attitude before much of the discussion of the text found there, else he will find himself interpreting a text that never existed save in the commentator's mind.

340. Bible Text—No Vital Doctrine Rests on Disputed Readings SOURCE: Frederic Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1958), p. 55. Copyright 1958 by Kathleen Mary Kenyon and Gwendoline Margaret Ritchie. Used by permission.

No fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith rests on a disputed reading. Constant references to mistakes and divergences of reading, such as the plan of this book necessitates, might give rise to the doubt whether the substance, as well as the language, of the Bible is not open to question. It cannot be too strongly asserted that in substance the text of the Bible is certain.

341. Bible Text—Textual Criticism Becomes More Conservative SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, editor's Introduction, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. xxv. Used by permission.

In the field of Lower, or Textual, Criticism, the most significant tendency of our period has been seen in the greater respect paid to the Massoretic text. Sometimes this has been carried to the extent of holding that the text is completely inviolable, but this has been an overpressing of the tendency. It has often to be recognized that the Hebrew text that has come down to us is not in its original state, though nothing like so often as was formerly held.

342. Birth Control, Catholic Position on Morality of

SOURCE: John L. Thomas, *The Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 115–118. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 115]. In the light of these principles let us consider the morality of birth control. A study of the structure and function of the generative system indicates that its primary purpose is reproduction. The production of sperm in the male and the process of the menstrual cycle in woman are clearly geared to reproduction. Further, a study of the conjugal act indicates clearly that its primary purpose is to bring about the union of the sexual act, but the act itself is designed to make the fusion of sperm and ovum possible. Although the immediate, experienced result of sexual relations is physical release, a

temporary cessation of sexual desire, and an intimate, psychological union of the partners, these are consequent, accompanying effects of the act and clearly not the primary purpose either of the reproductive system or of sexual union.

Since marital union is an act by which husband and wife mutually complete each other by supplying that which the other lacks in terms of reproduction, its very meaning implies that each gives freely and unreservedly what they are able. It is precisely this generous, mutual gift of self that unites husband and wife in a procreating act of love. To deprive this mutual gift of its life-giving, generative character by placing a direct obstacle to the natural procreative process inherent in it, is to destroy the essential significance of the act. In other words, when a couple employ contraceptives they perform an act that is generative by its nature, but at the same time they attempt to frustrate or hinder its inherent reproductive purpose by deliberately placing an obstacle to the natural generative process. Hence, they are not acting as reasonable persons because they will and do not will the generative act at the same time. Such [p. 116] action constitutes a clear contradiction in the practical order, for the couple freely choose to perform a generative act, and at the same time they do not choose it, inasmuch as they attempt to frustrate its primary generative character...

In using their reproductive faculties husband and wife supply the human co-principles of life and have the privilege of co-operating with the Creator in the production of a new life. This power has been entrusted to them by God...

To summarize then, the moral evil of birth control consists in the positive and direct intervention in the process of procreation which the couple have freely initiated by their marital union. It should be noted that the essential evil of the act is not that it may hinder a possible conception. The union of the sperm and the ovum may or may not follow the conjugal act and is quite independent of the will of the spouses. The evil of birth control consists primarily in deviation from the order of right reason. By interfering with the natural process of the reproductive act, the spouse assume a dominion that they do not possess over their generative faculties.

Some people argue that spouses have the right to use birth control because the marital act has other purposes besides re- [p. 117] production. Marital union does have other purposes which amply justify its use, but these purposes must not be achieved by means of an immoral act. Moral rectitude requires that the couple follow the order of right reason in their actions. If they desire to perform the conjugal act for any number of valid reasons they must respect the natural procreative process inherent in the act. It is not in their power to decide whether conception will follow from their union. They act in accord with right reason as long as they do not attempt to interfere with the natural physiological process that they have initiated in seeking marital relations. Thus, husband and wife do not act contrary to the order of reason if they desire sexual relations even when they are certain that conception cannot follow. In doing so they are seeking some of the other purposes that marital union achieves, while they are not interfering with the natural procreative process of the sexual act itself.

The Catholic viewpoint on birth control has been clearly stated by Pius XI in his encyclical *On Christian Marriage:* "Any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of grave sin." He shows that birth control violates the order of reason and is gravely sinful as follows: "Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose, sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically evil."

Finally, it should be noted that the Catholic position on this matter does not represent a mere disciplinary regulation promulgated for the direction of the faithful and consequently binding only them. Rather, it is an obvious application of general moral principles to a specific act binding all who possess the use of reason. It follows that neither the Pope nor any one else has the power to change it. When Catholics say that the use of birth control is *unnatural* or *against nature*, they mean it is contrary to the created order of things which right reason [p. 118] can discover and to which reasonable creatures must adhere in their actions. The rejection of the Catholic viewpoint in this matter implies either a lack of logic in reasoning or a denial of the basic moral principles upon which it is based.

343. Birth Control—No Hope for Change of Catholic Position SOURCE: J. Kenneth O'Loane, Letter, *Science*, 131 (April 8, 1960), 1050. Copyright 1960 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington. Reprinted from *Science* by permission.

There remains the question of whether, as Sulloway, Davis, and Calingaert hope, the Catholic Church will change its opinion, even if it takes a few centuries to do so. This hope has been expressed repeatedly in the past several years by members of the Planned Parenthood Federation, various demographers, and even Protestant clergymen, who, in some cases, have asserted that the Catholic Church must or will change its mind. Perhaps the worst feature of Sulloway's very unfortunate book will be its effect in helping to foster this delusion.

This vain hope arises because these critics do not understand that the Church's ban on artificial birth control is not a disciplinary matter, as are, for example, Friday abstinence, the observance of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, and the celibacy of the clergy. In the case of birth control the Church is interpreting both the natural moral law and Sacred Scripture. When she does this, she acts only as a teacher, not as a lawmaker. Since God, not the Church, is the author of the law, the Church cannot change it.

As I said previously, "an *essential* claim of the Catholic Church is that when it *does* take a definite doctrinal stand it cannot be in error." The Catholic Church would collapse if it ever changed in essence one of its doctrines. However, "over a period of 20 centuries the Church has never made an essential change in any of its doctrines," and it never will.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In several recent issues of *Science* (Vol. 130, Sept. 4 and Nov. 13, 1959, pp. 559, 560, and 1302, 1362, 1364) there appeared a review and discussions of Alvah W. Sulloway's *Birth Control and Catholic Doctrine*. Finally, J. Kenneth O'Loane presented a lengthy rebuttal, from which this quotation is taken.]

344. Birthdays, Not a Semitic Custom

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 249. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Birthdays were not generally celebrated among Semites... Keeping such holidays was rather an Aryan custom. Herodotus (1:133) says that it was the one day that every Persian honored most and it was celebrated by both Greeks and Romans, especially by the latter

during the early Empire when the oft discredited *natalicia* (natal entertainments) are mentioned by various Augustan writers,² [Note 2: See Ovid *Tristia* 3:12, 2 and 5:5, 1; Martial *Epigr*. 8:64, 4; etc.] when patrons received gifts from their clients in honor of

their "Genius." We learn from Josephus ³ [Note 3: *Jewish War* 7:3, 1 (37–40).] that the Emperor Titus after the fall of Jerusalem celebrated the eighteenth birthday of his brother Domitian with great pomp when over twenty-five hundred Jewish captives were slain in fights with beasts or with one another, and that later at Berytus (Beirut) he celebrated the sixty-first birthday of his father with still greater pomp.

345. Bishop, Universal, Views of Gregory I

SOURCE: Gregory the Great, *Epistles*, in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, pp. 179, 222, 240, 241, 170, 226, 2d pagination.

To Euglogius, Bishop of Alexandria, and Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch (bk. 5, epistle 43)

[p. 179] This name of Universality was offered by the holy synod of Chalcedon to the pontiff of the Apostolic See which by the providence of God I serve. But no one of my predecessors has ever consented to use this so profane a title; since, forsooth, if one Patriarch is called Universal, the name of Patriarch in the case of the rest is derogated. But far be this, far be it from the mind of a Christian, that any one should wish to seize for himself that whereby he might seem in the least degree to lessen the honour of his brethren. While, then, we are unwilling to receive this honour when offered to us, think how disgraceful it is for any one to have wished to usurp it to himself perforce.

Wherefore let not your Holiness in your epistles ever call any one Universal.

To Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch (bk. 7, epistle 27)

[p. 222] You have made use of imperial language in your letters, since there is a very close relationship between love and power. For both presume in a princely way; both ever speak with authority.

And indeed on the receipt of the synodical epistle of our brother and fellow-bishop Cyriacus it was not worth my while to make a difficulty on account of the profane title at the risk of disturbing the unity of holy Church: but nevertheless I took care to admonish him with respect to this same superstitious and proud title, saying that he could not have peace with us unless he corrected the elation of the aforesaid expression, which the first apostate invented. You, however, ought not to say that this is a matter of no consequence, since, if we bear it with equanimity, we are corrupting the faith of the Universal Church; for you know how many not only heretics but heresiarchs have issued from the Constantinopolitan Church. And, not to speak of the injury done to your dignity, if one bishop is called Universal, the Universal Church comes to ruin, if the one who is universal falls. But far, far be this levity from my ears. Yet I trust in Almighty God that what He has promised He will soon fulfil; *Whosoever exalteth himself shall be humbled* (Luke xiv. 11).

To Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria (bk. 8, epistle 30)

[p. 240] Your Blessedness has also been careful to declare that you do not now make use of proud titles, which have sprung from a root of vanity, in writing to certain persons, and [p. 241] you address me saying, *As you have commanded*. This word, *command*, I beg you to remove from my hearing, since I know who I am, and who you are. For in position you are my brethren, in character my fathers. I did not, then, command, but was desirous of indicating what seemed to be profitable. Yet I do not find that your Blessedness has been willing to remember perfectly this very thing that I brought to your recollection. For I said that neither to me nor to any one else ought you to write anything of the kind; and lo, in the preface of the epistle which you have thought fit to make use of a proud appellation, calling me Universal Pope. But I beg your most sweet Holiness to do this no more. *To Emperor Mauricius Augustus (bk. 5, epistle 20; bk. 7, epistle 33)* [p. 170] Who is this that, against the evangelical ordinances, against the decrees of canons, presumes to usurp to himself a new name? Would indeed that one by himself he were, if he could be without any lessening of others,—he that covets to be universal... If then any one in that Church takes to himself that name, whereby he makes himself the head of all the good, it follows that the Universal Church falls from its standing (which God forbid), when he who is called Universal falls. But far from Christian hearts be that name of blasphemy, in which the honour of all priests is taken away, while it is madly arrogated to himself by one.

[p. 226] Now I confidently say that whosoever calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest, is in his elation the precursor of Antichrist, because he proudly puts himself above all others. Nor is it by dissimilar pride that he is led into error; for, as that perverse one wishes to appear as God above all men, so whosoever this one is who covets being called sole priest, he extols himself above all other priests. But, since the Truth says, *Every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled* (Luke xiv. 11; xviii. 14), I know that every kind of elation is the sooner burst as it is the more inflated.

346. Blue Laws, Against Blasphemy (Maryland, 1649)

SOURCE: William Hand Browne, Archives of Maryland, Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, January 1637/8–September 1664 (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1883), pp. 244, 245.

[p. 244] That whatsoever pson or psons within this Province and the Islands thereunto belonging shall from henceforth blaspheme God, that is Curse him, or deny our Saviour Jesus Christ to bee the sonne of God, or shall deny the holy Trinity the ffather sonne and holy Ghost, or the Godhead of any of the said Three psons of the Trinity or the Vnity of the Godhead, or shall use or utter any reproachful Speeches, words or language concerning the said Holy Trinity, or any of the said three psons thereof, shalbe punished with death and confiscation or forfeiture of all his or her lands and goods to the Lord Proprietary and his heires. And bee it also Enacted by the Authority and with the advise and assent aforesaid. That whatsoever pson or psons shall from henceforth use or utter any reproachful words or Speeches concerning the blessed Virgin Mary the Mother of our Saviour or the holy Apostles or Evangelists or any of them shall in such case for the first offence forfeit to the said Lord Proprietary and his heirs Lords and Proprietaries of this Province the sume of ffive pound Sterling or the value thereof to be Levved on the goods and chattells of every such pson soe offending, but in case such Offender or Offenders, shall not then have goods and chattells sufficient for the satisfying of such forfeiture, or that the sume bee not otherwise speedily satisfyed that then such Offender or Offenders shall publiquely whipt and bee imprisoned during the pleasure of the Lord Proprietary or the Leive or cheife Governor of this Province for the time being. And that every such Offender or Offenders for every second offence shall forfeit tenne pound sterling or the value thereof to be levyed as aforesaid, or in case such offender or Offenders shall not then have goods and chattells within this Province sufficient for that purpose then to bee publiquely and severely whipt and [p. 245] imprisoned as before is expressed. And that every pson or psons before mentioned offending herein the third time, shall for such third offence forfeit all his lands and Goods and bee for ever banished and expelled out of this Province.

347. Blue Laws, Against Blasphemy (Virginia, 1610–1611) SOURCE: *For the Colony in Virginea Britannia. Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, c.* [first established by Sir Thomas Gates, 1610; exemplified and enlarged by Sir Thomas Dale, 1611], edited by William Strachey, London, 1612. In Peter Force, *Tracts and Other Papers, Relating Principally to ... the Colonies in North America* (Washington: William Q. Force, 1844), Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 10.

That no man blaspheme Gods holy name upon paine of death, or use unlawful oathes, taking the name of God in vaine, curse, or banne, upon paine of severe punishment for the first offence so committed, and for the second, to have a bodkin thrust through his tongue, and if he continue the blaspheming of Gods holy name, for the third time so offending, he shall be brought to a martiall court, and there receive censure of death for his offence. [See No. 1655n.]

348. Blue Laws, Against Swearing (New Haven Colony, 1656) SOURCE: *New-Haven's Settling in New-England. And Some Lawes for Government:* Published for the Use of that Colony (London: Printed by M.S. for *Livewell Chapman*, at the *Crowne* in *Popes-head*-Alley, 1656), p. 99.

Be it Enacted by the Governour, Council and Representatives, in General Court Assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That if any person within this Colony shall Swear Rashly and Vainly, either by the Holy Name of God, of any other Oath: Or shall Sinfully and Wickedly Curse any person or persons; such person shall forfeit to the Treasury of the County wherein he liveth for every such offence, the Sum of *Ten Shillings:* And it shall be in the power of any Assistant, or Justice of the Peace, by Warrant to the Constable, to call such person or persons before him, and upon just proof to pass Sentence according to Law, and levy the said penalty according to the usual order of Justice. And if such person or persons be not able, or shall refuse to pay the aforesaid fine, he or they shall be set in the Stocks, not exceeding three Hours, and not less than one Hour.

349. Blue Laws—Church Attendance Required (New Haven Colony) SOURCE: Charles J. Hoadly, *Records of the Colony or Jurisdiction of New Haven, From May, 1653, to the Union, Together With the New Haven Code of 1656* (Hartford: Case, Lockwood and Company, 1858), p. 588.

And it is further Ordered, That wheresoever the Ministry of the word is established within this Jurisdiction, according to the Order of the Gospel, every person according to the mind of God, shall duly resort and attend thereunto, upon the Lords dayes at least, and also upon dayes of publick Fasting, or Thanksgiving, Ordered to be gen[39]-erally kept and observed. And if any person within this Jurisdiction, shall without just and necessary cause, absent or withdraw from the same, he shall after due means of conviction used, for every such sinfull miscarriage, forfeit five shillings to the Plantation, to be levied as other Fines.

350. Blue Laws, in American Colonies

SOURCE: Walter F. Prince, "An Examination of Peter's 'Blue Laws,' in *Annual Report of the American Historical Association, for the Year 1898.* U.S. 55th Congress, 3d sess., H. R. Document No. 295 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899), pp. 97, 99.

[p. 97] The most famous portion of Peter's book is, of course, that which treats of the blue laws. It is that which rouses in its adversaries the bitterest agonies of disgust. For sixty years patriotic souls have assailed the authenticity of these laws, and the nays have had it by a large majority. "The false blue laws invented by the Rev. Samuel Peters" are words which confront us from a title page. "The so-called blue laws of New Haven never had any existence except in the imagination of Samuel Peters," says a historian of Connecticut. "Peters not only invented the blue law code, but he forged legal cases for its application," another writer declares. "The greater part of these probably never had an existence, as standing laws or otherwise," chimes in another, more moderately...

- [p. 99] 1. Over one half of Peters's "Blue Laws" did exist in New Haven, expressly or in the form of judicial customs under the common law.
- 2. More than four-fifths of them existed, in the same fashion, in one or more of the colonies of New England.
- 3. Were the "Blue Laws" shown to be forgeries, Peters could not be made to shoulder the whole burden of guilt, since he derived nearly two-thirds of them directly from other writers on New England history.

351. Blue Laws—Quaker Meetings Forbidden (Virginia, 1663) SOURCE: 15th Charles II, September, 1663, Act I, *An act prohibiting the unlawfull assembling of Quakers*, in William Waller Hening, *Statutes at Large*, ... *Virginia* (New York: R & W & G. Bartow, 1823), Vol. 2, pp. 180, 181.

[p. 180] Be it enacted by this present grand assembly and the authority thereof that if any person or persons commonly called Quakers, or any other seperatists whatsoever in this colony shall at any time after the publishing of this act in the severall respective counties departe from the [p. 181] place of their severall habitations and assemble themselves to the number of five or more of the age of sixteene yeares or upwards at any one tyme in any place under pretence of joyning in a religious worship not authorized by the laws ... of England nor this country that then in all and every such cases the party soe offending being thereof lawfully convict by the verdict of twelve men, or by his owne confession, or by notorious evidence of the fact, shall for the ffirst offence fforfeite and pay two hundred pounds of tobacco, and if any such person or persons being once convicted shall againe offend therein, and shall in forme aforesaid be thereof lawfully convicted shall for the second offence forfeite and pay five hundred pounds of tobacco to be levyed by distresse and ... sale of the goods of the party soe convicted, by warrant from any one of the justices before whome they shalbe soe convicted rendering the overplus to the owners (if any be,) and for want of such distresse or for want of ability of any person among them to pay the said fine or fines then it shalbe lawfull to levy and recover the same from the rest of the Quakers or other seperatists or any one of them then present, that are of greater ability to pay the said fine or fines; and if any person after he or she in forme aforesaid hath bin twice convicted of any of the said offences shall offend the third time and be thereof lawfully convicted, that then every person soe offending and convict as a foresaid shall for his or her third offence be banished this colony of Virginia to the places the governor and councell shall appoint.

352. Brethren (German Baptists, or Dunkers)

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 275, 276.

[p. 275] *History*. Among the various communities which arose toward the close of the seventeenth century for the purpose of emphasizing the inner life of the Christian above creed and dogma, ritual and form, and ceremony and church polity, one of the most influential, though not widely known, was that of the Pietists of Germany. They did not arise as protestants against Catholicism, but rather as protestants against what they considered the barrenness of Protestantism itself. With no purpose of organizing a sect,

⁶Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

they created no violent upheaval, but started a healthy wave of spiritual action within the state churches already organized.

Among their leaders were Philip Jacob Spener and August Herman Francke, who together organized and supervised the mission, industrial, and orphan school at Halle. They gave a great impulse to the critical study of the Bible, struck a plane of moderation in theology, revived an interest in church history, and left a lasting testimony in at least one organization, the Church of the Brethren.

Among the students at the Halle School, was Ernst Christoph Hochmann, who, after varying experiences of expulsion, arrest, ascetic life, and confinement in Castle Detmold, retired to Schwarzenau, where he came into intimate association with Alexander Mack, with whom he went on various preaching tours. In 1708, at Schwarzenau, eight of these Pietists went from the house of Alexander Mack to the River Eder. One of them, chosen by lot, led Alexander Mack into the water and immersed him three times in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Then Alexander Mack baptized the other seven and these eight, probably the first to receive trine immersion in the history of the Protestant Church, organized a new congregation which became the basis of the Täufer, Tunkers or Dunkers, Dompelaars, German Baptist Brethren, or Church of the Brethren, as they have been variously called, as a separate church.

The members of the new organization waived the question of apostolic succession, subscribed to no written creed, differed from other Pietists in that they were not averse to church organization, did not abandon the ordinances which Christianity, as a whole, held to be necessary for salvation, and in general gave evidence that they were men of intelligence and steadfastness. Gradually they worked out their doctrine, polity, and practice, following in many respects the same general line as the Quakers, Mennonites, and similar bodies, though they had no association with them, and are to be held as entirely distinct.

The church in Schwarzenau grew, and other congregations were organized in the Palatinate, at Marienborn, Crefeld, and Epstein in Switzerland, and in West Friesland; all suffered, at the hands of the state churches of Germany, Holland, and Switzerland, the hardships which have been the usual lot of independents and separatists. It was from Crefeld that the first Brethren, under the leadership of Peter Becker, sailed for America, settling in Germantown, Pa., in 1719. The next year Alexander Mack, with the remaining members of the Schwarzenau community, fled to Westervain in West Friesland, and in 1729, with 59 families, or 126 souls, crossed the Atlantic, landing in Philadelphia on September 15. The fate of the Brethren who did not come to America is not known. In all probability the greater number migrated, and thus the nucleus of the church was removed from European to American soil.

After the Brethren came to America the details of the organization were developed and individual congregations increased in number—first in the immediate vicinity of Philadelphia; then in New Jersey, southern Pennsylvania, northern Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas; then reaching westward over the old Braddock road, immediately after the Revolution, to western Pennsylvania, and from the Carolinas into Kentucky, they were among the first to enter the Ohio and Mississippi valleys, and from 1790 to 1825 the great central plain was rapidly populated by Brethren.

The Brethren of colonial times (then known generally as Dunkers) were for the most part German or Dutch farmers, although they engaged in some other occupations, particularly weaving. They retained their own language, and this created a prejudice against them on the part of their English neighbors, who looked upon them as illiterate, although the Saur presses of Germantown, Pa., [p. 276] were famous in American colonial days. One private library contains over 400 different imprints of these presses, and their output of papers, almanacs, Bibles, and religious and secular work gives evidence not only of a flourishing business, but of a literary appreciation. This would seem to call for the organization of schools, but, aside from the interest of certain members in the founding of Germantown Academy, there is no early school history to record.

There was also a widespread, though unjust, feeling that socially and politically they belonged with the party that had opposed the Revolution, and the result was a mutual dislike, which was probably increased by the fact that, though not essentially selfish, they kept very much to themselves, mingled little with the world, and took little part in the general movements of the times.

The Brethren shared the experience of other religious bodies organized in the early history of this country. As conditions changed they developed different practices and to some extent different conceptions, which resulted in the formation of separate communities. The first to withdraw were John Conrad Beissel and his followers,¹ [Note 1: German Seventh Day Baptists, now Seventh Day Baptists (German, 1728).] who founded, in 1728, the famous monastic community at Ephrata, Pa. In 1848, in Indiana, George Patton, Peter Eyman, and others organized a small group.² [Note 2: Church of God (New Dunkers).] From that time there was no further division until 1881, when a comparatively small company withdrew³ [Note 3: Old Order German Baptist Brethren.] in protest against certain modifications which they felt to be inconsistent with their early history. The next year another division took place,⁴ [Note 4: The Brethren Church (Progressive Dunkers).] based chiefly upon objection to the form of government which had gradually developed within the larger body. As the years have passed there has grown up a feeling that, with a little more patience on all sides, this division might have been avoided. Recently greetings from the conferences of The Brethren Church and Church of the Brethren have been exchanged, and efforts have been made to unite these two bodies. In some localities the union is all but effected [not united in 1959].

Doctrine. The Church of the Brethren in general terms is classed as orthodox trinitarian.

Baptism is by trine forward immersion, the person baptized being confirmed while kneeling in the water. The rite of foot washing and the love feast or agape immediately precede the communion or eucharist, the entire service being observed in the evening. Sisters are expected to be "veiled" during prayer, and especially at communion services. In case of illness, anointing with oil in the name of the Lord is administered as a means of reconsecration of spirit and healing of the mind and body. The rule of the eighteenth chapter of Matthew with respect to differences between members is observed. Plain attire, excluding jewelry for adornment, is advocated. The civil law is resorted to but little. Taking an oath is forbidden, all affidavits being made by affirmation. Nonresistance is taught, and all communications are asked to be noncombatants, not because of personal fear nor out of a desire to be disloyal citizens, but because war is outlawed by the teaching and example of Jesus. Any connection, direct or indirect, with the liquor business is prohibited, and there is a corresponding insistence upon total abstinence.

The ideal in all these ceremonies and beliefs is the reproduction and perpetuation of the life and activities of the primitive Christians, and, while its effect is manifest in a somewhat stern and legal type of religious life, mysticism or the Pietistic temper has modified it in the direction of a quiet moderation in all things.

Organization. The polity of the church corresponds more nearly to the Presbyterian than to any other specific ecclesiastical form. The local congregation, usually presided over by the bishop of that body, is governed by the council of all the members. [The polity of the Progressives (the Brethren Church) is congregational.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership: Church of the Brethren (1959), 201,219; Brethren Church (Progressive) (1959), 25,198; other Brethren bodies: Brethren Church (Ashland, Ohio) (1958), 19,474; Old German Baptist Brethren (1959), 4,002; Church of God (New Dunkards) (1958), 667 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

⁷Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

353. Calendar—Date Line, Adjustment of Date at, by Travelers

SOURCE: Lucia Carolyn Harrison, *Sun, Earth, Time and Man*, p. 201. Copyright © 1960 by Rand McNally & Company, New York. Used by permission.

When the route of a plane or ship takes it across the International Date Line, the change in the calendar date is made whenever it seems most convenient. It is customary not to omit or to repeat a Sunday or a holiday and to make the adjustment during the night, as if the actual crossing had occurred at midnight. Of course no one adds a day to his life by a west to east crossing or loses a day of his life by an east to west crossing. He merely adjusts his record of day and date to accord with that of the region into which he is going. Somewhere it is necessary that he either repeat or omit a day in order to bring his calendar record into alignment with the calendar of his longitude.

354. Calendar.—Date Line — Day "Lost" in (Westbound) Round-the-World Voyage

SOURCE: Douglas C. Ridgley, "College Cruise Around the World", in *The Journal of Geography*, 26 (March, 1927), 110–112. Used by permission.

[p. 110] Our ship crossed the 180th meridian [the "Date Line"] on Monday night. We therefore went to bed on Monday night, October 25, and awoke the [p. 111] next morning on Wednesday, October 27. We experienced no Tuesday, and we did not live during the date known as October 26, 1926... From Sunday, October 24, to Sunday, October 31, there were only five intervening days, not six, as usual between two consecutive Sundays...

[p. 112] Our days have been lengthened, bit by bit, so that we have lengthened the days by a total of 24 hours. We will see the sun rise, run its course thru the sky, and set one time less than our friends at home. The number of meals served on our cruise around the world will be three meals fewer than served at our homes. We have lost one day, having had one day less than our friends at home. But we have not lost a single hour, for we have lived as many hours as our friends at home; 24 hours have been distributed, bit by bit, among our 226 days of daylight, which have been 227 days at home. We provided for the "lost day" in the mid-Pacific so that our days of the week and dates of the month will be the same as at the seaports and the home port at which we are to go ashore.

355. Calendar—Date Line, No Time Really Lost in Crossing SOURCE: Lucia Carolyn Harrison, *Daylight, Twilight, Darkness, and Time*, pp. 180, 181. Copyright 1935 by Silver, Burdett and Company, New York. Used by permission of Rand McNally & Company.

[p. 180] One can always make a given calendar day last longer by traveling westward, for he has the benefit of an earlier appearance of the sun at the place from which he starts in the morning and of a later disappearance at the place at which he arrives in the evening... [p. 181] He will seem [at the end of a trip around the world] to have gained an entire day [by the calendar; see editors' note below].

In reality he has already lived that day. He has been lengthening his day an hour for every 15° of longitude he flew westward... He is, therefore, a day behind in his counting of the passage of time. He must move his calendar reckoning ahead a day to compensate for the minutes he has been adding to each day.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The terminology in cases like this can be confusing. Upon returning to his starting point, if he has made no correction in crossing the date line, the traveler discovers that the calendar at that point registers one day later than his own observations en route would indicate should be the case. The calendar will seem to him to have gained a day. That is, he arrives home on what, for example, he thinks is Monday the 15th, to find that it is actually Tuesday the 16th. He wonders where the extra day has gone, the day that, from one point of view, he seems to have "lost" because he did not know he had it. The second

paragraph of the extract explains that he *has* had it, by piecemeal, an hour of it every time he has crossed a 15° longitude line (or a standard time zone, which is approximately equivalent).]

356. Calendar—Date-Line Problem—"Lost" Day Puzzles Magellan's Sailors

SOURCE: Pietro Martire d' Anghiera, *De Orbe Novo*, trans. by Francis Augustus MacNutt, Vol. 2 (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1912), pp. 170, 171.

[p. 170] When the *Victoria* [the last surviving ship of Magellan's globe-girdling expedition] reached the Cape Verde islands, the sailors believed the day to be Wednesday, whereas it was Thursday. They had consequently lost one day on their voyage, and during their three years' absence. I said: "Your priests must have deceived you, since they have forgotten this day in their ceremonies and the recitation of their office." They answered: "Of what are you thinking? Do you suppose that all of us, including wise and experienced men, could have made such a mistake? ..."

Some gave one reason and some another, but all agreed upon one point, they had lost a day. I added: "My friends, remember that the year following your departure, that is to say, the year 1520, was a bissextile year, and this fact may have led you into error." They affirmed that they had taken account of the twenty-nine days in the month of February in that year, which is usually shorter, and that they did not forget the bissextile of the calends of March of the same year. The eighteen men who returned from the expedition are mostly ignorant, but when questioned, one after another, they did not vary in their replies.

Much surprised by this agreement, I sought Gaspar Contarino,¹ [Note 1: A learned Venetian, afterwards created Cardinal by Paul II. He died in 1552.] ambassador of the illustrious republic of Venice at the court of the Emperor. He is a great sage [p. 171] in many subjects. We discussed in many ways this hitherto unobserved fact, and we decided that perhaps the cause was as follows. The Spanish fleet, leaving the Gorgades Islands, proceeded straight to the west, that is to say, it followed the sun, and each day was a little longer than the preceding, according to the distance covered. Consequently, when the tour of the world was finished, —which the sun makes in twenty-four hours from its rising to its setting,—the ship had gained an entire day; that is to say, one less than those who remain all that time in the same place. Had a Portuguese fleet, sailing towards the east, continued in the same direction, following the same route first discovered, it is positive that when it got back to the Gorgades it would have lost a little time each day, in making the circuit of the world; it would consequently have to count one day more. If on the same day a Spanish fleet and a Portuguese fleet left the Gorgades, each in the opposite direction, that is to say one towards the west and the other towards the east, and at the end of the same period and by different routes they arrived at the Gorgades, let us suppose on a Thursday, the Spaniards who would have gained an entire day would call it Wednesday, and the Portuguese, who would have lost a day would declare it to be Friday. Philosophers may discuss the matter with more profound arguments, but for the moment I give my opinion and nothing more.

357. Calendar—Date Line, Where the New Day Begins SOURCE: Lucia Carolyn Harrison, *Sun, Earth, Time and Man*, pp. 194–169. Copyright © 1960 by Rand McNally & Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 194] It [the International Date Line] is the calendar [p. 195] boundary between today and tomorrow or yesterday when crossing the Pacific.

The general trend of the Date Line is along the meridian of 180°, but there are several deflections from this longitude line. It is customary to place all members of an island group on the same side of the Date Line. Small islands in the South Pacific, whose commercial or political ties are with Australia or New Zealand, use the Asiatic calendar even though they may lie east of the meridian of 180°. A swerve of the Date Line to the east brings the eastern tip of Siberia, about 169° 30'W., under the Asiatic calendar reckoning. A swerve to the west draws the western end of the Aleutian Island chain, about 172° 30'E., under the American calendar...

[p. 196] Were there no zigzags in the Date Line, one date, February 14, would exist all over the world for one instant; the beginning of the first second of it east of the Line would occur simultaneously with the ending of the last second of it west of the Line. Immediately February 15 would come into being west of the Line and begin progressing westward; but February 14 that was just born east of the Line would survive at all places along that meridian for twenty-four hours...

When it is noon of July 1 in New York City, 75°W., it is midnight of that date 180° to the east, or along the meridian of 105°E. July 1 is the calendar date form 105°E. westward to 180°W., or for 285° of longitude. New York is 105° from 180°W., so its time is 7 hours later than the time at 180°W., where it is only 5:00 A.M. July 2 has spread from 180°C westward over 75° (180°–105°) and so that date is 5 hours old. At Osaka, Japan, 135°E., the time is 2:00 A.M. of July 2. This date is just coming into being at Singapore, 105°E.

358. Calendar—Day and Night in the Arctic

SOURCE: Lucia Carolyn Harrison, *Sun, Earth, Time and Man*, pp. 107, 108. Copyright © 1960 by Rand McNally & Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 107] Longyearbyen [near Spitzbergen] is in latitude about 78°N., more than 5,000 miles north of the Equator. On March 21 the Sun rises due east about six o'clock, at noon is about 12° above the southern horizon, and sets about six o'clock due west. A long, bright twilight slowly deepens, but at midnight the Sun is still only about 12° below the northern horizon; the twilight is then so dim that the stars are visible, although, if the day is clear, there may be a faint glow in the northern sky.

Each morning thereafter, the Sun rises slightly earlier and farther to the north of east, at noon is a little higher in the southern sky, sets slightly later and farther to the north of west, at midnight is a little closer to the horizon, and the midnight twilight grows steadily brighter. When the Sun is vertical to the Earth at latitude 12°N., April 22, the circle of illumination lies 12° beyond the North Pole, and were it not for atmospheric refraction, that date would mark the beginning of the period of continuous daylight. The noon altitude that day is 24° above the southern horizon. Daily thereafter the Sun circles the sky, a little higher each day above the southern horizon at noon and above the northern horizon at midnight. On June 21 the Sun is $35 \ 1/2^{\circ}$ above the southern horizon at noon and 11 1/2° above the northern horizon at midnight. For two months the Sun has seemed to be circling the sky, each day following a higher path than on the preceding day, and daylight has been continuous; for two months more the Sun is visible the entire twentyfour hours, although its daily circuit of the sky steadily lowers. By August 22 Longvearbyen is 90° at midnight from the latitude where the Sun is vertical, but because of refraction, the Sun can still be seen in the northern sky at midnight until [p. 108] about August 25. Each day thereafter, the Sun sets a little earlier, a little nearer to due west, the midnight twilight becomes less bright, the Sun rises a little later and nearer to due east,

and at noon is a little lower in the sky. Conditions on September 23 duplicate those of March 21.

After September 23 the Sun does not rise until after six o'clock, each day somewhat later and farther to the south of east than on the previous day; each noon it is a little lower in the southern sky and it sets a little earlier and farther to the south of west. Darkness at midnight gradually replaces the dim twilight of September 23. By October 25 the Sun merely appears on the southern horizon for a few moments at noon. For nearly four months thereafter, it cannot be seen. At first it is so close to the southern horizon at midday that the twilight is as bright as daylight, and the southern sky is suffered with a rosy glow, if the day is fair—tantalizing for it foretells no coming sunrise. Gradually the midday twilight dims. On December 22 the Sun is $11 \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ below the southern horizon at noon. A very dim twilight at that time, light from the Moon, and reflection from the snow and ice afford some relief during the many weeks of no daylight. By late January the Sun is close enough to the southern horizon at midday to produce civil twilight. Daylight will not return until the vertical ray has migrated back to 12°S. and again brought Longvearbyen within 90° of the center of the lighted half at noon. This happens in mid-February and the Sun then rolls along the southern horizon for a few moments at midday. The long night has ended. Thereafter, the Sun rises earlier and nearer to the east each day, mounts a little higher in the sky at noon, and sets later and a little nearer to due west. By March 21 the Sun is again rising in the east at six o'clock and the year's pattern of Sunbehavior begins to repeat itself. At Longvearbyen there are about 128 days of continuous daylight and only about 110 days with no daylight. Refraction of light-rays accounts for this lengthening of the daylight period in part. An important contributing factor is the slower rate of the Earth's revolution when in aphelion ... [northern summer]. [For sunset in the arctic, see Nos. 1392, 1393.]

359. Calendar—Day and Night in the Arctic, Ancient Knowledge of SOURCE: Procopius, *History of the Wars* vi. 15. 6, 7, 9–12; translation by H. B. Dewing, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 417. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

For [on the island of Thule (identification uncertain)] the sun at the time of the summer solstice never sets for forty days, but appears constantly during this whole time above the earth. But not less than six months later, at about the time of the winter solstice, the sun is never seen on this island for forty days, but never-ending night envelops it... I made enquiry from those who come to us from the island as to how in the world they are able to reckon the length of the days, since the sun never rises nor sets there at the appointed times. And they gave me an account which is true and trustworthy. For they said that the sun during those forty days does not indeed set just as has been stated, but is visible to the people there at one time toward the east, and again toward the west. Whenever, therefore, on its return, it reaches the same place on the horizon where they had previously been accustomed to see it rise, they reckon in this way that one day and night have passed. When, however, the time of the nights arrives, they always take note of the courses of the moon and stars and thus reckon the measure of the days.

360. Calendar, Gregorian, Adopted in British Countries in 1752 SOURCE: *The Ladies Diary: or Woman's Almanack For the Year of our Lord, 1752* ([n.p.]: A. Wilde, 1752), calendar for September (unpaged).

1752 SEPTEMBER HATH ONLY XIX DAYS IN THIS YEAR ...

1	Т	Giles, Abbat & Conf. Sun faster than Year 3'55"	8A 12
2		<i>London</i> Burnt, 1666. Sun rises 5,37, sets 6,22.	8 49

By 365 Days, 6 Hours, the mean Julian Year, being long reckon'd for 365d. 5h. 48m. 54s. 41th. 27 fourths, the Year by the Sun, according to Dr. Halley, (See Palladium 1750, p. 53.) The Account of Time has each Year run a head of Time by the Sun 11m. 5s. 18th. 33 fourths, or 44m. 21s. 14th. 12 fourths, every 4 Years, and consequently 3d. 1h. 55m. 23s. 40 thirds in 400 Years: And so from the Council of Nice, when the Kalendar was settled, in the Year 325, to this present Year 1752, being 1427 Years, the Time by Account is forward of that by the Sun 10d. 23h. 43m. and therefore 11 Days is left out of Account, in this Month, as the most convenient, for reducing the Kalendar or Year to its first establish'd Order. And for keeping the shortest and longest Days (or the Solstices) and also the Days of 12 h. long (or the Equinoxes) on the same nominal Days of the Month for the future, it is ordain'd by Act of Parliament, that every fourth hundred Year is to consist of 366 Days as usual, but all other whole hundred Years of 365 Days only: The Years between which whole hundreds to be common and Bissextile as formerly, and the Date of the Year henceforward to begin on the first of January.

14	Т	<i>Holy Cross Day, Holy-Rood,</i> or <i>Exalt. of the Cross</i> Day 12 hours 20 minutes	
		or Exalt. of the Cross	9 33
15	F	Day 12 hours 20 minutes	
		long	10 24

The third of *September* the fourteenth is nam'd,

For which *British* Annals will ever be fam'd;

For by Wisdom and Art to the House made appear,

The Sun was reduc'd to attend on the Year.

[EDITORS' NOTE: By 1752 the error in the calendar was 11 days, one day more than in 1583. See Nos. 362, 363.]

361. Calendar, Gregorian, Adopted in Various Countries

SOURCE: *The* [British] *Nautical Almanac* for the Year 1932 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1930), p. 740. Crown Copyright. Used by permission of the Controller of Her Britannic Majesty's Stationery Office.

The Gregorian calendar was adopted in Italy, France, Spain, Portugal and Poland in 1582, by most of the German Roman Catholic states and by Holland and Flanders in 1583, and by Hungary in 1587. The adoption in Switzerland was gradual; it began in 1584 and was completed in 1812. The German and Dutch Protestant states generally, along with Denmark, adopted it in 1700, the British dominions in 1752, Sweden in 1753, Japan in 1873, China in 1912, Bulgaria in 1915, Turkey and Soviet Russia in 1917, Yugoslavia and Romania in 1919, and Greece in 1923. The rules for Easter have not, however, been adopted by those oriental churches which are not subject to the papacy.

362. Calendar, Gregorian—Revision Did Not Change the Week

SOURCE: Gerald M. Clemence, "Calendar," *McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology*, Vol. 2, p. 416. Copyright © 1960 by the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission from the McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology.

The calendar used for civil purposes throughout the world, known in western countries as the Gregorian calendar, was established by Pope Gregory XIII, who decreed that the day following Thursday, October 4, 1582, should be Friday, October 15, 1582, and that thereafter centennial years (1600, 1700, and so on) should be leap years only when divisible by 400 (1600, 2000, and so on), other years being leap years when divisible by four, as previously.

363. Calendar, Gregorian—Why Ten Days "Dropped"

SOURCE: William T. Skilling and Robert S. Richardson, *Astronomy*, pp. 211, 212. Copyright 1939, 1947, by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 211] The reason for dropping ten days out of the year was to [p. 212] bring the celebration of Easter back to the time that had been fixed for it by the famous Council of Nice [Nicaea] which had met in 325 A.D. The Council had decreed that Easter should be observed on the first Sunday after the first full moon occurring after the vernal equinox. When the date of Easter was thus fixed the vernal equinox was occurring on the 21st of March. During the more than 1200 years that had elapsed since 325 A.D. the date of the vernal equinox had slipped back from March 21 to March 11. Ten too many leap years had been observed.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Such expressions as "too many leap years," "the spring equinox slipping," or "ten lost days" may require some explanation. In the first place, it was the calendar, not the equinox, that slipped out of line. The equinoxes and solstices recur regularly each solar year, which is the time required for one circuit of the earth around the sun, amounting to 365 days plus slightly less than 1/4 day. Caesar's calendar (beginning 45 B.C.) accounted for the fraction of the day above 365 days by the addition of one day to February every four years, it being then believed that this fraction of a day was exactly 1/4 day. Since it was slightly less, a correction over a period of time would require slightly fewer leap years than one in four. The regular succession of leap years between 325 and 1583 had inserted into the calendar ten February 29ths more than were needed to keep the year in step with the equinoxes. This accumulated error of ten days in the calendar count could be remedied only by correcting the count, which was done in 1582. The day that was numbered as October 4 in that particular year would have been numbered the 14th if the calendar had been running in step with the equinoxes. Therefore, by calling the following day the 15th the revisers brought the calendar back into the same relation to the equinoxes that it had held in A.D. 325, and March 21 once more became the day of the spring equinox. The ten days were not "lost"; the error in the count was simply corrected. Nor were the days of the week affected. Thursday October 4 was followed by Friday October 15. See No. 362.]

364. Calendar, Jewish—Day From Sunset

SOURCE: Josephus *The Jewish War* iv. 9. 12.; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 9 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), pp. 171, 173. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 171] Above the roof of the priests' chambers, ... it was the custom for [p. 173] one of the priests to stand and to give notice, by sound of trumpet, in the afternoon of the approach, and on the following evening of the close, of every seventh day, announcing to the people the respective hours for ceasing work and for resuming their labours.

365. Calendar, Jewish—Festivals Kept on Two Days in the Diaspora SOURCE: Talmud *Rosh Hashanah* 21*a*, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), p. 87. Used by permission.

R. Johanan issued a proclamation: 'In all those places which can be reached by the messengers sent out in Nisan but not by those sent out in Nisan but not by those sent out

in Tishri, two days should be kept [on Passover], Nisan being included so that there should be no mistake as to Tishri'.

366. Calendar, Jewish — Intercalary Month, Need for, Determined by Calculation

SOURCE: Talmud *Rosh Hashanah 7a*, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), pp. 24, 25. Used by permission.

[p. 24] Has it not been taught: 'A leap year is not decreed ¹¹ [Note 11: In the time of the Second Temple the calendar was not fixed, but the Beth din declared any year a leap year (i.e., inserted an intercalary month) according as they judged necessary, subject to certain rules.] before New Year, and if such a decree is issued it is not effective. In cases of emergency, however, the decree may be issued immediately after New Year, and even so the intercalary month must be [the second] Adar'! ...

[p. 25] People know that a leap year depends on calculation, and they say to themselves that the Rabbis have only now got the calculation right.

367. Calendar, Jewish — Month Delayed Because of Late Arrival of Witnesses

SOURCE: Mishnah *Rosh Hashanah* 4.4, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), *Rosh Hashanah* 30b, pp. 143, 144. Used by permission.

[p. 143] Originally they used to accept testimony with regard to the new moon during the whole of the day. On one occasion the witnesses were late in arriving, and the Levites went wrong in the daily hymn. It was therefore ordained that testimony should be accepted [on New Year] only until [p. 144] the afternoon sacrifice, and that if witnesses came after the afternoon sacrifice that day should be kept as holy and also the next day. After the destruction of the Temple Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai ordained that testimony with regard to the new moon should be received during the whole of the day. [Brackets in the original.]

368. Calendar, Jewish — New Moon Announced to Diaspora by Fire Signals

SOURCE: Mishnah Rosh Hashanah 2.2, 3, 4, trans. in The Babylonian Talmud, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35

vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), *Rosh Hashanah* 22*b*, 23*a*, pp. 96, 97. Used by permission.

[p. 96] Originally they used to light beacons. When the Cutheans [Samaritans] adopted evil courses, they made a rule that messengers should go forth. How did they light the beacons? They used to bring long poles of cedar and reeds and olive wood and flax fluff which they tied to the poles with a string, and someone used to go up to the top of a mountain and set fire to them and wave them to and fro and up and down until he saw the next one doing the same thing on the top of the second mountain; and so on the top of the third mountain. Whence did they carry the [chain of] beacons? From [p. 97] the Mount of Olives [in Jerusalem] to Sartaba, and from Sartaba to Grofina, and from Grofina to Hauran, and from Hauran to Beth Baltin. The one on Beth Baltin did not budge from there but went on waving to and fro and up and down until he saw the whole of the Diaspora before him like one bonfire. [Brackets in the original.]

369. Calendar, Jewish — Postponements to Avoid a Festival Falling on Friday or Sunday

SOURCE: Talmud **Rosh Hashanah** 20*a*, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), pp. 82, 83. Used by permission.

[p. 82] When 'Ulla came [from Palestine to Babylon], he said: They have prolonged

Elul. Said 'Ulla thereupon: Do our Babylonian colleagues recognize what a boon we are

conferring on them? What was the boon?—'Ulla said: On account of the vegetables; [p. 83] R. Aha b. Hanina said: On account of the [unburied] dead. What difference does it make [in practice which view we adopt here]?—There is a difference, in the case of a Day of Atonement coming just after Sabbath... We must therefore say that the practical difference is in the case of a festival which comes just before or just after Sabbath...

Rabbah b. Samuel has learnt: I might think that just as the year is prolonged in case of emergency, so the month may be prolonged to meet an emergency.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Brackets are in the original. To "prolong" the month Elul meant giving it 30 days instead of an expected 29; to prolong the year meant inserting a thirteenth month.]

370. Calendar, Jewish—Witnesses of New Moon, to Establish the First of the Month

SOURCE: Mishnah Rosh Hashanah 2.6, trans. in The Babylonian Talmud, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35

vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), *Rosh Hashanah* 23*b*, pp. 101, 102. Used by permission.

[p. 101] How do they test the witnesses? The pair who arrive first are tested first. The senior of [p. 102] them is brought in and they say to him, Tell us how you saw the moon—in front of the sun or behind the sun? To the north of it or the south? How big was it, and in which direction was it inclined? And how broad was it? If he says [he saw it] in front of the sun, his evidence is rejected. After that they would bring in the second and test him. If their accounts tallied, their evidence was accepted, and the other pairs were only questioned briefly, not because they were required at all, but so that they should not be disappointed, [and] so that they should not be dissuaded from coming. [Brackets in the original.]

371. Calendar, Jewish — Year, Described

SOURCE: "Calendar," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959), col. 388. Copyright 1959 by Encyclopedia Publishing Company, Ltd. Used by permission of I. J. Carmin-Karpman, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

The Jewish c[alendar] is a "bound lunar" type: it consists of twelve months calculated according to the moon, but in order to celebrate the agricultural festivals in their proper season, the difference between the lunar year (354 days) and the solar year (365 1/4 days) is made up by adding (intercalating) a full month after *Adar* in the 3rd, 6th, 8th, 11th, 14th, 17th, and 19th year of each 19-year cycle (5711 [A.D. 1950–51] began such a cycle). The month so added is called *Adar Sheni* ("Second *Adar*") and the year, a leap

year. The year commences at the New Moon of *Tishri* (Sept.–Oct.) but its beginning may be shifted by a day for various reasons, among them the rule that the Day of Atonement must not fall on Friday or Sunday, or the 7th day of Tabernacles on a Sabbath. Thus non-leap years can have 353, 354, or 355 days, leap years 383–385 days. The months are counted (following the biblical custom) from *Nisan*. Only a few biblical month-names

are known (*Abib* and *Ziv* in the spring; *Bul* and *Ethanim* in the fall); the present ones are of Babylonian origin:

HEBREW	BABYLONIAN NAME	LENGTH
NAME 1. Nisan 2. Iyyar	Nisannu Ayaru ("Bud")	30 days 29 "
3. Sivan	Simânu	30 "
4. <i>Tammuz</i>	Du'ûzu (Name of a god)	29 "
5. Av	Abu	30 "
6. <i>Elul</i>	<i>Ulûlu</i> ("Purification")	29 "
7. Tishri	Tashrêtu ("Beginning")	30 "
8.	Arakhshamna	29 or 30
Marḥeshvan		
(Heshvan)		
9. Kislev	Kislîmu	29 or 30
10. Tevet	Tabêtu ("Flooding?")	29 "
11. Shevat	Shabâtu ("Beating")	30 "
12. Adar	Addaru	29 "
(in lean year	30)	

(in leap year 30)

This constant c. was probably officially introduced by the patriarch Hillel II (330–65). Before that time, witnesses had to report each month the appearance of the new moon to the Sanhedrin which announced the date by fire-signals, and later by messengers (because of the uncertainty involved, it became customary for countries in the Diaspora to celebrate certain holidays for 2 days); the Sanhedrin also determined each year whether intercalation was to take place. Some sectarians, whose views are preserved in the Book of Jubilees, etc., advocated a purely solar calendar (probably 12 months of 30 days and 4 extra days).

[EDITORS' NOTE: It is not known when the "postponements," to avoid having festivals fall on certain days of the week, or the fixed sequence of 29- and 30-day months, came into use; probably not until some time after Bible times; some think even later than Hillel's day. For the variability in the lengths of the months in NT times, see No. 372n.; see *SDADic*, "Year."]

372. Calendar, Lunar (Babylonian), Difficulties in Computation of SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (2d ed.; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1957), pp. 102, 106–109, 119, 120.

[p. 102] Up to about 480 B.C., the intercalations of the lunar calendar show no regularity whatsoever. One century later, however, the rule of 7 intercalations in 19 years at fixed intervals seems to be in use, and remains from now on the basis of all the lunar calendar which were derived from the Babylonian scheme, including the lunar calendar of the Middle Ages...

In the preceding period a "year" was an interval of sometimes 12 or sometimes 13 months, where probably the state of the harvest decided the need for a 13th month. The

existence of a cycle, however, proves that a more precise astronomical definition of "year" was adopted. We cannot give accurate data about the mean length of such a year or how it was determined. There are good reasons, however, which point to an observation of the summer solstice as the point of comparison. At any rate, it is the summer solstices which are systematically computed, whereas the equinoxes and the winter solstices are simply placed at equal intervals. Because much more accurate methods were known in the Seleucid period [beginning 311 B.C.], it is plausible to assume that the scheme of the 19-year cycle represents a slightly earlier phase of development...

Mathematical astronomy is fully developed at about 300 B.C. at the latest. The 19year intercalation cycle is certainly one of the most important steps preceding the later astronomical methods, that is to say, later than about 450 B.C. Roughly to the same period, probably the fourth century, belongs also the invention of the zodiac... The constellations which lent their names to the zodiacal signs are, of course, much older. But it was only for mathematical reasons that a definite great circle which measured the progress of the sun and the planets with respect to exactly 30°-long sections was introduced...

[p. 106] So far as we know, the Babylonian calendar was at all periods truly lunar, that is to say, the "month" began with the evening when the new crescent was for the first time again visible ... shortly after sunset. Consequently the Babylonian "day" also begins in the evening and the "first" of a month is the day of the first visibility. In this way the beginning of a month is made dependent upon a natural phenomenon which is amenable to direct observation...

No two consecutive reappearances of the new crescent after a short period of invisibility of the moon are ... separated by more than 30 days or by less than 29 days. Thus immediately the main problem arises: when is a month 30 days long, when 29? To answer this problem we must obtain an estimate not only of the lunar motion, but also of the motion of the sun... The time from one new crescent to the next is obviously about equal to the time from invisibility to invisibility. But the moon is invisible because it is close to the sun. Thus a month is measured by the time from one "conjunction" of the moon with the sun to the next…

[p. 107] Now the real difficulties begin. In order to make the first crescent visible the sun must be sufficiently deep below the horizon to make the moon visible shortly before it is setting... The evening before, the moon was still too close to the sun to be seen. Hence it is necessary to determine the distance from the sun to the moon which is required to obtain visibility. This distance obviously depends on the relative velocity of the two bodies...

But even if we had insight into the variable velocity of both bodies the visibility problem would not be solved. For a given place, all stars set and rise at fixed angles which are determined by the inclination of the equator and the horizon. The relative motion which we were discussing before is a motion in the ecliptic, which makes an angle of about 24° with the equator. Consequently we must know the variations of the angles between ecliptic and horizon. For Babylon we find a variation from almost 30° to almost 80°...

[p. 108] Then we must still remember that only the sun travels in the ecliptic whereas the moon deviates periodically from it between the limits of about $+5^{\circ}$ and -5° in "latitude"...

All these effects act independently of each other and cause quite irregular patterns in the variation of the length of lunar months. It is one of the most brilliant achievements in the exact sciences of antiquity to have recognized the independence of [p. 109] these influences and to develop a theory which permits the prediction of their combined effects. Epping, Kugler, and Schaumberger have indeed demonstrated that the lunar ephemerides of the Seleucid period follow in all essential steps the above outlined analysis...

We can observe that the solution of the problem of first visibility readily permits the solution of some other problems which were also of great interest. First of all, the day by day positions of sun and moon can easily be established as soon as the laws which determine the variation of solar and lunar velocity are known. Thus it is not surprising to find tables which give the daily motion of sun or moon. Secondly, one can solve the problem of last visibility of the moon by applying essentially the same argument to the eastern horizon and the rising of sun and moon. Finally, both the first and last visibility require as a preliminary step the knowledge of the moments of conjunction which fall in the middle of the interval of invisibility. Exactly the same considerations lead to the computation of the moments of opposition. If we combine this knowledge with the rules which determine the latitude of the moon, we can answer the question when the moon will be close to the ecliptic at oppositions or conjunctions. In the first case we can expect a lunar eclipse, in the second a solar eclipse. Thus it is only a logical step which leads from the computation of the new moons to eclipse tables which we find derived from the ephemerides...

[p. 119] Tables for solar eclipses are computed exactly like the tables for lunar eclipses... The Babylonian texts do not suffice to say anything more than that a solar eclipse is excluded or that a solar eclipse is possible. But they cannot answer even approximately the question whether a possible solar eclipse will actually be visible or not. One has to remember that this is the state of affairs during the last period of Mesopotamian astronomy, from about 300 B.C. to 0. Before 300 B.C. the chances for the correct prediction of a solar eclipse are still smaller. At all periods, exclusion of an eclipse of the sun is the only safe prediction that was possible...

The remaining part of the [Babylonian] ephemerides concerns the fundamental problem of the lunar calendar: to determine the evening of first visibility after conjunction when the new crescent again becomes visible... [p. 120] For this particular evening [on which the first crescent might be expected] one computes how long the new crescent will be above the horizon after sunset. If the resulting time difference between sunset and the setting of the moon is long enough to secure visibility, then ... the evening which starts the new month is known. If the resulting value seems too high, the computation has to be repeated for one day earlier. If the first result seems too low, a new value must be found for 24 hours later. In some cases alternative results are recorded in the final column *P*, corresponding to either a 29-day month or a 30-day month.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This last sentence shows that even at the peak of their astronomical knowledge the ancients often had to allow an uncertainty of a day in predicting the first day of the (lunar) month. The fact that this was necessary for them, because of variable factors affecting the visibility of the new crescent, demonstrates the futility of modern attempts to find the exact day of an ancient event, such as the

crucifixion. See letter from the same author in *SDACom* 5, p. 264, in which he points out this element of uncertainty in modern attempts to compute an exact day in a lunar month two thousand years ago.]

373. Calendar. Lunar (Babylonian)—19-Year Cycle

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, Astronomical Cuneiform Texts, Vol. 1 (12 Bedford Sq., London, W.C.1: Lund Humphries, [1955]), p. 33.

The months of the Babylonian calendar are here simply denoted by I, II, ... XII, and VI_2 or XII₂ for the intercalary month in leap years.

During the whole Seleucid period a fixed intercalation cycle was followed. One cycle contains 19 years with 7 intercalations, 6 of which are a XII_2 , one a VI_2 . We shall use the following notation:

(4)	n*	leap year with XII ₂
	n**	leap year with VI ₂

The arrangement of these leap years within the cycle is illustrated by the following cycle:

	S[eleucid]	E[ra]	1*	2	3	4*	5	6	7*
(5)	8	9*	10		11		12*		13
	14	15*	16		17		18**		19
T .	1						~	0 1 0	1 2 5 1

It seems as if the **-year was considered as the "first" year of a 19-year cycle.² [Note 2: *Cf.* No. 821b, column VIII ([vol. 2,] p. 442).]

374. Canaanite Religion, Depravity of, Demoralizing in the Extreme SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization," in *Studies in the History of Culture* (Menasha, Wisconsin: Published for the Conference of Secretaries of the American Council of Learned Societies by the George Banta Publishing Company, 1942), pp. 28, 29. Used by permission of the American Council of Learned Societies and the author.

[p. 28] Canaanite religion ... inherited a relatively very primitive mythology and had adopted some of the most demoralizing cultic practices then existing in the Near East. Among these practices were human sacrifice, long [p. 29] given up by the Egyptians and Babylonians, sacred prostitution of both sexes, apparently not known in native Egyptian religion though widely disseminated through Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, the vogue of eunuch priests, ... who were much less popular in Mesopotamia and were not found in Egypt, serpent worship to an extent unknown in other lands of antiquity. The brutality of Canaanite mythology, both in the tablets of Ugarit and in the later epitome of Philo Byblius, passes belief; to find even partial parallels in Egypt and Mesopotamia one must go back to the third millennium B.C.

375. Canaanite Religion, Depravity of, Justifies Destruction

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 175, 176. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich, Used by permission.

[p. 175] The Ugaritic epic literature has helped to reveal the depth of depravity which characterized Canaanite religion. Being a polytheism of an extremely debased type, Canaanite cultic practice was barbarous and thoroughly licentious...

The brutality, lust and abandon of Canaanite mythology is far worse than elsewhere in the Near East at the time. And the astounding characteristic of Canaanite deities, that they had no moral character whatever, must have brought out the worst traits in their devotees and entailed many of the most demoralizing practices of the time, such as sacred prostitution, child sacrifice and snake worship...

So vile had the practices of the Canaanites become that the land was said to "vomit out its inhabitants" (Lev. 18:25) and the Israelites were warned by Yahweh to keep all His statutes and ordinances "that the land," into which He was about to bring them to

dwell, "vomit" them not out (Lev. 20:22). The character of Canaanite religion as portrayed in the Ugaritic literature furnishes ample background to illustrate the accuracy of these Biblical statements in their characterization of the utter moral and religious degeneracy of the [p. 176] inhabitants of Canaan, who were accordingly to be decimated and dispossessed.

3. The Character of Canaanite Cults Completely Justifies the Divine Command to Destroy *Their Devotees*. It is without sound theological basis to question God's justice in ordering the extermination of such a depraved people or to deny Israel's integrity as God's people in carrying out the divine order...

The principle of divine forbearance, however, operates in every era of God's dealings with men. God awaits till the measure of iniquity is full, whether in the case of the Amorite (Gen. 15:16), or the wicked antediluvian race, which He destroyed by the flood (Gen. 6), or the degenerate dwellers of Sodom and Gomorrah, whom He consumed by fire (Gen. 19). In the case of the Canaanites, instead of using the forces of nature to effect His punitive ends, He employed the Israelites as the ministers of His justice. The Israelites were apprized of the truth that they were the instruments of the divine justice (Josh. 5:13, 14). In the light of the total picture the extermination of the Canaanites by the Israelites was just and the employment of the Israelites for the purpose was right. It was a question of destroying or being destroyed, of keeping separated or of being contaminated and consumed.

4. *Canaanite Cults Dangerously Contaminating*. Implicit in the righteous judgment was the divine intention to protect and benefit the world.

376. Canaanite Religion — Fertility Cults

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 82, 83. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 82] Study of our source materials shows that Canaanite cult practice was oriented toward sex and its manifestations. In no country has so relatively great a number of figurines of the naked goddess of fertility, some distinctly obscene, been found. Nowhere does the cult of serpents appear so strongly. The two goddesses Astarte (Ashtaroth) and Anath are called "the great goddesses which conceive but do not bear." Sacred courtesans and eunuch priests were excessively common. Human sacrifice was well known, though it does not seem to have been practiced quite so frequently as used to be thought. [p. 83] The aversion felt by followers of YHWH-God when confronted by Canaanite idolatry is, accordingly, very easy to understand.

377. Canaanite Religion — Fertility Cults, Influence on Israelites SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 71, 72. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co. Ltd., London.

[p. 71] For evidences of fertility rites in Palestine we are not dependent on the Ras Shamra texts alone. The frequent polemic against practices connected with such rites standing in the Old Testament, and the allusions to the Adonis myth found there, would sufficiently demonstrate that these things had entered into the texture of the life of the people. The Queen of Heaven, who figures in the book of Jeremiah as an object of popular worship, is probably to be identified either with the Ashtarte or with the Anat of the Ras Shamra texts, and in either case is to be connected with this cycle of myths, and the rites that belonged to them. The goddess Anat has left her name in some place-names, including Anathoth, Jeremiah's birthplace, and a Beth Anath in Judah and another in Galilee. She appears in Bethshean, where she is connected with Resheph, the Syrian god of the Underworld, who figures not only in Ras Shamra texts, but also in Aramaic inscriptions from North Syria. More surprising still, we find this goddess mentioned in the Elephantine papyri, as having a place beside Yahweh in the Temple there.

Archaeology has frequently reinforced this evidence of the hold of the fertility cults on the people by turning up large numbers of figurines of a nude goddess, with exaggerated emphasis on sex. It is not difficult to see why grave moral evils and impurities were associated with this wor- [p. 72] ship, or why the Israelite prophets should so vigorously oppose it.

378. Canaanite Religion, Immorality in, Israelite Reaction to SOURCE: James B. Pritchard, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 91, 92, 122, 124, 125. Copyright 1958 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 91] While the picture of the religion of Canaan preserved in the Old Testament is vague, there are many references to it. "To go a whoring after" other god, is a phrase as fran in its original Hebrew as it is in this older translation into Elizabeth English; it is the usual way of referring to participation in the rites for the Canaanite god Baal. Along with Baal, other deities are occasionally mentioned: the goddess Ashtoreth, to whom there was a temple at Beth-shan, where the armor of Saul was placed after his death; Chemosh, the god of the Transjordan Moabite, for whom Solomon erected a high place; Molech, the god to whom child August was made; and Dagon, the Philistine god of Ashdod. More frequently the pantheon of Canaan is referred to merely by the anonymous "other gods."

Vague also is the picture of how the Canaanites worshipped. From scattered references in the Bible we can piece together a picture of worship at high places, equipped with altars, standing pillars, and images of Asherah. [p. 92] Idols were used, described as being of two kinds, molten images and graven images. The officians at Canaanite shrines are named by two Hebrew words, the meanings of which translators have found difficult to convey in English. The word for the male functionary has been variously rendered by "sodomite," "temple prostitute," and "cult prostitute" in the Revised Standard Version. The female attendant is known by a term which has been translated as "cult prostitute," or "whore." Such was the language used to describe the personnel of the shrines of Israel's rivals.

These tantalizing references label, rather than describe, the objects and the personnel of the cult of Canaan. Yet the frequency with which these labels occur on the pages of the Old Testament makes it clear that the contest between Yahweh, the God of Israel, and Baal was a real and a long struggle.

The story of how this vague picture given in the Bible has, in the course of the last century, become clearer is largely the account of the work of French archaeologists in that area of ancient Canaan called Phoenicia...

[p. 122] The prohibition by Hebrew prophet and lawmaker against the making of idols suggest the prevalence of idolatry in Canaan. From this clue one would naturally look for the remains of Canaanite images in the debris of the dozens of ancient sites which have been excavated in Palestine-Syria.

The most frequently recurring "likeness of anything that is the heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath," is the clay plague of a nude female figure no larger than a man's hand... These terrocattas are far from being works of art. They are generally crude, but always emphasize, sometimes through exaggeration, the distinctively feminine aspects of the human figure...

[p. 124] At one point at least the picture of Canaanite religion in the Old Testament and the discoveries of the past century converge: the cult Canaan was concerned with fertility in field, flock, and family.

Ugaritic mythology pictures the gods as engaging in most human activities: they sacrifice, eat, make war, kill, build houses, relax and "twiddle their fingers," ride on beautiful jackasses. One text, of which only a fragment is preserved, has a graphic account of sexual union between Baal and Anath and seems to be followed by a description of the resulting fertility of the herds: "Calves the cows drop: an ox for the Maiden Anath and a heifer for Yahamat Liimmim."

By a kind of sympathetic magic the union of gods, resulting, as it was believed, in the fertility of flocks and family, was effected, or at least stimulated, by similar actions among humans in the temples of the gods. Evidence for this ritual comes from a late, and possibly somewhat exaggerated, source in the writing of the Greek Lucan of Samosata, who lived in the second century A.D. Under the thin veneer of the deities aphrodite and Adonis may be recognized the older Canaanite personages of Ashtoreth and Baal. Wrote Lucian:

But I also saw in Byblos a great temple of Aphrodite of Byblos, in which also the rites of Adonis are performed. I also made inquiry concerning the rites; for they tell the deed which is done to Adonis by a boar in their own country, and in memory of his suffering they beat their breasts each year, and wail, and celebrate these rites, and institute great lamentation throughout the country. But when they have bewailed and lamented, first they perform funeral rites to Adonis as if he were dead, but afterward upon another day they say he lives, and they [p. 125] cast dust into the air and shave their heads as the Egyptians do when Apis dies. But women such as do not wish to be shaven pay the following penalty: On a certain day the stand for prostitution at the proper time; and the market is open to strangers only, and the pay goes as a sacrifice to Aphrodite.³¹ [Note 31: *De Dea Syria*, 6.]

The practice of sacred prostitution is probably the occasion for the invective of the prophet Hosea of the eighth century, who cried out: "They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and offer upon the hills, under oaks and poplars and terebinths, because the shadow thereof is good; therefore your daughter-in-law commit adultery ... and they sacrifice with harlots."

379. Canaanites, Curse on

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 74, 75. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 74] Noah in an unguarded moment dishonors himself. In turn his son Ham, revealing the licentious bent of his character, shamefully dishonors his father. The patriarch, by the Spirit of prophecy, foretells the inevitable outworking of this lascivious tendency in the curse that lights upon Ham's "son" (rather, "descendant") Canaan, who represents the progenitor of that branch of the Hamitic peoples which later occupied Palestine before Israel's conquest (Gen. 10:15–20).

The curse does not involve the infliction of a grievous disability upon a large portion of the human race either by God or Noah. It is rather an expression used prophetically to describe the natural outworking of the sensuality characteristic of Ham which, although it would doubtless be manifested throughout the various Hamitic peoples, would be fully developed with its disastrous results in the posterity of Canaan. That this is a the case is shown by the fact that neither Ham, the son actually guilty of shameful license, nor his sons Cush, Mizraim and Put come either directly or indirectly under the prophesied malediction, but only Ham's fourth son, Canaan (Gen. 10:6). The purpose of this prophecy is clearly to show the origin of the Canaanites and to set forth the source of their moral pollution, which centuries later was to lead to their destruction by Joshua and their enslavement by Israel. As H. C. Leupold notes [*Exposition of Genesis* (1950), Vol. 1, pp. 350, 351],

... The descendants of Canaan, according to 10:15–20, are the peoples that afterward dwelt in Phoenicia and in the so-called land of Canaan, Palestine. That they became races accursed in their moral impurity is apparent from passages such 15:16; 19:5; Lev. 18 and 20; Deut. 12:31. In Abraham's day the measure of their iniquity was already almost full. By the time of the entrance of Israel into [p. 75] Canaan under Joshua the Canaanites, collectively also called Amorites, were ripe for divine judgment through Israel,His scourge. Sodom left its name for the unnatural vice its inhabitants practiced. The Phoenicians and the colony of Carthage surprised the Romans by the depth of their depravity. Verily cursed was Canaan!

In their religion the Canaanites were enslaved by one of the most terrible and degrading forms of idolatry, which abetted rather restrained their immorality. That Canaan's curse was basically religious has been amply demonstrated by archeology, particularly by the discovery of the Canaanite religious texts from ancient Ugarit in North Syria, 1929–1937. These texts fully corroborate the estimate of such older scholars as Lenormand, who said of Canaanite religion, "No other people ever rivalled them in the mixture of bloodshed and debauchery with which they though to honor the Deity." ³ [Note 3: *Manual of the Ancient History of the Near East*, Vol. II, p. 219.]

380. Canaanites, Depravity of

SOURCE: James Baikie, *The Life of the Ancient East*, pp. 434–439. Copyright 1923 by The Macmillan Company, New york. Used by permission.

[p. 434] Already, before you reach the gate [in an imaginary visit to ancient Gezer], your nostrils have been saluted by the aroma... Such a thing as sanitation is undreamt of, and ... all the garbage and filth of the tightly packed population is cast out into the narrow streets or upon the nearest open space, there to rot and fester, and breed disease... The inhabitants are quite careless of the horror which they breathe every day and all day, though it has left its marks, plainly enough to be seen, on their unhealthy complexions, and their disease-marked frames. Over the sea, in Create, the Minoan of this time is rearing stately palaces, whose drainage-systems make us open our eyes with wonder at the present day, so modern are they; but the Semite of Gezer in those days was ... indifferent [to sanitation]... If you were to examine the cisterns from which they draw the water-supply for their cooking, or for their infrequent ablutions, you would very likely find at the bottom of several of them all that remains of one of the family, or of the family next door, who unfortunately overbalanced himself or herself in stooping to draw up the waterpot, and found a watery grave. Literally so; for again it was nobody's business to clean out the cistern, and the [p. 435] mourners were at least saved the trouble of providing a funeral. Whether they went on drinking essence of ancestor or not, one cannot [sic] say positively. "We can but hope," says Dr. Macalister, "that the water was never used again: certainly the bodies were never taken out." On the one side you have a hope; on the other a certainty...

[p. 436] The inhabitants have their own High-Place on an open piece of ground near the centre of the town. it is an irregularly shaped area, about 150 feet by 120, and in the middle of it stands a row of ten great unhewn stones set upright... [p. 437] As to the rites which go on under the shadow of the standing-stones of Gezer, perhaps the less said the better. To the Amorite mind of that day there may have been something very sacred about them; to the Western mind of to-day they can be summed up in two words,—beastliness and blood. As to the first part of this description, the evidence of the type of votive

offering found on the high place is too clear to be misunderstood; as to the second, it is enough to say that "the whole area of the High Place was found on excavation to be a cemetery of new-born infants." ... Manifestly the Gezerites regularly sacrificed their first-born to whatever god or demon they adored, and the little skeletons, crushed into large two-handed jars, and buried under the shadow of the sacred stones, are the witnesses to their devotion to a faith surely the most horrible and degrading which has ever possessed the human mind. Indications were not wanting that adults, as well as infants, [p. 438] were sometimes offered on this place of abominations; and indeed the whole city gave evidence of what Dr. Macalister calls "an Aztec-like disregard of the value of human life."

As you go through the streets you are stopped by the crowd gathered to watch the ceremony at the foundation of a new house. No house can be lucky unless it is reared upon a sacrifices life, and so the builder of this one is going to ensure good fortune by the offering of one of his dependants. Being a thrifty man, he chooses one who is crippled with disease and comparatively useless; and so a poor old woman, bent double with spinal curvature, is dragged along, bound, and thrown into a hole in the ground, with a jar of food and a bowl of water beside her to nourish her spirit in the shades; and the stones of the new house are piled above the poor tortured body. A little further along they sacrificed a man recently; but he had lost his left hand in a fight anyway, and so was not of much use. If you could dig down in another spot, not far away, you would come upon a half, disposed in a way that suggests an even ghastlier horror. Two skeletons are lying side by side, and above them lies the upper half of the body of a youth about 18 years of age, who has been sawn asunder at the waist. Around the bones lie vessels for food and drink; and the grimmest horror of all is that the skeleton fingers of the left hand of one of the figures are dipping into one of the bowls. You picture the poor wretch groping in the stifling darkness of his living grave for a last morsel of food; and when you have seen the "weird charnel-house," as the excavator justly calls the ghastly [p. 439] cistern where fourteen men and a young girl of sixteen, this last sawn asunder at the waist also, had been cast, and wondered what horrible tragedy could account for their presence in such a place, you have probably had about enough of "the iniquity of the Amorite," and wonder, not at the command of extermination which went forth against the race, but rather that it was allowed to curse the earth for so long.

381. Catechisms, Catholic, Important, Listed

SOURCE: A Catholic Dictionary, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.), p. 79. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

The best known catechism in England is the so-called "Penny Catechism," approved by the archbishops of England and Wales and directed to be used in all their dioceses... In the United States the official Baltimore Catechism of 1885 is only one among many in use: a revision of this, in two parts according to age, was published in 1941. The first synod of Maynooth (1875) produced the "Maynooth Catechism" for use in Ireland. The "Catechism of the Council of Trent" or "Roman Catechism," published in 1566, is not really a catechism at all but a manual of Christian instruction for the use of the clergy. It is a document of high authority, being written by command of a general council and approved by many popes. Three quasi-official catechisms, for little children, for children and for grown-ups, were compiled by Cardinal Peter Gasparri and published in Rome in 1931. These have been translated into English and other languages.

382. Catholic Church, Roman, Age and Vigor of

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays*(London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, p. 128.

There is not, and there never was on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that Church joins together the two great ages of human civilisation. No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the times when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when camelopards and tigers bounded in the Flavian amphitheatre. The proudest royal house are but of yesterday, when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs. That line we trace back in an unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond the time of Pepin the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable.

The republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the republic of Venice was modern when compared with the Papacy; and the republic of Venice is gone, and the Papacy remains. The papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigour. The Catholic Church is still sending forth to the farthest ends of the world missionaries as zealous as those who landed in Kent with Augustin, and still confronting hostile kings with the same spirit with which she confronted Attila. The number of her children is greater than in any former age. Her acquisitions in the New World have more than compensated for what she has lost in the Old. Her spiritual ascendancy extends over the vast countries which lie between the plains of the Missouri and Cape Horn, countries, which, a century hence, may not improbably contain a population as large as that which now inhabits Europe...

Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she in not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished at Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.

383. Catholic Church, Roman—Commandments of the Church SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1913), p. 49.

243. Which are the chief commandments of the Church?? The chief commandments of the church are

- 1) To hear Mass on Sundays and Holydays to obligation.
- 2) To fast and to abstain on the days appointed.
- 3) To confess at least once year and to receive Holy Communion at Easter or within the time appointed.
- 4) Not to join forbidden societies.
- 5) To contribute to the support of the Church and our pastors.
- 6) Not to marry contrary to the laws of the Church.

384. Catholic Church, Roman—Creed Subscribed To by Converts (Creed of Pope Pius IV, or Profession of the Tridentine Faith)

SOURCE: Double bull of Pope Pius IV, Nov. 13 and Dec. 9, 1564, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, pp. 98, 99.

[p. 98] I. THE NICENE CREED OF 381, with the Western Changes.

1. I,—, with a firm faith, believe and profess all and every one of the things contained in the symbol of faith, which the holy Roman Church makes use of, viz.:

I believe in ONE GOD THE FATHER Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord JESUS CHRIST, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds; *God of God*, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all thins were made;

Who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man;

He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate; suffered and was buried;

And the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures;

And ascended into heaven; sitteth on the right hand of the Father;

And he shall come again, with glory, to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

And in the HOLY GHOST, the Lord, and Griver of life; who proceedeth from the Father *and the Son;* who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets.

And one holy catholic and apostolic Church;

I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins;

And I took for the resurrection of the dead;

And the life of the world to come. Amen.

[p. 99] II. Summary of the TRIDENTINE CREED (1563).

- 2. I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.
- 3. I also admit the holy Scriptures according to that sense which our holy Mother Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the scriptures; neither will I never take and interpret them otherwise than according to

the unanimous consent of the Fathers (juxta unanimem consensum Patrum).

- 4. I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new land, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one, to wit: baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, and extreme unction, holy orders, and matrimony; and that they confer grace; and that of these, baptism, confirmation, and ordination can not be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacrament.
- 5. I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.
- 6. I profess likewise that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead (*verum*, *proprium*, *et propititorium sacrificium pro vivis et defunctis*); and that is the most holy sacrament of the eucharist

there is truly, really, and substantially (*vere, realiter, et substantialler*) the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made

a change of the whole essence (*conversionem totius substantiae*) of the bread into the body, and of the whole essence of the wine into the blood; which change the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation.

- 7. I also confess that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.
- 8. I firmly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

Likewise, that the saints reigning with Christ are to be honored and invoked

(venerandos atque invocandos esse), and that they offer up prayers to God for us; and

that their relics are to be held in veneration (esse venerandas).

9. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ and of the perpetual Virgin, the Mother of God, and also of other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them.

I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

III. ADDITIONAL ARTICLES AND SOLEMN PLEDGES (1564).

- 10. I acknowledge the holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church as the mother and mistress of all churches, and I promise and swear (*spondeo ac juro*) true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, and as the vicar of Jesus Christ.
- 11. I likewise undoubtingly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and oecumenical Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized.
- 12. I do at this present freely profess and truly hold this true Catholic faith, without which

no one can be saved (*extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*); and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. And I will take care, as far as in me lies, that it shall be held, taught, and preached by my subjects, or by those the care of whom shall appertain to me in my office. This I promise, vow, and swear—so help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This Profession of Pius IV (or of Tridentine Faith) is, says Schaff (p. 98), "the most concise and, practically, the most important summary of the doctrinal system of Rome." He remarks that "to bring the Tridentine formula up to the present standard of Roman orthodoxy, it would require the two additional dogmas of the immaculate conception, and papal infallibility." To that would now be added the dogma of the assumption of the Virgin.]

385. Catholic Church, Roman—Development After Constantine SOURCE: T. Valentine Parker, *American Protestantism: An Appraisal*, pp. 4–7. Copyright 1956 by Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 4] [Constantine] granted toleration to the Christian church and then professing Christianity himself lifted it to a privileged position. The effects were obvious. The church gained tremendous prestige. Its growth and prosperity were assured. But inevitably the church became a worldly institution mixed inextricably with the politics of Rome and Christianity was soon the religion of the state.

Constantine, emperor, took upon himself authority to summon councils of the church. It was thus that the Nicene creed was adopted. The same council recognized the claims to primacy of the bishop of Rome in the west. The decisions of the council of Nicaea were promulgated as imperial law. Thus not only were state and church united but the state was seen as superior in power...

The Roman empire had been divided into an eastern dominion with its capital Byzantium, afterwards re-named Constantinople, and a western where Rome continued its domination, challenged by barbarians who eventually took over and became the rulers. In these changeful times the Church was the stabilizing force. It was natural that with the advance of episcopacy the prestige of the "Eternal City," Rome, should enhance the Rome, the position of the Bishop of Rome. It was Leo, called the Great, bishop of Rome, 440–461, who envisaging an ecclesiastical monarchy, made the first claims for the supremacy of the Roman see and became the first real Pope...

[p. 5] In the year 590 Gregory the Great came to the papal chair. His vigorous reforms and energetic politics put the church into first place in Italy and the West. His credulity in respect of miracles and his veneration of relics are signs of the way the church had taken. The period in general is notable for three things: The order the church was able to impose upon the barbarians, whose incursions were destined to change Europe drastically; the extension of Roman Christianity through missionary effort; and the schism that separated the eastern church from the west...

In order to understand the course of the church in these almost fantastic developments from the simplicity of Apostolic times, it should be noted that in exchange for papal favors in the recognition of his dynasty, Pepin the Frank granted the pope political and territorial authority in Ravenna. It was thus that the pope first acquired temporal dominion.

[p. 6] ... The story of the church and what it came to mean is made clear by conditions and claims that evolved from this somewhat undefined relation between church and empire. There was admitted corruption in the monasteries and among the clergy, but even a pope inclined to reforms found his intentions impeded by the intermixture of spiritual and political authority...

[p. 7] Hildebrand, who became Pope Gregory VII was a reformer. It was logical from the papal point of view to claim for the spiritual potentate supremacy over the political monarch. Was not the pope the representative of God as no emperor or king could be? Did he not possess the rights guaranteed to him as the successor of Peter, to whom were given the keys of the kingdom of God? When such assumptions were made, it was inevitable that they should come into conflict with imperial claims and ambitions. In the struggle, the advantage was with the pope. The zenith of papal power was attained when an emperor stood as a penitent, asking the forgiveness of the pope and accepting the claim of the pope to be the judge of kings.

386. Catholic Church, Roman—Enters Void Left by Collapsing Empire SOURCE: Douglas Auchincloss, "City of God & Man," *Time*, 76 (Dec. 12, 1960), 64. Copyright 1960 by Time, Inc., New York; courtesy *Time*.

The all-conquering barbarians were storming the gates of Augustine's city when the saint died in 430. The North African town Hippo was one of the last imperial outposts to

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

be attacked. Rome had already gone under. Only four years before, St. Augustine's *City* of God had laid the theological groundwork for the church to step into the void left by the collapsing Roman Empire. Ever since, Western civilization and the Christian enterprise have been joined together for better or worse; the church has moved and countermoved, advanced, backtracked, tottered and triumphed before the contingencies of history. And the barbarian is seldom far from the city gates.

387. Catholic Church, Roman—History, Doctrines, Organization, Worship

SOURCE: CRB 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1542–1550.

[p. 1542] *History*. The Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church, commonly known as the "Catholic Church," recognizes the Bishop of Rome as Pope, the Vicar of Christ on earth, and the Visible Head of the Church on earth, and the Visible Head of the Church. It dates its origin from the selection by Jesus Christ of the Apostle Peter as "chief of the Apostles," and it traces its history through his successors in the Bishopric of Rome.

Until the tenth century practically the entire Christian Church was recognized as one. Divergent views on various matters culminated in the eleventh century in the separation of a considerable portion of the Near East countries. It was then that the use of the word "Roman" became more frequent, though even in the earliest centuries it had been one of the tests of truly Catholic doctrine. The discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries contributed new life to the church and resulted in wider extension. Africa, India, China, and Japan were visited by the missionary fathers, numerous Catholic converts were made, and many Catholic communities were established. The discovery of America opened still another field. Missionaries accompanied the various Spanish expeditions of discovery and settlement in the first half century after Columbus made the first voyage to America, and they always raised the cross and conducted divine worship.

The first Catholic congregation in the territory now constituting the United States was founded at St. Augustine, Fla., in 1565, although Catholic services had been held on the soil of Florida long before that date, and from that point many companies of missionaries went along the coast, particularly toward the north, and labored among the Indians. That date also marks the evangelization of practically all of the present Latin America... Many tribes of Indians accepted the Catholic faith...

The history of the Catholic Church among the English colonists began with the immigration of English and Irish Catholics to Maryland in 1634 and the founding of the town of St. Marys in that year. Religious toleration was from the beginning the law of the colony; but in later years the Catholics were restricted and even disfranchised, and the restrictions were not entirely removed until after the War of the Revolution. In Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and New England, severe laws against Catholics were enforced for many years. In New York there were, it is said, no more than seven Catholic families in 1696, and the few Catholics living on Manhattan Island 80 years later had to go to Philadelphia to receive the sacraments. In a report to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1763, Bishop Challoner gave the number of missionaries in Maryland as 12, of Catholics, including children, 16,000; in Pennsylvania, missionaries 5, Catholics 6,000 or 7,000. The Roman Catholic missionaries in Maryland and the other English colonies were under the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical superiors in England...

[p. 1543] Catholics, almost to a man, took sides with the colonists in the War of the Revolution. Among the signers either of the Articles of Confederation, the Declaration of

Independence, or the Constitution, were three Catholics—Thomas Fitzsimmons, Daniel Carroll, and Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who saw in the Declaration "the basis for a future charity and liberty for his church"; while Thomas Sim Lee was war governor of Maryland. Volunteers joined the Army and Navy, and a regiment of Catholic Indians from Maine was enlisted for the colonial forces, while the accession of the French Government to the American cause brought to the service of the Republic many Catholics, both officers and men, from Europe.

Following the war ... some of the colonies promptly removed the existing restrictions on the Catholics, admitting members of that church to all rights of citizenship. Religious equality, however, became universal and complete only after the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, in which the present Constitution [o]f the United States was adopted. During the discussion of the Constitution a memorial was presented by Rev. John Carroll, recently appointed (1784) superior of the missions in the United States, which undoubtedly contributed to the adoption of the provision of the sixth article which abolishes religious tests as a qualification for any office or public trust, and of that portion of the first amendment which says: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The Revolutionary War left the Catholic Church in America without any immediate hierarchical superior. The vicar apostolic of London held no intercourse with the church in America and refused to exercise jurisdiction in the United States. The Maryland clergy took steps to secure their property and maintain some kind of discipline, and application was made to Rome for the appointment of a superior with power to administer confirmation and with other privileges not strictly of the episcopal order... French influence was brought to bear to secure a Frenchman as ecclesiastical superior in the colonies, with a view of making the church a dependency of the Church of France... After considerable investigation and delay the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith proposed the name of John Carroll as the superior, or prefect apostolic, of the church in the Thirteen Original States, with the power to administer confirmation. This nomination was confirmed and was followed by a decree making the church in the United States a distinct body from that in England.

Already the question of foreign jurisdiction had arisen, and the new superior in 1785 urged that as Catholics were not admitted to any office in the State unless they renounced all foreign jurisdiction, civil or ecclesiastical, some plan should be adopted by which an ecclesiastical superior might be appointed "in such a way as to retain absolutely the spiritual jurisdiction of the Holy See and at the same time remove all ground of objecting to us [Catholics] as though we [they] held anything hostile to the national independence." Accompanying this letter was a statement of the number of Catholics in the United States, according to which there were 15,800 in Maryland; in Pennsylvania, 700; in Virginia, 200; and in New York, 1,500. In the territory bordering on the Mississippi there were said to be many Catholics, for whom there were no priests.

In the early history of the church various perplexing situations appeared. One of the first was occasioned by what was known as "trusteeism." In 1785 the board of "Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the city of New York" was incorporated and purchased a site for a church. These trustees were not content with holding the property, but held that the congregation represented by them had the right not only to choose its pastor but to dismiss him at pleasure, and that no ecclesiastical superior, bishop, or prefect, had any

right to interfere. Such a situation, as Dr. Carroll wrote to the New York trustees, "would result in the formation of distinct and independent societies in nearly the same manner as the Congregational Presbyterians," and several churches for a time firmly resisted the authority of the bishops. Subsequently the present system was adopted.

[p. 1544] Another problem was that of providing a body of native clergy in place of the older missionaries, who were mostly members of the Society of Jesus, and were fast passing away. The immediate difficulty was solved in a measure by the coming of a number of priests of the Congregation of St. Sulpice in Paris, during the French Revolution (1791). They founded an ecclesiastical seminary in Baltimore, and made their special work the preparation for the priesthood of those who were native to America and thoroughly identified with the new national life.

The general policy of the earlier episcopate was to avoid the antagonisms often occasioned by different nationalities, languages, and training. To accomplish this an effort was made to incorporate the non-English speaking Catholics in the same churches with those whose habitual language was English, and whose spirit was thoroughly American. As immigration increased, however, great pressure was brought to bear for the appointment of clergy native to the various countries and familiar with the languages and customs—as Irish, German, French, and Slavic. The Church of the Holy Trinity, opened for Germans in Philadelphia in 1789, was the first effort to meet this demand, and since then the immediate needs of these foreign communities have been met, in the main, by the appointment of priests of their own nationality, although the general policy of the church has been to extend the use of the English language as much as possible. Restriction of immigration in recent years has greatly diminished the problem.

In this connection mention should be made of what are known as the "Uniat Churches," some of which were formerly connected with the Eastern or Oriental Churches, particularly in southeastern Europe and the Levant. They recognize the authority of the Pope but have divergences from the Latin Church, in some matters of discipline, and they use their own languages, as Greek, Syriac, Slavonic, Armenian, etc., in the liturgy. Among them are the Maronite, the Greek Catholic or United Greek, and the Slavonic.

A difficulty which the church faced during the second quarter of the nineteenth century was the "Know-nothing" movement. Some raised the cry that Catholics were not merely un-American, but anti-American and absolutely disloyal. As a result, riots occurred in various cities and considerable property of Catholics was destroyed, but the storm soon spent its force.

During the same period the school question arose. As the elementary school system developed it was under the control of Protestants, who introduced Protestant forms of religious observance. The Catholics objected to conditions which constrained their children to attend, or take part in, non-Catholic services or instruction. The result was the absolute separation of public education from the control of any religious body. The Catholics initiated and developed the parochial school system in order to meet the demands of conscience and the right of the parent to secure the religious education which he wished for his child.

Of a somewhat similar nature to this was a question which arose in regard to Government assistance in missionary education, especially in the West. The church had organized extensive schools among the Indians and Protestant bodies had done the same. The question arose as to the relation of the Government to such religious teaching, and the result was that Government aid was withdrawn from all alike.

In these questions two men stand out preeminently as leaders: Archbishop Carroll, of Baltimore, and Archbishop Hughes, of New York. Their influence, however, was not confined to distinctively church matters; the former was one of a committee sent to Canada in 1776 by the Continental Congress, in order to induce the Canadian Catholics to join the Revolutionary forces; while the latter was sent by President Lincoln as an envoy to France and Spain during the Civil War and succeeded in materially checking the movement in Europe in favor of the Confederacy.

The growth of the church is indicated by the increase in its membership, the development of its dioceses, and its councils.

In 1807 about 80 churches and a Catholic population of 150,000 were reported. Since that date a number of estimates have been made by different historians, some of them differing very widely. Thus, Prof. A. J. Schemm gives the total Roman Catholic population in 1860 as 4,500,000, while John Gilmary Shea estimates it as 3,000,000. According to the census report of 1890 the number of communicants or members, not including those under 9 years of age, was 6,231,417.

The first diocese was that of Baltimore, erected in 1789, becoming likewise the first archdiocese in 1808...

[p. 1545] Three plenary or national councils have been held in Baltimore—in 1852, in 1866, and in 1884. Other items of interest are the promotion to the Cardinalate of Archbishop McCloskey, of New York, in 1875, of Archbishop Gibbons, of Baltimore, in 1886; of Archbishop Farley, of New York, in 1875, of Archbishop Gibbons, of Baltimore, in 1886; of Archbishop Farley, of New York, in 1875, of Archbishop O'Connell, of Boston, in 1911; of Archbishop Dougherty, of Philadelphia, in 1921; and of Archbishop Mendelien, of Chicago, and Archbishop Hayes, of New York, in 1924. The Catholic University of America was founded at Washington, D. C., by the decree of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884). The Apostolic Delegation was established at Washington in 1893...

In 1917 ... the National Catholic War Council was called into existence, and rendered much service in caring for the spiritual and moral welfare of American service men in the war...

The War Council was succeeded in peace times by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, with departments dealing with education, social action, laws and legislation, press, lay organizations, immigration, and other fields...

Doctrine. The doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are found in that deposit of faith given to it by Christ and through His apostles. That deposit of faith is sustained by Holy Scripture and by tradition. These doctrines are both safeguarded and defined by the Pope when he speaks "ex cathedra," or as Head of the Church, and specifically declares he speaks as such and on a matter of Christian faith and morals. Such definitions by the Holy Father neither constitute nor establish new doctrines, but are official statements that the particular doctrine was revealed [p. 1546] by God and is contained in the "Depositum Fidei," or Sacred Depository of Faith.

The Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed are regarded as containing essential truths accepted by the church. A general formula of doctrine is presented in the "profession of faith," to which assent must be given by those who join

the church. It includes the rejection of all such doctrines as have been declared by the church to be wrong, a promise of obedience to the authority of the church in matters of faith, and acceptance of the following statement of belief:

One only God, in three divine Persons, distinct from, and equal to, each other—that is to say, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

The Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ; and the personal union of the two Natures, the divine and the human; the divine maternity of the Most Holy Mary, together with her most spotless virginity.

The true, real, and substantial presence of the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

The seven sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ for the salvation of mankind; that is to say: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, Matrimony.

Purgatory, the resurrection of the dead, everlasting life.

The primacy, not only of honor, but also of jurisdiction, of the Roman Pontiff, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, Vicar of Jesus Christ; the veneration of the saints and of their images; the authority of the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and of the Holy Scriptures, which we must interpret, and understand, only in the sense which our holy mother the Catholic Church has held, and does hold; and everything else that has been defined, and declared by the sacred Canons, and by the General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent, and delivered, defined, and declared by the General Council of the Vatican, especially concerning the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and his infallible teaching authority.

The sacrament of baptism is administered to infants or adults by the pouring of water and the pronouncement of the proper words and "cleanses from original sin." Baptism is the condition for membership in the Roman Catholic Church, whether that sacrament is received in infancy or in adult years. At the time of baptism the name of the person is officially registered as a Catholic and is so retained unless by formal act he renounces such membership. Confirmation is the sacrament through which "the Holy Spirit is received" by the laying on of hands of the bishop, and the anointing with the holy chrism in the form of a cross. The Eucharist is "the sacrament which contains the Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity, of the Lord Jesus Christ, under the appearance of bread and wine." It is usually to be received fasting and is given to the laity only in the form of bread. Penance is a sacrament in which the sins committed after baptism are forgiven. Extreme Unction is a sacrament in which the sick who are in danger of death receive spiritual succor by the anointing with holy oil and the prayers of the priest. The sacrament of Orders, or Holy Orders, is that by which bishops, priests, and other ministers of the church are ordained and receive power and grace to perform their sacred duties. The sacrament of Matrimony is the sacrament which unites a Christian man and woman in lawful marriage, and such marriage "cannot be dissolved by any human power."

The chief commandments of the church are: To hear mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation; to fast and abstain on the days appointed; to confess at least once a year; to receive the Holy Eucharist during Easter time; to contribute toward the support of pastors; and to observe the regulations in regard to marriage.

Organization. The organization of the Roman Catholic Church centers in the Bishop of Rome as Pope, and his authority is supreme in matters of faith and in the conduct of the affairs of the church. Next to the Pope is the College of Cardinals, whose members act as his advisers and as heads or members of various commissions called congregations, which are charged with the general administration of the church. These never exceed 70 in number, and are of 3 orders—cardinal deacons, cardinal priests, and cardinal bishops. These terms do not indicate their jurisdictional standing, but only their position in the cardinalate. With few exceptions the cardinal priests are archbishops or bishops, and the

cardinal deacons are [p. 1547] generally priests. In case of the death of the Pope the cardinals elect his successor, authority meanwhile being vested in the body of cardinals. Most of the cardinals reside in Rome, and their active duties are chiefly in connection with the various congregations which have the care of the different departments of church activity.

The Roman Curia is constituted of these congregations and other departments, together with the tribunals and offices...

[p. 1548] The organization of the church in the United States includes an Apostolic Delegate, ... archbishops, ... bishops, and ... priests. The special province of the Apostolic Delegate is the settling of difficulties that may arise in the conduct of the dioceses. An archbishop has the care of his archdiocese, and has precedence and a certain limited competence in his province... Within each diocese authority is vested in the bishop, although appeal may be made to the Apostolic Delegate, and in the last resort to one of the congregations in Rome. In addition to the bishop the organization of a diocese includes a vicar-general, who, under certain conditions, acts as the bishop's representative; a chancellor, or secretary; a council of consultors, usually six in number, three of whom are nominated by the bishop and three by the clergy of the diocese; and different boards of examination and superintendence. Special appointments are also made of persons to conduct specific departments of the diocesan work.

In the parish the pastor is in charge, subject to the bishop; he alone has authority to administer the sacraments, though he has the assistance of other priests as may be needed. Appointment to a parish rests with the bishop or archbishop.

Appointment to a bishopric rests with the Holy See at Rome, but names are recommended by the hierarchy in this country...

An important element in the polity of the Roman Catholic Church is furnished by the religious orders. These are of two kinds—the monastic orders, the members of which take solemn vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity, and the religious congregations of priests and the various brotherhoods and sisterhoods. Most of the members of these religious congregations take simple, not perpetual, vows. They are governed ultimately by a general or president, or superior, who is represented in the different countries by subordinates and by councils of various [p. 1549] forms, though some form independent communities. The clerical members are ordained, and constitute what is known as the "regular" clergy, in distinction from the parish priests, known as the diocesan or "secular" clergy. The term "regular" is from the Latin *regula*, a rule, and is applied to these priests because they live under a special rule in a community...

A prominent feature in the organization of the Roman Catholic Church, and an important factor in its history, is the system of ecclesiastical councils. These are general or ecumenical, plenary or national, and provincial. A general council is convoked by the Pope, or with his consent, is presided over by him or his legates, and includes all the Catholic bishops of the world. A plenary or national council is an assembly of all the bishops of a country, as the United States. A provincial council includes the bishops within the territory of a metropolitan or archbishop. There is, in addition, the diocesan synod, which is a gathering of the priests of a diocese.

The acts of a general council, to be binding, must be confirmed by the Pope; those of a plenary or provincial council must be submitted to the Holy See before promulgation, for confirmation, and for any needed correction. The scope of the general council includes doctrine and matters of discipline concerning the church in the whole world. Plenary and provincial councils do not define, but repeat the doctrine defined by the general councils, and apply universal discipline, determined by those councils and the Holy See, by explicit statutes to each country or province, or they initiate such discipline as the peculiar circumstances may demand.

The procedure and working of these councils are similar to those of an ordinary legislative body... At the close the minutes of the debates, called "*acta*," and the bills

passed, called "*decreta*," are sent to Rome, where they are examined by commissions who may make amendments, usually in the wording rather than in the matter. Their report is submitted to the Pope, whose approval is not, however, meant to be such an act as entails papal infallibility. As confirmed by the Holy See, these decrees are sent back to the president of the council, are promulgated and communicated to the bishops by him, and then become laws.

Diocesan synods make further promulgation and application of these decrees, applying thus the legislation to the priests and laymen of each diocese.

The laity have no voice in the conduct of the church, nor in the choice of the local priest, but they are consulted in the management of parish affairs...

[p. 1550] It is the custom to hold the Sunday morning services, or Masses, at different hours. The more important service, or high Mass, in which some parts of the liturgy are sung by the officiating clergyman and other parts by the choir, and at which a regular sermon is delivered by one of the priests, is celebrated between 10 a. m. and noon. At the other services, called low Masses, from 5 a. m. to noon, the Mass is read and a short instruction is given. At these services, varying from two to seven in number, the congregations attending are always quite different. Vespers are also sung on Sunday afternoon or evening, Mass is said daily by each priest, and special services are held on all holy days. The churches are kept open through the day for individual worship and confession. The liturgy is the same for all Roman Catholic churches and is in Latin, except in such Uniat churches as have the privilege of using their own language. The sermons and instructions, however, are always in the language spoken by the congregation, and the Scriptures are read in the same language.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Membership (1959), 40,871,302 (YAC, 1961, p. 257).]

388. Catholic Church, Roman—Membership Gains Exceed Rate of Population Rise in U.S.

SOURCE: News item, *The Washington Post*, Oct. 17, 1960, p. A2. Copyright 1960 by The Washington Post Co., Wash., D.C. Used by permission.

Roman Catholic Church membership increased faster than the population last year, while Protestant growth lagged slightly behind the population's upward trend, the latest statistics showed today.

Roman Catholic membership rose to 40,871,302, a gain of 1,361,794 or 3.4 per cent, while Protestant membership reached 62,543,502, a gain of 1.7 per cent. During the same period, population gained an estimated 1.8 per cent.

The figures, compiled by the bureau of research and survey of the National Council of Churches, showed total religious affiliations climbed to 112,226,905.

This was an over-all increase of 2,669,164, or 2.4 per cent, a proportionately faster rise than the population. Of all Americans, 63.4 per cent belonged to a church or synagogue in 1959, compared to 63 per cent in 1958.

Gathered for use in the "Yearbook of American Churches for 1961," the figures showed that 33.8 per cent of the population are Protestants, and 23.1 per cent are Roman Catholics.

389. Catholic Church, Roman—Penalties Revoked in New Code of Canon Law

SOURCE: Charles Augustine [Bachofen], *A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law,* Vol. I (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1918), pp. 60, 77, 78. Copyright 1918 by Joseph Gummersbach. Used by permission.

[p. 60] Our gloriously reigning Holy Father Benedict XV, in his Bull of promulgation, refers to the Motu proprio "Arduum sane," which was issued by Pius X, March 17, 1904, and gave rise to the present Code. In that memorable pronouncement the late Pontiff stated the reasons which prompted him as the supreme Pastor of souls, who has the care of all the churches, to provide for a new codification of ecclesiastic laws, with a view "to put together with order and clearness all the laws of the Church thus far issued, removing all those that would be recognized as abrogated or obsolete, adapting others to the necessities of the times, and enacting new ones in conformity with the present needs." …

[p. 77] CAN. 6...

The Code for the most part retains the discipline hitherto in force, but makes some opportune changes. Thus:

- 1.° All laws, whether universal or particular, that are opposed to the prescriptions of this Code, are abrogated, unless some special provision is made in favor of particular laws;
- [p. 78] 2.° Those canons which restate the ancient law without change, must be interpreted upon the authority of the ancient law, and therefore in the light of the teaching of approved authors;
- 3.° Those canons which agree with the ancient law only in part, must be interpreted in the light of the ancient law in so far as they agree with it, and in the light of their own wording in so far as they differ from the ancient law;
- 4.° When it is doubtful whether a canon contained in this Code differs from the ancient law, the ancient law must be upheld;
- 5.° As regards penalties not mentioned in the Code, whether spiritual or temporal, medicinal or (as they say) vindictive, whether incurred by the act itself or imposed by judicial sentence, they are to be considered as abrogated;
- 6.° If there be one among the other disciplinary laws hitherto in force, which is neither explicitly nor implicitly contained in this Code, it must be held to have lost all force unless it is found in approved liturgical books or unless it is of divine right, positive or natural.

[EDITORS' NOTE: As Coulton remarks (see No. 840), any physical or temporal penalties inflicted on Protestants for the sake of religion are a violation of present canon law.]

390. Catholic Church, Roman, Power of, Decline in 18th Century SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N. Y.: Hanover House. 1958), pp. 21, 22. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 21] That eighteenth-century trade war between the British and French in North America (which the Americans call the "French and Indian War" and the British "Seven Years' War") ... brought about a reverse to Catholic fortunes in the New World as grave as the revolution of 1688 had caused in England...

[p. 22] The French lost the war, and the Church lost North America, surviving only at Quebec, in the North, and in Maryland, Florida, Louisiana, and Mexico in the South.

And again, because the British Navy was more efficient than the French Navy, the trade of the French West Indian Islands was ruined in the war, and the Jesuits, heavily involved in that trade, were also ruined, and were compelled to return to Paris to defend themselves. In Paris their archenemies, the lawyers of the French *parlement*, saw to it that their ruin was consummated, and the Society of Jesus was expelled from France. And this expulsion, in its turn, led on to the general suppression of the society by Pope Clement XIV in 1773... The balance of world power in the eighteenth century was tilted against the Church by the victories of Anglo-Saxon arms.

391. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood, Functions of—Priest Held to Be Representative of Christ

SOURCE: A. Nampon, *Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent* (Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham, 1869), pp. 543, 544. Ellipses in source.

[p. 543] The priest is the man of God, the minister of God, the portion of God, the man called of God, consecrated to God, wholly occupied with the interests of God; "he that despiseth him, despiseth God; he that hears him hears God: he remits sins as God, and that which he calls his body at the altar is adored as God by himself and by the congregation. This shows Jesus Christ as God-Man ... The priest is not vested with the functions and powers of the priesthood except by a *holy anointing*, whence comes the name of *Christ* (anointed) given Him in the Scriptures. This shows that the Incarnation was for the Saviour an anointing altogether divine, celebrated by the prophets, which causes the name of *Christ* to be added to his name Jesus... The priest daily offers a great sacrifice; and the victim which he immolates is the Lamb of God, bearing the sins of the world; and by continence, by Apostolic self-devotion, he ought daily to associate himself with this great immolation. This shows Jesus Christ content to offer Himself as a holocaust upon the altar of the caenacle and on that of the cross, for the salvation of the whole world... From the [p. 544] virtue of this sacrifice, which he offers daily, the priest derives the power and the right to teach the faith, to administer the sacraments, to govern souls. It is because Jesus Christ, becoming our Redeemer, by the sovereign efficacy of His sacrifice, is thereby also teacher, pattern, pastor, legislator, supreme judge of all men, the eternal glory of the saints. In one word, the priest, such as he is in the christian system, that is to say, the Catholic priest, presupposes, represents, shows forth Jesus Christ, the God-Man.

392. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood, Origin of, Claimed From Christ

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXIII (July 15, 1563), Sacrament of Order, chap. 1, On the Institution of the Priesthood of the New Law, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 150, 151. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 150] Sacrifice and priesthood are, by the ordinance of God, in such wise conjoined, as that both have existed in every law. Whereas, therefore, in the New Testament, the Catholic Church has received, from the institution of Christ, the holy visible Sacrifice of the Eucharist [the mass]; it must needs also be confessed that there is, in that Church, a new, visible and [p. 151] external priesthood (can. i), into which the old has been translated. And the Sacred Scriptures show, and the tradition of the Catholic Church has always taught, that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord our Saviour (can. iii), and that to the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood was the power delivered of consecrating, offering and administering His Body and Blood, as also of forgiving and retaining sins.

393. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood, Position of

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests,* trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), p. 318. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

Bishops and priests being, as they are, God's interpreters and ambassadors, empowered in His name to teach mankind the divine law and the rules of conduct, and holding, as they do, His place on earth, it is evident that no nobler function than theirs can be imagined. Justly, therefore, are they called not only Angels, but even gods, because of the fact that they exercise in our midst the power and prerogatives of the immortal God.

In all ages, priests have been held in the highest honor; yet the priests of the New Testament far exceed all others. For the power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of our Lord and of forgiving sins, which has been conferred on them, not only has nothing equal or like to it on earth, but even surpasses human reason and understanding.

394. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood, Power of Absolution by SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIV (Nov. 25, 1551), On the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 118, 119. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 118] Canon IX. If anyone saith that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who con- [p. 119] fesses; provided only he believe himself to be absolved, or (even though) the priest absolve not in earnest, but in joke; or saith that the confession of the penitent is not required in order that the priest may be able to absolve him; let him be anathema.

Canon X. If anyone saith that priests who are in mortal sin have not the power of binding and of loosing; or that not priests alone are the ministers of absolution, but that to all and each of the faithful of Christ is it said: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall be loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven;" and, "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained"; by virtue of which words every one is able to absolve from sins, to wit, from public sins by reproof only, provided he who is reproved yield thereto, and from secret sins by a voluntary confession; let him be anathema.

395. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood—Priest Held to Be Creator of the Creator

SOURCE: Alphonsus de Liguori, *Dignity and Duties of the Priest; or, Selva* (Brooklyn: Redemptorist Fathers, 1927), pp. 26, 27, 31–35.

[p. 26] With regard to the power of priests over the real body of Jesus Christ, it is of faith that when they pronounce the words of consecration the Incarnate Word has obliged himself to obey and to come into their hands under the sacramental species... We find that in obedience to the words of his priests—HOC EST CORPUS MEUM [This is my body]—God himself descends on the altar, that he comes wherever they call him, and as often as they call him, and places [p. 27] himself in their hands, even though they should be his enemies. And after having come, he remains, entirely at their disposal; they move him as they please, from one place to another; they may, if they wish, shut him up in the tabernacle, or expose him on the altar, or carry him outside the church; they may, if they choose, eat his flesh, and give him for the food of others...

- [p. 31] Besides, the power of the priest surpasses that of the Blessed Virgin Mary; for, although this divine Mother can pray for us, and by her prayers obtain whatever she wishes, yet she cannot absolve a Christian from even the smallest sin...
- [p. 32] Thus the priest may, in a certain manner, be called the creator of his Creator, since by saying the words of consecration, he creates, as it were, Jesus in the sacrament, by giving him a sacramental existence, and produces him as a victim to be offered to the eternal Father...
- [p. 33] "The power of the priest," says St. Bernardine of Sienna, "is the power of the divine person; for the transubstantiation of the bread requires as much power as the creation of the world." ...
- [p. 34] "Let the priest," says St. Laurence Justinian, "approach the altar as another Christ." According to St. Cyprian, a priest at the altar performs the office of Christ...

The priest holds the place of the Saviour himself, when, by saying "Ego te absolvo," he absolves from sin. This great power, which Jesus Christ has received from his eternal Father, he has communicated to his priests... [p. 35] The Jews justly said: *Who can forgive sins but God alone?* But what only God can do by his omnipotence, the priest can also do by saying "Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis" ["I absolve you from your sins"]...

Cardinal Hugo represents the Lord addressing the following words to a priest who absolves a sinner: "I have created heaven and earth, but I leave to you a better and nobler creation; make out of this soul that is in sin a new soul, that is, make out of a slave of Satan, that the soul is, a child of God."

396. Catholic-Protestant Relations—Coercion of Press SOURCE: James Hastings Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951), pp. 260, 261. Copyright 1951 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 260] As Heywood Broun had said: "There is not a single New York editor who does not live in mortal terror of the power of this group [the Catholic Church]. It is not a case of numbers but of organization." ¹³ [Note 13 refers to George Seldes, *The Catholic Crisis*, p.. 186.]...

In every parish of the United States and Canada, agencies were established to watch the press and to coerce it. Coercion was preferred to any attempt to persuade. Instead of arguing, the Church hits through the business office. Cardinal Dougherty, for example, turned the Philadelphia archdiocese on the Record for identifying the cause of the Spanish Republic with democracy. Boycott of the newspaper was urged in Catholic pulpits throughout the city as well as by the diocesan paper. Pamphlets were distributed at Masses, with the suggestion that recipients show them to the advertising managers of department and other stores that advertised in the *Record*. The New York and Baltimore prelates similarly bullied great newspapers into warping their news by threats of advertising boycotts. The Legion of Decency achieved similar results in the movies. The same technique was applied in the case of the magazines. A systematic campaign of letters and post cards to advertisers in magazines was used to suppress free expression. These are the devices by which a small minority of a minority sect was able to control the news of a great war in a neutral press and simultaneously to poison the [p. 261] springs of democratic discussion in America and contribute to the establishment of a totalitarian state in Spain. They have been employed elsewhere in the English-speaking world, as in Australia and Britain, with similar if less sweeping success.

Occasionally one would hear of a publisher, movie producer, or department store owner who challenged the insolence of the bishop, and in such cases he often won a complete victory. There was the case of the famous department store owner who refused to take the local bishop's order to withdraw his advertising from an offending newspaper. When the bishop then announced that he would impose a boycott on the store also, the owner merely asked to be notified in advance of the time of the boycott. The bishop's agent asked why. The businessman replied that at that time all Roman Catholic employees of the store would receive their final checks, with a letter explaining the reasons for their dismissal. At this the episode ended.

397. Catholic-Protestant Relations, Forthrightness and Charity in (a Catholic's View)

SOURCE: Donald Attwater, "The Other Sheep," Worship, 28 (January, 1954), 88.

A false "eirenicism," toning down or disregarding real disagreement between Christians and minimizing the significance of what the Church teaches as revealed truth—that would be both a betrayal of our faith and a grave disservice to our separated brethren. But equally does that faith call for a true "eirenicism" towards those who know it not or share it only in part: a spirit of understanding of patience, of humility, of lovingkindness, of tolerance, in a word, of real love in Christ.

That she is the Body of Christ is, I suppose, the one truth about His Church about which all Christians are in some manner agreed. When all of us, of all "denominations," realize, that is, make real to ourselves, that the vast majority of us are by charity united one to another invisibly by means of that Mystical Body; when we realize the significance of valid baptism and of a sincere desire to follow Christ in His way (huge numbers of non-Catholics have the first [see editors' note below]; and the second is inseparable from everyone in good faith); when we all think of and act towards one another in the light of these things then—and not till then—shall we have begun to do our part in preparing the way to the *complete and visible* Christian unity that our Lord wills.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For the Catholic view that Protestant baptism can be valid, that is, that it places the recipient in the "true" church, see Nos. 837, 838.]

398. Catholic-Protestant Relations, Forthrightness and Charity in (a Protestant View)

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown. "The Issues Which Divide Us," in *American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View*, edited by Philip Scharper, p. 60. © Sheed and Ward, Inc., New York, 1959. Used by permission.

The attitude which this chapter will attempt to exemplify is an attitude of forthrightness in the context of charity. St. Paul puts it less formidably when he talks about "speaking the truth in love"; speaking the truth, however sharp and cutting a two-edged sword that truth may be, but speaking also in love, remembering that the edge of truth's sword is dulled if it is flourished in malice, jealousy, spite or hatred. This means sifting out true charges from false, replacing caricature by accurate description, but also, in less exalted terms, calling the shots as one sees them. It does *not* mean assuming sentimentally that underneath "we really all believe the same thing," and that a little give and take will uncover this least common denominator. We do *not* all believe the same thing, even though we may believe a lot of the same things. The areas where we agree may actually outnumber the areas where we disagree, but the latter are so fundamental as to outweigh much of the former.

399. Celibacy, Catholic Advocacy of

SOURCE: E. Friedberg, "Celibacy," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 2, pp. 465, 466. Copyright 1908 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of the present publisher, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich.

[p. 465] Celibacy, in the Roman Catholic Church, means the permanently unmarried state to which men and women bind themselves either by a vow or by the reception of the major orders which implies personal purity in thought and deed... Very early in the history of the Church the idea grew up that the unmarried state was preferable (Hermas, I, ii. 3; Ignatius to Polycarp, v.), and grew into a positive contempt of marriage (Origen, Hom. vi. in Num.; Jerome, Ad Jovinianum, i. 4). As early as the second century examples of voluntary vows of virginity are found, and the requirement of continence before the performance of sacred functions. By the fourth century canons began to be passed in that sense (Synod of Neocaesarea, 314 A.D., canon i; Synod of Ancyra, 314 A.D. canon x.). Unmarried men were preferred for ecclesiastical offices, though marriage was still not forbidden; in [f]act, the clergy were expressly prohibited from deserting a lawfully married wife on religious grounds (Apostolic Canons, v.)... Within its own boundaries the Latin Church has held more and more strictly to the requirement of celibacy, though not without continual opposition on the part of the clergy. The large number of canons on this subject enacted from the eighth century on, shows that their enforcement was not easy. After the middle of the eleventh century the new ascetic tendency whose champion was Gregory VII had a strong influence in this matter. Even before Hildebrand's accession to the Papacy, the legislation of Leo IX. (1054), Stephen IX. (1058), Nicholas II. (1059), and Alexander II. (1063), had laid down the principles which as Pope he was to carry out. In the synod of 1074 he renewed the definite enactment of 1059 and 1063, according to which both the married priest who said mass and the layman who received communion at his hands were excommunicate... After the Reformation had done its work, Charles V. endeavored by the Interim of 1548 to bring about the abolition of these rules, and with several other [p. 466] princes requested the discussion of the question at the Council of Trent. The council, however, maintained the system as a whole, and the following rules are now in force: (1) through the reception of major orders or the taking of monastic or other solemn vows, celibacy becomes so binding a duty that any subsequent marriage is null and void. (2) Any one in minor orders who marries loses his office and the right to go on to major orders, but the marriage is valid. (3) Persons already married may receive the minor orders if they have the intention of proceeding to the major, and show this by taking a vow of perpetual abstinence; but the promotion to the higher orders can only take place when the wife expresses her willingness to go into a convent and take the veil. The Council of Trent further lays down that the functions of the minor orders may be performed by married men in default of unmarried—though not by those who are living with a second wife. In the nineteenth century attempts were not lacking, even within the Roman Catholic Church, to bring about the abolition of celibacy. They were rather hindered than helped by temporal governments, and always firmly rejected by Rome. Celibacy has been abolished among the Old Catholics; and modern legislation in Germany, France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland authorizes the marriage both of priests and of those who have taken a solemn vow of chastity. Austria, Spain, and Portugal still forbid it. The evangelical churches at the very outset released their clergy from the obligation of celibacy, professing to find no validity in the arguments adduced in its favor on the Roman side.

400. Celibacy, Council of Trent's Pronouncement on

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXIV (Nov. 11, 1563), Canons on the Sacrament of Matrimony, can. 10, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 164. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

If anyone saith that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity or of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity or in celibacy than to be united in matrimony; let him be anathema.

401. Celibacy, of Clergy

SOURCE: A Catholic Dictionary, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.), pp. 83, 84. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

- [p. 83] i. In the Western church marriage is prohibited to all clergy of the rank of subdeacon and upwards... This is a matter of discipline which rests on a positive enactment of ecclesiastical law, which is rarely dispensed... It is grounded in the doctrine of the superior excellence of virginity and has been reinforced by the spiritual and temporal experience of many centuries: by it the clergy are left free for the things of God (*cf.*, 1 Cor. vii, 32–3), and on countless occasions have been enabled to carry on under circumstances wherein wife and children would have made it impossible...
- [p. 84] ii. Amongst Catholics of most Eastern rites the discipline of clerical marriage is that common to the East: married men may be ordained to the priesthood and retain their wives; if his wife dies the deacon or priest cannot remarry, nor can men ordained while bachelors afterwards marry; bishops must be single or widowers...
- iii. Amongst the non-Catholic Easterns the discipline is as just stated and has been maintained, with periods of local relaxation.

402. Celibacy, of Clergy, Decreed in 1074

SOURCE: Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 134, 135. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[p. 134; translator's note:] Although the opinion had long prevailed in the church that the celibate life, or chastity, was more holy than the married life, and therefore more becoming in the clergy, yet it was not uncommon for clergymen to marry. The Cluniac party regarded this state of affairs as especially blameworthy, and demanded that all the clergy be required to take the vow of perpetual chastity. In this, as in other respects, Gregory VII endeavored to carry out the Cluniac party called it, clerical concubinage...

THE ROMAN COUNCIL, 1074.

Mansi, XX, p. 404...

[p. 135] Nor shall clergymen who are married say mass or serve the altar in any way. We decree also that if they refuse to obey our orders, or rather those of the holy fathers, the people shall refuse to receive their ministrations, in order that those who disregard the love of God and the dignity of their office may be brought to their senses through feeling the shame of the world and the reproof of the people...

GREGORY VII, 1074.

Mansi, XX, p. 433; Corpus Juris Can., Dist. LXXXI, c. xv.

If there are any priests, deacons, or subdeacons who are married, by the power of omnipotent God and the authority of St. Peter we forbid them to enter a church until they repent and mend their ways. But if any remain with their wives, no one shall dare hear them their wives, no one shall dare hear them [when they officiate in the church], because their benediction is turned into a curse, and their prayer into a sin. For the Lord says through the prophet, "I will curse your blessings" [Mal. 2:2]. Whoever shall refuse to obey this most salutary command shall be guilty of the sin of idolatry. For Samuel says: "For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry" [1 Sam. 15:23]. Whoever therefore asserts that he is a Christian but refuses to obey the apostolic see, is guilty of paganism.

403. Census, Edict for, Similar to That at Christ's Birth

SOURCE: Adolf Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East* (London: Hodder and Stoughton Publishers, [1927]), pp. 270, 271. Used by permission of the publisher and Harper & Brothers, New York.

[p. 270] On the occasion of the enrolment for taxation made by Cyrenius, "all went to enrol themselves, every one to his own city." That this was no mere figment of St. Luke or his authority, but that similar things took place in that age, is proved by an edict ⁷ [Note 7: *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, Vol. III., ed. F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell, London, 1907 p. 125, No. 904 ^{18ff.}, with facsimille (Plate 30)...] of G. Vibius Maximus, [p. 271] governor of Egypt, 104 A.D.: ...

Gaius Vibius Maximus, Praefect of Egypt, saith: The enrolment by household being at hand, it is necessary to notify all who for any cause soever are outside their nomes to return to their domestic hearths, that they may also accomplish the customary dispensation of enrolment and continue steadfastly in the husbandry that belongeth to them.

404. Chaldean, as Variously Defined

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 16.

The word $\kappa\alpha\lambda\delta\alpha\hat{i}o\varsigma$, *Chaldaeus*, bore amongst the ancients very different meanings from time to time. These terms designated first of all the inhabitants of Chaldea, that is, lower Mesopotamia, and next the members of the Babylonian priesthood... Later the epithet $\kappa\alpha\lambda\delta\alpha\hat{i}o\varsigma$ was applied as a title of honour to the Greeks who had studied in the Babylonian schools and proclaimed themselves disciples of the Babylonians; finally it served to denote all those charlatans who professed to foretell the future according to the stars.

405. Chaldeans (Babylonia Priests), in Babylon and Elsewhere Under Alexander (*c*. 330 B.C.) and After

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, pp. 9–11, 13. Copyright 1954 by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 9] In the days of Eudoxus [4th cent. B.C.] the word "Chaldaean" did not—as in Cicero's day—connote *astrologer* only, but also the priestly class of Babylon, or even the population of the area in general...

The invasion and destruction of the Persian empire by Alexander the Great (336–323 B.C.) intensified but did not inaugurate the cultural exchange between east and west...

[p. 10] With the successful conquest of the Persian empire the relations between the Chaldaeans and their new ruler, Alexander, were soon established on a friendly basis. True to his cosmopolitan ideals, Alexander went out of his way to woo and cajole the influential priestly groups throughout his realm. In turn, the Chaldaeans, at least according to Hellenistic tradition, were willing to put their divinatory prowess at Alexander's disposal...

[p. 11] Seleucus, moreover, was reported to have consulted Babylonian astrologers (called *magi* by our late source of information in the second century A.D.) when founding his new city Seleuceia not far from Babylon. The Chaldaeans may have feared—and rightly—that Seleuceia would eventually eclipse Babylon—a development which led to the complete abandonment of the ancient metropolis in the first century. ⁶⁷ [Note 67: Strabo, 16, 1, 6 (f. 739): Cassius Dio. *ep.*, 68, 30, 1.]...

[p. 13] The lesser Hellenistic princes followed the example of the great rulers... The Seleucids, Lagids, Attalids surrounded themselves with court astrologers...

The rise of Stoicism in the Greek world greatly facilitated the growth of Hellenistic faith in the science of fatalist astrology. The first oriental apostle according to Graeco-Roman tradition was a Babylonian priest, who left Mesopotamia to settle on the Greek island of Cos, long famous for its school of medicine. His name was Berossus.

He was credited with revealing to the Greek world the hitherto secret priestly astrology of Babylonia.⁸⁴ [Note 84: Josephus, *contra Apionem*, 1, 129.]

406. Chaldeans (Babylonian Priests), in Babylon Still After

Depopulation

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* vi. 30. 121–123; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 431. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

The temple of Jupiter Belus [i.e. Bel Marduk] in Babylon is still standing—Belus was the discoverer of the science of astronomy; but in all other respects the place has gone back to a desert, having been drained of its population by the proximity of Seleucia, founded for that purpose by [Seleucus] Nicator not quite 90 miles away, at the point where the canalised Euphrates joins the Tigris... Hippareni—this also a school of Chaldaean learning like Babylon— [is] situated on a tributary of the river Narraga, from which the city-state takes its name (the walls of Hippareni were demolished by the Persians); also Orcheni, a third seat of Chaldaean learning, is situated in the same neighbourhood towards the south.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Hippareni and Orcheni are apparently Sippar and Uruk (see O. Neugebauer, *Astronomical Cuneiform Texts,* Vol. 1, p. 5).]

407. Chaldeans (Babylonian Priests)—Relations With Greeks in Hellenistic Period

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 33.

The Chaldaeans, whom the policy of the [Seleucid] kings of Antioch strove to conciliate, entered into close relations with the learned men who came to Asia in the train of their conquerors, and they even proceeded to carry their precepts throughout the land of Greece. A priest of Bel, Berosus, established himself about the year 280 in the island of Cos, and there revealed to his sceptical hearers the contents of the cuneiform writings accumulated in the archives of his country, annals of the ancient kings and astrological treatises. Another Chaldaean, Soudines, invited to the court of Attalus I., king of Pergamus, practised there, about the year 238, the methods of divination in vogue in his native land, such as inspection of the liver... At the same time [3d cent. B.C.] centres of Greek science were established in the heart of Mesopotamia, and in the ancient observatories of Bel learners were initiated into the methods and discoveries of the astronomers of Alexandria or Athens. Under the Seleucids and the early Arsacids Babylon was a hellenised city.

408. Chaldeans (Babylonians Priests), Subdivisions of, in First Century B.C.

SOURCE: Strabo *The Geography of Strabo* 16. 1. 6, translated by Horace Leonard Jones, Vol. 7 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 201, 203. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 201] In Babylonia [Note 2: $B\alpha\beta\nu\lambda\omega\nu\iota$, Groskurd and Meineke emend to $B\alpha\beta\nu\lambda\omega\nu\iota\alpha$.] a settlement is set apart for the [p. 203] local philosophers, the Chaldaeans, as they are called, who are concerned mostly with astronomy; but some of these, who are not approved of by the others, profess to be genethlialogists [casters of horoscopes]. There is also a tribe of the Chaldaeans, and a territory inhabited by them, in the neighbourhood of the Arabians and of the Persian Sea, as it is called. There are also several tribes of the Chaldaean astronomers. For example, some are called Orcheni, others Borsippeni, and several others by different names, as though divided into different sects which hold to various different dogmas about the same subjects. And the mathematicians make mention of some of these men; as, for example, Cidenas and Naburianus and Sudinus. Seleucus of Seleuceia is also a Chaldaean, as are also several other noteworthy men.

409. Character, Power of Habit in Formation of

SOURCE: William James, *The Principles of Psychology* (Vol. 53 of Great Books of the Western World), p. 83. Copyright 1952 by Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago. Used by permission of Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York.

The physiological study of mental conditions is thus the most powerful ally of hortatory ethics. The hell to be endured hereafter, of which theology tells, is no worse than the hell we make for ourselves in this world by habitually fashioning our characters in the wrong way. Could the young but realize how soon they will become mere walking bundles of habits, they would give more heed to their conduct while in the plastic state. We are spinning our own fates, good or evil, and never to be undone. Every smallest stroke or virtue or of vice leaves its never so little scar. The drunken Rip Van Winkle, in Jefferson's play, excuses himself for every fresh dereliction by saying, "I won't count this time!" Well! he may not count it, and kind Heaven may not count it; but it is being counted none the less. Down among his nerve-cells and fibres the molecules are counting it, registering and storing it up to be used against him when the next temptation comes. Nothing we ever do is, in strict scientific literalness, wiped out. Of course, this has its good side as well as its bad one. As we become permanent drunkards by so many separate drinks, so we become saints in the moral, and authorities and experts in the practical and scientific spheres, by so many separate acts and hours of work. Let no youth have any anxiety about the upshot of his education, whatever the line of it may be. If he keep faithfully busy each hour of the working-day, he may safely leave the final result to itself. He can with perfect certainty count on waking up some fine morning, to find himself one of the competent ones of his generation, in whatever pursuit he may have singled out. Silently, between all the details of his business, the *power of judging* in all that class of matter will have built itself up within him as a possession that will never pass away. Young people should know this truth in advance. The ignorance of it has probably engendered more discouragement and faint-heartedness in youths embarking on arduous careers than all other causes put together.

410. Chastity, Catholic Position on

SOURCE: John L. Thomas, *The Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House), pp. 106, 107. Copyright ° 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

[p. 106] Catholic philosophers and theologians have developed a balanced, carefully defined set of principles related to sex. In their teaching, chastity is the virtue that moderates the use of the sexual functions in accordance with right reason, and as such it is a form of the cardinal virtue of temperance, which controls the human appetites having to do with the pleasures of eating, drinking, and sex. The chaste person is one who realizes the order of reason in the province of sexuality, while sins against chastity are transgressions and violations of the rational order in this area of human activity. As the term is used here, the "order of reason" is the order that corresponds to the reality made evident to man through faith human knowledge. Now, considering the nature of man and his purpose in life, together with what we know about the generative faculties and their reproductive purpose, we must conclude that right reason requires that all voluntary expression of the [p. 107] sensitive appetite for venereal pleasure be excluded among the unmarried and be regulated in conformity with the purposes of marriage and the inherent purpose of the generative act in marriage. One who has acquired the habitual disposition to act in this manner possesses the virtue of chastity.

411. Christian and Missionary Alliance

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 364, 365.

[p. 364] History. The Christian and Missionary Alliance originated in a somewhat informal movement started by Rev. A. B. Simpson, D. D., in the year 1881. At that time Dr. Simpson was pastor of a Presbyterian church in New York City, but left the pastorate, and also withdrew from the presbytery of New York, for the purpose of conducting a wider evangelistic movement among the unchurched masses. For several years he held services in public halls, theaters, and in the summer in gospel tents. Shortly after the movement was started an independent church was organized in New York with an independent charter, still known as the Gospel Tabernacle Church. The work became more widely known and affiliated throughout the country through many calls for evangelistic services and religious conventions in popular centers, such as Old Orchard Beach, Maine, and various other resorts, and a number of local organizations were formed. From the beginning a strong missionary tone characterized the conferences, and in 1887 two societies were organized, respectively, for home and foreign missionary work—one known as the Christian Alliance (incorporated in 1890), for [p. 365] home work, especially among the neglected classes in towns and cities of the United States; the other, the International Missionary Alliance (incorporated in 1889), was for the purpose of planting missions among neglected communities in non-Christian lands. In 1897 the two societies were united in The Christian and Missionary Alliance and since then have labored in the double function of home and foreign evangelism.

Doctrine. The Christian and Missionary Alliance is strictly evangelical in its doctrine. It stands firmly for the inspiration of the Scriptures, the atonement of Christ, the supernaturalism of religious experience, and a life of separation and practical holiness. It has no strict creed, but expresses the great essential features of its testimony in a simple formula known as the fourfold Gospel of Christ, as Saviour, Sanctifier, Healer, and Coming Lord. It is not a sectarian body, but allows liberty in the matter of church government, and is in fraternal union with evangelical Christians of all denominations,

accepting missionaries from the various churches, provided they are in full sympathy with the evangelical standards of the Alliance.

Organization. There is no close ecclesiastical organization, though the society has in the United States and Canada about a dozen organized districts with about 500 regular branches. Only a small proportion of these are organized churches, as the society seeks always to avoid a sectarian aspect and therefore is somewhat averse to the establishment of independent churches. Each local branch is entirely self-directing and in most cases is primarily evangelistic in character and a center of missionary conference. An annual council meets in the spring, to which reports are submitted from all branches and fields, and which passes such legislation as may be needed concerning the government and administration of the work. It is to be noted that many of the most liberal and active supporters of this work are still in active membership in various Protestant churches, giving their support to the Alliance in its evangelistic work.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 59, 644 (YAC, 1961, p. 253).]

412. Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ), International Convention SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 540–542.

[p. 540] *History*. The Disciples of Christ trace their origin to a movement in the early part of the nineteenth century, when a number of leaders arose who pleaded for the Bible alone, without human addition in the form of creeds and formulas. At first they emphasized Christian fellowship and the independence of the local church, without adherence to any ecclesiastical system. Somewhat later an element was added which sought to restore the union of the churches through a "return, in doctrine, ordinance, and life, to the religion definitely outlined" in the New Testament.

In 1807 Rev. Thomas Campbell, a minister of the Secession branch of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, came to the United States, was received cordially, and found employment in western Pennsylvania. Finding that, in the generally destitute condition of that region, a number of families belonging to other presbyteries had not for a long time enjoyed the communion service, he invited them to attend his service. For this he was censured by his presbytery, but upon his appeal to the Associate Synod of North America, on account of informalities in the proceedings of the presbytery, he was released from censure. In the presentation of his case, however, he emphasized very strongly the evils of sectarianism, and as it became increasingly evident that his views differed from those of the presbytery, he formally withdrew from the synod. In 1809 his son, Alexander Campbell, with the rest of the family, joined him, and an organization called the Christian Association of Washington, Pa., was formed. From this association was issued a "declaration and address," which became historic.

Its main purpose was to set forth the essential unity of the Church of Christ, which, while necessarily existing in particular and distinct societies, ought to have "no schisms, or uncharitable divisions among them." To this end, it claimed that nothing should be inculcated "as articles of faith or terms of communion but what is expressly taught and enjoined *** in the Word of God," which is "the perfect constitution for the worship, discipline, and government of the New Testament Church," nor has "any human authority power to impose new commands and ordinances upon the church." While "inferences and deductions from Scripture promises *** may be truly called the doctrine of God's Holy Word, yet they are not formally binding upon the consciences of Christians," and while "doctrinal expositions of divine truths are advantageous, yet they ought not to be

made terms of Christian communion," all the "precious saints of God" being under obligation "to love each other as brethren."

Division among Christians is characterized as "a horrid evil, fraught with many evils," anti-Christian, anti-Scriptural, antinatural, and "productive of confusion and every evil work." Membership in the church should be confined to such as "profess their faith in Christ and obedience to Him in all things according to the Scriptures," and "continued to manifest the reality of their profession by their temper and conduct." Ministers are "to inculcate none other things than those articles of faith and holiness expressly revealed and enjoined in the Word of God," and in administration are to observe the "example of the Primitive Church without any additions whatsoever of human opinions or inventions of men." Should there be any "circumstantials indispensably necessary to the observance of divine ordinances not found upon the page of express revelation," these may be adopted only under the title of "human expedients without any pretense to a more sacred origin."

The publication of this address did not meet with much response, and the two Campbells appear to have been somewhat uncertain as to just what to do. The development of their Christian Association into a distinct denomination was the very thing they did not wish, and accordingly overtures were made to the Presbyterians Synod of Pittsburg. The address, however, stood in the way of acceptance, and in 1810 they and their associates organized "The First Church of the Christian Association of Washington, meeting at Cross Roads and Brush Run, Washington County, Pennsylvania."

[p. 541] Subsequently, an invitation was given to the members of this association to join the Redstone Baptist Association, but difficulties arose on both sides. The Campbells had accepted the general principle of believers' baptism, but some elements in their position were not pleasing to the Baptists. On the other hand, the Baptist Association, in accepting the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, had done the very thing to which the Campbells objected. Still it seemed advantageous for them to enter into fellowship with the churches nearest to their own in belief and practice, and, accordingly, the invitation was accepted. This alliance, however, did not continue for any length of time, as difference of views became more evident, and later the Campbell association withdrew and joined the Mahoning Baptist Association, in which their teachings had gained general acceptance. In 1829, however, since a majority of the members believed that there was no warrant in Scripture for an organization such as theirs, the association was disbanded as an ecclesiastical body. Alexander Campbell was opposed to this action, as he thought that such an organization was needed and that there was no reason why a specific "Thus saith the Lord" should be required in a case of this character.

Meanwhile, Barton W. Stone, another Presbyterian minister, and a number of his associates had accepted the principle of baptism by immersion, although comparatively few made it a test of fellowship; and as they came into relations with Alexander Campbell a partial union was effected in Lexington, Ky., in the early part of 1832. In this there seems to have been no effort at entire agreement, but only a readiness to cooperate heartily. When the question arose as to the name to be adopted, Mr. Stone favored "Christians," as the name given in the beginning by divine authority. Mr. Campbell and his friends preferred the name "Disciples" as less offensive to good people and quite as scriptural. The result was that no definite action was taken and both names were used, the

local organization being known, generally, as a "Christian Church," or a "Church of Christ," and, rarely, as a "Church of Disciples," or a "Disciples' Church."

During the first few years of the movement, Alexander Campbell and other leaders were often engaged in more or less heated controversies with representatives of other denominations. Gradually, however, these discussions became less frequent and at the same time more conciliatory in tone.

The growth of the new organization was very rapid, especially in the Middle West. Throughout Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, and Missouri it gathered numerous congregations, though there was evident a strong objection to any such association, even for fellowship, as would appear to involve ecclesiastical organization. This manifested itself in various ways, especially in opposition to the use of societies for carrying on missionary work. The use of instrumental music in the churches also occasioned dissatisfaction.

During the Civil War the movement suffered from the general disorganization of the sections in which it had gained its strength, and the death of Alexander Campbell in 1866 was no doubt a severe blow. From the effect of these discouragements, however, it soon recovered, and the period since that war has been one of rapid expansion. With this expansion there developed, out of the objections referred to above, and especially to any semblance of ecclesiastical organization and to the use of instrumental music in the churches, two parties, generally termed "Progressives" and "Conservatives." The former were anxious to include all under one general head as was done in the census report for 1890, leaving each church free to conduct its affairs in its own way, but the Conservatives objected, and insisted on separate classification. Accordingly, in the report for 1906 and in subsequent reports the "Conservative" churches have been listed as Churches of Christ. The line of demarcation between the two bodies, however, is by no means clear.

Doctrine. The doctrinal position of the Disciples has been summarized as follows: They accept the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; the all-sufficiency of the Bible as a revelation of God's will and a rule of faith and life: the revelation of God in threefold personality of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as set forth by the Apostles; the divine glory of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, His incarnation, doctrine, miracles, death as a sin offering, resurrection, ascension, and coronation; the personality of the Holy Spirit and His divine mission to convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment to come, and to comfort and sanctify the people of God; the alienation of man from his Maker, and the necessity of faith, repentance, and obedience in order to salvation; the obligation of the divine ordinances of baptism and the [p. 542] Lord's Supper; the duty of observing the Lord's day in memory of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus; the necessity of holiness on the part of believers; the divine appointment of the Church of Christ, composed of all who by faith and obedience confess His name, with its ministries and services for the edification of the body of Christ and the conversion of the world; the obligation of all disciples to carry the gospel into all the world, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you"; the fullness and freeness of the salvation that is in Christ to all who will accept it on the New Testament conditions; the final judgment, with the reward of the righteous and punishment of the wicked.

In addition to these beliefs, in which they are in general accord with other Protestant churches, the Disciples hold certain positions which they regard as distinctive:

- 1. Feeling that "to believe and to do none other things than those enjoined by our Lord and His Apostles must be infallibly safe," they aim "to restore in faith and spirit and practice the Christianity of Christ and His Apostles as found on the pages of the New Testament."
- 2. Affirming that "the sacred Scriptures as given of God answer all purposes of a rule of faith and practice, and a law for the government of the church, and that human creeds and confessions of faith spring out of controversy and, instead of being bonds of union, tend to division and strife," they reject all such creeds and confessions.
- 3. They place especial emphasis upon "the Divine Sonship of Jesus, as the fundamental fact of Holy Scripture, the essential creed of Christianity, and the one article of faith in order to baptism and church membership."
- 4. Believing that in the Scriptures "a clear distinction is made between the law and the gospel," they "do not regard the Old and New Testaments as of equally binding authority upon Christians," but that "the New Testament is as perfect a constitution for the worship, government, and discipline of the New Testament church as the Old was for the Old Testament church."
- 5. While claiming for themselves the New Testament names of "Christians," or "Disciples," "they do not deny that others are Christians or that other churches are Churches of Christ."
- 6. Accepting the divine personality of the Holy Spirit, through whose agency regeneration is begun, they hold that men "must hear, believe, repent, and obey the gospel to be saved."
- 7. Repudiating any doctrine of "baptismal regeneration," and insisting that there is no other prerequisite to regeneration than confession of faith with the whole heart in the personal living Christ, they regard baptism by immersion "as one of the items of the original divine system," and as "commanded in order to the remission of sins."
- 8. Following the apostolic model, the Disciples celebrate the Lord's Supper on each Lord's day, "not as a sacrament, but as a memorial feast," from which no sincere follower of Christ of whatever creed or church connection is excluded.
- 9. The Lord's day with the Disciples is not a Sabbath, but a New Testament institution, commemorating our Lord's resurrection, and consecrated by apostolic example.
- 10. The Church of Christ is a divine institution; sects are unscriptural and unapostolic. The sect name, spirit, and life should give place to the union and cooperation that distinguished the church of the New Testament.

Organization. In polity the Disciples churches are congregational.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 1,801,414 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

413. Christian Connection

SOURCE: Joshua V. Himes, "Christian Connexion," *Fessenden & Co. 's Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Brattleboro, Vt.: Brattleboro Typographic Company, 1838), pp. 362, 363.

[p. 362] CHRISTIAN CONNEXION, or Christians, sometimes erroneously pronounced *Christ*-ians. This is a religious denomination of recent origin in the United States of America, and among the last that has arisen, which, from its numbers and character, has

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

attained much consideration and influence. Its beginning may be dated about the year 1800... The denomination seems to have sprung up almost simultaneously in different and remote parts of the country, without any preliminary interchange of sentiments or concerted plan of action...

In New England, where the Christian denomination seems first to have attracted attention by any public demonstration or organization as a distinct sect, it was composed, principally, of individuals who separated from the Calvinistic Baptists. Soon after the formation of their first churches, several large churches of the Calvinistic Baptists declared themselves independent of the Baptist [p. 363] association and united with them... In the southern states, the first associations of this sect consisted, mostly, of seceders from the Methodists, and, in the western states, from the Presbyterians... At first, they were generally Trinitarians; subsequently they have, almost unanimously, rejected the Trinitarian doctrine as unscriptural.

But though toleration is still their predominant principle, and it would be wide of the truth to say that any doctrine is universally held by the connexion, or is considered indispensable to membership, still it may be asserted, with confidence, that discussion in their periodicals and personal intercourse and conference, have produced a manifest approximation to unanimity of sentiment, and that the following are very generally regarded as Scripture doctrines:-That there is one living and true God, the Father almighty, who is unoriginated, independent, and eternal, the Creator and Supporter of all worlds; and this God is one spiritual intelligence, one infinite mind, ever the same, never varying: That this God is the moral Governor of the world, the absolute source of all the blessings of nature, providence and grace, in whose infinite wisdom, goodness, mercy, benevolence and love have originated all his moral dispensations to man: That all men sin and come short of the glory of God, consequently fall under the curse of the law: That Christ is the Son of God, the promised Messiah and Savior of the world, the Mediator between God and man, by whom God has revealed his will to mankind; by whose sufferings, death and resurrection a way has been provided by which sinners may obtain salvation, may lay hold on eternal life: that he is appointed of God to raise the dead and judge the world at the last day: That the Holy Spirit is the power and energy of God, that holy influence of God by whose agency, in the use of means, the wicked are regenerated, converted and recovered to a virtuous and holy life, sanctified and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light; and that, by the same Spirit, the saints, in the use of means, are comforted, strengthened and led in the path of duty. The free forgiveness of sins, flowing from the rich mercy of God, through the labors, sufferings and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ: The necessity of repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ: The absolute necessity of holiness of heart and rectitude of life to enjoy the favor and approbation of God: The doctrine of a future state of immortality: The doctrine of a righteous retribution, in which God will render to every man according to the deeds done in the body: The baptism of believers by immersion: And the open communion at the Lord's table of Christians of every denomination having a good standing in their respective churches.

The principles upon which their churches were at first constituted, and upon which they still stand, are the following: The Scriptures are taken to be the only rule of faith and practice, each individual being at liberty to determine, for himself, in relation to these matters, what they enjoin: No member is subject to the loss of church fellowship on account of his sincere and conscientious belief, so long as he manifestly lives a pious and devout life: No member is subject to discipline and church censure but for disorderly and immoral conduct: The name Christian to be adopted, to the exclusion of all sectarian names... Each church is considered an independent body, possessing exclusive authority to regulate and govern its own affairs.

For the purpose of promoting the general interest and prosperity of the connexion by mutual efforts and joint counsels, associations were formed, denominated Conferences... In twenty of the United States, there are now, (1833,) thirty-two conferences. The number of their ... communicants, from 75,000 to 100,000, and from 250 to 300,000 who entertain their views and attend upon their ministry.

Several periodicals have been published under the patronage of the connexion; the principal of which are, the Christian Herald at Portsmouth, New Hampsphire, the Gospel Luminary at New York, the Christian Messenger at Georgetown, Kentucky, and the Christian Palladium at Rochester, New York.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The writer of this article, Joshua V. Himes, was for a time the general secretary of the Christian Connection, and later became a leader in the Millerite movement. From this Christian denomination came many Millerites and at least two of the early SDA leaders, Joseph Bates and James White, who had been in the Miller movement. For the recent history of this denomination see United Church of Christ.]

414. Christian Life—Christ Living Within

SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *The Case for Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 53, 54. Used by permission of the publisher and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 53] Your natural life is derived from your parents; that doesn't mean it will stay there if you do nothing about it. You can lose it by neglect, or you can drive it away by committing suicide. You've got to feed it and look after it: but remember, all the time you're not making it you're only keeping up a life you got from someone else. In the same what a Christian can lose the Christ-life which as been put into him, and he has to make efforts to keep it. But even the best Christian that ever lived is not acting on his own steam—he is only nourishing or protecting a life he could never have acquired by his own efforts. And that has practical consequences. As long as the natural life is in [p. 54] your body, it will do a lot towards repairing that body. Cut it, and up to a point it will heal, as a dead body wouldn't. A live body isn't one that never gets hurt, but one that can to some extent repair itself. In the same way a Christian isn't a man who never goes wrong, but a man who is enabled to repent and pick himself up and begin over again after each stumble—because the Christ-life is inside him, repairing him all the time, enabling him to repeat (in some degree) the kind of voluntary death which Christ Himself carried out.

That is why the Christian is in a different position from other people who are trying to be good. They hope, by being good, to please God if there is one; or—if they think there isn't—at least they hope to deserve approval from good men. But the Christian thinks any good he does comes from the Christ-life inside him. He doesn't think God will love us because we're good, but that God will make us good because He loves us; just as the roof of a greenhouse doesn't attract the sun because it's bright, but becomes bright because the sun shines on it.

And let me make it quite clear that when Christians say the Christ-life is in them, they don't mean simply something mental or moral. This isn't simply a way of saying that we

are thinking about Christ or copying Him. They mean that Christ is actually operating through them.

415. Christian Life.—Spiritual and Social Aspects

SOURCE: Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial*, pp. 246–248. Copyright 1948 by Oxford University Press, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 246] If man has been created in the likeness of God, and if the true end of man is to make this likeness ever more and more like, then Aristotle's saying that 'man is a social animal' applies to man's highest potentiality and aim—that of trying to get into ever closer communion with God. Seeking God is itself a social act. And if God's love has gone into action in this world in the Redemption of mankind by Christ, then man's efforts to make himself liker to God must include efforts to follow Christ's example in sacrificing himself for the redemption of his fellow men. Seeking and following God in this way, that is God's way, is the only true way for a human soul on Earth to seek salvation. The antithesis between trying to save one's own soul by seeking and following God and trying to do one's duty to one's neighbour is therefore wholly false. The two activities are indissoluble. The human soul that is truly seeking to save itself is as fully social a being as the ant-like Spartan or the bee-like Communist. Only, the Christian soul on Earth is a member of a very different society from Sparta or Leviathan. He is a citizen of the Kingdom of God, and therefore his paramount and all-embracing aim [p. 247] is to attain the highest degree of communion with, and likeness to, God Himself; his relations with his fellow men are consequences of, and corollaries to, his relations with God; and his way of loving his neighbour as himself will be to try to help his neighbour to win what he is seeking for himself-that is, to come into closer communion with God and to become more godlike.

If this is a soul's recognized aim for itself and for its fellow souls in the Christian Church Militant on Earth, then it is obvious that under a Christian dispensation God's will *will* be done in Earth as it is Heaven to an immeasurably greater degree than in a secular mundane society...

Therefore, while the replacement of the mundane civilizations by the worldwide and enduring reign of the Church Militant on Earth would certainly produce what to-day would seem a miraculous improvement in those mundane social conditions which the civilizations have been seeking to improve during the last six thousand years, the aim, and test, of progress under a truly Christian dis- [p. 248] pensation on Earth would not would be the spiritual life of individual souls in their passages through this earthly life from birth into this world to death out of it.

416. Christianity—Background in Pagan Roman Empire SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 17–19. ° 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 17] To a considerable degree, as many writers have pointed out, the way had been opened for the swift permeation of the Graeco-Roman world by the waning vigor of its old faiths. The temples of the Roman and Greek gods were still open; the prescribed sacrifices were still offered in them. But there was a general feeling that what virtue the ancient forms of worship had once possessed [p. 18] was rapidly seeping out of them. Both Roman and Greek literature from the time of Cicero on is filled with mourning for the passing of the "good old days," and with exhortations to return to the virtues of the fathers, now largely vanished. This pervasive sense of unfulfilled spiritual desires encouraged the important from Egypt and the East of a number of so-called "mystery religions."

By the time Peter and Paul started on their missionary labors, Rome was filled with these new fads in religion, existing alongside the official cult of the state gods and goddesses, commanding devotion from their initiates and exerting an alluring fascination on thousands. Such a great emperor, for example, as Hadrian (117–138), who spent little of his reign in Rome, eagerly sought initiation into whatever cults he encountered as he moved about his vast domain. This sense of the weakening hold of the old gods and of the need to find satisfaction in strange new rites was as deeply felt in the other cities of the empire as in Rome.

Indeed, the time had come when a moral decline in all the lands clustered around the Mediterranean showed the need for a new spiritual lift to higher levels of conduct. Not that the Graeco-Roman world was bereft of moral ideals. Far from it. Socrates, Plato, and the other great Greek philosophers had taught principles of conduct which remain an imperishable legacy. The Stoics held up standards that were loftier than the mine-run of human beings have ever lived up to anywhere or at any time. Nevertheless, the corruption which, as Lord Acton says, goes with power was working havoc in Roman society, while the outlying cities of the empire sometimes seemed to be vying with one another to win notoriety as centers of vice. As one reads today the history of the Caesars, or the comments of contemporary satirists on the society they observed about them, the smell of putrefaction rises from page after page. Read Juvenal and Martial and Suetonius's *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*.

Into this morally sick world Christianity came like a breath of fresh air. It had a theology of a God-man who opened a way of salvation that was more arresting than any of the myths of the older faiths. It had baptismal and eucharistic rites as conducive to the the curiosity of outsiders as any rites of the mystery religions. [p. 19] (Some of the wild rumors that gained general credence concerning these rites were to make bitter trouble for the Christians.) But primarily, it had an object lesson to show that pagan world in the form of communities in which people of all kinds—a few aristocrats, numbers of artisans and tradesmen and housewives, even numerous slaves—were living the sort of daily lives which their neighbors instinctively wished they were living.

417. Christianity, Early—Adherents Described

SOURCE: *The Epistle to Diognetus* (anonymous) v. 1–17, in *The Apostolic Fathers*, trans. Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), pp. 359, 361. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and the Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 359] For the distinction between Christians and other men, is neither in country nor language nor customs. For they do not dwell in cities in some place of their own, nor do they use any strange variety of dialect, nor practise an extraordinary kind of life. This teaching of theirs has not been discovered by the intellect or thought of busy men, nor are they the advocates of any human doctrine as some men are. Yet while living in Greek and barbarian cities, according as each obtained his lot, and following the local customs, both in clothing and food and in the rest of life, they show forth the wonderful and confessedly strange character of the constitution of their own citizenship. They dwell in their own fatherlands, but as if sojourners in them; they share all things as citizens, and suffer [p. 361] all things as strangers. Every foreign country is their fatherland, and every fatherland is a foreign country. They marry as all men, they bear children, but they do not expose their offspring [see editors' note]. They offer free hospitality, but guard their purity. Their lot is cast "in the flesh," but they do not live "after the flesh." They pass their time upon the earth, but they have their citizenship in heaven. They obey the appointed laws, and they surpass the laws in their own lives. They love all men and are persecuted by all men. They are unknown and they are condemned. They are put to death and they gain life. "They are poor and make many rich"; they lack all things and have all things in abundance. They are dishonoured, and are glorified in their dishonour, they are spoken evil of and are justified. "They are abused and give blessing," they are insulted and render honour. When they do good they are buffeted as evil-doers, when they are buffeted they rejoice as men who receive life. They are warred upon by the Jews as foreigners and are persecuted by the Greeks, and those who hate them cannot state the cause of their enmity.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Among the pagans it was customary to dispose of an unwanted newborn infant by abandoning it in some public place where it might either die or be picked up and reared in slavery.]

418. Christianity, Early, Brotherhood Manifest in SOURCE: Jérôme Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, p. 139. Copyright 1940 by Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

The Christians were brothers and called each other so. Their meetings were often called *agape*, which in Greek means "love." They constantly assisted each other "without parage or patronage." An unceasing interchange "of counsel, of information, and of practical help" took place between one Christian and the other and, as Duchesne has said, "all this was alive and active in a fashion wholly different from that of the pagan brotherhoods." Many observers in those days were constrained to say of the Christians: "How simple and pure is their religion! What confidence they have in their God and His promise! How they love one another and how happy they are together!"

419. Christianity, Early, Conditions Favorable to Spread of SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, 1st ed., pp. 21, 22. Copyright 1953 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 21] At the time when Christianity came into being, much in the basin of the Mediterranean favoured the spread of religions, either new or old. Jesus was ... born in the reign of Augustus. After a long period of wars which had racked the Mediterranean and its shores, political unity had been achieved and the Roman Empire had become roughly conterminous with the Mediterranean Basin. Here and there it was soon to spread beyond it. Augustus was the first Emperor. Building on the foundations laid by his uncle, Julius Caesar, he brought peace and under the guise of the chief citizen of a restored republic ruled the realm which for several generations Rome had been building. The internal peace and order which Augustus achieved endured, with occasional interruptions, for about two centuries. Never before had all the shores of the Mediterranean been under one rule and never had they enjoyed such prosperity. The *pax Romana* made for the spread of ideas and religions over the area where it prevailed.

With the *pax Romana* went the building of roads and the growth of commerce. Highways of solid construction traversed the Empire and made possible more extensive travel and trade than the region had ever known. The pirates had been curbed who had imperilled shipping in the Mediterranean. Roads, travel, and commerce facilitated cultural and religious as well as political unity.

Travel and trade were accompanied by the spread of two languages, Greek and Latin. Greek was spoken among one or more groups in most of the cities of the Empire where commerce was to be found. The Greek-speaking and Greek-reading groups were most numerous in the eastern part of the Mediterranean. Alexandria in Egypt was a particularly prominent focus of Greek culture. Yet those for whom Greek was a primary tongue were also present in Rome, in Sicily and the south of Italy, in some of the cities of the south of Gaul, and in several other centres in the western portions of the Mediterranean. The

Greek was the *koine* in one or more of its varieties. Latin was more [p. 22] prevalent in the West. In the first centuries of the Christian era, while Christianity was expanding in the Empire, it was increasingly the speech of much of the population on the western borders of the Mediterranean. A religion which employed Greek and Latin, and especially Greek, had advantages over rivals which did not and might gain an Empirewide hearing.

420. Christianity, Early, Contrasted With Paganism

SOURCE: Jérôme Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, p. 139. Copyright 1940 by Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

To the polytheism of the Graeco-Roman gods, reduced to mere symbols as they were, to the vague and diffuse monotheism of the oriental religions, the Christian opposed his doctrine of the One God, the Father Omnipotent. In contrast to the various idolatries, spiritualized though they might be by the divine ether and the eternal stars, he offered a worship solely of the spirit, purified of astrological aberration, of bleeding sacrifice, of mystery-ridden initiation; for all these he substituted a baptism of pure water, prayer, and a frugal common meal. Like the pagan religionists he gave answer in the name of his sacred books to every question about the origin of things and the destiny of man; but the Redeemer whose "good tidings" he brought, instead of being an elusive and ambiguous figure lost in a mythological labyrinth, was revealed in miraculous reality in the earthly life of Jesus, the Son of God. Like the pagan religionists, the Christian guaranteed salvation after death, but instead of engulfing the believer in the silence of a starry eternity, he restored him to life in a personal resurrection foreshadowed by the resurrection of Christ himself. Like the pagan, the Christian laid down a rule of life for all believers, but while not excluding contemplation or asceticism or ecstasy, he did not abuse them and condensed his moral teaching into man's love of his neighbour which the gospels inculcated.

Herein lay beyond question the strongest attraction of the new religion.

421. Christianity, Early, Corruption of

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 28, Vol. 3 (London: Methuen & Co., 1897), pp. 214, 215.

[p. 214] The sublime and simple theology of the primitive Christians was gradually corrupted; and the MONARCHY of heaven, already clouded by metaphysical subtleties, was degraded by the introduction of a popular mythology, which tended to restore the reign of polytheism...

The Christians frequented the tombs of the martyrs, in the hope of obtaining, from their powerful intercession, every sort of spiritual, but more especially [p. 215] of temporal, blessings... Edifying pictures, which could not long escape the abuse of indiscreet or idolatrous devotion, represented the image, the attributes, and the miracles of the tutelar saint... The most respectable bishops had persuaded themselves that the ignorant rustics would more cheerfully renounce the superstitions of Paganism, if they found some resemblance, some compensation, in the bosom of Christianity. The religion

of Constantine achieved, in less than a century, the final conquest of the Roman empire: but the victors themselves were insensibly subdued by the arts of their vanquished rivals.

422. Christianity, Early, in Western Europe SOURCE: Ferdinand Lot, *The End of the Ancient World*, trans. by Philip Leon and Mariette Leon (New York:

Alfred A. Knopf, 1931), p. 392. Used by permission of Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

The form of Christianity which triumphed in the West was of neither a high nor a pure quality. Even the best bishops were superstitious, believing in omens and haunted by fear of the Devil. Their notion of the deity was too often that of a jealous vindictive god who favoured his devotees without troubling about their morality. What are we to say of the bulk of believers? Certain practices contributed to the degradation of Christian feeling, such as the use of "penitentials," coming apparently from Ireland; these were tariffs of prices for the redemption of sins.

From this period, the worship of God gave way to the worship of the Saints... Gradually differentiations between the saints were set up which specialized the effects of their intervention, so that the healing saints replaced the gods and heroes of Antiquity... Left to itself the human mind fell back wholly into paganism.

423. Christianity, Essence of, in Redemption

SOURCE: James Orr, "Christianity: II. Historical and Doctrinal," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 1, p. 625. Copyright 1939 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

Though, therefore, Christ, in His relations of love and trust to the Father, and perfection of holy character, necessarily ever remains the Great Exemplar to whose image His people are to be conformed (Rom 8 29), in whose steps they are to follow (1 Pet 2 21), it is not correct to describe Christianity simply as the religion which Christ practised. Christianity takes into account also the work which Christ came to do, the redemption He achieved, the blessings which, through Him, are bestowed on those who accept Him as their Saviour, and acknowledge Him as their Lord. Essentially Christianity is a religion of redemption; not, therefore, a religion practised by Jesus for Himself, but one based on a work He has accomplished for others. Experimentally, it may be described as consisting, above all, in the joyful consciousness of redemption from sin and reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ, and in the possession of a new life of sonship and holiness through Christ's Spirit. Everything in the way of holy obedience is included here. This, at least, reduced to its simplest terms, is undeniably what Christianity meant for its first preachers and teachers, and what historically it has meant for the church ever since.

424. Christianity, Modern—Practice Without Belief

SOURCE: Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial*, p. 237. Copyright 1948 by Oxford University Press, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

We have obviously, for a number of generations past, been living on spiritual capital, I mean clinging to Christian practice without possessing the Christian belief—and practice unsupported by belief is a wasting asset, as we have suddenly discovered, to our dismay, in this generation.

425. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Accepted From Popular Custom

SOURCE: Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), pp. 745, 746. Copyright 1950 by Will Durant. By permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc.

[p. 745] In general the Church did not so much encourage superstitions as inherit them from the imagination of the people or the traditions of the Mediterranean world. The belief in miracle-working objects, talismans, amulets, and formulas was as dear to Islam as to Christianity, and both religions had received these beliefs from pagan antiquity. Ancient forms of phallic worship lingered far into the Middle Ages, but were gradually abolished by the Church. The worship of God as Lord of Hosts and King of Kings inherited Semitic and Roman ways of approach, veneration, and address; the incense burnt before altar or clergy recalled the old burnt offerings; aspersion with holy water was an ancient form of exorcism; processions and lustrations continued immemorial rites; the vestments of the clergy and the papal title of *pontifex maximus* were legacies from pagan Rome. The Church found that rural converts still revered certain springs, wells, trees, and stones; she thought it wiser to bless these to Christian use than to break too sharply the customs of sentiment. So a dolmen at Plouaret was consecrated as the chapel of the Seven Saints, and the worship of the oak was sterilized by hanging images of Christian saints upon the trees. Pagan festivals dear to the people, or necessary as cathartic moratoriums on morality, reappeared as Christian feasts, and pagan vegetation rites were transformed into Christian liturgy. The people continued to light midsummer fires on St. John's Eve, and the celebration of Christ's resurrection took the pagan name of Eostre, the old Teutonic goddess of the spring. The Christian calendar of the saints replaced the Roman *fasti*; ancient divinities dear to the people were allowed to revive under the names of Christian saints; the Dea Victoria of the Basses-Alpes became St. Victoire, and Castor and Pollux were reborn as Sts. Cosmas and Damian.

The finest triumph of this tolerant spirit of adaptation was the sublimation [p. 746] of the pagan mother-goddess cults in the worship of Mary. Here too the people took the initiative. In 431 Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, in a famous sermon at Ephesus, applied to Mary many of the terms fondly ascribed by the pagans of Ephesus to their "great goddess" Artemis-Diana; and the Council of Ephesus in that year, over the protests of Nestorius, sanctioned for Mary the title "Mother of God." Gradually the tenderest features of Astarte, Cybele, Artemis, Diana, and Isis were gathered together in the worship of Mary. In the sixth century the Church established the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin into heaven, and assigned it to August 13, the date of ancient festivals of Isis and Artemis. Mary became the patron saint of Constantinople and the imperial family; her picture was carried at the head of every great procession, and was (and is) hung in every church and home in Greek Christendom. Probably it was the Crusades that brought from the East to the West a more intimate and colorful worship of the Virgin.

426. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Adaptation of Pagan Customs

SOURCE: André Rétif, *The Catholic Spirit*, trans. by Dom Aldhelm Dean (Vol. 88 of *The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism*), p. 85. Copyright 1959 by Hawthorn Books, New York. Used by permission.

The missionary history of the Church clearly shows her adaptability to all races, all continents, all nations. In her liturgy and her art, in her traditions and the forming of her doctrine, naturally enough she includes Jewish elements, but also elements that are of pagan origin. In a certain respect, she has copied her organization from that of the Roman Empire, has preserved and made fruitful the philosophical intuitions of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, borrowed from both Barbarians and the Byzantine Roman Empire, but always remains herself, thoroughly digesting all elements drawn from external sources.

In her laws, her ceremonies, her festivals and her devotions, she makes use of local customs after purifying them and "baptizing" them. "This adaptation of pagan customs,"

says Fr Sertillanges in *Le Miracle de l'Église*, p. 183, "prudently regulated, allows for the utilization of instincts and sentiments that preserve local traditions, and so lends powerful aid to the furthering of the Gospel... The Church's cultus of saints and martyrs is a helpful substitute and replaces popular divinities in the minds of the populace."

427. Christianity—Non-Christian Elements in, Admonition of Gregory I Concerning

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 129, 130.

[p. 129] "Remember," said [p. 130] Gregory the Great, when issuing his instructions to a missionary to the Saxon heathens, "that you must not interfere with any traditional belief or religious observance that can be harmonized with Christianity."

428. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Adopted From Paganism SOURCE: Grant Showerman, Introduction, in Franz Cumont, *Oriental Religious in Roman Paganism* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), p. xi.

Nor did Christianity stop there. It took from its opponents their own weapons, and used them; the better elements of paganism were transferred to the new religion.

429. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Bowing to the Sun SOURCE: Leo the Great, Sermon 27, "On the Feast of the Nativity, VII," chap. 4, *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 140.

From such a system of teaching [astrology, demon worship, etc.] proceeds also the ungodly practice of certain foolish folk who worship the sun as it rises at the beginning of daylight from elevated positions: even some Christians think it is so proper to do this that, before entering the blessed Apostle Peter's basilica, which is dedicated to the one living and true God, when they have mounted the steps which lead to the raised platform, they turn round and bow themselves towards the rising sun and with bent neck do homage to its brilliant orb. We are full of grief and vexation that this should happen, which is partly due to the fault of ignorance and partly to the spirit of heathenism.

430. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Brought by Pagan

Converts

SOURCE: Arthur E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (4th ed.), p. 502. Copyright 1955 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

The long association between pagans and Christians and the rapid incorporation of new converts into the ranks of the Church [after Constantine's conversion], exercised a profound influence upon Christian beliefs and practices. Pagan belief in magic contributed largely to the spread of Christian belief in miracles; and the development of the cult of the saints was stimulated by pagan concepts of inferior divinities, demigods and daemons. Many pagan festivals were transformed into festivals of the Church.

431. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Brought Into the Church SOURCE: Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. by Neil Buchanan, Vol. 4 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898), pp. 304, 305.

[p. 304] There existed in Christendom, ever since there was a *doctrina publica* [public teaching], *i.e.*, from the end of the second century, a kind of subsidiary religion, one of the second rank, as it were subterranean, different among different peoples, but everywhere alike in its crass superstition, naïve doketism, dualism, and polytheism. "when religions change, it is as if the mountains open. Among the great magic snakes,

golden dragons and crystal spirits of the human soul, which ascend to the light, there come forth all sorts of hideous reptiles and a host of rats and mice." Every new religion invigorates the products of the ancient one which it supersedes. In one aspect of it we know very little of the "Christianity" of the second rank, for it had no literary existence; in another we are thoroughly familiar with it; for we only need to set before us, and to provide with a few Christian reminiscences, the popular conditions and rites with which Christianity came in contact in different provinces, as also the tendencies, everywhere the same, of the superstitious mob, tendencies inert in the moral sphere, exuberant in the realm of fancy. Then we have this second-class Christianity. It consisted in worship of angels—demigods and demons, reverence for pictures, relics, and amulets, a more or less impotent enthusiasm for the sternest asceticism-therefore not infrequently strictly dualistic conceptions-and a scrupulous observance of certain things held to be sacred, words, signs, rites, ceremonies, places, and times. There probably never was an age in which Christendom was free from this "Christianity," just as there never will be one in which it shall have been overcome. But in the fully formed Catholic Church as it passes over into the Middle Ages, this Christianity was not only dragged along with it as a tolerated, because irremovable, burden, but it was to a very large extent legitimised,

though under safeguards, and fused with the *doctrina publica*. Catholicism as it meets us in Gregory the Great and in the final decisions of the seventh [p. 305] Council, presents itself as the most intimate union of Christianity of the first order with that subterranean, thoroughly superstitious, and polytheistic "Christianity"; and the centuries from the third to the eighth mark the stages in the process of fusion, which seems to have reached an advanced point even in the third and was yet reinforced from century to century to a most extraordinary extent.

It is the business of the historian of the Church and of civilisation to describe these developments in detail, and to show how in separate provinces the ancient gods were transformed into Christian saints, angels, and heroes, and the ancient mythology and cultus into Christian mythology and local worship. This task is as aesthetically attractive as that other which is closely allied to it, the indication of the remains of heathen temples in Christian Churches. The temple of Mithras which became St. George's Church, proves that St. George was Mithras; in St. Michael the ancient Wotan had been brought to life again, just as Poseidon in St. Nicholas; the different "mothers of God," who were honoured with all sorts of sacred offerings—one preferred fruits, another animals—only show that Demeter, Venus, Juno, and countless other great mothers and holy or unholy virgins, had merged in the one mother.—The provincial calendars and various "Church Years" conceal significant reminiscences from the old heathen times.

432. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Egyptian Influence SOURCE: Jaroslav Cerny, *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (London, W. I.: Hutchinson, 1952), pp. 147–149. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 147] Attempts have sometimes been made to show that among early Christian beliefs there are traces of the influence of the Egyptian religion. A direct influence can hardly be proved; it is, however, extremely likely that the Egyptian religion had its share in the formation of a common cultural background and the fertile soil from which Christianity rose and spread. In fact, neither the beliefs nor the requirements which Christianity imposed upon its devotees lacked analogies in contemporary religions and philosophical thought...

On the other hand Christianity added much that was new...

[p. 148] It cannot, however, be denied that when greater numbers were gained for the Christian faith, various pagan elements found their way into Christian beliefs and religious practices. The worship of the Virgin Mary and the picture of her with the child Jesus in her arms almost certainly owe a great deal to the influence of the goddess Isis with the young Horus on her lap. The creation of various local saints, the erection of their shrines, pilgrimages to these holy places and festivals around them were substitutes—almost the continuation—of the worship of former local deities. The resemblance between St. George killing the dragon with his spear to Horus killing his enemy, the evil god Setekh, in the form of a crocodile, must be very striking to anyone... [p. 149] The practice of astrology and magic which had long been forbidden was now tolerated and countless magical texts have come down to us from Christian Egypt. They resemble the pagan ones except that the names of the old Egyptian gods are replaced by those of Jesus and the saints, who are even threatened if they should not comply with the magician's orders.

433. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Holydays From Roman Pagan Festivals

SOURCE: Tertullian, On Idolatry, chap. 14, trans. in ANF, Vol. 3, p. 70.

Let us live with all; let us be glad with them, out of community of nature, not of superstition. We are peers in soul, not in discipline; fellow-possessors of the world, not of error. But if we have no right of communion in matters of this kind with strangers, how far more wicked to celebrate them among brethren! Who can maintain or defend this? The Holy Spirit upbraids the Jews with their holy-days. "Your Sabbaths, and new moons, and ceremonies," says He, "My soul hateth." By us, to whom Sabbaths are strange, and the new moons and festivals formerly beloved by God, the Saturnalia and New-year's and Mid-winter's festivals and Matronalia are frequented—presents come and go—New year's gifts-games join their noise-banquets join their din! Oh better fidelity of the nations to their own sect, which claims no solemnity of the Christians for itself! Not the Lord's day, not Pentecost, even if they had known them, would they have shared with us; for they would fear lest they should seem to be Christians. We are not apprehensive lest we seem to be *heathens*! If any indulgence is to be granted to the flesh, you have it. I will not say your own days, but more too; for to the *heathens* each festive day occurs but once annually: you have a festive day every eighth day. Call out the individual solemnities of the nations, and set them out into a row, they will not be able to make up a Pentecost.

434. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Image Worship Forced on the Clergy

SOURCE: John William Draper, *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1876), Vol. 1, p. 368.

The inhabitants of Italy and Greece were never really alienated from the idolatries of the old times. At the best, they were only Christianized on the surface. With many other mythological practices, they forced image-worship on the clergy.

435. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Listed and Justified by Newman

SOURCE: John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1906), pp. 371–373, [See FRS No. 73.]

[p. 371] Confiding then in the power of Christianity to resist the infection of evil, and to transmute the very instruments [p. 372] and appendages of demon-worship to an evangelical use, and feeling also that these usages had originally come from primitive revelations and from the instinct of nature, though they had been corrupted; and that they must invent what they needed, if they did not use what they found; and that they were moreover possessed of the very archetypes, of which paganism attempted the shadows; the rulers of the Church from early times were prepared, should the occasion arise, to adopt, or imitate, or sanction the existing rites and customs of the populace, as well as the philosophy of the educated class...

[p. 373] In the course of the fourth century two movements or developments spread over the face of Christendom, with a rapidity characteristic of the Church; the one ascetic, the other ritual or ceremonial. We are told in various ways by Eusebius, ⁷ [Note 7: V. Const. iii. 1, iv. 23, &c.] that Constantine, in order to recommend the new religion to the heathen, transferred into it the outward ornaments to which they had been accustomed in their own. It is not necessary to go into a subject which the diligence of Protestant writers has made familiar to most of us. The use of temples, and these dedicated to particular saints, and ornamented on occasions with branches of trees; incense, lamps, and candles; votive offerings on recovery from illness; holy water; asylums; holydays and seasons, use of calendars, processions, blessings on the fields; sacerdotal vestments, the tonsure, the ring in marriage, turning to the East, images at a later date, perhaps the ecclesiastical chant, and the Kyrie Eleison, ⁸ [Note 8: According to Dr. E. D. Clarke, Travels, vol. i. p. 352.] are all of pagan origin, and sanctified by their adoption into the Church.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This essay was written shortly before Newman left the Anglican Church to become a Roman Catholic.]

436. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Manichaean Accusation (5th Century)

SOURCE: Faustus' accusation, quoted in Augustine, *Reply to Faustus the Manichaean* xx. 4, trans. in *NPNF*, 1st series, Vol. 4, p. 253. [FRS No. 86.]

The sacrifices you [the Christians] change into love-feasts, the idols into martyrs, to whom you pray as they do to their idols. You appease the shades of the departed with wine and food. You keep the same holidays as the Gentiles; for example, the calends and the solstices. In your way of living you have made no change. Plainly you are a mere schism; for the only difference from the original is that you meet separately.

437. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Moslem Denunciation of Eastern Church

SOURCE: Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial*, p. 76. Copyright 1948 by Oxford University Press, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

As the Muslims saw it, the Prophets of Israel were all right, and Jesus was God's last and greatest prophet before His final messenger Muhammad. The Muslims' quarrel was not with the Prophet Jesus but with the Christian Church, which had captivated Rum [the Byzantine, or Eastern "Roman" Empire] by capitulating to pagan Greek polytheism and idolatry. From this shameful betrayal of the revelation of the One True God, Islam had retrieved the pure religion of Abraham. Between the Christian polytheists on the one side and the Hindu polytheists on the other there again shone the light of monotheism; and in Islam's survival lay the hope of the world. [See No. 483.]

438. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Sacred Cakes SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 165, 172, 173. [p. 165] Of especial interest are the cakes (*liba farinacea*) offered at the festival of Summanus, which were made in wheel-shaped moulds. And in this connection we should consider the moulds for sacred cakes described by Sir Arthur Evans in his article on "Recent Discoveries of Tarentine Terra-cottas." That the objects he mentions are cake-moulds seems clear from the evidence he adduces, and we find on them, besides symbols of several gods, wheel and cross impressions. Moreover, some of the moulds are divided into segments and Evans plausibly suggests that the cakes were made in this way in order to facilitate distribution. In the British Museum also there are representations of round cakes, apparently used as offerings, which are divided into four parts, like the loaves found at Pompeii…

[p. 172] It seems probable that some of the Roman customs connected with sacred cakes have survived. For example, the hot cross buns that we eat on Good Friday have an obvious affiliation with the sacred cakes made in such moulds as those found at Tarentum. Again, the Simnel cakes eaten on Midlent Sunday are stamped with the figure of Christ or the Virgin Mary, replacing in all probability representations or symbols of pagan divinities. The marking of segments on some of the cakes used on festivals of the Christian year, as for example on Twelfth Day, certainly suggests the idea of distribution which has been mentioned as the probable reason for the dividing lines on the sacred cakes of the ancients. In the case of Twelfth cakes there seems to have been a part for every person in the house and for Christ, the Virgin, and the wise men from the East as well. And it is not too far a call to trace back to the sacred cake of the confarreate marriage [p. 173] in Rome the importance of the wedding-cake in modern marriage.

Nor did the custom of offering cake or bread as sacrifice pass away with paganism. We are told that in Franconia persons entering a forest make an offering to the spirit of the woods; and that in Bohemia bread is thrown into a stream in which a man has been drowned. In Devonshire offerings of pieces of cake, accompanied by libations of cider, used to be made to the trees in the orchards.

439. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Survive in Greek and Roman Church Practices Today

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 70.

The spirit of Graeco-Roman paganism is not extinct. It still lives in the natural heart of man, which at this day as much as ever needs regeneration by the spirit of God. It lives also in many idolatrous and superstitious usages of the Greek and Roman churches, against which the pure spirit of Christianity has instinctively protested from the beginning.

440. Christmas, and the Roman Saturnalia, a Comparison of the Two Festivals

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 58, 62-65.

[p. 58] The festival of Saturn fell on December 17, but its popular celebration lasted for seven days. It began as a country festival in the time when agriculture was one of the chief activities of the Romans, but it soon came to be celebrated in urban centers also. It was a period of indulgence in eating, drinking, and gambling, and during these seven days city officials condoned conduct that they would not have tolerated at any other season. One feature of the occasion was the license allowed to slaves, who were permitted to treat their masters as if they were their social equals. Frequently indeed masters and slaves changed places and the latter were waited on by the former. Another feature of the celebration was the exchange of gifts, such as candles (*cerei*) which are supposed to have symbolized the increasing power of the sunlight after the winter solstice, and little puppets of paste or earthenware (*sigillaria*), the exact significance of which is obscure. It was a season of hilarity and good-will...

[p. 62] The extremists who have said that Christmas was intended to replace the Saturnalia have vastly overstated the case. Nor is it of any importance that Epiphanius, the bishop of Salamis in Cyprus in the fourth century, places the Saturnalia on the twenty-fifth of December. This is not the only error in the list of dates in which it occurs. Without doubt, however, many of the customs of the Saturnalia were transferred to Christmas. Although the dates did not exactly coincide, for the Saturnalia proper fell on the seventeenth of December, the time of year was practically the same, and it has already been pointed out how frequently festivals of the merry-making type occur among various peoples at this season. Fowler, mentioning the good-will that so generally characterizes these celebrations, raises the question whether this was one of the reasons why Christmas was put at the winter solstice. Possibly, as has also been suggested, the postponement of the festivities from the date of the [p. 63] Saturnalia to Christmas week was in part at least caused by the institution of the Advent fast covering the period of the four Sundays before Christmas.

Certainly many of the customs of the Christmas season go back to the Roman festival. In it lies the origin of the excessive eating and drinking, the plethora of sweets, the playing of games, and the exchange of gifts. Nor can we fail to connect our custom of burning candles with the candles (*cerei* that were so conspicuous a part of the Saturnalia. Moreover, our Christmas holidays, like the Roman festival, are approximately a week...

In mediaeval times there were still other sur- [p. 64] vivals, and the king of the Saturnalia is obviously the prototype not only of the Abbot of Unreason who at one time presided over the Christmas revels in Scotland, but also of the Lord of Misrule in England and the Abbé de Liesse in Lille. This mock dignitary had other titles...

[p. 65] We hear also of the Boy-Bishop (*Episcopus Puerorum*), whose authority lasted from St. Nicholas' day (December 6) till Childermas (December 28) and whose tradition (as well as that of the Bishop of Unreason) still survives to a certain extent in Santa Claus. Apparently the compromise made by the early Church in adapting the customs of the Saturnalia to Christian practice had little or no effect in checking the license of the festival. This continued through the whole Christmas festival and sometimes lasted till the day of Epiphany (January 6). We find many criticisms by churchmen or councils. In England Henry VIII issued a proclamation in 1542, abolishing the revels, but Mary restored them in 1554.

441. Christmas, Date and Origin of

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 60–62. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 60] The early Christians, who attributed to Christ not only the title (*Kyrios*) but also many other honors that the pagans paid to their "divine" emperors, naturally felt inclined to honor the birth of the Saviour. In most places the commemoration of Christ's birth was included in the Feast of the Epiphany (Manifestations) on January 6, one of the oldest annual feasts.

Soon after the end of the last great persecution, about the year 330, the Church in Rome definitely assigned December 25 for the celebration of the birth of Christ. For a while, many Eastern Churches continued to keep other dates, but toward the end of the fourth century the Roman custom became universal.

No official reason has been handed down in ecclesiastical documents for the choice of this date. Consequently, various explanations have been given to justify the celebration of the Lord's nativity on this particular day. Some early Fathers and writers claimed that December 25 was the actual date of Christ's birth...

[p. 61] It was expressly stated in Rome that the actual date of the Saviour's birth was unknown and that different traditions prevailed in different parts of the world.

A second explanation was of theological-symbolic character. Since the Bible calls the Messiah the "Sun of Justice" (Malachi 4, 2), it was argued that His birth had to coincide with the beginning of a new solar cycle, that is, He had to be born at the time of the winter solstice... This explanation, though attractive in itself, depends on too many assumptions that cannot be proved and lacks any basis of historical certitude.

There remains then this explanation, which is the most probable one, and held by most scholars in our time: the choice of December 25 was influenced by the fact that the Romans, from the time of Emperor Aurelian (275), had celebrated the feast of the sun god (*Sol Invictus*: the Unconquered Sun) on that day. December 25 was called the "Birthday of the Sun," and great pagan religious celebrations of the Mithras cult were held all through the empire. What was more natural than that the Christians celebrate the birth of Him Who was the "Light of the World" and the true "Sun of Justice" on this very day? The popes seem to have chosen December 25 precisely for the purpose of inspiring the people to turn from the worship of a material sun to the adoration of Christ the Lord. This thought is indicated in various writings of contemporary authors.

It has sometimes been said that the Nativity is only a "Christianized pagan festival." However, the Christians of those early centuries were keenly aware of the difference between the two festivals—one pagan and one Christian—on the same day. The coincidence in the date, even if intended, does not make the two [p. 62] celebrations identical. Some newly converted Christians who thoughtlessly retained external symbols of the sun worship on Christmas Day were immediately and sternly reproved.

442. Christmas, Date of

SOURCE: A. H. Newman, "Christmas," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 3, p. 47. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

Christmas: The supposed anniversary of the birth of Jesus Christ, occurring on Dec. 25. No sufficient data ... exist, for the determination of the month or the day of the event... There is no historical evidence that our Lord's birthday was celebrated during the apostolic or early postapostolic times. The uncertainty that existed at the beginning of the third century in the minds of Hippolytus and others—Hippolytus earlier favored Jan.

2, Clement of Alexanderia (*Strom.*, i. 21) "the 25th day of Pachon" (= May 20), while others, according to Clement, fixed upon Apr. 18 or 19 and Mar. 28—proves that no Christmas festival had been established much before the middle of the century. Jan. 6 was earlier fixed upon as the date of the baptism or spiritual birth of Christ, and the feast of Epiphany ... was celebrated by the Basilidian Gnostics in the second century ... and by catholic Christians by about the beginning of the fourth century.

The earliest record of the recognition of Dec. 25 as a church festival is in the Philocalian Calendar (copied 354 but representing Roman practise in 336).

443. Christmas, Development of

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York; Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 62–67. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 62] MIDDLE AGES. The great religious pioneers and missionaries who brought Christianity to the pagan tribes of Europe also introduced the celebration of Christmas...

[p. 63] The period from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries was the peak of a general Christian celebration of the Nativity... It was at this period, too, that most of the delightful Christmas customs of each country were introduced. Some have since died out; others have changed slightly through the ages; many have survived to our day. A few practices had to be suppressed as being improper and scandalous, such as the customs of dancing and mumming in church, the "Boy Bishop's Feast," the "Feast of the Ass," New Year's fires, superstitious (pagan) meals, impersonations of the Devil, and irreverent carols.

DECLINE. With the Reformation in the sixteenth century there naturally came a sharp change in the Christmas celebration for many countries in Europe. The Sacrifice of the Mass—the very soul of the feast—was suppressed. The Holy Eucharist, the liturgy of the Divine Office, the sacramentals and ceremonies all disappeared. So did the colorful and inspiring processions, the veneration of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the saints. In many countries all that remained of the once rich and glorious religious festival [p. 64] was a sermon and a prayer service on Christmas Day. Although the people kept many of their customs alive, the deep religious inspiration was missing, and consequently the "new" Christmas turned more and more into a feast of good-natured reveling.

On the other hand, some groups, including the German Lutherans, preserved a tender devotion to the Christ Child and celebrated Christmas in a deeply spiritual way within their churches, hearts, and homes.

In England the Puritans condemned even the reduced religious celebration that was held in the Anglican Church after the separation from Rome...

When the Puritans finally came to political power in England, they immediately proceeded to outlaw Christmas...

[p. 65] REVIVAL IN ENGLAND. When the old Christmas eventually returned with the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, it was actually a "new" Christmas. The spiritual aspect of the feast was now left mostly to the care of the ministers in the church service on Christmas Day. What was observed in the home consisted of a more shallow celebration in the form of various non-religious amusements and of general reveling... However, a spirit of good [p. 66] will to all and of generosity to the poor ennobled these more worldly celebrations of the great religious feast. Two famous descriptions of this kind of popular celebration are found in Charles Dickens's *A Christmas Carol* and in Washington Irving's *Sketch Book*...

CHRISTMAS IN AMERICA... The feast was celebrated with all the splendor of liturgical solemnity and with the traditional customs of the respective nationalities in Florida, on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, in Canada, and in the territory of the present State of Michigan.

In the colonies of New England, however, the unfortunate and misdirected zeal of the Puritans against Christmas persisted far into the nineteenth century...

[p. 67] It was not until immigrants from Ireland and from continental Europe arrived in large numbers toward the middle of the last century that Christmas in America began to flourish. The Germans brought the Christmas tree. They were soon joined by the Irish, who contributed the ancient Gaelic custom of putting lights in the windows...

Very soon their neighbors, charmed by these unusual but attractive innovations, followed their example and made many of these customs their own.

444. Christmas, on the Sun's Birthday

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 150-153.

[p. 150] One of the dominant religious ideas of the second and third centuries was the belief in the divinity of the Sun...

This divinity is of especial interest for our inquiry, for his annual festival fell on the twenty-fifth of December and its relation to Christmas [p. 151] has been a matter of protracted discussion. Obviously the season of the winter solstice, when the strength of the sun begins to increase, is appropriate for the celebration of the festival of a sun-god. The day in a sense marks the birth of a new sun. But the reason for its being chosen as the day for the commemoration of Christ's nativity is not so evident... [p. 152] The identity of date is more than a coincidence. To be sure the Church did not merely appropriate the festival of the popular sun-god. It was through a parallelism between Christ and the sun that the twenty-fifth of December came to be the date of the nativity... [p. 153] Even Epiphanius, the fourth century metropolitan of Cyprus, though giving the sixth of January as the date of birth, connects the event with the solstice. Moreover, the diversion of the significance of a popular pagan holiday was wholly in accord with the policy of the Church. Of the actual celebration of a festival of the nativity, it should be added, there is no satisfactory evidence earlier than the fourth century. Its first observance in Rome on December the twenty-fifth took place in 353 or 354 (Usener) or in 336 (Duchesne). In Constantinople it seems to have been introduced in 377 or 378.

445. Christmas, on Winter Solstice, Sun's Birthday

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 89, 90.

[p. 89] A very general observance required that on the 25th of December the birth of the "new Sun" should be celebrated, when after the winter solstice the days began to lengthen and the "invincible" star triumphed again over darkness. It is certain that the date of this *Natalis Invicti* was selected by the Church as the commemoration of the *Nativity* of Jesus, which was previously confused with the Epiphany. In appointing this day, universally marked by pious rejoicing, which were as far as possible retained,—for instance the old chariot-races were preserved,—the ecclesiastical authorities purified in some degree the customs which they could not abolish. This substitution, which took place at Rome probably between 354 and 360, was adopted throughout the Empire, and that is why we still celebrate Christmas on the 25th of December.

The pre-eminence assigned to the *dies Solis* also certainly [p. 90] contributed to the general recognition of Sunday as a holiday. This is connected with a more important fact, namely, the adoption of the week by all European nations.

446. Christmas, Pagan Parallels to (Dusares' Birthday)

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic [Mythology]* (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), pp. 15–19. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York. [p. 15] Babylonian influence becomes particularly prominent in the great Nabataean kingdom whose principal capitals were Petra [p. 16] and Damascus, and whose history can be traced from their first mention by Ashurbanipal in the middle of the seventh century B.C., to their absorption into the Roman Empire in 106 A.D. They were a North Arabic race who used the Aramaic script, and their principal male deity is Dusura, rendered into Greek as Dousares, and identified by the Greeks with Dionysus. The name means "he of Shara" (*dhu Šar*), "he of the mountain range *esh–sharā*," at Petra, and he is a Sun-god according to Strabo Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, writing in the fourth century, preserves the only illuminating information about the mythology of this great cult of the Nabataeans. As he was born and educated in Palestine, and served in a monastic order there, his statement must be taken authoritatively. He says that the Nabataeans praised the virgin whose Arabic name is $X\alpha\alpha\betao\hat{o}$. In Nabataeans the Arabic nominative ending in *u* is regularly preserved in proper names, and Epiphanius

undoubtedly heard the word *ka'bu*, "square stone," symbol in Nabataean religion for both Dusares and the great Mother-goddess Allat of the Nabataeans. An Arabic writer says that a four-sided stone was worshipped as Allat, who in a Nabataean inscription was called "Mother of the gods." ... Epiphanius states that Dusares was the offspring of the virgin Chaabou and only son of the "lord" ($\delta \epsilon \zeta \pi \dot{\sigma} \tau \sigma \upsilon$). The panegyrarchs of Nabataean cities came to Petra to assist in the festival of his birth, which was celebrated on the twenty-fifth of December.

[p. 17] Worship of a dying god, son of the Earth-mother, was the principal cult of this North Arabian people during the period immediately before and after the life of Jesus of Nazareth in Palestine. The title of the Mother-goddess Allat is "Mother of the gods" here, and a translation of the title of the great Mother-goddess of Babylonia, bêlet ilāni, "queen of the gods," whose title in Sumerian is also "goddess Mother." Dusares and Allat of the Nabataeans are an Arabian reflex of the great Babylonian myth of Tammuz and Ishtar, and if the god is identified with Dionysus, the original character common to both is that of a Sun-god and patron of fertility. Strabo describes the Nabataeans as a particularly abstemious people; the Greeks and Romans called Dusares the Arabian Dionysus or Bacchus; and a statue of him found in the Hauran (see Fig. 5) portrays him as a deity of the vine. The cornucopia and patera are also characteristic of Dusares on coins of Nabataean cities. As an Arabian [p. 18] Bacchus, Dusares is a Greek and Roman deity; as a god of Fertility, represented by a baetyl, he is a local Arabic Earth and Sun deity; and, as son of the virgin Earth-goddess, he is a Babylonian deity. The celebration of his birth in December at Petra and the northern cities of Bostra and Adraa in the Hauran with games and festivities is a replica of the spring festivities at Babylon, when the death, burial, and resurrection of Marduk were celebrated with weeping, which was exchanged

for rejoicing. The meaning of the *actia dusaria* at Petra may be inferred from the similar festival at Alexandria in Egypt, there called after an unexplained Egyptian word Kikēllia, or in Greek the Cronia, which also occurred by night on the twenty-fifth of December. In this festival an image of a babe was taken from the temple sanctuary and greeted with loud acclamation by the worshippers, saying, "the Virgin has begotten." On the night of the fifth of December occurred a festival before the image of Corē; it ended with bringing forth from beneath the earth the image of Aiōn, which was carried seven times around the inner sanctuary of Corē's temple. The image was then returned to its place below the

surface of the earth. Epiphanius, in whose writings this Egyptian cult is described, identifies the virgin mother of this myth with the Greek Under-world goddess Corē, as he does the virgin mother of Dusares, Chaabu of the Nabataeans. There is a wide [p. 19] syncretism here in this Arabic religion, composed of Babylonian, Greek, and Egyptian elements; and beyond all doubt the Nabataeans possessed an elaborate cult of Tammuz and Ishtar, of Osiris and Isis, of Dionysus and Basilinna, the equivalent of Proserpine-Corē, in which this deity was represented as a youth, son of the Mother-goddess, who was reborn yearly in midwinter and who died in the summer.

The Mother-goddess of the Nabataeans, Allat, identified with Corē by the Greeks, is essentially the North Semitic Ashtart, and the Babylonian Ishtar.

447. Christmas, Symbols of—Mistletoe, a Sacred Plant in the Pagan Religion of the Druids

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feats and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 103, 104. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 103] The mistletoe was a sacred plant in the pagan religion of the Druids in Britain. It was believed to have all sorts of miraculous qualities: the power of healing diseases, making poisons harmless, giving fertility to humans and animals, protecting from witchcraft, banning evil spirits, bringing good luck and great blessings. In fact, it was considered so sacred that even enemies who happened to meet beneath a mistletoe in the forest would lay down their arms, exchange a friendly greeting, and keep a truce until the following day. From this old custom grew [p. 104] the practice of suspending mistletoe over a doorway or in a room as a token of good will and peace to all comers...

After Britain was converted from paganism to Christianity, the bishops did not allow the mistletoe to be used in churches because it had been the main symbol of a pagan religion. Even to this day mistletoe is rarely used as a decoration for altars. There was, however, one exception. At the Cathedral of York at one period before the Reformation a large bundle of mistletoe was brought into the sanctuary each year at Christmas and solemnly placed on the altar by a priest. In this rite the plant that the Druids had called "All-heal" was used as a symbol of Christ, the Divine Healer of nations.

The people of England then adopted the mistletoe as a decoration for their homes at Christmas. Its old, pagan religious meaning was soon forgotten, but some of the other meanings and customs have survived: the kiss under the mistletoe; the token of good will and friendship; the omen of happiness and good luck and the new religious significance.

448. Christmas, Symbols of-Santa Claus

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 113, 114. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 113] When the Dutch came to America and established the colony of New Amsterdam, their children enjoyed the traditional "visit of Saint Nicholas" on December 5, for the Dutch had kept this ancient Catholic custom even after the Reformation. Later, when England took over the colony and it became New York, the kindly figure of Sinter Klaas (pronounced like Santa Claus) soon aroused among the English children the desire of having such a heavenly visitor come to their homes, too.

The English settlers were glad and willing to comply with the anxious wish of their children. However, the figure of a Catholic saint and bishop was not acceptable in their eyes, especially since many of them were Presbyterians, to whom a bishop was

repugnant. In addition, they did not celebrate the feasts of saints according to the ancient Catholic calendar.

The dilemma was solved by transferring the visit of the mysterious man whom the Dutch called Santa Claus from December 5 to Christmas, and by introducing a radical change in the figure itself. It was not merely a "disguise," but the ancient saint was completely replaced by an entirely different character. Behind the name Santa Claus actually stands the figure of the pagan Germanic god Thor (after whom Thursday is named). Some details about Thor from ancient German mythology will show the origin of the modern Santa Claus tale:

Thor was the god of the peasants and the common people. He was represented as an elderly man, jovial and friendly, of heavy build, with a long white beard. His element was the fire, his color red. The rumble and roar of thunder were said to be caused by the rolling of his chariot, for he alone among the gods never rode on horseback but drove in a chariot drawn by two white goats (called Cracker and Gnasher). He was fighting the giants of ice and snow, and thus became the Yule-god. He was said to live in the "Northland" where he had his palace among icebergs. By our pagan forefathers he was considered as the cheerful and friendly god, never harming the humans but rather helping and protecting them. The fireplace in every home was especially sacred to him, and he was said to come down through the chimney into his element, the fire. ⁷⁰ [Note 70: H. A. Grueber, *Myths of Northern Lands*, Vol. I, New York, 1895, 61 ff.]

[p. 114] Here, then, is the true origin of our "Santa Claus." It certainly was a stroke of genius that produced such a charming and attractive figure for our children from the withered pages of pagan mythology. With the Christian saint whose name he still bears, however, this Santa Claus has really nothing to do.

449. Christmas—Uncertainty About Date of Christ's Birth SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 249, 250. Copyright 1946 by the University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 249] Uncertainty about Jesus' birthday in the early third century is reflected in a disputed passage of the presbyter Hippolytus, who was banished to Sardinia by Maximin in 235, and in an authentic statement of Clement of Alexandria. While the former favored January second, the learned Clem- [p. 250] ent of Alexandria enumerates several dates given by the Alexandrian chronographers, notably the twenty-fifth of the Egyptian month

Pachon (May twentieth) in the twenty-eighth year of Augustus and the twenty-fourth or

twenty-fifth of *Pharmuthi* (April eighteenth or nineteenth) of the year A.D. 1, although he favored May twentieth. This shows that no Church festival in honor of the day was established before the middle of the third century. Origen at that time in a sermon denounced the idea of keeping Jesus' birthday like that of Pharaoh and said that only sinners such as Herod were so honored. Arnobius later similarly ridiculed giving birthdays to "gods." A Latin treatise, *De pascha computus* (of *ca.* 243), placed Jesus' birth on March twenty-first since that was the supposed day on which God created the Sun (Gen. 1:14–19), thus typifying the "Sun of righteousness" as Malachi (4:2) called the expected Messiah. A century before Polycarp, martyred in Smyrna in 155, gave the same date for the birth and baptism placing it on a Wednesday because of the creation of the Sun on that day.

450. Christmas—Worshipers of Mithras Won by Making December 25 Birthday of Christ

SOURCE: H. Lamer, "Mithras," *Wörterbuch der Antike* (2d ed.; Leipzig: A. Kröner, 1933). Used by permission. German.

While Christianity won a comparatively easy victory over the Graeco-Roman religion, it had a hard struggle with the Mithras religion. The worshipers of Mithras were won by taking over the birthday of Mithras, December 25, as the birthday of Christ.

451. Chronology — Astronomically Fixed Dates—Assyrian (Eclipse of 763 B.C.)

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Vol. 1 (6th ed., rev.; New York: Abingdon, 1915), p. 503.

The fragments of this [eponym] list which have come down to us begin during the reign of Shalmaneser III (859–824 B.C.), and brief though they are, have proved of immense importance. On one of these fragments, by the side of the Eponym Pur (ilu) Sa-gal-e, there is mentioned an eclipse of the sun under these words, "In the month of Sivan there was an eclipse of the sun." Astronomical investigations have shown that a total eclipse of the sun occurred at Nineveh June 15, 763 B.C. lasting two hours and forty-three minutes, with the middle of the eclipse at 10:05 A. M. This astronomical calculation gave a fixed date for the year of that eponym and thereby fixed every year in the entire canon.

452. Chronology — Astronomically Fixed Dates—Babylonian (37th Year of Nebuchadnezzar)

SOURCE: Paul V. Neugebauer und Ernst F. Weidner, "Ein astronomischer Beobachtungstext aus dem 37. Jahre Nebukadnexars II (-567/66)" (An Astronomical Observation Text From the 37th Year of Nebuchadnezzar [-567/66]), Berichte über die Verhandlugen der Königlich Saächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig ("Reports Concerning the Proceedings of the Royal Saxon Society of Science at Leipzig"), Philologisch Historische Klasse, Vol. 67 (1915), Part 2, pp. 29, 34, 35, 38. German.

[p. 29] Among the historical cuneiform texts in the near Eastern Department of the Berlin Museums, tablet VAT 4956 occupies first place in significance. It is the earliest known historical observation text which is composed in the detailed form of the late Babylonian times. Up to now this honor had been ceded to the text 78,11–7,4 of the British Museum, which originated in the 7th year of Cambyses, hence of the year – 522/21 [i.e. 523/22 B.C.]. This was therefore composed already in the time of the Persian Kings. Our new text, however, comes from the year –567/66 [i.e. 568/67 B.C.], and is therefore the first extensive and purely historical document from the time which preceded the destruction of the Neo-Babylonian empire. As far as its contents are concerned, it contains, just as all later similar documents, detailed observations of the moon, the sun and the planets, also data concerning meteorological and geological phenomena, information on the height of the water, prices of food, and at the end also some paragraphs dealing with some interesting curiosities.

Translation

[p. 34] 1. 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon. On Nisan 1 (the intercalary Adar had twenty-nine days) the moon became visible behind the Hyades; the duration of visibility was sixty-four minutes [].

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

2. Saturn is opposite of the southern fish of the zodiac. On the morning of the 2d a rainbow was stretched out in the west. In the night of the 3d the moon was two cubits before []...

[p. 35] 17. []. On the 15th the god was seen together with the god. There was an interval of thirty minutes between sunrise and the disappearance of the moon the next morning. The eclipse of the moon which was skipped []...

 $[p.\,38]$ 22. 38th year of Nebuchadnezzar. On Nisan 1 (the month Adar had 29 days) it was cloudy the whole $[\]$...

[Note to line 17:]

[p. 50] The lunar eclipse of Sivan 15 (= -567, July 4) was not visible in Babylon. The Babylon astronomer had ascertained it only on the basis of an eclipse period (probably of the Saros) known to him, and had therefore written: *atalû Sin* 'computed lunar eclipse.'

Accordingly it probably has to be read: ša etetik (LU) 'which is skipped' (i.e. is invisible

in Babylon; see Kugler, *Sternkunde* I, p. 268a). Traces of *ša LU* are still recognizable with some certainty.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The expression "the god was seen together with the god" is explained elsewhere, on p. 42:

"ilu itti ili ittanmar 'the god (moon) was seen together with the god (sun).' Both luminaries stand in the evening, the moon in the eastern horizon, the sun on the western horizon, on opposition, i.e. it is full moon. This idiomatic expression has been known for a long time."

In this translation, places where portions of the original text are now missing on the clay tablet, in breaks of varying sizes, are indicated by brackets thus [...]. The brackets in the first paragraph are editorial insertions, indicating the B.C. dates (see No. 454 for the alternate date forms).

In reply to an inquiry Dr. Otto Neugebauer writes (3/26/63) that a text of this kind fixes the date uniquely within historical possibility, since similar positions of the sun, moon, and planets would not recur within hundreds, perhaps thousands, of years.

453. Chronology—Astronomically Fixed Dates — Persian (7th Year of Cambyses)

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, "Babylonian Astronomy—Historical Sketch," *AJSL*, 55 (April, 1938), 122. Reprinted by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

"Year VII [of Cambyses], Du'uzu (July), night of the 12th, 1 2/3 double hours (3 hours 20 minutes) after night came, Sin [the moon] was eclipsed, the whole was established, the going out of the disk went north"; this very tablet may have been the ultimate source from which Hipparchus drew his knowledge of this lunar eclipse.²⁹

[EDITORS' NOTE: Olmstead's Note 29 cites sources for: the ancient tablet (Strassmaier, Kambyses,

No. 400); the modern astronomical dating of the eclipse to July 16, 523 B.C. (Kugler, Sternkunde, I,

61ff.); and Ptolemy's data on the same eclipse (Ptolemy, *Almagest* v. 14. 3). See also *SDACom* 3:88.]

454. Chronology—Christian Era, Modes of Reckoning

SOURCE: *The* [British] *Nautical Almanac* for the Year 1932 (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1930), p. 741. Crown Copyright. Used by permission of the Controller of Her Britannic Majesty's Stationery Office.

The Christian era invented by Dionysius Exiguus and popularised by Bede has been adopted at different times and in different countries with different initial days for the year. The most common initial dates have been December 25, January 1, March 1 and March 25... In England the Nativity style beginning on December 25 was superseded in the fourteenth century by the Annunciation style (commonly called old style) beginning

on March 25, but the Circumcision style (or new style) beginning on January 1 [the old Roman New Year] was substituted in 1753 by the Act which introduced the Gregorian calendar...

The Christian era begins with the beginning of the year 1 or of the first year. The year immediately preceding is the year 1 B.C. or the first year before Christ. The year before [A.D.] 1 is styled 0 by astronomers, and the preceding year is -1, corresponding to 2 B.C. in the usage of historians. Therefore in converting years B.C. into astronomical dates it is necessary to subtract 1 and to prefix the minus sign. In converting negative astronomical dates into years B.C. it is necessary to remove the minus sign and to add 1 to the number of the year.

455. Chronology—Christian Era, Origin

SOURCE: Reginald L. Poole, *Studies in Chronology and History*, ed. by Austin Lane Poole (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), pp. 28, 33, 34. Used by permission.

[p. 28] The Easter cycle of Dionysius Exiguus ... was a continuation of that attributed to Cyril of Alexandria, and was drawn up in A.D. 525, for a period of five lunar cycles or ninety-five years. But whereas Cyril accompanied his Easter tables with a consecutive series of years beginning with the Emperor Diocletian, Dionysius, as he says, preferred to date his years not from the rule of a persecutor of the Christians but with the Incarnation of our Lord. There is no hint that he intended to establish an era for ordinary historical purposes; he only gave the years for reference, in order to identify the dates assigned to Easter...

[p. 33] So soon as the cycle of Dionysius gained currency, it was not unnatural that the series of years, reckoned from the era of the Incarnation which accompanied it, should be made use of for the indication of historical dates. There is indeed evidence that this era was known in Spain as early as 672; but it is not until [p. 34] the production of the Church History of Bede that we find an historical work in which it is inserted.

456. Chronology—Inclusive Reckoning in Biblical Usage

SOURCE: A. J. Maclean, "Chronology of the New Testament," in James Hastings, ed., *Dictionary of the Bible* (1-vol. ed.; 1924), p. 133. Copyright 1909 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and that of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

It must also be noted that reckoning in old times was inclusive. Thus 'three years after' (Gal 1¹⁸) means 'in the third year after' (cf. Ac $19^{8,10}$ with 20^{31}); 'three days and three nights' (Mt 12^{40}) means 'from to-day to the day after tomorrow' (Mt 17^{23}). Cf. also Gn 42^{17f} .

[EDITORS' NOTE: See SDACom 2:136; 5:249, 250.]

457. Chronology—Inclusive Reckoning in Greek Usage

SOURCE: Censorinus, *De Die Natali*, chap. xviii. secs. 3, 4, 12 (Hultsch ed.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1867), pp. 37, 39. Latin.

[p. 37] They [the Greeks] used tetraeterida (four-year cycles), but this, because it

returned every fifth year, they named *pentaeterida* (five-year cycles)... For this reason the games [dedicated] to Jupiter Olympius in Elis [that is, the Olympic Games] and to Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome are celebrated when every fifth year returns. This period also

... was doubled and made an octaeteris (eight-year cycle), which was then called

enneaeteris (a nine-year cycle) because its first year returned also in the ninth year...

[p. 39] Of all these the Greeks observed mostly ... the *pentaeterida* (five-year cycles), that is, the cycle of four years, which they call the Olympiads. And now among them this is numbered as the second year of the 254th Olympiad.

458. Chronology—King's Reigns, Two Methods of Dating by SOURCE: Richard A. Parker, "Persian and Egyptian Chronology," *AJSL*, 58 (July, 1941), 298. Reprinted by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

Under the Twenty-sixth Dynasty [of Egypt] the regnal year coincided with the civil year, which began with ... Thoth 1. That portion of the civil year which remained after the death of a king was counted as *year 1* of his successor. According to the Persian method of dating adopted from the Babylonians, the regnal and civil years also coincided, beginning with Nisanu 1, but the unexpired part of the civil year after a king's death was called the *accession year* of his successor.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Of these two methods of numbering the years of a king's reign, the first (the "nonaccession-year" method, or "antedating") was used at certain times in Egypt and apparently in the northern Hebrew kingdom (Israel), and by the Macedonians in Alexander's empire and in its succeeding Hellenistic kingdoms in the East. The second (the "accession-year method" or "postdating") was employed by the kings of Babylon, Assyria, and Persia (until Alexander), and most probably by the kings of Judah throughout the history of Judah. Note that in both reckonings the regnal year coincided with the calendar year. See *SDACom* 2:138, 139; *SDADic*, "Chronology."]

459. Chronology — Month, Theroretical, of 30 Days

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, Astronomical Cuneiform Texts, Vol. 1 (12 Bedford Sq., London, W.C.1: Lund Humphries, [1955]), p. 40.

In planetary ephemerides there occurs a peculiar counting of time which is especially fitted to the situation arising in the [advance] computation of planetary phenomena... Let us assume, *e.g.*, that we know ... the calendaric date D of the first phenomenon. In order to find the date of the second phenomenon [200 days later], we should know for all months between D and D + 200 whether they are 29 or 30 days long... But there would always remain doubtful cases where the lunar ephemerides offer alternative solutions. Consequently, the planetary ephemerides adopted a method of time reckoning which is independent of the civil calendar by introducing thirtieths of the mean length of a synodic month. The name for these units is unknown; we call them here "lunar days" or "*tithis*"...

On a lower level the introduction of tithis has its analogy in the practice of counting "months" as always 30 days.

460. Chronology—Problems of B.C. Dating of Biblical Events SOURCE: Ira Maurice Price and others, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, pp. 64, 65. Copyright 1958 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 64] One of the most tangled questions connected with the Old Testament has to do with the chronology. The reader doubtless is aware that the dates given in the margins of many English Bibles (King James Version) were worked out by Archbishop U[s]sher of Armagh (A.D. 1580–1656), and were not inserted in the margins of the Bible until A.D. 1701. It is conceded by all scholars that his scheme of dates, though carefully wrought out, and as good as could be constructed at that time, is now, in view of the many discoveries which have been made in Babylonia-Assyria, largely untenable.

The available data for constructing a reasonable chronology of the Old Testament may be found in the following: (1) Ptolemy, an Egyptian astronomer of the second century A.D., left us a list of the kings of Egypt, Persia, and Babylonia down to the accession of Nabonassar, 747 B.C. It is arranged by the use of astronomical calculations,

and these have some real value. (2) Cuneiform literature contains lists of years and chief events kept by the Assyrian kings. These are called Eponym Lists; that is, each year is named after some person, king, or officer. These lists are practically unbroken from 893 to 666 B.C. For a part of that stretch of time, they parallel the list by [p. 65] Ptolemy. Where comparison is possible, the two lists are in substantial agreement. An eclipse of the sun which occurred at Nineveh in the month Sivan (May–June) 763 B.C., has been verified by the calculations of modern astronomers. This then gives us a fixed basis for the chronology of the Old Testament within the years of these lists. (3) Assyrian and Babylonian rulers occasionally made calculations of their own regarding the dates of previous events or rulers, and incorporated these calculations in their records or in the cornerstones of notable buildings. While some of these have a semblance of accuracy, they must be used with caution, as must so many other figures that have reached us from those early days...

Dates earlier than 893 B.C. in Babylonia-Assyria, must be accepted with reservations. Those of the Old Testament may be calculated on the basis of Babylonian-Assyrian lists with credible accuracy back to the beginnings of the Hebrew monarchy (c. 1025 B.C.).

[EDITORS' NOTE: A fourth source of chronological data may be found in numerous dated clay tablets and papyri from ancient sites. Their date lines, given in terms of the numbered regnal years of various kings, in combination with other information, can be of great value in dating the reigns.

In a few cases exact dates can be established from astronomical or calendrical data in such documents as the eclipse record of 763 B.C., dating the Assyrian chronology, and the astronomical texts fixing exactly the 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar and the 7th year of Cambyses. Besides, there are certain of the Elephantine papyri that have double date lines, giving the lunar month and day along with the corresponding known Egyptian solar-calendar date, and thus fix the regnal years of several Persian kings. See *SDACom* 3:88, 89, and note.]

461. Chronology, Radioactive Decay an Inconclusive Basis for Time Measurements

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 354, 355. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 354] We conclude, therefore, that a time measurement based on the principle of radioactive decay is in itself quite inconclusive. It is, in the first place, quite reasonable to believe that both parent and daughter elements in each radioactive chain were created at the beginning, probably in "equilibrium" amounts. The amount of originally created radiogenic end-product in each chain is uncertain; it is likely, however, that homologous amounts were created in all such minerals so that all such elements would, when created, give an "appearance" of the same degree of maturity or of age. Furthermore, the intense environmental radiation present in the upper atmosphere could well have resulted in much higher decay rates for the radioactive elements at one or more times in the past.

Thus, by the end of the Creation period, each radioactive mineral would very likely contain a sizeable amount of its radiogenic daughter, though actually but a few days old! Again, at the time of the Deluge, it seems reasonable that the increased radioactivity in the environment would have speeded up all decay processes by some unknown amount. Therefore, even in the relatively rare cases where the radioactive mineral was not disturbed excessively during the in [p. 355] tense geologic upheavals of the Creation and Deluge periods, the relative amounts of parent and daughter elements would still be entirely incapable of yielding a valid record of *true* age, since neither the original amount of radiogenic material nor the changes in past decay rates can now be determined. The only thing reasonably certain is that the present decay rate and present amount of

daughter element, if applied in a uniformitarian computation, must result in an ageestimate immensely too great!

462. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating Depends on Assumptions of Uniformity

SOURCE: J. Laurence Kulp, "The Carbon 14 Method of Age Determination," *The Scientific Monthly*, 75 (November, 1952), 261. Reprinted by permission of *The Scientific Monthly*.

There are two basic assumptions in the carbon 14 method. One is that the carbon 14 concentration in the carbon dioxide cycle is constant. The other is that the cosmic ray flux has been essentially constant—at least on a scale of centuries.

463. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating Disputed in Tests in English Excavation

SOURCE: Stuart Piggott, "The Radio-Carbon Date from Durrington Walls" (under Notes and News), *Antiquity*, 33 (December, 1959), 289, 290. Used by permission of *Antiquity* and the author.

[p. 289] During the 1952 excavations on the settlement site adjacent to the south bank of the Durrington Walls Henge Monument, a well-preserved mass of wood charcoal was found on the old land surface beneath the chalk rubble mound of the Henge. The position is shown in *Ant*. Journ., XXXIV (1954), 163, fig. 4, marked 'charcoal' in Cutting III. The charcoal was fresh and crisp, and must have been covered by the bank immediately after its deposition. Two radio-carbon tests on a sample from this charcoal were made by Professor de Vries of Groningen in 1955–6, and the results were: 4575 ± 40 and 45685 ± 70 before present, thus indicating a date of *c*. 2620–2630 B.C. for the charcoal, and so for the construction of the Henge of Durrington Walls.

This date is archaeologically inacceptable for the following reasons. The evidence observed during the excavation makes it virtually impossible to regard the charcoal and the bank of the Henge as anything but contemporary. The 1950–2 excavations on the site [p. 290] showed that in archaeological terms the Henge must be contemporary with the occupation material of Secondary Neolithic (Woodhenge) type which underlies the North Bank of the Henge, and overlaps the tail of the South Bank (*loc. cit.*, 168). Two small scraps of Beaker ware were found with the occupation material at Durrington...

Certain absolute dates in the Dutch Beaker sequence have been provided by radiocarbon tests in the Groningen Laboratory, and a date of 1980±70 is given to a Bell Beaker of the type which stands in an ancestral position to much of our British Beaker pottery; 1685±50 for a 'zigzag' ornamented Beaker; the Veluwe phase is placed between 1700 and 1500 B.C. If one accepts these dates (and they are in accordance with chronologies constructed by archaeological means), we cannot accept the Durrington Walls radio-carbon date, which is roughly a millennium too high!

464. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating, Doubts Concerning SOURCE: Glyn Daniel, Editorial, *Antiquity*, 33 (December, 1959), 239. Used by permission of the author.

It is very important to realize that doubts about the archaeological acceptability of radiocarbon dates is not obscurantism nor another chapter in the battle of Science versus the Arts. It is an attempt to evaluate all the available evidence, physical and non-physical...

We are at a moment when some of us at least are uncertain how to answer this question: when is a Carbon 14 reading an archaeological fact? We certainly need reassurance beyond all reasonable doubt at the present moment that scientists know all about the variables involved, that Elsasser, Ney and Winckler are wrong in supposing

that there was variation in the intensity of cosmic-ray formation and that others are wrong in supposing that there were fluctuations in the original C 14 content.

465. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating, Question of Reliability SOURCE: Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land* (New York: Praeger, 1960), pp. 34, 35. Copyright 1960 by Kathleen M. Kenyon. Used by permission.

[p. 34] A chronology based on an ancient calendar, however, can take us no farther back than c. 3000 B.C. Until very recently, that was all that we had. Anything earlier was a sequence only and dates in [p. 35] years assigned to any phase were also only guesswork. Since 1944, however, a new method, first developed by Dr. Libby in Chicago, has been introduced. This is usually known as the Carbon-14, or radio-active carbon, method. It is based on the fact that all living organisms, human beings and other animals, trees and plants, absorb radio-activity while they are alive, and after they are dead give it up at a rate which can be established. The surviving amount can be measured in organic materials recovered on archaeological sites. For various technical reasons charcoal, and to a lesser extent shell, is the most satisfactory material. By comparison of the surviving amount of radioactivity and the established annual rate of loss, the date at which the organism died, for instance the date at which the tree was cut down, can be established. The method is not yet absolutely reliable, but a series of consistent results, including ones which can be checked against evidence from other sources, makes it probable that it can be of much use to archaeologists. There is, however, always a standard margin of deviation, usually of about a hundred and fifty to two hundred years on either side of a central date. Therefore for the periods after c. 3000 B.C., the Carbon-14 method is unlikely to give as exact a result as evidence based on other archaeological grounds. But for the earlier periods it is our only source. As will be seen, we already have dates going back to c. 8000 B.C., and as evidence accumulates from additional observations we shall both gain assurance whether or not these comparatively isolated results are reliable, and be able to fit other phases and cultures into the general scheme.

466. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating Wrong if Atmospheric Carbon Has Varied

SOURCE: Gilbert N. Plass, "Carbon Dioxide and the Climate," *American Scientist*, 44 (July, 1956), 314. Copyright 1956 by The Society of the Sigma Xi, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

All calculations of radiocarbon dates have been made on the assumption that the amount of atmospheric carbon dioxide has remained constant. If the theory presented here of carbon dioxide variations in the atmosphere is correct, then the reduced carbon dioxide amount at the time of the last glaciation means that all radiocarbon dates for events before the recession of the glaciers are in question.

467. Church, as Defined by Certain Reformers

SOURCE: J. Kostlin, "Church, The Christian," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 3, pp. 81–83. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 81] In the West, on the other hand, the definite or- [p. 82] ganization of the church at large took shape in the papal monarchy; the further history of Catholicism and its idea of the church is really a history of the Roman primacy...

The first medieval Christian body which, while holding fast to the general Christian faith, abandoned that doctrine of the church sketched above [the Roman Catholic view] was the Waldenses. They considered themselves members of the church of Christ and partakers of his salvation, in spite of their exclusion from organized Christendom,

recognizing at the same time a "church of Christ" within the organization whose heads were hostile to them. There is not, however, in their teaching any clear definition of the nature of the church or any new principle in reference to it.

The first theologian to bring forward a conception of the church radically opposed to that which had been developing was Wyclif; and Huss followed him in it. According to him the church is the "totality of the predestinated"; there, as in his doctrine of grace, he followed Augustine, but took a standpoint contrary as well to Augustine's as to that of later Catholicism in his account of the institutions and means of grace by which God communicates the blessings of salvation to the predestined, excluding from them the polity of priest, bishop, and pope. He denied the divine institution both of papal primacy and of the episcopate as distinct from the presbyterate, and attributed infallible authority to the Scriptures alone. [p. 83] The idea of both Wyclif and Huss was thus not of an actually existing body of united associates, but merely the total of predestined Christians who at any time are living holy lives, scattered among those who are not predestined, together with those who are predestined but not yet converted, and the faithful who have passed away.

Luther defended Wyclif's definition at the Leipsic Disputation of 1519, in spite of its condemnation by the Council of Constance. But his own idea was that the real nature of the church was defined by the words following its mention in the creed—"the communion of saints," taking the word "saints" in its Pauline sense. These (although sin may still cling to them) are sanctified by God through his word and sacramentssacraments not depending upon an organized episcopally ordained clergy, but committed to the church as a whole; it is their faith, called forth by the word of God, which makes them righteous and accepted members of Christ and heirs of eternal life. Thus the Lutheran and, in general, the Calvinist conception of the church depended from the first upon the doctrine of justification by faith. In harmony with Luther's teaching, the Augsburg Confession defines the church as "the congregation of saints in which the gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered." In one sense the church is invisible, since the earthly eve can not tell who has true faith and in this sense is a "saint," but in another it is visible, since it has its being here in outward and visible vital forms, ordained by God, in which those who are only "saints" in appearance have an external share.

468. Church, as Defined by Pope Boniface VIII in the Bull Unam

Sanctam

SOURCE: *The Papal Encyclicals*, ed. by Anne Fremantle, pp. 72, 73. Copyright © 1956 by Anne Fremantle. Used by permission of G. P. Putnam's Sons, publishers, New York.

[p. 72] We are compelled, our faith urging us, to believe and to hold—and we do firmly believe and simply confess—that there is one holy Catholic and apostolic Church, outside of which there is neither salvation nor remission of sins... Therefore of this one and only church [p. 73] there is one body and one head—not two heads as if it were a monster:—Christ, namely, and the vicar of Christ, St. Peter, and the successor of Peter.

469. Church, as Fulfilling Ancient Israel's Role

SOURCE: Oscar Cullmann, *Knigsherrshaft Christi und Kirche im Neuen Testament* (Royal Reign of Christ and the Church in the New Testament) (Theologische Studien Eine Schriftenreihe, ed. Karl Barth, No. 10. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1941), pp. 35, 36. German. Used by permission.

[p. 35] Man was appointed to rule over the rest of creation. He fell, and his fall into sin involved the entire creation in the divine curse "by reason of him" (Gen. 3:17; Rom. 8:20). Out of sinful mankind God selected a community, the people of Israel, for the salvation of the world. However, within this people a further reduction takes place, first of all to a small human community upon whom the role indicated by God fell—the

"remnant of Israel," the *qehal Yahweh*. This "remnant" is further compressed and reduced to *one* man who alone could undertake Israel's role—in Deutero-Isaiah the "servant of Yahweh," and in Daniel the "Son of man," who represents the "people of the saints" (Dan. 7:13ff.). This One must enter history in God's Son, Christ, who through His vicarious death only now accomplishes that for which God elected the people of Israel. Thus until Christ there was in redemptive history a progressive reduction: mankind—the people of Israel—the remnant of Israel—the One, Christ. Thus redemptive history reached its central [p. 36] point, but it did not end there. Now it is necessary, so to say, from this center to proceed in reverse: from the One to the many, but so as to have *the many represent the One*. Now we go from Christ to those who believe on Him, who know they are redeemed by His vicarious death. The road thus leads to the church, which is the body of the One and which now for mankind must fulfill the task of the "remnant" *gehal Yahweh*, the Hebrew equivalent for *ekklēsia*, "church."

Thus this redemptive history proceeds in two movements: the one going from the many to the One—this is the old covenant; the other from the One to the many—this is the new covenant. Precisely in the center is the decisive *factum* of the death of Christ.

470. Church, Early, Changes in, before Constantine's Accession SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 2 (8th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1903), pp. 8, 11.

[p. 8] The second period, from the death of the apostle John to the end of the persecutions, or to the accession of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, is the classic age ... of heathen persecution, and of Christian martyrdom and heroism... It furnishes a continuous commentary on the Saviour's words: "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." ... [p. 11] The ante-Nicene age ... is ... the common root out of which both have sprung, Catholicism (Greek and Roman) first, and Protestantism afterwards. It is the natural transition from the apostolic age to the Nicene age, yet leaving behind many important truths of the former (especially the Pauline doctrines) which were to be derived and explored in future ages. We can trace in it the elementary forms of the Catholic creed, organization and worship, and also the germs of nearly all the corruptions of Greek and Roman Christianity.

471. Church, Early, Changes in, Before Constantine's Conversion SOURCE: W. D. Killen, *The Ancient Church* (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 1883), pp. xv, xvi.

[p. xv] In the interval between the days of the apostles and the conversion of Constantine, the Christian commonwealth changed it[s] aspect. The Bishop of Rome—a personage un- [p. xvi] known to the writers of the New Testament—meanwhile rose into prominence, and at length took precedence of all other churchmen. Rites and ceremonies, of which neither Paul nor Peter ever heard, crept silently into use, and then claimed the rank of Divine institutions. Officers for whom the primitive disciples could have found no place, and titles, which to them would have been altogether unintelligible, began to challenge attention, and to be named apostolic.

472. Church, Early, Changes in, Before Eusebius

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* viii. 1; translated by J. E. L. Oulton, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 253, 255. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 253] But when, as the result of great freedom [immediately preceding the persecution by Diocletian], a change to pride and sloth came over our affairs, we fell to envy and fierce railing against one another, warring upon ourselves, so to speak, as occasion offered, with weapons and spears formed of words; and rulers attacked rulers and laity formed factions against laity, while unspeakable hypocrisy and pretence pursued their evil course to the furthest end... [p. 255] We took not the least care to secure the goodwill and propitious favour of the Deity, but, like some kind of atheists, imagined that our affairs escaped all heed and oversight, we went on adding one wickedness to another other; and those accounted our pastors, casting aside the sanctions of the fear of God, were enflamed with mutual contentions, and did nothing else but add to the strifes and threats, the jealousy, enmity and hatred that they used one to another, claiming with all vehemence the objects of their ambition as if they were a despot's spoils.

473. Church, Early, Changes in—Decline of Standards, 3d Century SOURCE: Cyprian, *The Treatises of Cyprian*, Treatise 3, "On the Lapsed," sec. 6, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 5, p. 438.

Each one was desirous of increasing his estate... Among the priests there was no devotedness of religion; among the ministers there was no sound faith: in their works there was no mercy; in their manners there was no discipline... Not a few bishops ..., 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.

474. Church, Early, Changes in, Under Constantine and Later SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 5.

[Constantine] appears in the imperial purple at the council of Nice [Nicaea] as protector of the church, and takes his golden throne at the nod of bishops, who still bear the scars of persecution. The despised sect, which, like its Founder in the days of His humiliation, had not where to lay its head, is raised [under Constantine and his successors] to sovereign authority in the state, enters into the prerogatives of the pagan priesthood, grows rich and powerful, builds countless churches out of the stones of idol temples to the honor of Christ and his martyrs, employs the wisdom of Greece and Rome to vindicate the foolishness of the cross, exerts a molding power upon civil legislation, rules the national life, and leads off the history of the world. But at the same time the church, embracing the mass of the population of the empire, from the Caesar to the meanest slave, and living amidst all its institutions, received into her bosom vast deposits of foreign material from the world and from heathenism, exposing herself to new dangers and imposing upon herself new and heavy labors.

The union of church and state extends its influence, now healthful, now baneful, into every department of our history.

The Christian life of the Nicene and post-Nicene age reveals a mass of worldliness within the church; an entire abatement of chiliasm with its longing after the return of Christ and his glorious reign, and in its stead an easy repose in the present order of things; with a sublime enthusiasm, on the other hand, for the renunciation of self and the world, particularly in the hermitage and the cloister, and with some of the noblest heroes of Christian holiness.

475. Church, Early, Changes in, Under Constantine and Later SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), p. 51. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

For Christianity, the reign of Constantine marked the transition from the days in which it lived perilously and amid derision to the days of its freedom from fear and the beginnings of its social prestige. To be sure, the legal process by which Christianity became the religion of the state and paganism a proscribed faith was not completed for nearly half a century after Constantine's death. But Constantine took the decisive steps that were to culminate in the edicts of Theodosius. It is with Constantine on the throne that the process summed up in a famous sentence by Gibbon reached its climax: "While that great body [the Roman Empire] was invaded by open violence, or undermined by slow decay, a pure and humble religion gently insinuated itself into the minds of men, grew up in silence and obscurity, derived new vigor from opposition, and finally erected the triumphant banner of the Cross on the ruins of the Capitol."

Great as was the change in the fortunes of the church with Constantine's tolerance and favor, a greater change was yet to come. During Constantine's reign many professed Christianity to gain worldly advantage, but no one was compelled to do so. Christianity was still, as it had been in the beginning, a voluntary religion. Constantine frowned upon those who would divide the church, because he wanted it to be a unifying force in his empire, but he did not make Christianity compulsory. The great divide in Christian history came near the end of the fourth century when the acceptance of Christianity became mandatory [under Theodosius I, 379–395] and when the church, having so lately escaped from its persecutors, became a persecuting church.

476. Church, Early, Changes in, Under Theodosius I and II SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 72, 73. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 72] Not until Theodosius I did it become politically practicable to attempt serious enforcement of decrees banning pagan worship [see No. 1208] and making orthodox Christianity the sole and compulsory religion within the empire.

A series of edicts beginning in 380 and continuing for more than half a century, through the reign of Theodosius II, achieved this result. With the increasingly rigorous enforcement of these [p. 73] decrees, the revolution in the character of the church became complete. It had ceased to be the voluntary association of believers; it had become the sole legal religion of the empire; its membership had become everybody. To reject this religion was thereafter equivalent to treason against the state and, naturally, was punishable by death. Church and state alike adopted the presupposition that religious homogeneity was essential to the cohesion of the social order and the stability of the civil government. This principle dominated the Middle Ages and was part of the heritage that the great Protestant state churches of the Reformation period accepted from the medieval Catholic Church.

477. Church, Early—Degeneracy With Elevation

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 93.

The elevation of Christianity as the religion of the state presents also an opposite aspect to our contemplation. It involved great risk of degeneracy to the church... The christianizing of the state amounted therefore in great measure to a paganizing and secularizing of the church... The mass of the Roman empire was baptized only with water, not with the Spirit and fire of the gospel, and it smuggled heathen manners and practices into the sanctuary under a new name.

478. Church, Early—Development of Dogma and Sacrament SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), p. 127. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

In a living and vitalizing religion like Christianity, developments were inevitable and evolution from germinal to riper forms. But that all the developments which have taken place within institutional Christianity were either inevitable or for the best it would be precarious to affirm. No one conversant with Jesus and with the religion of Jesus and forecasting the fortunes of Christianity when cast upon the stream of history could have anticipated the eagerness with which the new religion at an early stage stepped forth on the bypaths of dogmatism and sacramentarianism, or how the rich and suggestive sacramentalism which was of Jesus' own religion should hold dalliance with the ubiquitous contemporary magic and degenerate into a rigid sacramentarianism dogmatic, exclusive, miraculous. Jesus, in the interests of ethical and personal religion, protested against the monopolies and pretensions of sacerdotalism, but sacerdotalism survived and secured greater prestige in His religion despite His protests and despite His conception of a God whose love needs no mediatorial offices.

479. Church, Early-Development of Organization SOURCE: T. Valentine Parker, *American Protestantism: An Appraisal*, pp. 1–4. Copyright 1956 by Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1] Any careful reader of the New Testament will perceive that the apostolic church was more of a gelatinous substance than a skeletal structure. Organization was inchoate. The church sprang from a kind of spontaneous necessity. The group of believers held something in common that virtually compelled them to meet together. A new religious direction derived from association with Jesus supplied the primary impulse. Their firm belief that Jesus had conquered death supplied the spark to set them in motion. They were Jews and originally had no thought of breaking away completely from temple and synagogue. Indeed they carried over something of the ideas of the temple and the usages of the synagogue into the Christian churches. But this was later. In the beginning they were not at all sure that mundane affairs would not come to a speedy end with some sort of a triumphant reappearance of Jesus. Meantime they met in simple [p. 2] fashion reading the Scriptures as they had been accustomed to do for the Old Testament then as now was considered a book of divine inspiration. They sang. They prayed. They talked. One custom established relatively early was unique. They partook of bread and wine in commemoration of the Last Supper. Apparently this observance was connected with a common meal. That itself would indicate informality. What leadership existed seemed to be supplied by the apostles-the chosen men who had been close to Jesus... The far flung churches consisted first principally of Jews. More and more Gentiles were received. The Apostle Paul was not the pioneer in establishing Gentile churches but his efforts extended the number of such churches and his interpretation of Christianity loosed the cords that bound Christianity to the Jewish faith and it expanded into a universal religion.

Naturally organization was required. It is not surprising that there was not uniformity in development. Canon Streeter maintains that Episcopal, Presbyterian and Independent usages have equal claim to whatever authority attaches to primitiveness. Presbyters and bishops are mentioned in the later books of the New Testament. Obviously no distinctive priestly powers inhered in the offices, but there was the seed from which clericalism eventually sprang. Similarly the simple eucharist developed into formalism...

[p. 3] Not only was spiritual food transformed in the teaching of the church into a literal partaking of the body and blood of Christ, but liturgy grew and simple leaders became clothed with priestly power that separated them from the laity. Bishops were at first local. Gradually there came to exist the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Probably the germ of what has subsequently become the doctrine of apostolic succession came into being through practical reasons. When an heretical sect like the Gnostics laid claim to doctrines going back to the Apostle Peter, the church could counter with apostolic sanction for the appointment of bishops. It should be observed that such officers made no pretension to powers claimed by later bishops and also that primacy lay not in a particular bishop—of Rome for example—for bishops were local and theoretically equal. But the bishops did eventually become priests, with distinctive authority, and the simple breaking of bread was changed into a sacrament. As the church organization was solidified its boasted catholicity was attained by the process of excluding all who deviated from the official norm. Emerging from the long period of persecution, the church in time became intolerant of dissent.

At the beginning of the fourth century Constantine was [p. 4] enthroned emperor of Rome and granted toleration to the Christian church and then professing Christianity himself lifted it to a privileged position. The effects were obvious. The church gained tremendous prestige. Its growth and prosperity were assured. But inevitably the church became a worldly institution mixed inextricably with the politics of Rome and Christianity was soon the religion of the state.

480. Church, Early, Discord in

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 21, Vol. 2 (London: Methuen & Co., 1896), p. 390.

The simple narrative of the intestine divisions, which distracted the peace, and dishonoured the triumph, of the church, will confirm the remark of a pagan historian, and justify the complaint of a venerable bishop. The experience of Ammianus had convinced him that the enmity of the Christians towards each other, surpassed the fury of savage beasts against man; and Gregory Nazianzen [late 4th cent.] most pathetically laments that the kingdom of heaven was converted, by discord, into the image of chaos, of a nocturnal tempest, and of hell itself.

481. Church, Early — Influence of Gnosticism

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Greaco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), pp. 400, 401. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

[p. 400] The Catholic Church was largely the product of the Gnostic controversy. The Church won the victory, but at what a cost! It was a Pyrrhic victory. The Church took the *via media* and entered upon her long career of compromise; the hierarchic organization standardized faith, and forbade the former spontaneity. The Spirit was no longer free for individuals and individual communities—it spoke in classical writings and through ecclesiastical organization. Apostolic tradition was enthroned oftentimes at a considerable violence to history... [p. 401] The Church would no longer allow the wheat

and tares to grow together until harvest; while attempting to remain a missionary Church it turned persecutor and prepared the way for later defections. As the Catholic Church later, in the throes of the Donatist controversy, formulated a mystic-magical view of baptism which recognized the validity of heretical (Donatist) baptism and so facilitated for numerous Donatist the path of return to the Church, so the earlier Catholic Church was quite willing to accept the sacramentarianism and vicarious value of ecclesiastical rites as held by the Gnostics. Gnostic magic became easily acclimatized in Christianity.

482. Church, Early—Persecuted Becomes Persecutor SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 57, 58. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 57] From Constantine on, the Christian record undergoes a fundamental change. Many will contend that it was not a change for the better. "After Constantine," said the late Dean William R. Inge, of St. Paul's Cathedral, London (often called "the Gloomy Dean"), "there is not much that is not humiliating." This is, of course, too sweeping. But certainly life in a church that had vanquished its rivals, that enjoyed so many special privileges and was constantly being given evidences of the imperial favor, a church in which membership was soon by imperial decree to include all loyal subjects, was bound to differ from that in a church where membership was by individual choice and might involve martyrdom. At one swoop Christian congregations throughout the empire were swamped with hordes of candidates clamoring for baptism whose only motive in becoming Christians was to get on board the imperial bandwagon.

Such a church historian as Bevan laments that, after the church "won" its acceptance by Constantine, no perceptible change or improvement followed in Roman customs or courts. (Constantine [p. 58] did, to be sure, put a final end to gladiatorial contests, but these had been losing their attraction for a long time before his rescript was issued.) How could any improvement have been expected? The new Christians were, so far as thinking and habits went, the same old pagans; their desire for baptism was strictly prudential. Their surge into the churches did not mean that Christianity had wiped out paganism. On the contrary, hordes of baptized pagans meant that paganism had diluted the moral energies of organized Christianity to the point of social impotence. St. Jerome and St. Augustine both deplored the corruption of the Christian community by the sudden influx of the unconverted.

Even more distressing, as one looks back, was the alacrity with which the Christian clergy who had suffered under pagan persecution turned to persecuting their opponents. "In the hour of victory," writes Arnold Toynbee, "the intransigence of the Christian martyrs degenerated into the intolerance of Christian persecutors who had picked up from the martyrs' defeated pagan opponents the fatal practice of resorting to physical force as a short cut to victory in religious controversy." * [Note*: *A Study of History*, Oxford University Press, 1954, vol. VII, p. 439.] [Used by permission.] By the time a century had passed, St. Augustine had found in the text from Luke 14:23, "Compel them to come in," a command from Christ himself for the persecution of heretics!

483. Church, Eastern, Apostasy in, and Islamic Conquest (A Moslem's View)

SOURCE: Abdullah Yusuf Ali, Appendix 5, in his translation of the Koran (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 1, pp. 412, 413. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 412] The Christian creed became narrower and narrower, less and less rational, more and more inclined to use earthly weapons to suppress the eternal truth of God. In 415 the Jews were expelled from Alexandria... Meanwhile the native Christian community—the Coptic Church,—which had all along clung to the Monophysite doctrine, a corrupt form of Unitarianism, was out of the pale, and its members were held down as a depressed class by their Orthodox brethren. The latter also, basking in official sunshine, collected [p. 413] power and property into their own hands. As Kingsley remarks in *Hypatia*, the Egyptian Church "ended as a mere chaos of idolatrous sects, persecuting each other for metaphysical propositions, which, true or false, were equally heretical in their mouths because they used them as watchwords for division." The social conditions produced an amount of discontent, for which the redress came only with the

advent of Islam.

It was for this reason that the Copts and the inhabitants of Egypt generally welcomed the forces of Islam under 'Amr as delivers in 639 A.D. ... Except a negligible remnant of conservatives the Egyptians as a nation accepted the religion, the language, and the institutions of the Arabs...

It should be remarked, however, that what happened in Egypt happened generally in western Asia. The jarring sectarian irrational religions gave place before the triumphant religion of Unity and Brotherhood, and the Byzantine Empire receded and receded until it was swept out of existence. The feeble efforts made by the Emperor Leo the Isaurian in 726–731 to restrict the use of images were a reflection of the puritanical zeal of Islam. But they did not succeed in the area of his authority, and they completely alienated the Papacy from the Eastern Orthodox Church... When Islam was making its triumphant march in the 8th century after Christ, the original (Greek) Church began to take some steps to put its own house in order. But it had lost its mission, and the new Islamic people took its place.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract represents simply the views of the translator.]

484. Church, Eastern—Byzantine Emperors and Doctrinal Controversies SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 63–65. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 63] From the time of Julian on, especially in the East, the church was to become little more than an appendage of the state, a tool and plaything of emperors. After Theodosius the Roman realm permanently split into two parts, though a theory of sovereignty over the western half held by the emperor in Constantinople was kept alive down to the time, at the very end of the eighth century, when Charlemagne put an end to that fantasy. In the Byzantine, or Eastern, Empire, where the imperial court remained, the inner rot permeated almost everywhere.

Perhaps the Byzantine emperors were not to blame. A few of them seem to have had at least a glimmering of what the Christian gospel was all about, and would have been happy had the churches in their domains, with their clergy, exemplified the spirit as well as the teaching of that gospel. But most of the emperors regarded the [p. 64] ambitious schemes of patriarchs and bishops with the same cynical complacency they showed toward all the other maneuverings for power that swirled around their thrones. They acquiesced in it when they did not encourage it. As a consequence, ecclesiastics grew more and more servile in their attendance on the throne, clerical preferment became increasingly a pawn of palace intrigue...

While the Eastern church was thus suffering internally through the corruption of its clergy by their ceaseless competition for imperial favor, it was likewise passing through a series of convulsions over doctrine. The less its spiritual vigor, the greater its attention to meticulous definitions of spiritual mysteries. Fighting over the precise Greek words to use to define the indefinable became more and more part of the struggle over ecclesiastical preferment. When one patriarch or bishop wanted to get rid of [p. 65] another patriarch or bishop, either to exalt the comparative importance of his own see or to build up his own personal power, the most effective way of going about it was to accuse his rival of heresy in an appeal to the throne.

Although the great Justinian, who reigned in the middle of the sixth century, was a better theologian than most of his clerical subjects, most of the emperors knew little theology but they knew the value of having what might be called a "palace party" in control of the key bishoprics. So they seldom hesitated to intervene by passing on doctrinal issues and banishing recalcitrant bishops.

485. Church, Medieval, Submerged Anti-Catholic Movements in SOURCE: C. A. Scott, "Paulicians," in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 9, p. 697. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and that of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

That continuous stream of anti-Catholic and anti-hierarchical thought and life ... runs parallel with the stream of "orthodox" doctrine and organization practically throughout the history of the Church. Often dwindling and almost disappearing in the obscurity of movements which had no significance for history, it swelled from time to time to a volume and importance which compelled the attention even of unsympathetic historians. The initial impulse of such reaction and of successive renewals of its force was probably practical rather than intellectual—an effort after a "purer," simpler, and more democratic form of Christianity, one which appealed from tradition and the ecclesiastics to Scripture and the Spirit... The notes common to nearly all the forms of this reaction [were] the appeal to Scripture, the criticism of Catholic clergy in their lives, and of Catholic sacraments in the Catholic interpretation of them, and the emphasis on the pneumatic [spiritual] character and functions of all believers.

486. Church and State—America and Its Status at Present SOURCE: Paul Blanshard, *God and Man in Washington* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960), pp. 211–213. Copyright 1960 by Paul Blanshard. Used by permission.

[p. 211] On the whole, Congress and the executive have supported the Supreme Court in its championship of religious liberty and religious equality. In spite of Congressional shortcomings, no major law has come out of Washington in this century abridging religious freedom in any way or granting to any single faith any discriminatory advantage. No impediments have been erected by Congress to the free flow of religious influence into political institutions. We can safely assert that the maintenance of religious liberty in the [p. 212] United States is not at the present time a serious problem. It will become a serious problem only if some single church gains enough political and religious power to threaten our beneficent pluralism.

It is quite a different matter with the partial establishment of religion and the resultant violations of the principle of the separation of church and state. This is still a very critical issue, and it is becoming more critical with the growth of church power. The pressure on the government by churches for sectarian privilege is far stronger than any pressure on the churches by government for conformity. It can be truly said that the state is in need of

protection from the church, not the church from the state... [For the politicians,] church support is a constant political temptation... It is profitable to appear to be on God's side—which often means, in practice, on the side of some religious group that is asking for special favors. For powerful religious organizations, the temptation is even more compelling. The public treasury is there: why not partake of it? The public school is there: why not adapt it to promote religion? The majority of the people are professing Christians: why not use state machinery to maintain the Christian brand of Godliness?

The encroachments upon the neutral state during the last fifty years have not been massive or sensational. Each encroachment has been in the nature of a tiny erosion of the wall of separation between church and state, relatively insignificant in itself but meaningful as an indication of a trend. A "Pray for Peace" cancellation stamp on American mail is followed by an "under God" phrase in the pledge of allegiance to the flag and the adoption of "In God We Trust" as the national motto. No one wishes to protest against such sentimental gestures, but each gesture is used as a precedent for a more substantial favor. Hundreds of Protestant communities [p. 213] ... are defying the Supreme Court's ruling that religion must not be taught in public classrooms, and several scores of Catholic communities ... are defying the same Court's ruling against the use of public money for sectarian schools by ironing their nun-directed "captive schools" into the public treasury. Even a Senate committee directed by an outstanding liberal does not dare to expose these violations of the First Amendment for fear of the counter-charge of bigotry or hostility to religion.

The chief danger in the situation is not conscious, creeping secularism or conscious, creeping clericalism, but unconscious, creeping sentimentalism. The underpinning of America's policy of church-state separation is being eroded by goodhearted people with exalted moral motives who are willing to make step-by-step concessions in order to maintain religious peace and good will. Too often, the good will between established faiths is considered more important than the national policy of state neutrality which has made it possible for all sects to live together with comparative good will.

487. Church and State—American Catholic Bishops on First

Amendment to the Constitution

SOURCE: "The Christian in Action," A Statement of the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States, released Nov. 21, 1948 (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1948), [p. 3]. (The text in full was printed in the New York *Times*, Nov. 21, 1948, p. 63.)

To one who knows something of history and law, the meaning of the First Amendment is clear enough from its own words: "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or forbidding the free exercise thereof." The meaning is even clearer in the records of the Congress that enacted it. Then, and throughout English and Colonial history, an "establishment of religion" meant the setting up by law of an official Church which would receive from the government favors not equally accorded to others in the cooperation between government and religion—which was simply taken for granted in our country at that time and has, in many ways, continued to this day. Under the First Amendment, the Federal Government could not extend this type of preferential treatment to one religion as against another, nor could it compel or forbid any state to do so. If this practical policy be described by the loose metaphor "a wall of separation between Church and State," that term must be understood in a definite and typically American sense. It would be an utter distortion of American history and law to make that practical policy involve the indifference to religion and the exclusion of cooperation between religion and government implied in the term "separation of Church and State" as it has become the shibboleth of doctrinaire secularism.

Within the past two years secularism has scored unprecedented victories in its opposition to governmental encouragement of religious and moral training, even where no preferential treatment of one religion over another is involved. In two recent cases, the Supreme Court of the United States has adopted an entirely novel and ominously extensive interpretation of the "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment [see No. 506; on the founders' view, see No. 502]. This interpretation would bar any cooperation between government and organized religion which would aid religion, even where no discrimination between religious bodies is in question. This reading of the First Amendment, as a group of non-Catholic religious leaders recently noted, will endanger "forms of cooperation between Church and State which have been taken for granted by the American people," and "greatly accelerate the trend toward the secularization of our culture."

488. Church and State, American Catholic View on

SOURCE: Theodore Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism*, p. 152. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

If these provisions [against a Federal establishment of religion (6th article of the Constitution] have been a charter of freedom for the Catholic Church—as for every other religious body in the country—one thing should be frankly said. The basis decided upon has never been considered by the Catholic Church as being, absolutely considered, the best basis, though American Catholics will not wish any change so long as our society is constituted as it is. According to Catholic doctrine, however, the union of Church and State is still affirmed to be the most perfect solution, in itself. As the statement is likely to be misunderstood, it should be added that this union is thought of only in a society so predominantly Catholic as to be able to be described as Catholic sans phrase, one in which government and people are in full accord in the matter of religion. For only where such unity exists is it possible for ecclesiastical and secular authority to act freely, each in its own field, and to cooperate. Elsewhere there is no chance of putting the principle into operation at all. Under prevailing conditions, therefore, the Church is quite content with the guarantee of sufficient freedom to exercise its functions unhampered. Things being as they are, the Church does not contemplate putting her preferred principle into execution. Before that were done a homogeneity, which would seem to have been permanently destroyed, would first have to be regained.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Here is the contrast between the Catholic's ideal of church-state union and the practical necessity of separation under present conditions, that is, in a "pluralistic" society of many religions. This contrast has been expressed by other Catholic writers under the terms "thesis" and "hypothesis." By "thesis" they mean their ideal; they use "hypothesis" (less-than-thesis) to refer to the possibility or necessity under existing conditions. For the original "thesis-hypothesis" explanation see Nos. 508–511; for a modern liberal Catholic's reversed use of the terms, see No. 512.]

489. Church and State, American Catholic Views on SOURCE: "Church and State," *Time*, 76 (Oct. 10, 1960), 27. Copyright 1960 by Time Inc. Used by permission.

The Reverend Gustave Weigel, professor of ecclesiology at Maryland's Woodstock College, stepped forward not as an official spokesman but as a distinguished Jesuit theologian to express his views... Father Weigel begins with the premise of two orders, sacral and secular, governed by divine and human law. Each is autonomous in its own sphere. Divine law concerns man's relationship to God, human law his relationship to his fellow beings. The secular order is inferior to but not subject to the sacral. Man lives in both orders simultaneously, and when they conflict, it is commonly agreed that the individual abides by the dictates of his conscience whether he be Protestant, Jew or Catholic. With this basis stated, Father Weigel turns to some implied questions by "the thinking Protestant," bluntly posed and candidly answered: ...

Would a Catholic statesman be unduly influenced by his confessor? "The confessor's service would be exclusively private, moral and religious. He has no competence in political matters, which belong not to the order of morality and piety but to the order of law."

Would the Pope interfere with a Catholic President? "The Pope does not meddle with the political activity of Adenauer or De Gaulle, nor would either man permit it. The Catholic President's comportment with the clergy of his church would be exactly like the comportment of a Protestant President with the clergy of his church."

What about lands where the church is established by law? "It may be that such laws are good for those communities, maybe not. The American Catholic is not concerned. He only knows that the American law of religious freedom for all citizens is excellent law for his land."

Would a Catholic majority seek to restrict the religious rights of others? "Officially and really American Catholics do not want now or in the future a law which would make Catholicism the favored religion of this land. They do not want the religious freedom of American non-Catholics to be curtailed in any way. They sincerely want the present First Amendment to be retained and become ever more effective. With a note of desperation, I ask, what more can we say?"

490. Church and State — Cardinal Manning's View of Church-State Cooperation

SOURCE: Henry Edward [Manning], Petri Privilegium: Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1871), first pastoral letter, pp. 82, 83.

[p. 82] Since the Council of Trent, the revolutions in France, Austria, and Italy have separated the civil powers from the unity of the Church. The nations remain Catholic as before, but many public laws are at variance with the laws of the Church. The old forms of usage and of arrangement need revision, in order to bring into peaceful co-operation the two supreme authorities on which the welfare of society reposes. If the governments of the world know their own highest interests, they will recognise the necessity of entering into loyal and honourable relations of confidence and co-operation with a power [p. 83] which pervades, sometimes a large proportion, sometimes the whole population, subject to their civil rule. The Church pervades at least one-fourth, if not a third, of the population of Great Britain and its colonies; about a fifth of the United States; nearly a half of the Prussian monarchy; and almost the entire population of other great kingdoms; and the influence of religion is that which most deeply affects the loyalty and fidelity of nations. It is of the highest moment to the civil powers of the world to readjust their relations with the Catholic Church; for so long as the public laws are at variance with its divine rights and liberties, internal peace and fidelity are hardly to be secured.

491. Church and State—Catholic Citizen's Duty, Modern Roman Synod on

SOURCE: "The Rules for Rome," *Time* (Feb. 8, 1960), pp. 76, 79. Copyright 1960 by Time Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 76] The Roman Catholic diocese of Rome had its first synod in almost 500 years last week, and Pope John XXIII explained the occasion as "a meeting of a bishop with his priests to study the problems of the spiritual life of the faithful, to give or restore vigor to ecclesiastical laws so as to eliminate abuses, to promote Christian life, foster divine worship and religious practices." ...

[p. 79] For the most part the new constitutions [of this synod; applicable to the local diocese of Rome] restate and re-emphasize existing provisions of canon law, apply old disciplines to new situations. Items: ...

The church must maintain its right and duty to advise laymen on how to vote in elections, and those who profess or defend Communistic, materialistic or anti-Christian principles may not be married in a religious ceremony (which means not being married at all in the eyes of the church) or serve as godparents in baptisms and confirmations. Laymen may not attend non-Catholic church services or argue religion in public with non-Catholics.

492. Church and State—Catholic Citizen's Duty, Vatican City Editorial on

SOURCE: Excerpts from editorial, "*Punti Fermi* ["Firm Points"]," in *L'Osservatore Romano* (Vatican City), May 18, 1960, p. 1.

There is a tendency to separate Catholics from the Church's hierarchy, restricting the relationship between them to the sphere of a simple sacred ministry and proclaiming the full autonomy of the faithful in the civic sphere.

Thus, an absurd distinction is made between a man's conscience as a Catholic and his conscience as a citizen, as though the Catholic religion were a special and occasional phase of the life of the spirit and not the driving idea that binds and guides the whole of man's existence...

The Church, constituted with its hierarchy by Jesus Christ as a perfect society, has full powers of real jurisdiction over all the faithful and thus has the right and the duty to guide, direct and correct them on the plane of ideas and of action in conformity with the dictates of the Gospel in what is necessary to attain the supreme end of man, which is eternal life...

A Catholic can never depart from the teachings and directives of the Church. In every sector of his activity, his conduct, both private and public, must be motivated by the laws, orientation and instructions of the hierarchy.

The political-social problem cannot be separated from religion because it is a highly human problem and as such has as its basis an urgent ethical-religious need that cannot be abolished. And, by the same token, conscience and the sense of duty, which have a large role in such a problem, likewise cannot be abolished.

Consequently, the Church cannot remain indifferent, particularly when politics touch the altar, as Pope Pius XI said. The Church has the right and the duty to enter also this field to enlighten and aid consciences to make the best choice according to moral principles and those of Christian sociology. Outside of these principles and of the dutiful discipline of the laity toward the hierarchy, anyone can see what a vast field of special responsibilities, courageous initiatives and fruitful activity is open to the civic activity of Catholic lay people so that they may offer their contribution of opinions and discussions, experiences and accomplishments, to promote the progress of their country.

The problem of collaboration with those who do not recognize religious principles might arise in the political field. It is then up to the ecclesiastical authorities, and not to the arbitrary decisions of individual Catholics, to judge the moral licitness of such collaboration...

It is highly deplorable ... that some persons, though professing to be Catholics, not only dare to conduct their political and social activities in a way which is at variance with the teachings of the Church, but also take upon themselves the right to submit its norms and precepts to their own judgment, interpretation and evaluation with obvious superficiality and temerity.

493. Church and State—Catholic Citizens in America SOURCE: James Hastings Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951), p. 99. Copyright 1951 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

Catholics in free societies [as in America] have frequently tried to reserve for their independent judgment the area of "politics" as distinct from "morals." But only the Roman court can decide where the line falls, so that in practice the Roman court has the right to demand obedience of any Catholic on any political issue. As Cardinal Manning said, "Politics is a branch of morals," meanings, "Morals is a branch of Church politics." A democratic society on the most fundamental level is a society where policy is determined by free discussion of moral and political issues. It is incompatible with a society where such issues are determined by decree.

494. Church and State, Catholic Principle of

SOURCE: James Hastings Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951), p. 266. Copyright 1951 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

The textbook on public ecclesiastical law used at the Pontifical University in Rome, where the elite of the American clergy are trained, makes the duty of Catholics in the United States very clear: "Catholics must make all possible efforts to bring about the rejection of this religious indifference of the State and the instauration, as soon as possible, of the wished-for union and concord of State and Church... Whether tolerance of non-Catholic religions is promised under oath by a statutory law or not, it can never be admitted.²³ [Note 23: Cited, La Piana, *Shane Quarterly*, April, 1949, pp. 92f.]

495. Church and State, Modern Catholic Views on, in Conflict SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, "The Issues Which Divide Us," in *American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View*, ed. by Philip Scharper, pp. 82–86. © Sheed and Ward, Inc., New York, 1959. Used by permission.

[p. 82] *Who really speaks for Catholicism* on such crucial issues as toleration, minority rights, and the relationship of church and state?

To get the issues quite clearly before us, here is a statement from the official publication of the Society of Jesus in Rome, *La Civilita* [*sic*] *Cattolica*. It presents a Catholic interpretation of the meaning of religious freedom. The statement was published ten years ago. I have since seen it reproduced in at least half a dozen Protestant books and twice as many Protestant articles, all of which subjoin appropriately Protestant comments:

The Roman Catholic Church, convinced, through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true church, must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that by legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a *de facto* existence, without opportunity to spread their beliefs. If, however, actual circumstances, either due to government hostility or the strength of the dissenting groups, makes the complete application of this principle impossible, then the [Catholic] church will require for herself all possible concessions, limiting herself to accept, as a minor evil, the *de jure* toleration of other forms of worship. In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabitate where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the [p. 83] church does not renounce her thesis, which remains the most imperative of her laws, but merely adapts herself to *de facto* conditions, which must be taken into account in practical affairs. Hence arises the great scandal among Protestants, who tax the Catholics with refusing to others freedom and even *de jure* toleration, in all places where they are in the majority, while they lay claim to it as a right when they are in a minority. We ask Protestants to understand that the Catholic Church would betray her trust if she were to proclaim, theoretically and practically, that error can have the same rights as truth, especially where the supreme duties and interest of man are at stake. The church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice.

Five years later the same kind of position was upheld by Cardinal Ottaviani, and the Vatican found nothing in his comments to which to take exception. To the average Protestant, this all means in effect that the Catholic Church advocates religious freedom when it is in the minority, but practices religious discrimination when it is in the overwhelming majority.

If it should be urged that these statements are simply Italian ones, and that (a) American Catholics do not think this way, and (b) that the American Constitution guarantees freedom of religion, the Protestant is ready with the famous American "Ryan and Boland" quotation, which is a kind of tired staple for discussion of this sort, but none the less relevant to Protestant concerns. It goes in part:

Suppose that the constitutional obstacle to proscription of non-Catholics has been legitimately removed and they themselves have become numerically insignificant: what then would be the proper course of action for a Catholic State? Apparently, the latter State could logically tolerate only such religious activities as were confined to the members of the [p. 84] dissenting group. It could not permit them to carry on general propaganda nor accord their organization certain privileges that had formerly been extended to all religious corporations, for example, exemption from taxation. While all this is very true in logic and in theory, the event of its practical realization in any State or country is so remote in time and in probability that no practical man will let it disturb his equanimity or affect his attitude towards those who differ from him in religious faith.²⁸ [Note 28: John A. Ryan and Francis J. Boland, *Catholic Principles of Politics* (Macmillan), p. 320.] [Used by permission.]

This, I must insist, is the image of Catholicism which the average non-Catholic has. And it is far from a comfortable image to behold.

However, the whole point of the present discussion is that this is not the only thing that Catholicism says on the matter. There is another point of view, which not only expresses dissatisfaction with the "traditional" position outlined above, but tries in scholarly fashion to voice an alternative position which is not simply heterodox or "expedient." Its leading exponent in this country is Fr. John Courtney Murray, S.J., and it has received popular articulation in such Catholic journals as *The Commonweal*. It takes into consideration that what was proper for a feudal agrarian state, totally Catholic, may not be proper position for a modern democratic state. The presupposition from which this new position would flow is expressed in the words of Leo XIII:

It is the special property of human institutions and laws, that there is nothing in them so holy and salutary but that custom may alter it, or time overthrow it, or social habits bring it to naught. So in the Church of God, in which changeableness of discipline is joined with absolute immutability of doctrine, it happens not rarely that things which were once [p. 85] apposite and suitable become in the course of time out of date, or useless, or even harmful.²⁹ [Note 29: Cited in *The Commonweal*, August 7, 1953.]

Thus Fr. Murray could say of the "traditional" view, that "It is still entirely possible and legitimate for Catholics to doubt or dispute whether Cardinal Ottaviani's discourse represents the full, adequate and balanced doctrine of the church."³⁰ [Note 30: Cited in *Time*, August 3, 1953, p. 41.]

It is not within the scope of this chapter to outline Fr. Murray's alternative position on the relationship of church and state. It would be most instructive, however, not only to Protestants, but also to many Catholics, one suspects, to have a full statement of the position readily available. In order, however, to give readers a basis for comparison, a brief summary of the position, as stated by Professor John C. Bennett, is here appended:

The idea of a Confessional Catholic state belongs to an earlier period in European history and it has become an irrelevancy under contemporary conditions.

Anglo-Saxon democracy is fundamentally different from the democracy of the French Revolution which was totalitarian in tendency.

The state in this country is by its very nature limited and in principle the Church does not need to defend itself against such a state as was necessary in the case of Nineteenth Century European revolutionary states which formed the immediate background of Leo XIII's political thinking.

There is no anti-clerical or anti-religious motivation behind the American constitutional provision for Church-State relations, and the Church need not defend itself against this doctrine as such.

The Church in America has as a matter of fact enjoyed greater freedom and scope for its witness and activities than it has in the Catholic states of the traditional type.

[p. 86] It is important to emphasize the rights of the state in its own sphere, the freedom of the Church from state control, and the influence of Catholic citizens on the state.

It is impossible to separate religious freedom from civil freedom and there can be no democracy if the freedom of the citizen is curtailed in religious matters, for such curtailing can often take place as a means of silencing political dissent.

Error does not have the same rights as truth, but persons in error, consciences in error, do have rights which should be respected by the Church and the State.

The Church should not demand that the state as the secular arm enforce the Church's own decisions in regard to heresy.

It does more harm than good to the Church for the state to use its power against non-Catholics.³¹ [Note 31: John C. Bennett, *Christians and the State* (New York: Scribner, 1959), pp. 265, 266. This book is the sanest treatment of the issue now available.] [Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons. © 1958 John C. Bennett.]

In similar vein, *The Commonweal*, commenting on a concordat between the Holy See and the government of Spain, says:

If coöperation between Church and State in the U.S. is to be effective, it must be along American lines and unquestionably in terms other than those acceptable in Spain... The Spanish pattern may suit Spain; it would be hopelessly discordant in our American climate and destructive of political liberty as we understand it. We have our own tradition; we are proud of that tradition; and in its favor we point to the health of the Church in the U.S., which speaks eloquently for its claims.³² [Note 32: *The Commonweal*, September 18, 1953. *Cf.* also *ibid.*, January 14, 1955: "For our part we do not like the identification of canon and civil law in Spain any better than most other Americans. We would not want to see such a system in force in America." And again, concerning the confiscation of Protestant Bibles in Spain, "We regret this and similar actions of the Franco regime which have been directed against the Protestant minority in Spain..." (*ibid.*, June 14, 1956).]

Now all this, as even the Catholic reader will see, is something else again.

496. Church and State, Pope Leo XIII on, Various Statements Concerning Different Aspects of

SOURCE: The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIIi (3d ed.; New York: Benziger, 1903), pages as indicated.

a. On Government by Consent of the People

From The Christian Constitution of States:

[p. 120] Sad it is to call to mind how the harmful and lamentable rage for innovation which rose to a climax in the sixteenth century ... spread amongst all classes of society. From this source, as from a fountainhead, burst forth all those later tenets of unbridled license which, in the midst of the terrible upheavals of the last century, were wildly conceived and boldly proclaimed as the principles and foundation of that *new jurisprudence* which was not merely previously unknown, but was at variance on many points with not only the Christian, but even with the natural law.

Amongst these principles the main one lays down that as all men are alike by race and nature, so in like manner all are equal in the control of their life; that each one is so far his own master as to be in no sense under the rule of any other individual; that each is free to think on every subject just as he may choose, and to do whatever he may like to do; that no man has any right to rule over other men. In a society grounded upon such maxims, all government is nothing more nor less than the will of the people, and the people, being under the power of itself alone, is alone its own ruler. It does choose nevertheless some to whose charge it may commit itself, but in such wise that it makes over to them not the right so much as the business of governing, to be exercised, however, in its name...

Thus, as is evident, a State becomes nothing but a multitude, which is its own master and ruler... [p. 121] Moreover, it believes that it is not obliged to make public profession of any religion; or to inquire which of the very many religions is the only one true; or to prefer one religion to all the rest; or to show to any form of religion special favor; but, on the contrary, is bound to grant equal rights to every creed, so that public order may not be disturbed by any particular form of religious belief.

And it is a part of this theory that all questions that concern religion are to be referred to private judgment; that every one is to be free to follow whatever religion he prefers, or none at all if he disapprove of all. From this the following consequences logically flow: that the judgment of each one's conscience is independent of all law; that the most unrestrained opinions may be openly expressed as to the practice or omission of divine worship; and that every one has unbounded license to think whatever he chooses and to publish abroad whatever he thinks.

Now when the State rests on foundations like those just named ... it readily appears into what and how unrightful a position the Church is driven. For when the management of public business is in harmony with doctrines of such a kind, the Catholic religion is allowed a standing in civil society equal only, or inferior, to societies alien from it. b. On Separation of Church and State

From Human Liberty:

[p. 150] Since, then, the profession of one religion is necessary in the State, that religion must be professed which alone is true, and which can be recognized without difficulty, especially in Catholic [p. 151] States, because the marks of truth are, as it were, engraven upon it. This religion, therefore, the rulers of the State must preserve and protect, if they would provide—as they should do—with prudence and usefulness for the good of the community.

From On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens:

[p. 198] The Church cannot give countenance or favor to those ... who make it their aim and purpose to tear asunder the alliance that should, by the very nature of things, connect the interests of religion with those of the State. On the contrary, she is ... the upholder of those who are themselves imbued with the right way of thinking as to the relations between Church and State... These precepts contain the abiding principle by which every Catholic should shape his conduct in regard to public life.

From The Christian Constitution of States, quoting Pope Gregory XVI:

[p. 125] "Nor can We hope for happier results either for religion or for the civil government from the wishes of those who desire that the Church be separated from the State, and the concord between the secular and ecclesiastical authority be dissolved. It is clear that these men, who yearn for a shameless liberty, live in dread of an agreement which has always been fraught with good, and advantageous alike to sacred and civil interests."

From Human Liberty:

[p. 148] Hence follows the fatal theory of the need of separation between Church and State. But the absurdity of such a position is manifest.

[p. 159] From this teaching, as from its source and principle, flows that fatal principle of the separation of Church and State.

c. On Freedom of Religion

From Human Liberty:

[p. 149] Let us examine that liberty in individuals which is so opposed to the virtue of religion, namely the *liberty of worship*, as it is called. This is based on the principle that every man is free to profess as he may choose any religion or none

[p. 150] A liberty such as We have described ... is no liberty, but its degradation, and the abject submission of the soul to sin...

Justice therefore forbids, and reason itself forbids, the State to be godless; or to adopt a line of action which would end in godlessness—namely, to treat the various religions (as they call them) alike, and to bestow on them promiscuously equal rights and privileges.

From The Christian Constitution of States:

[p. 110] Since, then, no one is allowed to be remiss in the service due to God, and since the chief duty of all men is to cling to religion in both its teaching [p. 111] and practice—not such religion as they may have a preference for, but the religion which God enjoins, and which certain and most clear marks show to be the only one true religion—it is a public crime to act as though there were no God. So, too, is it a sin in the State not to have care for religion, as a something beyond its scope, or as of no practical benefit; or out of many forms of religion to adopt that one which chimes in with the fancy; for we are bound absolutely to worship God in that way which He has shown to be His will...

[p. 112] It is evident that the only true religion is the one established by Jesus Christ Himself, and which He committed to His Church to protect and to propagate [in other words, the Roman Catholic religion].

[p. 126] From these pronouncements of the Popes it is evident that the origin of public power is to be sought for in God Himself and not in the multitude... It is not lawful for the State, any more than for the individual, either to disregard all religious duties or to hold in equal favor different kinds of religion.

[p. 125] Gregory XVI ... inveighed with weighty words against the sophisms, ... namely, that no preference should be shown for any particular form of worship; that it is right for individuals to form their own personal judgments about religion; that each man's conscience is his sole and all-sufficing guide.

From Human Liberty:

[p. 155] Another liberty is widely advocated, namely *liberty of conscience*. If by this is meant that every one may, as he chooses, worship God or not, it is sufficiently refuted by the arguments already adduced.

d. On Freedom of Speech

From *Human Liberty*:

[p. 151] We must now consider briefly *liberty of speech*, and liberty of the Press. It is hardly necessary to say that there can be no such right as this, if it be not used in moderation... Right is a moral power which ... it [p. 152] is absurd to suppose that nature has accorded indifferently to truth and falsehood, to justice and injustice.

[p. 161] And where such liberties are in use, men ... should estimate them as the Church does.

From The Christian Constitution of States:

[p. 126] The unrestrained freedom of thinking and of openly making known one's thoughts is not inherent in the rights of citizens, and is by no means to be reckoned worthy of favor and support.

e. On Freedom of the Press

From Human Liberty:

[p. 161] From what has been said, it follows that it is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of worship, as if these were so many rights given by nature to man.

From On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens:

[p. 183] We are bound, then, to love dearly the country whence we have received the means of enjoyment this mortal life affords, but we have a much more urgent obligation to love, with ardent love, the Church to which we owe the life of the soul, a life that will endure for ever.

f. On the Duties of Citizens

From On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens:

[p. 193] But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires ... complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself...

[Quoting St. Thomas Aquinas:] "Now it is evident that he who clings to the doctrines of the Church as to an infallible rule yields his assent to everything the Church teaches..."

[p. 194] In defining the limits of the obedience owed ... to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, it must not be supposed that it is only to be yielded in relation to dogmas... Nay, further, it is not enough ... to assent to doctrines... But this likewise must be reckoned amongst the duties of Christians, that they allow themselves to be ruled and directed by the authority and leadership of bishops, and above all of the Apostolic See.

[p. 197] In the public order itself of States ... it is always urgent, and indeed the main preoccupation, to take thought how best to consult the interests of Catholicism. From *The Christian Constitution of States:*

[p. 132] It is the duty of all Catholics ... to endeavor to bring back all civil society to the pattern and form of Christianity which We have described... [p. 133] The defence of Catholicism, indeed, necessarily demands that in the profession of doctrines taught by the Church all shall be of one mind and all steadfast in believing...

Further, it is unlawful to follow one line of conduct in private and another in public, respecting privately the authority of the Church, but publicly rejecting it.

g. On the Duties of American Catholics

From True and False Americanism in Religion:

[p. 442] The principles on which the new opinions We have mentioned are based may be reduced to this: that ... the Church ought to adapt herself somewhat to our advanced civilization, and relaxing her ancient rigor, show some indulgence to modern popular theories and methods...

[p. 444] In the matter of which we are now speaking, Beloved Son, the project involves a greater danger and is more hostile to Catholic doctrine and discipline, inasmuch as the followers of these novelties judge that a certain liberty ought to be introduced into the Church, so that, limiting the exercise vigilance of its powers, each one of the faithful may act more freely in pursuance of his own natural bent and capacity. They affirm, namely, that this is called for in order to imitate that liberty which, though quite recently introduced, is now the law and the foundation of almost every civil community... [p. 445] For they say, in speaking of the infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff, that after the solemn decision formulated in the Vatican Council, there is no more need of solicitude in that regard, and, because of its being now out of dispute, a wider field of thought and action is thrown open to individuals. A preposterous method of arguing, surely. For if anything is suggested by the infallible teaching of the Church, it is certainly that no one should wish to withdraw from it; nay, that all should strive to be thoroughly imbued with and be guided by its spirit, so as to be the more easily preserved from any private error whatsoever.

From Human Liberty:

[p. 162] It is not of itself wrong to prefer a democratic form of government, if only the Catholic doctrine be maintained as to the origin and exercise of power. From *Catholicity in the United States:*

[p. 323] For the Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and government of your nation, ... is free to live and act without hindrance. Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church... [p. 324] She would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.

From Human Liberty:

[p. 158] And although in the extraordinary condition of these times the Church usually acquiesces in certain modern liberties, not because she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient to permit them, she would in happier times exercise her own liberty.

497. Church and State—Pope's Authority Asserted

SOURCE: William E. Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance* (bound with two of his other tracts as *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion*. New York: Harper, 1875), pp. 30, 31.

[p. 30] Absolute obedience, it is boldly declared, is due to the Pope, at the peril of salvation, not alone in faith, in morals, but in all things which concern the discipline and

government of the Church. Thus are swept into the Papal net whole multitudes of facts, whole systems of government, prevailing, though in different degrees, in every country of the world. Even in the United States, where the severance between Church and State is supposed to be complete, a long catalogue might be drawn of subjects belonging to the domain and competency of the State, but also undeniably affecting the government of the Church; such as, by way of example, marriage, burial, education, prison discipline, blasphemy, poor-relief, incorporation, mortmain, religious endowments, vows of celibacy, and obedience. In Europe the circle is far wider, the points of contact and of interlacing [being] almost innumerable. But on all matters respecting which any Pope may think proper to declare that they concern either faith or morals, or the government or discipline of the Church, he claims, with the approval of a Council un- [p. 31] doubtedly Oecumenical in the Roman sense, the absolute obedience, at the peril of salvation, of every member of his communion.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Gladstone refers to chap. 3 of the same decree of the Vatican Council that declared the pope infallible (see No. 865).]

498. Church and State.—Prediction of Great Issues Ahead SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Leviathan* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1946), p. 19. Copyright 1946 by Paul Hutchinson. Used by permission of Harper & Brothers, New York.

There is reason to believe, accordingly, that the old issue of church and state, or of church against state, will soon be upon us in a fury unknown for a thousand years. Are we ready to face that storm? Do we comprehend from how many quarters it is likely to blow?

499. Church and State, Separation of, as Seen by an Englishman SOURCE: James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (3d ed., rev.; New York: Macmillan, 1895), Vol. 2, p. 695.

In examining the National government and the State governments we have never once had occasion to advert to any ecclesiastical body or question, because with such matters government has in the United States absolutely nothing to do. Of all the differences between the Old World and the New this is perhaps the most salient. Half the wars of Europe, half the internal troubles that have vexed European states, ... have arisen from theological differences or from the rival claims of church and state. This whole vast chapter of debate and strife has remained virtually unopened in the United States. There is no Established Church. All religious bodies are absolutely equal before the law, and unrecognized by the law, except as voluntary associations of private citizens.

500. Church and State, Separation of, Dangers Threatening

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 62, 63. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 62] Through agony and blood this country at least has learned the doctrine of separation between church and state. In the fundamental law of the land it has disclaimed all right to regulate religion, and has distinctly forbidden legislation designed to establish or maintain any form of worship.

⁴Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Feeling the restraint of these constitutional provisions certain citizens have assumed for themselves an extra amount of piety and patriotism, and have banded themselves together in such organizations as the National Reform Association, or the American Sabbath Union, for the [p. 63] avowed purpose of securing "such an amendment to the constitution of the United States as shall suitably express our national acknowledgment of Almighty God as the source of all authority in civil government, of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and of his revealed will as of supreme authority."

Plainly stated the purpose of these intolerant people is to remove the constitutional provisions that guarantee religious liberty, re-instate the cast-off principles that wrought the inquisition, and turn the country over to fanatics and fakirs.

501. Church and State, Separation of, in America Benefits Christianity SOURCE: James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (3d ed., rev.; New York: Macmillan, 1895), Vol. 2, pp. 702, 710, 711.

[p. 702] The legal position of a Christian church is in the United States simply that of a voluntary association or group of associations corporate or unincorporate, under the ordinary law...

[p. 710] The influence of Christianity seems to be, if we [p. 711] look not merely to the numbers but also to the intelligence of the persons influenced, greater and more widespread in the United States than in any part of western Continental Europe, and I think greater than in England.

502. Church and State, Separation of—Intention of Founding Fathers SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison. 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 231, 232. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 231] The concept of civil and political liberty, which was also an import from England, had so far developed in the American climate that the separation of church and state was inevitable and imminent.

Virginia led the way. Its Declaration of Rights—adopted two weeks before the signing of the Declaration of Independence—asserted that "all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience." Ten years later—and just a year before the writing of the Federal Constitution—the Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, drafted by Jefferson, declared that the state has no right to tax a citizen for the support of any religion, even his own, and that civil rights and eligibility to public office "have no dependence on religious opinions." This meant absolute disestablishment. The act was all the more emphatic because before enacting it the Virginia lawmakers had defeated a compromise proposal to set up a sort of establishment of Christianity in general and levy church taxes that would be prorated among all the churches. The widely publicized [p. 232] debate on this latter proposition should dispose of the argument—sometimes heard in our own times—that the framers and supporters of the First Amendment could not have thought of prohibiting tax support for the churches if only it were fairly distributed among them.

The Articles of Confederation (1777), which created "The United States of America," had declared that the thirteen states enter into a firm league "for their common defense ... against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretence whatever." The inclusion of religion, and at the head of the list of the possible grounds of attacks that are to be resisted, is not without significance. In view of the religious diversity of the Americans and the steps already taken and about to be taken to guarantee complete religious liberty, it is obvious

that what they were banding together to defend was not some one preferred church but the vital principle of freedom in religion.

503. Church and State, Separation of—Religion Outside the Province of Government

SOURCE: Justice John Welch in *Board of Education of Cincinnati* v. *Minor et al* (1872–73), 23 Ohio State Reports 253.

Government is an organization for particular purposes. It is not almighty, and we are not to look to it for everything. The great bulk of human affairs and human interests is left by any free government to individual enterprise and individual action. Religion is eminently one of those interests, lying outside the true and legitimate province of government.

504. Church and State, Separation of—U.S. Constitution, First Amendment

SOURCE: First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, in *United States Code*, 1958 ed., p. XLVI.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

505. Church and State, Separation of—U.S. First Amendment Dictated by Regard for Religion

SOURCE: Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States*, bk. 3, chap. 44 (Boston: Hilliard, Gray, and Company, 1833), p. 702, sec. 992.

It was under a solemn consciousness of the dangers from ecclesiastical ambition, the bigotry of spiritual pride, and the intolerance of sects, thus exemplified in our domestic, as well as in foreign annals, that it was deemed advisable to exclude from the national government all power to act upon the subject.

506. Church and State, Separation of—U.S. Supreme Court's View of First Amendment

SOURCE: U.S. Supreme Court Opinions in U.S. Reports, as indicated.

From Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (Feb. 10, 1947)

[p. 15] The "establishment of religion" clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertain- [p. 16] ing or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and *vice versa*. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect "a wall of separation between Church and State."

From Concurring opinion of Justice Felix Frankfurter in *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203 (March, 1948).

[p. 231] Separation means separation, not something less. Jefferson's metaphor in describing the relation between Church and State speaks of a "wall of separation," not of a fine line easily overstepped... "The great American principle of eternal separation"— Elihu Root's phrase bears repetition—is one of the vital reliances of our Constitutional system for assuring unities among our people stronger than our diversities. It is the Court's duty to enforce this principle in its full integrity.

507. Church and State—Syllabus of Errors (Some of the Propositions Pronounced Erroneous by Pope Pius IX)

SOURCE: Pope Pius IX, Syllabus of Errors, trans. in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 191, 193–199, 202, 208, 209. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 191] 15. Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, guided by the light of reason, he shall consider true...

17. Good hope at least is to be entertained of the eternal salvation of all those who are not at all in the true Church of Christ...

18. Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion, in which form it is given to please God equally as in the Catholic Church...

[p. 193] 21. The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion...

23. Roman pontiffs and occumenical councils have wandered outside the limits of their powers, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even erred in defining matters of faith and morals...

[p. 194] 24. The Church has not the power of using force, nor has she any temporal power, direct or indirect...

27. The sacred ministers of the Church and the Roman pontiff are to be absolutely excluded from every charge and dominion over temporal affairs...

[p. 195] 30. The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons derived its origin from civil law...

31. The ecclesiastical forum or tribunal for the temporal causes, whether civil or criminal, of clerics, ought by all means to be abolished, even without consulting and against the protest of the Holy See...

[p. 196] 37. National churches, withdrawn from the authority of the Roman pontiff and altogether separated, can be established...

38. The Roman pontiffs have, by their too arbitrary conduct, contributed to the division of the Church into Eastern and Western...

[p. 197] 39. The State, as being the origin and source of all rights, is endowed with a certain right not circumscribed by any limits...

40. The teaching of the Catholic Church is hostile to the well-being and interests of society...

[p. 198] 45. The entire government of public schools in which the youth of a Christian state is edu- [p. 199] cated, except (to a certain extent) in the case of episcopal seminaries, may and ought to appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the conferring of degrees, in the choice or approval of the teachers...

47. The best theory of civil society requires that popular schools open to children of every class of the people, and, generally, all public institutes intended for instruction in

letters and philosophical sciences and for carrying on the education of youth, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, control and interference, and should be fully subjected to the civil and political power at the pleasure of the rulers, and according to the standard of the prevalent opinions of the age...

[p. 202] 55. The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church...

[p. 208] 77. In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship...

78. Hence it has been wisely decided by law, in some Catholic countries, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own peculiar worship...

79. Moreover, it is false that the civil liberty of every form of worship, and the full power, given to all, of overtly and publicly manifesting any opinions whatsoever and [p. 209] thoughts, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to propa gate the pest of indifferentism...

80. The Roman Pontiff can, and ought to, reconcile himself, and come to terms with progress, liberalism and modern civilization.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The encyclical *Quanta Cura*, published by Pope Pius IX, Dec. 8, 1864, was accompanied by a syllabus containing a summary in eighty propositions of various doctrines condemned by that pontiff. In reading this document it should be remembered that every proposition is from the Catholic viewpoint an error. Some hold that it is therefore legitimate to conclude in a general way that the Roman Catholic Church teaches the exact opposite of the errors condemned in these propositions. However, other writers point out that a reversed statement may imply more than what accords with facts. The "thesis and hypothesis" explanation [No. 508] has had more than one interpretation. Different Roman Catholic writers of considerable standing take varying views upon the authority of this Syllabus of Errors, as to whether it is

an *ex cathedra* statement and therefore infallible. It is generally acknowledged to be of great authority, and ultramontane partisans doubtless regard it as infallible.]

508. Church and State—"Thesis" and "Hypothesis" as Explanation of Pope Pius IX's Syllabus of Errors

SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 124–126, 130, 131. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 124] Though the issues involved are still a matter for argument, upon which Catholic historians are not entirely agreed, it would seem that, tactically speaking, the issue of the Syllabus was a move whose wisdom may well be doubted...

[p. 125] The cumulative effect of reading the whole Syllabus is naturally very harsh, and to the layman often provoking. The most recent and scholarly historian of the pontificate of Pius IX, Roger Aubert of Louvain, has described its effect by saying that "the majority of Catholics were stupefied." Even many of the bishops, especially in France and in Germany, were somewhat at a loss to know how to interpret it... [p. 126] It was the great Bishop of Orleans, Dupanloup, who saved the situation by promptly publishing a pamphlet in which he explained the denunciations of the Syllabus in terms of what was called the "thesis" and the "hypothesis." What was denounced, he explained, was the thesis, the general proposition, the notion, for instance, that the *ultimate and universal ideal* was a society with rival religious beliefs, and in which many children were brought up in ignorance of the Faith or in hostility to it. It was impossible that the

Church should hold such a state of things to be an *ideal* for society. But to assert, as a consequence of this thesis, the hypothesis that in the present state of society it was necessarily wrong to have a very wide measure of freedom of speech or of the press, or even (it might be) to disestablish the Catholic Church, was quite incorrect. There was no intention of trying to interfere with such liberties, for example, as Napoleon III chose to permit in France, or to criticise those much fuller liberties which pertained in England or in America. Conversely, however, because America had no Established Church, and a secular education only, and enjoyed the "benefits" of divorce laws, it was not correct to say that such things should be introduced universally—for example in the Papal States.

Such was Dupanloup's reasoning on the Syllabus and, though it was accepted a little grudgingly at Rome, it earned for the Bishop of Orleans more than six hundred letters of congratulation from bishops all over the world, who now knew where they stood. Some there were who regarded the distinction between thesis and hypothesis as specious (it was an invention of the *Civiltà Cattolica*). But if the wits of Paris enjoyed saying: "The thesis is when the Church condemns the Jews; the hypothesis is when the papal nuncio dines with the Baron de Rothschild," the argument was none the less perfectly valid, and it remains applicable to a wide range of matters where the Church is concerned with order and discipline, rather than with faith...

[p. 130] The Syllabus of Errors was not an infallible papal pronouncement; since it was a summarised classified index to previous pronouncements it [p. 131] could not be. If the infallibility lay anywhere it lay with the documents to which the Syllabus made reference; but since these, for the most part, were concerned with particular people, books, and occasions, it was not likely that they either, would fulfil the conditions of an infallible pronouncement, namely that it must be made by the Pope "when exercising the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians."

509. Church and State—"Thesis" and "Hypothesis" in Catholic Political Doctrine

SOURCE: J. B. Bury, *History of the Papacy in the 19th Century (1864–1878)*, ed. by R. H. Murray (London: Macmillan, 1930), pp. 42, 43. Used by permission.

[p. 42] How is it that two such different interpretations [of Pope Pius IX's Syllabus of *Errors*] as that of the Liberal Catholic Dupanloup and the ultramontane Schrader could be alike accepted by the Vatican? How is it that ultramontanes themselves, when they choose, can explain away what seems the plain and obvious meaning of the Syllabus, and accept principles to which it seems to be opposed? The answer lies in the distinction between thesis and hypothesis. The Syllabus is concerned with thesis, the laving down of principles, which are of absolute validity, and would prevail in an ideal society when the Church possessed the power of enforcing its authority, as it did to such a vast extent in the Middle Ages. But in modern times the Church in [p. 43] practice has to deal with hypothesis, i.e. it has to determine its actions to meet certain given conditions which it cannot control; it has to compromise and conciliate its theoretical principles, up to a certain point, with actual circumstances. This it has had to do in the interests of selfpreservation; the Concordat of 1801 [with Napoleon] began the policy. But notwithstanding this unwilling and necessary condescension, the Papacy never abandoned the theoretical principles which are the logical consequence of its claim to independent sovran authority, superior to the civil authority; they remain in the background as the ideal, like a utopia, which the Church would realize if it could. On the

other hand, the Pope had no illusions that there was any chance of realizing them at present. Thus the ultramontane interpretation of the *Syllabus* as thesis was perfectly correct; on the other hand, the softer interpretation of the French Liberal Catholic was, though not literally sound, yet in spirit at least *just*, in so far as it went to show that there was no practical danger that the Papacy would not continue to compromise and find,

however reluctantly, a modus vivendi with modern political institutions.

510. Church and State—"Thesis" and "Hypothesis," Pope Leo XIII on SOURCE: James Hastings Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951), pp. 141, 142. Copyright 1951 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 141] On these issues Leo [XIII] set forth thesis and hypothesis especially in Immortale Dei and Libertas humana. In them he made it clear that his most fundamental objection to the modern democratic state was that it refused on principle to respect the Roman claim to have a monopoly of truth, and to have a directive and veto power on political actions. The great fault of liberal democracy was "the rejection of the holy and august authority of the Church, which presides in the name of God over the human race." "States have been constituted without any count at all of God or of the order established by him."²¹ On the contrary, the State must "act up to the manifold and weighty duties linking it to God, by the public profession of religion," as is evident to natural reason. "It is a sin in the State not to have any care for religion, as if this [p. 142] were something beyond its scope, or of no practical benefit; or else out of many forms of religion to adopt that one which chimes in with its fancy."²² It is one of the first obligations of all States consequently to give official privileged status to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, since, as "is evident," this religion alone is established of God, the others being human inventions. First principles thus laid down, Leo proceeds to the hypothesis: "The Church indeed deems it unlawful to place various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion, but does not, on that account, condemn those rulers who for the sake of securing some great good, or of hindering some great evil, tolerate in practice that these various forms of religion have a place in the State."²³ Even this concession seems to fall far short of the liberal democratic principle of separation, and, rather, to sanction, under extenuating circumstances, the system of toleration and conjoint establishments as found in Germany or France under the Napoleonic Concordat. Separation as embodied in American fundamental law would not even come under Leo's hypothesis, once Roman Catholics were in a position to abrogate it.

"Corollary to the separation of Church and State are the civil and religious liberties of various democratic constitutions and bills of rights. With reference to such liberties Leo reaffirmed specifically the condemnations of *Mirari vos* and the Syllabus. Liberty of worship, of conscience, of thought, of the press, are all contrary to the Catholic doctrine of society." ²⁴ [Notes 21–24 refer to Husslein, *Social Wellsprings*, Vol. I, pp. 16, 68, 84, and 81f., respectively.]

511. Church and State—"Thesis" and "Hypothesis" Seen in Leo XIII's Encyclical *Immortale Dei*

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 72. Used by permission.

Although Leo XIII did not invent the famous distinction between "thesis" and "hypothesis" ² [Note 2: This distinction was first explicitly formulated by the Jesuits in

La Civiltà cattolica, in 1863, in a desperate attempt to find a rational explanation of the condemnations of Pius IX.] he seems nevertheless to have accepted it. Here is his clearest text on the matter, taken from the Encyclical "Immortale Dei":

"No one has any legitimate ground for accusing the Church of being an enemy of either just tolerance or healthy and justifiable liberty. While the Church considers *that it is not right to put the various forms of worship on the same footing* as the true religion, it does not follow that she condemns heads of states who, *with a view to achieving good or preventing evil, in practice* allow these various creeds each to have their own place in the state. It is indeed the custom of the Church to take the greatest care to ensure that no one shall be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will, for, as Saint Augustine wisely observes, a man can believe only of his own free will."

512. Church and State—"Thesis" Theory Reinterpreted

SOURCE: Albert Hartmann, Toleranz und Christlicher Glaube ("Tolerance and Christian Faith")

(Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht Carolusdruckerei, 1955), p. 211, trans. in A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 21. Used by permission of both publishers.

The ideal ("thesis"), which has obviously not been reached, [...] *is not the Catholic state, which refuses to allow non-Catholic public worship,* but that condition of human society in which tolerance is not necessary because everyone is united in confessing the truth. This is a great difference. The imperfection of the actual situation ("hypothesis") is due *not to the practice of tolerance but to the existence of invincible human errors.*

[EDITORS' NOTE: The omission is not indicated in translation.]

513. Church Councils, Ecumenical, Beginning of

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), pp. 334, 335.

[p. 334] The ecumenical councils have not only an ecclesiastical significance, but bear also a *political* or state-church character. The very name refers to ... the empire... The Christian Graeco-Roman *emperor* is indispensable to an ecumenical council in the ancient sense of the term; its temporal head and its legislative strength...

[p. 335] Upon this Byzantine precedent, and upon the example of the kings of Israel, the Russian Czars and the Protestant princes of Germany, Scandinavia, and England—be it justly or unjustly—build their claim to a similar and still more extended supervision of the church in their dominions.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The first ecumenical, or general, council at Nicaea, in 325, was called and presided over by Constantine.]

514. Church Councils, Ecumenical, List of

SOURCE: A Catholic Dictionary, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.), p. 126. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

The following councils are regarded as ecumenical by the Catholic Church, only the first seven by the Orthodox Eastern Church, the first two by the Nestorians and the first three by the separated Armenians, Syrians and Copts. 1. Nicaea I, 325; 2. Constantinople I, 381; 3. Ephesus, 431; 4. Chalcedon, 451; 5. Constantinople II, 553; 6. Constantinople III, 680–1; 7. Nicaea II, 787; 8. Constantinople IV, 869; 9. Lateran I, 1123; 10. Lateran II, 1139; 11. Lateran III, 1179; 12. Lateran IV, 1215; 13. Lyons I, 1245; 14. Lyons II, 1274; 15. Vienne, 1311–13; 16. Constance, 1414–18 (in part only); 17. Basle-Ferrara-Florence, 1431–43; 18. Lateran V, 1512–17; 19. Trent, 1545–1563; 20. Vatican, 1869, adjourned 1870 and still unfinished. The first six are commemorated on a single feast in the Byzantine rite and some of them separately in several Eastern churches.

515. Church of Christ, Scientist

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 397-399.

[p. 397] *History*. Christian Science is the religion founded by Mary Baker Eddy and represented by the Church of Christ, Scientist. The Christian Science denomination was founded by Mrs. Eddy at Boston in 1879, following her discovery of this religion at Lynn, Mass., in 1866, and her issuing of its textbook, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, in 1875.

For many years prior to 1866 Mrs. Eddy observed and studied mental causes and effects. Profoundly religious, she was disposed to attribute causation to God and to regard Him as divine Mind. In that year, she recovered almost instantly from a severe injury after reading an account of healing in the Gospel according to Matthew. The discovery of what she named Christian Science ensued from this incident. As she has said, "I knew the Principle of all harmonious Mind-action to be God, and that cures were produced in primitive Christian healing by holy, uplifting faith; but I must know the Science of this healing, and I won my way to absolute conclusions through divine revelation, reason, and demonstration." (Science and Health, p. 109.)

As her discovery developed in her thought, Mrs. Eddy demonstrated its importance to mankind by many cases of healing and by teaching which equipped students for successful practice. In due course, a distinct church became necessary to facilitate cooperation and unity between Christian Scientists, to present Christian Science to all people, and to maintain the purity of its teachings and practice. Accordingly, she and her followers organized the Church of Christ, Scientist, "to commemorate the words and works of our Master" and to "reinstate primitive Christianity and its lost element of healing." (Church Manual, p. 17.)

Mrs. Eddy passed away in 1910. Until then, she had initiated every step in the progress of Christian Science. Although the organic law of the Christian Science movement, its Church Manual, confers adequate powers upon an administrative board, The Christian Science Board of Directors, yet this board always had functioned under her supervision. Mrs. Eddy's demise, therefore, tested the Church Manual as an organic law in the absence of its author, but it has fulfilled the most confident expectations. The period since 1910 has been the most fruitful and prosperous in the history of Christian Science.

The primary source of information about Christian Science is Mrs. Eddy's book, Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, first published in 1875 and occasionally revised "only to give a clearer and fuller expression of its original meaning." This book received from the author its final revision in 1907. Mrs. Eddy is the author of other books on Christian Science, published from 1886 to 1913, which are collected in her Prose Works Other Than Science and Health and her Poetical Works. Her writings can be found in many public libraries and in all Christian Science reading rooms.

Doctrine. Christian Science is a religious teaching and practice based on the words and works of Christ Jesus, which is applicable to health for the same reasons that the Christian religion originally was. As defined by Mrs. Eddy, the religion she founded is "divine metaphysics"; it is "the scientific system of divine healing"; it is "the law of God, the law of good, interpreting and demonstrating the divine Principle and rule of universal harmony." (Science and Health, pp. 111, 123; Rudimental Divine Science, p. 1.)

The theology of Christian Science begins with the propositions that God is "All-inall"; He is the "Divine Principle of all that really is." To define God further, it employs frequently the word "good," besides such terms as Life, Truth, Love, and Mind, Soul, Spirit. Next to God, the name of Jesus and references to him occur most frequently in the authorized literature of Christian Science. Concerning Jesus Christ and His relation to God and man, Christian Science distinguishes between what is in the New Testament and what is in the creeds, doctrines, and dogmas of later times. Accordingly, Christian Scientists [p. 398] speak of Him oftenest as the Master or the "Way-shower," and they regard the atonement, His chief work, as "the exemplification of man's unity with God'[,] whereby man reflects divine Truth, Life, and Love." (Science and Health, p. 18.)

The most distinctive feature of Christian Science teaching is its absolute distinction between what is real and what is apparent or seeming, but unreal. This distinction Mrs. Eddy explains, for instance, as follows: "All reality is in God and His creation, harmonious and eternal. That which He creates is good, and He makes all that is made. Therefore the only reality of sin, sickness, or death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human, erring belief, until God strips off their disguise. They are not true, because they are not of God." (Science and Health, p. 472.)

Contrary to common misapprehension, Christian Science does not ignore what it regards as unreal. This religion teaches its adherents to forsake and overcome every form of error or evil on the basis of its unreality; that is, by demonstrating the true idea of reality. This it teaches them to do by means of spiritual law and spiritual power.

In this connection, Christian Science maintains that the truth of being—the truth concerning God and man—includes a rule for its practice and a law by which its practice produces effects. To a certain extent Jesus declared this rule and law when he said, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" (John viii, 32). Accordingly, for an individual to gain his freedom from any form of error or evil, he should know the truth, the absolute truth of being, applicable to his case; and Christian Science further teaches that this practice is effective when employed by one individual for another, because such is the unity of real being and such is the law of God. For these reasons, evidently Jesus could and did declare the possibility of Christian healing in unlimited terms. (See Matthew x, 5–10 and XXVIII, 16–20; Mark XVI, 14–18; John xiv, 12.)

The practice of Christian Science is not merely mental; it must be also spiritual. Indeed, it is truly mental only as it is absolutely spiritual. The nonspiritual elements in the so-called human mind do not contribute to harmony or to health. The practitioner must know or realize spiritually, and his ability to do this is derived from the divine Mind. Therefore, he must agree with the Teacher and Way-shower, who said, "I can of mine own self do nothing" (John v, 30), and he must prepare for the healing ministry and keep himself in condition for it by living the life of a genuine Christian. The practice of Christian Science is not limited, as is commonly supposed, to the healing of the sick. On the contrary, Christian Scientists regard their religion as applicable to practically every human need...

Organization. Since its reorganization in 1892, the denomination has consisted of the Christian Science Mother Church, the proper name of which is The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass., and branch churches or branch societies at all places where there are enough adherents for a local organization. A branch church is called First Church of Christ, Scientist, of its city or town, or is called Second Church of Christ, Scientist, of that place, and so on. A society is the beginning of a church, and is called Christian Science Society of its locality.

Viewed in another way, The Mother Church consists of members who constitute the local congregation in Boston and of members who reside in other places throughout the world, either where there are branch organizations or where there are not...

[p. 399] The officers of The Mother Church consist of The Christian Science Board of Directors, a president, the first and second readers, a clerk, and a treasurer. The governing body of the denomination is The Christian Science Board of Directors, but each branch church has its own self-government.

The lesson-sermon, which constitutes the principal part of the Sunday services in Christian Science churches, is prepared by a committee connected with The Mother Church and is read in every church by two readers who read alternately, the first reader from Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, the second reader from the Bible.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership in 1936 was reported at 268,915 (CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, p. 390).]

516. Church of God (Anderson, Ind.)

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 414, 415.

[p. 414] *History*. The name Church of God is used by a number of small religious groups in the United States, and this fact makes for confusion. This particular group sometimes attempts to differentiate itself from the others using this name by inserting [p. 415] the name of its headquarters (Anderson, Ind.), but regards such insertion as no part of the name. At Anderson, Ind., are the offices of its general boards, its college and seminary, its publishing plant, and other promotional organizations. The group uses the name Church of God, which it holds as the Scriptural designation of the church, not in a denominational or exclusive sense, but in an inclusive sense, as the name of the church to which all true Christians belong, and that a recognition of this fact would be a big step forward in the direction of Christian unity, and the name Church of God would then be applied to all Christians in all the world.

From the beginning this group has regarded itself as a movement within the church rather than another denomination or church among churches, working, as it holds, for the restoration of the New Testament standard of faith and life, particularly in the matter of church or Christian unity.

The movement began about 1880 when D. S. Warner, of the Church of God, Winebrennerian movement, began to work in Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and other Midwestern States, and soon found others in various sections of the United States who were possessed of like beliefs and ideals. They believed that the church was too much restricted by human organization and ecclesiasticism and demanded that the church be more directly under the rule of God. The movement was strongly evangelistic and spread rapidly into many States. Considerable emphasis was put upon the doctrine of holiness, and in this the church held many things in common with the various holiness movements of that period, though in other respects differing from them.

Doctrine. In doctrine the Church of God would be classed orthodox and evangelical. The members, in common with many groups of Christians, hold: The divine inspiration of the Scriptures; that the Bible is a book at once divine and human; that it grew out of human life in touch with God. They believe in the Holy Trinity; that Christ is the Son of God; that the Holy Spirit is a person, in His indwelling presence in the heart of man, sanctifying and giving power for life and service; that the Holy Spirit gives gifts for the work of God in the world, but that none or all of these gifts are evidences of the presence of the Holy Spirit; that sin separates men from God; in the forgiveness of sin on the basis of the atonement of Christ and by repentance and faith on the part of the person; in the doctrine and experience of holiness; in a personal second coming of Christ, that this coming has no connection with a millennial reign, but that the kingdom of God is here and now; in the final judgment, the general resurrection of the dead, with reward of the righteous and punishment of the wicked.

Generally, they practice baptism by immersion, the Lord's Supper, and feet washing, but do not regard their practice as an essential basis of fellowship. Perhaps their most distinctive doctrine is that concerning the nature of the church and the unity of Christian people; that the church is the body of Christ, made up of all Christians, and that all Christians are one in Christ Jesus, but the denominationalism and the sectarian system are a hindrance to the expression of this unity, hence are unscriptural. They believe that God is working in this time to restore the New Testament ideal of this church; and that this restoration is based upon the fact of spiritual experience rather than of creedal agreement.

Organization. The local churches of the movement, numbering nearly 2,000, are congregational in form of church government... Membership in the local churches is not on a formal basis, and there are no membership lists kept... The ministers of the various States meet in State or regional conventions, but such associations are purely voluntary, and in no way are invested with authority over local churches, but act in an advisory capacity. The General Ministerial Assembly meets annually in connection with the annual convention and camp meeting in June at Anderson, Ind., which has jurisdiction over the business and cooperative aspects of the work, but not in doctrinal matters or over the local churches.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 135,294 (YAC, 1961, p. 253).]

517. Church of God (Cleveland, Tenn.)

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 406, 407.

[p. 406] *History*. The denomination known as the Church of God had its origin in the conviction of a number of people, in different denominations in Tennessee, that existing bodies with which they were acquainted were not strictly in accord with their views of Scripture, and in the belief that their wishes for a body conforming to their own views must be satisfied. The first organization was formed in August 1886 in Monroe County, Tenn., under the name "Christian Union." In 1902 there was a reorganization under the name "Holiness Church," and in January 1907 a third meeting, at Union Grove, Bradley County, Tenn., adopted the name "Church of God," with a membership of 150, representing 5 local churches [p. 407] in North Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee. From that time the body has grown until it is represented in 45 States and has churches in 11 foreign countries. The international headquarters in 1936 were in Cleveland, Tenn.

Doctrine. In doctrine this body is Arminian and in accord with the Methodist bodies. It recognizes no creed as authoritative, but relies upon the Bible "as a whole rightly divided" and as the final court of appeals. It emphasizes sanctification as an experience subsequent to regeneration; also the baptism of the Holy Ghost, evidenced by speaking in other tongues, subsequent to sanctification. Conditions of membership are profession of faith in Christ, experience of being "born again," bearing the fruits of a Christian life, and recognition of the obligation to accept and practice all the teachings of the church. The sacraments observed are the Lord's Supper, foot washing, and water baptism by immersion.

Organization. The ecclesiastical organization is described as "a blending of congregational and episcopal, ending in theocratical," by which is meant that every

question is to be decided by God's Word... The officers of the churches are bishops, deacons, evangelists, and exhorters...

When a reasonable number of churches have been organized in a State an annual State assembly is held, not legislative in character, but rather educational and for the advancement and interest of the church in that State. A general assembly convenes annually, and is composed of representatives from all States, provinces, and countries; and this is recognized as the supreme council.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 162,794 (YAC, 1961, p. 253).]

518. Churches of Christ

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 469, 470.

[p. 469] *History*. In their early history the churches which gathered under the leadership of Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, and Barton W. Stone emphasized the distinctively apostolic character of the individual church, not merely as a worshiping congregation and a working force, but as an autonomous ecclesiastical body. As set forth in the Declaration and Address, by Thomas Campbell, they deplored human creeds and systems and protested against considering anything as a matter of faith and duty for which there could not be produced a "Thus saith the Lord," either in expressed terms, approved example, or necessary inference. They also held that they should follow "after the example of the primitive church exhibited in the New Testament without any additions whatever of human opinions or inventions of men." With this basis of action they adopted as the keynote of their movement, "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent."

As the churches increased in membership and wealth, however, there arose what seemed to some to be a desire for popularity and for such "human inventions" as had been deplored in the beginning of the movement. Chief among these "inventions" were a general organization of the churches into a missionary society, with a "money basis" of membership, and the use of mechanical instrumental music in the worship of the church. The agitation for the organization of a missionary society began soon after 1840 and continued until the American Christian Missionary Society was formed in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1849. Although this movement received Alexander Campbell's approval, yet the literature of that period abundantly shows that he was not the real leader behind the effort nor the same man mentally who had previously opposed such inventions of men. Many of his brethren were dissatisfied with this departure from the original ground and held firmly to the earlier position, quoting his own language in speaking of the apostolic Christians:

Their churches were not fractured into missionary societies, Bible societies, and educational societies; nor did they dream of organizing such. *** They knew nothing of the hobbies of modern times. In their church capacity alone they moved. *** They viewed the Church of Jesus Christ as the scheme of salvation to ameliorate the world. As members of it they considered themselves bound to do all they could for the glory of God and the good of men. They dared not transfer to a missionary society a cent or a prayer, lest in so doing they should rob the Church of its glory and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God.

A society with a "money basis" and a delegated membership, it was urged, was the beginning of apostasy from New Testament Christianity. The article in the constitution of the missionary society which gave more offense than any other, because, in the view of some, it established a "money basis" and created a "moneyed aristocracy," read as follows: "The society shall be composed of annual delegates, life members, and life directors. Any church may appoint a delegate for an annual contribution of \$10; and \$20 paid at one time shall be requisite to constitute a member for life." Various and earnest

efforts were made at different times to dissuade them from this "departure from New Testament Christianity," but without avail.

The question as to the use of instrumental music in the services of the church became an issue as early as 1859, when a melodeon was placed in the church at Midway, Ky. Much opposition was aroused, and the claim was made that instrumental music in the church services "ministered to pride and worldliness, was without the sanction of New Testament precept and example, and was consequently unscriptural and sinful."

Other matters in regard to which there was controversy were the introduction of the "modern pastor" and the adoption of "unscriptural means of raising money."

It was inevitable that such divergencies of opinion should result in the formation of opposing parties, and these parties were variously called "Conservatives" [p. 470] and "Progressives," or "Antis" and "Digressives." Actual division, however, came slowly. Many who sympathized with the Progressives continued to worship and work with the Conservatives because they had no other church facilities; and on the other hand, many Conservatives associated with the Progressives for a similar reason.

In the census report for 1890 both parties were reported together under the title, "Disciples of Christ." In the report for 1906 the Conservatives were reported separately as "Churches of Christ," but the results were not altogether satisfactory, as it was difficult to draw the line between them and the Disciples of Christ. There is now a clear distinction between the two groups, and the statistics for 1936 are far more complete.

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrine and polity the Churches of Christ are, in some respects, in accord with the Disciples of Christ. They reject all human creeds and confessions, consider the Scriptures a sufficient rule of faith and practice, emphasize the "divine Sonship of Jesus" and the "divine personality of the Holy Spirit," and regard the Lord's Supper as a memorial service rather than as a sacrament, to be observed each Lord's Day. The church, with such officers as belonged to it in apostolic times, is considered a divine institution. Each local church is independent; it elects its own officers, calls its own ministers, and conducts its own affairs. Membership is on the general basis of faith in Christ, repentance, and baptism (immersion). The ministerial office is not emphasized, and there are no ministerial associations. Each minister is a member of the church which he serves, and is subject to its discipline. In general, the doctrine of nonresistance is advocated.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 2,007,650 (YAC, 1961, p. 253).]

519. Commandments, Keeping of, in Relation to Justification—Council of Trent on

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VI (Jan. 13, 1547), Decree Concerning Justification, chap. 11, trans. in H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, pp. 36–38. Copyright 1941 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

[p. 36] But no one, however much justified, should consider himself exempt from the observance of the commandments; no one should use that rash statement, once forbidden by the Fathers under anathema, that the observance of the commandments of God is impossible for one that is justified. For God does not command impossibilities, but by commanding admonishes thee to do what thou canst and to pray for what thou canst not, and aids thee that thou mayest be able. *His commandments are not heavy*, and *his yoke is sweet and burden* [p. 37] *light*. For they who are the sons of God love Christ, but they who love Him, keep His commandments, as He Himself testifies; which, indeed, with the divine help they can do. For though during this mortal life, men, however holy and just,

fall at times into at least light and daily sins, which are also called venial, they do not on that account cease to be just, for that petition of the just, forgive us our trespasses, is both humble and true; for which reason the just ought to feel themselves the more obliged to walk in the way of justice, for being now freed from sin and made servants of God, they are able, *living soberly*, *justly and godly*, to proceed onward through Jesus Christ, by whom they have access unto this grace. For God does not forsake those who have been once justified by His grace, unless He be first forsaken by them. Wherefore, no one ought to flatter himself with faith alone, thinking that by faith alone he is made an heir and will obtain the inheritance, even though he suffer not with Christ, that he may be also glorified with him. For even Christ Himself, as the Apostle says, whereas he was the Son of God, he learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and being consummated, he became to all who obey him the cause of eternal salvation. For which reason the same Apostle admonishes those justified, saying: Know you not that they who run in the race, all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize? So run that you may obtain. I therefore so run, not as at an uncertainty; I so fight, not as one beating the air, but I chastise my body and bring it into subjection: lest perhaps when I have preached to others. I myself should become a castaway. So also the prince of the Apostles, Peter: Labor the more, that by good works you may make sure your calling and election. For doing these things, you shall not sin at any time. From which it is clear that they are opposed to the orthodox teaching of religion who maintain that the just man sins, venially at least, in every good work; or, what is more intolerable, that he merits eternal punishment; and they also who assert that the just sin in all works, if, in order to arouse [p. 38] their sloth and to encourage themselves to run the race, they, in addition to this, that above all God may be glorified, have in view also the eternal reward, since it is written: I have inclined my heart to do thy justifications on account of the reward; and of Moses the Apostle says; that he looked unto the reward.

520. Confession, Protestant View of

SOURCE: W. Caspari, "Confession of Sins," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 3, p. 221. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

Confession of sins is an acknowledgment of sin, which may be made by a Christian either to God alone, to a fellow Christian, or to one who holds an ecclesiastical office. Confession as an act prescribed or recommended by the Church is made in accordance with the free decision of the individual (voluntary private confession), in compliance with special rules of church training and discipline (confession of catechumens and penitents), and in conformity with general regulations binding on all (a prescribed confession, either of individuals or the congregation as a whole). The present article is confined to the lastnamed form; its end is to attain absolution.

The New Testament knows nothing of confession as a formal institution, Jas. v. 16 referring to the close association with the brethren, although the words of Jesus in Luke v. 20, vii. 48 may be compared to ecclesiastical absolution. Individual confession as a part of ecclesiastical discipline was, of course, customary in ancient times, and also served as a voluntary act of distressed sinner. The confession of sin and proclamation of pardon were likewise customary in the service of the ancient Church. But that confession existed in the earliest time as an established ecclesiastical institution is not proved by such isolated instances as are occasionally met with.

521. Confirmation, Council of Trent Canons on

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VII (March 3, 1547), On the Sacraments, cans. 1, 2, in *Dogmatic Canons* and Decrees, p. 66. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

Canon I. If anyone saith that the confirmation of those who have been baptized is an idle ceremony, and not rather a true and proper sacrament; or that of old it was nothing more than a kind of catechism whereby they who were near adolescence gave an account of their faith in the face of the Church; let him be anathema.

Canon II. If anyone saith that they who ascribe any virtue to the sacred chrism of confirmation offer an outrage to the Holy Ghost; let him be anathema.

522. Constantine, and the Supposed Donation

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 70, 71. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 70] Two mistaken ideas about Constantine must be cleared away. One is that he gave the bishop of Rome sovereignty over the city of Rome and its environs; the other [see No. 1312] is that he made Christianity the established and only legal religion of the empire. Actually he did neither. The first of these fables can be easily disposed of. A document known as the "Donation of Constantine" appeared without previous history in a medieval collection of decretals. It purported to be the original text of an edict by which Constantine transferred to Pope Sylvester absolute sovereignty over Rome and a large territory surrounding it. This seemed plausible enough, for by the time this forged "Donation" was brought to light the popes already had such sovereignty, conferred on the Roman see by [p. 71] Pippin (or Pepin) in the eighth century. In 1440 Laurentius Valla proved conclusively that the Constantine document was a pious fraud and that it had been written several centuries after Constantine's time. Valla's argument was never answered and his conclusion is not now disputed.

523. Constantine, as First Christian Roman Emperor

SOURCE: Arthur E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (4th ed.), pp. 432, 433. Copyright 1955 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

[p. 432] Constantine, the Christian Emperor. By birth and early training Constantine was a pagan. His father, Constantius, was a devotee of the Sun God and Constantine who followed his monotheistic example accepted at first Hercules and later the Sun God as his protective deity. His mother, Helena, in later life a zealous Christian, does not appear to have adopted Christianity before her son. But as we have seen Constantius showed [p. 433] a tolerant attitude towards Christians, and prior to his march on Rome in 312 A.D. Constantine must have become fairly well acquainted with the general doctrines and organization of the Church in his dominions. It is clear that on the eve of the final encounter with Maxentius, he placed both himself and his army under the protection of the Christians' God, and that he was convinced that his victory then and his later success in winning the whole Empire were due to the power and favor of this Divinity. From 312 A.D., he looked upon himself as designated by God to rule the Roman World. And in return for this divine recognition, he felt the obligation to promote the cause of Christianity in all possible ways... Constantine saw in Christianity the religion which could and should provide a spiritual bond among his subjects as well as a moral basis for political loyalty to himself as the elect of God. It is true that as late as 324 A.D. Constantine's coins bore non-Christian devices and legends, that he tolerated the imperial cult and other pagan practices, and continued to bear the title Pontifex Maximus. But this attitude is a tribute to his political astuteness. Even up to the time of his death a majority of his officials, soldiers, and civilian subjects were still pagans. He realized his need of

their support and could not afford to antagonize them too deeply by forcing them to abandon abruptly the ideas and symbols of the past. When, in 321 A.D., he declared Sunday a general holiday he had in mind both Christians and pagans, for while the former celebrated it as "the Lord's Day," the latter could regard it as the "day of the Sun-god." But in calling himself "the bishop of those without" he seems to have regarded himself as responsible for the conversion of the pagan elements and he applied direct and indirect pressure to accomplish this although he did not interfere with private, and in some cases public, practice of pagan rites.

Symbolic of Constantine's acceptance of Christianity was his adoption in 317 A.D. of a new spiritual standard, the Labarum. This was formed by a long-handled cross, having at the upper end a gold wreath enclosing the monogram Chi-Rho, below which from the crossbar hung a square silk cloth with the likeness of Constantine and his two sons, the Caesars. It is true that Constantine only received Christian baptism on his deathbed. But at that time this was not an uncommon practice, and in spite of his declared Christianity it may well be that the emperor, conscious of the wrongs which his violent temper had led him to commit, doubted his ability to fully measure up to the ethical standards that baptism implied.

524. Constantine, Conversion of—Detrimental Effect on Church SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), p. 104. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

The religion of Jesus might have secured a spiritual, rather than a political, victory in the ancient world, but for the so-called conversion of Constantine and his elevation of Christianity by edict as practically the state religion and royal cult with the baneful alliance of throne and altar. This establishment of the State Church and the reinforcement of Caesarism with religious sanctions, which was later carried out more drastically by Theodosius and Justinian, were accompanied by the consequent full equipment of the Church with the sacerdotalism to which the peoples of the Empire, legislated into Christians, had been accustomed and by the external splendours with which a religion purchases popularity.

525. Constantine, Early Religious Legislation of

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 31.

He [Constantine] exempted the Christian clergy from military and municipal duty (March, 313); abolished various customs and ordinances offensive to the Christians (315); facilitated the emancipation of Christian slaves (before 316); legalized bequests to catholic churches (321); enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though not as dies Domini [Lord's day], but as dies Solis [the Sun's day], ... (321).

526. Constantine, Favors of, to Christians

SOURCE: Albert Henry Newman, *A Manual of Church History*, Vol. 1 (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society), pp. 306, 307. Copyright 1933 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 306] The Edict of Milan (313), issued jointly by Constantine and Licinius, proclaimed liberty of conscience and showed partiality for Christianity. His policy at first was not to interfere with pagan worship, but by filling the chief offices with Christians and surrounding himself with Christian teachers to make the condition of Christians enviable...

He ... [p. 307] enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though only as the day of the Sun, and in connection with an ordinance [see No. 528] requiring the consultation of the soothsayer (321)...

As the Roman emperor was Pontifex Maximus of the pagan State religion, he would naturally assume the same relation to Christianity when it became predominant. This headship the gratitude of the Christians heartily accorded. In all of his dealings with Christian matters the supreme motive seems to have been that of securing unity. About doctrinal differences he was almost indifferent. But he dreaded dissension among those on whom he depended for the support of his government.

527. Constantine, Paganism of

SOURCE: Henry Hart Milman, *The History of Christianity* (rev. ed.; London: John Murray, 1867), Vol. 2, pp. 284, 285.

[p. 284] Up to this period [A.D. 312] all that we know of Constantine's religion would imply that he was outwardly, and even zealously, Pagan. In a public oration his panegyrist extols the magnificence of his offerings to the gods. His victorious presence was not merely expected to restore more than their former splendour to the Gaulish cities, ruined by barbaric incursions, but sumptuous temples were to arise at his bidding, to propitiate the deities, particularly Apollo, his tutelary god. [p. 285] The medals struck for these victories are covered with the symbols of Paganism. Eusebius himself admits that Constantine was at this time in doubt which religion he should embrace.

528. Constantine, Paganism of—Soothsayers to Be Consulted

SOURCE: *Theodosian Code* 16.10.1, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 472. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

If it should appear that any part of Our palace or any other public work has been struck by lightning, the observance of the ancient custom shall be retained, and inquiry shall be made of the soothsayers as to the portent thereof. Written records thereof shall be very carefully collected and referred to Our Wisdom. Permission shall be granted to all other persons also to appropriate this custom to themselves, provided only that they abstain from domestic sacrifices, which are specifically prohibited.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This edict, addressed to Maximus, the Prefect of the City of Rome, is recorded as having been received at Rome on March 8, 321, which was, interestingly enough, the day after the issuance of his first Sunday law. However, this decree concerning the soothsayers was actually issued by Constantine in the east (at Serdica, now Sofia) several months before, on Dec. 17, 320.]

529. Constantine, Paganism Retained by, in Transition to New Religion SOURCE: Charles Norris Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), pp. 215, 216. Used by permission.

[p. 215] What he [Constantine] saw in Christianity was simply a talisman by virtue of which *Romanitas* [the Roman political system] would be assured of material prosperity such as official paganism had failed to give it; and, as an uninterrupted series of successes appeared to vindicate this hope, he came more and more to identify the promise of the Evangel with that of the empire and of his own house. It was, indeed, in keeping with the pragmatic spirit of his faith that he should have retained on his coins, at least until middle age, the figures and emblems of the traditional pagan gods and that, while forbidding

⁵Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

divination in general, he should at the same time have specifically sanctioned it 'in the public interest'. Meanwhile, however, he girt himself, so to speak, with the armour of righteousness... These considerations, in themselves, constitute no valid reason for impugning the sincerity of the emperor. But they do most emphatically suggest that his apprehension of Christianity was imperfect. They thus indicate that, whatever his errors, they were merely those of a man who, in the transition to a new [p. 216] world, carried with him a heavy burden of prejudice from the old.

530. Constantine, Sun Worship of

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 20, Vol. 2 (London: Methuen & Co., 1896), p. 291.

But the devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the Sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology... The Sun [see No. 1566] was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine.

531. Constantine, Toleration of—Effect on Christians and Pagans SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), pp. 30, 31.

[p. 30] The Constantinian toleration [of the recently persecuted Christians] opened the door to the elevation of Christianity, and spe- [p. 31] cifically of Catholic hierarchical Christianity, with its exclusiveness towards heretical and schismatic sects, to be the religion of the state. For, once put on equal footing with heathenism, it must soon, in spite of numerical minority, bear away the victory from a religion which had already inwardly outlived itself.

From this time Constantine decidedly favored the church, though without persecuting or forbidding the pagan religions.

532. Constantine, Zeal of, for Increasing Church Membership SOURCE: Constantine, Instruction to the Bishops at the Council of Nicaea, in Eusebius *The Life of Constantine* iii. 21, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 1, p. 526.

Indeed we should do all in our power to save [unbelievers], and this cannot be unless our conduct seems to them attractive. But you are well aware of the fact, that testimony is by no means productive of blessing to all, since some who hear are glad to secure the supply of their mere bodily necessities, while others court the patronage of their superiors; some fix their affection on those who treat them with hospitable kindness, others again, being honored with presents, love their benefactors in return; but few are they who really desire the word of testimony, and rare indeed is it to find a friend of truth. Hence the necessity of endeavoring to meet the case of all and, physician-like, to administer to each that which may tend to the health of the soul, to the end that the saving doctrine may be fully honored by all.

533. Cosmetics, Ancient

SOURCE: R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, Vol. 3 pp. 18–20. Copyright 1955 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands. Used by permission.

[p. 18] Upto [*sic*] the later stages of Egyptian history it was customary to paint the upper eye-lid black with galena and the lower one green. Hence in all texts the black galena is coupled with the green malachite... Both ingredients were found locally in Egypt, but we also hear of imports "from the Asiatics", from Western Asia, "Punt" (Somaliland?) or Coptos.

The Mesopotamian equivalent ... is usually translated "stibium powder", but here again analyses of archaeological finds and records of the mines confirm the use of

stibnite or galena. Accadian texts also mention the occasional use of orpiment or realgar ..., the "yellow eye-paint" which is contrasted with red ochre ..., that was more rarely used...

We can trace the gradual change of these eye-paints from a real remedy and defence against eye-diseases and the flies transmitting them to means of beautifying the eye. The older double and quadruple tubes in which the eye-paints were stored still bear the qualifications [p. 19] "good for the sight" or "to stop bleeding". Later such expressions as "to lay on the lid and the lashes" become more frequent. Then the toxic properties of the ingredients become less important and the colour ranks first. Hence burnt almond shells, soot or manganese dioxyde begin to oust the galena and malachite, which latter ingredient is often replaced in later periods by the green resin from conifera ..., which was also used as an ingredient of incense and unguents. Soot later became the most popular ingredient and it still figures in modern mascara recipes mentioning lampblack, paraffin and petrolatum...

[p. 20] In Egypt lips and cheeks were coloured red with red ochre, often with a lipstick consisting of a reed holding a small piece of ochre at one end. The red colour often applied to the palms of the hand, the soles of the feet, nails and hair was derived from henna (Lawsonia inermis) made into an unguent or paste with oil or fat. The inhabitants of Mesopotamia used red ochre and henna or Asa foetida ..., but their ancestors, the Sumerians seem to have preferred yellow ochre as a face powder ... or also "face bloom" The Egyptians were less liberal with their face powders but pictures show that the ladies of ancient Egypt knew how to use a powder-puff.

534. Creation, As a Unique Period

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 223–224. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 223] But during the period of Creation, God was introducing order and organization and energization into the universe in a very high degree, even to life itself? *It is thus quite plain that the processes used by God in creation were utterly different from the processes which now operate in the universe*! The Creation was a unique period, entirely incommensurate with this present world. This is plainly emphasized and reemphasized in the divine revelation which God has given us concerning Creation, which concludes with these words:

And the heavens and the earth were *finished*, and *all* the host of them. [p. 224] And on the seventh day God *finished* His work which He had made; and He *rested* on the seventh day from *all His work* which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it; because that in it He *rested* from *all* His work which God had created and made.¹ [Note 1: Genesis 2:1–3.

In view of these strong and repeated assertions, is it not the height of presumption for man to attempt to study Creation in terms of present processes?

Here is the basic fallacy of uniformitarianism in geology. It may be fairly reasonable to use the uniformity principle as a key to decipher geologic history that has taken place since the *end* of the Creation. But when it is used, as it actually is, to attempt to deduce the entire history of the Creation itself (calling it "evolution"), it is no longer legitimate. The geologic record may provide much valuable information concerning earth history *subsequent* to the finished Creation (which Creation includes that of "heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is," as summarized in the fourth Commandment in Exodus 20:11), but it can give no information as to the processes or sequences employed by God

during the Creation, since God has plainly said that those processes no longer operate—a fact which is thoroughly verified by the two universal laws of thermo-dynamics!

535. Creation, Biblical and Babylonian Accounts of—Biblical the Original

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 37. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The Babylonian inscriptions and the records of Genesis evidently give us two forms of primitive traditions and facts concerning the beginning of the universe and man. These are not traditions peculiar to Semitic peoples and religions, which have developed out of their common characteristics. They are traditions common to all civilized nations of antiquity. Their common elements point to a time when the human race occupied a common home and held a common faith. Their likenesses are due to a common inheritance, each race of men handing on from age to age records, oral and written, of the primeval history of the race.

Early races of men wherever they wandered took with them these earliest traditions of mankind, and in varying latitudes and climes have modified them according to their religions and mode of thought. Modifications as time proceeded resulted in the corruption of the original pure tradition. The Genesis account is not only the purest, but everywhere bears the unmistakable impress of divine inspiration when compared with the extravagances and corruptions of other accounts. The Biblical narrative, we may conclude, represents the *original form* these traditions must have assumed.

536. Creation, Biblical and Babylonian Accounts of—Resemblance Superficial

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955), pp. 60, 61. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 60] The principal resemblance [between the Babylonian creation account and the Bible] is superficial: the Babylonian epic has seven tables, while the Hebrew account covers seven days of creation; the Babylonian text, like many similar ones, starts with the same formula (also found in the second account of creation, Gen. 2:4*ff*.): When ... then. The cosmological conceptions were also in some respects similar; e.g., all the people of southwestern Asia seem to have believed that there was a great subterranean fresh-water ocean, called *tehôm* by [p. 61] the Hebrews (and by the Jews of rabbinic and mediaeval

times) and *apsu* by the Accadians. Otherwise nothing could be more different from the purely monotheistic Hebrew account, where nothing is superfluous, than the verbose, redundant, crassly mythological Babylonian narrative... It is a little difficult to see how this mythological structure can be connected in any direct way whatsoever with the biblical story.

537. Creation, Defined by Postexilic Judaism and Christianity SOURCE: A. T. Mollegen, "Creation and Fall," in his *The Faith of Christians* (Washington, D.C.: The Organizing Committee, Christianity and Modern Man, 1954), p. 97. Copyright 1954 by A. T. Mollegen. Used by permission.

Creation, as post-Exilic Judaism and Christianity understand it, means that God wills all existence, and it is fundamentally and basically good. Its concreteness; the individuality of human beings; the differentiation of human beings into male and female; bodiliness, physicality; the earth, the rocks, the trees, the water—all this is good. It was brought into being by God out of nothing; and it is maintained in being by God, by his steady expenditure of energy—he supports it and keeps it going by active willing and continuation.

538. Creation—Science Cannot Explain Origins

SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *The Case for Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 18–20. Used by permission of the Macmillan Company and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 18] Ever since men were able to think, they've been wondering what this universe really is and how it came to be there. And, very roughly, two views have been held. First, there is what is called the materialist view. People who take that view think that matter and space just happen to exist, and always have existed, nobody knows why; and that the matter, behaving in certain fixed ways, has just happened, by a sort of fluke, to produce creatures like ourselves who are able to think. By one chance in a thousand something hit our sun and made it produce the planets; and by another thousandth chance the chemicals necessary for life, and the right temperature, arose on one [p. 19] of these planets, and so some of the matter on this earth came alive; and then, by a very long series of chances, the living creatures developed into things like us. The other view is the religious view. According to it, what is behind the universe is more like a mind than it's like anything else we know. That is to say, it's conscious, and has purposes, and prefers one thing to another. And on this view it made the universe, partly for purposes we don't know, but partly, at any rate, in order to produce creatures like itself—I mean, like itself to the extent of having minds. Please don't think that one of these views was held a long time ago and that the other has gradually taken its place. Wherever there have been thinking men both views turn up. And note this too. You can't find out which view is the right one by science in the ordinary sense. Science works by experiments. It watches how things behave. Every scientific statement in the long run, however complicated it looks, really means "I pointed the telescope to such and such a part of the sky at 2.20 A.M. on 15th Januarv and saw so-and-so." or "I put some of this stuff in a pot and heated it to suchand-such a temperature and it did so-and-so." Don't think I'm saying anything against science: I'm only saying what its job is. And the more scientific a man is, the more (I believe) he'd agree with me that this is the job of science-and a very useful and necessary job it is too. But why anything comes to be there at all, and whether there's anything behind the things science observes—something of a different kind—this is not a scientific question. If there is "Something Behind," then either it will have to remain altogether unknown to men or else make itself known in some different way. The statement that there is any such thing, and the statement that there's [p. 20] no such thing, are neither of them statements that science can make. And real scientists don't usually make them. It's usually the journalists and popular novelists who have picked up a few odds and ends of half-baked science from textbooks who go in for them. After all, it's really a matter of common sense. Supposing science ever became complete so that it knew every single thing in the whole universe. Don't you see that the questions "Why is there a universe?" "Why does it go on as it does?" "Has it any meaning?" would remain just as they were?

539. Creation—Science Must Presuppose Creation at the Beginning SOURCE: George S. Hendry, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press), p. 59. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

There can be no conflict between Christian faith and scientific theory if this difference is properly understood. All attempts to account for the origin of the world on the basis of scientific inquiry can only presuppose creation; for science operates with the

data of experience, and being created cannot be an object of experience, since it is the precondition of all our experience. Creation lies beyond the limits of human inquiry, at the point where faith apprehends God. Inquiry into origins is bound to seek them within existence, since the human mind cannot think the thought of any condition of existence which is without an antecedently existing condition. And thus, though scientific inquiry may succeed in tracing the existence of the world back to a condition, the antecedent condition of which cannot be ascertained, this is not creation. Creation signifies the absolute beginning of existence. The Biblical statement that "in the beginning God

created" has been rendered in the formula, "creation out of nothing" (*creatio ex nihilo*), which is meant to distinguish it from any idea that God brought the world into existence by giving form to some previously existing but unformed matter, or, perhaps, that he generated it from the substance of his own being. Whenever we speak of any human artist or craftsman as creating, it is always in this sense; for no human being can create except he have some material to create with, whether it be sticks or stones or words or colors or tones. But when God created the world, he did not create it out of *something;* for before the world was brought into existence, there was *nothing*, i.e., nothing but God himself.

540. Creed, The Apostles'

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 45.

I believe in GOD THE FATHER Almighty; Maker of heaven and earth. And in JESUS CHRIST his only (begotten) Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell [Hades, spirit-world]; the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into heaven; and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the HOLY GHOST; the holy catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body [flesh]; and the life everlasting. Amen.

541. Creed, the Athanasian

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 66-70.

- [p. 66] 1. Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith:
- 2. Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.
- 3. And the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity;
- 4. Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance [Essence].
- 5. For there is one Person of the Father: another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost.
- 6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty coeternal.
- 7. Such as the Father is: such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost.
- 8. The Father uncreate [uncreated]: the Son uncreate [uncreated]: and the Holy Ghost uncreate [uncreated].
- 9. The Father incomprehensible [unlimited]: the Son incomprehensible [unlimited]: and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible [unlimited, or infinite].
- [p. 67] 10. The Father eternal: the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal.
- 11. And yet they are not three eternals: but one eternal.

- 12. As also there are not three uncreated: nor three incomprehensibles [infinites], but one uncreated: and one incomprehensible [infinite].
- 13. So likewise the Father is Almighty: the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty.
- 14. And yet they are not three Almighties: but one Almighty.
- 15. So the Father is God: the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God. [EDITORS' NOTE: Bracketed insertions are in Schaff's edition.]
- 16. And yet they are not three Gods: but one God.
- 17. So likewise the Father is Lord: the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord.
- 18. And yet not three Lords: but one Lord.
- 19. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord:
- 20. So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion: to say, There be [are] three Gods, or three Lords.
- 21. The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.
- 22. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created: but begotten.
- [p. 68] 23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten: but proceeding.
- 24. So there is one Father, not three Fathers: one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.
- 25. And in this Trinity none is afore, or after another: none is greater, or less than another [there is nothing before, or after: nothing greater or less].
- 26. But the whole three Persons are coeternal, and coequal.
- 27. So that in all things, as aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshiped.
- 28. He therefore that will be saved, must [let him] thus think of the Trinity.
- 29. Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly [faithfully] the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.
- 30. For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man;
- 31. God, of the Substance [Essence] of the Father; begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance [Essence] of his Mother, born in the world.
- [p. 69] 32. Perfect God: and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.
- 33. Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead: and inferior to the Father as touching his Manhood.
- 34. Who although he be [is] God and Man; yet he is not two, but one Christ.
- 35. One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking [assumption] of the Manhood into God.
- 36. One altogether; not by confusion of Substance [Essence]: but by unity of Person.
- 37. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ;
- 38. Who suffered for our salvation: descended into hell [Hades, spirit-world]: rose again the third day from the dead.
- 39. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father God [God the Father] Almighty.
- 40. From whence [thence] he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
- 41. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies;
- 42. And shall give account for their own works.

- [p. 70] 43. And they that have done good shall go into the life everlasting: and they that have done evil, into everlasting fire.
- 44. This is the Catholic Faith: which except a man believe faithfully [truly and firmly], he can not be saved.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Bracketed insertions are in Schaff's edition.]

542. Creeds, Early, Bear Marks of Free Handling

SOURCE: William A. Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith* (New York: Scribner, 1912), pp. 406, 407. Used by permission of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[p. 406] Thus by the end of the seventh century the so-called Catholic or Oecumenical Creeds had assumed the forms in which they have come down to us. Sacred as the Church has deemed them, and highly as it has valued them as bonds of unity and defences of the Faith, they bear the marks of free handling, and became occasions of dissension. Their very titles reveal a certain wilfulness and pretension in their adoption. The *Apostles' Creed* is not the Creed of the Apostles: the *Nicene Creed* is not the Creed of Nicaea but the Creed of Constantinople, based on the Creed of Jerusalem, reinforced by elements from Nicaea, Chalcedon, and Toledo: the *Athanasian Creed* is not the Creed of Athanasius, but the anonymous composition of Gallic orthodoxy at least a century later than the champion of the Nicene Faith. Nor is one of them in its current form strictly Catholic or Oecumenical, for the Greek Orthodox Church gives no dogmatic sanction to

the *Quicunque Vult*, the *Apostles' Creed*, or the *Te Deum*, and denounces the form of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed which is current in the West, while in the Churches beyond the Greek and Roman pale there is every conceivable variety of attitude towards each and all of them. The application to them, therefore, of the title of catholicity and oecumenicity, involves a similar kind, though not perhaps an equal degree, of pious exaggeration to that which is inherent in [p. 407] its use in the official designations of the great Churches of the East and West.

543. Cross, Sign of, in Catholic Practice

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Cathechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th eds.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1913), p. 101.

- 480. Why is the sign of the cross so very beneficial and efficacious? The sign of the cross is so very beneficial and efficacious
- 1) because it drives away the devil who fears the cross,
- because by it we obtain many graces and blessings from God. Hence to '*bless oneself*' means to make the sign of the cross.
- 481. When should we particularly make the sign of the cross? We should particularly make the sign of the cross.
- 1) in the morning on awakening and in the evening when retiring,
- 2) before and after prayer,
- 3) when tempted, especially by bad thoughts,
- 4) in all dangers,
- 5) before undertaking anything important...
- 482. When in particular is the sign of the cross efficacious?

The sign of the cross is particularly efficacious when a bishop or priest, in the name of the Church, makes it over persons or things; because thereby they are blessed and made holy.

544. Cyrus, as Conqueror Before Taking Babylon

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 34–40, 45, 48, 49. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

[p. 34] In 559 this Cyrus II became vassal king in Anshan and ruled [under Media] from his open capital Parsagarda.

Shut off from the hot, unhealthy coastal plain by mountains through which wound tortuous trails, the high plateau of Parsa was well fitted to retain the old Iranian fighting spirit. Scorning a master [Astyages] so weakened by luxury, Cyrus plotted revolt. His own tribe of the Pasargadae could be depended upon, for his family, the Achaemenidae, provided its rulers. With it were associated two other Persian tribes, the Maraphii and the Maspii. To these were added still other Persian tribes...

[p. 35] Now that the Persians were all united under his rule, Cyrus looked about for an ally against Media among the other great powers. The nearest as well as the most logical was Babylonia...

[p. 36] In this hope, Nabu-naid made alliance with Cyrus, who thereupon openly rebelled against Media. To fulfil his part of the agreement, [p. 37] Nabu-naid promptly levied an army against the "rebels" who lived in the countries once held by Nebuchadnezzar...

Astyages did send out against his rebellious vassal an army under Harpagus, but he had forgotten how he had cruelly slain that general's son; Harpagus did not forget and promptly deserted to Cyrus, bringing over with him most of his soldiers. A second army, commanded by Astyages in person, reached the capital of Parsa; here it mutinied, seized its king, and handed him over to Cyrus. Ecbatana was captured, and its wealth of gold, silver, and precious objects was carried off to Anshan (550).

Media ceased to be an independent nation and became the first satrapy, Mada. Nevertheless, the close relationship between Persians and Medes was never forgotten. Plundered Ecbatana remained a favorite royal residence. Medes were honored equally with Persians; they were employed in high office and were chosen to lead Persian armies. Foreigners spoke regularly of the Medes and Persians; when they used a single term, it was "the Mede."

By his conquest of the Median Empire, Cyrus had taken over the Median claims to rule over Assyria, Mesopotamia, Syria, Armenia, and Cappadocia...

[p. 38] On news that his Median ally had been dethroned, Croesus of Lydia hastily collected his levies and crossed the former Halys boundary to pick up remnants of the empire. Cyrus, who had just revived the title "king of Parsa," felt this a challenge to his own pretensions, and in April, 547, he set out from looted Ecbatana to meet the invader. After he had traversed the pass, high above the city, his road wound steadily downward until he reached the main line of the Zagros at the "Gate of Asia." Beyond the "Gate," the descent was even more [p. 39] rapid. The cold air suddenly became warmer, the poplars, cypresses, and plane trees of the plateau gave way to a few palms, and Cyrus was on the edge of the great Mesopotamian plains.

Cyrus might easily have turned south against Babylon, had not the skill of Nebuchadnezzar's engineers formed that city and its surroundings into the world's mightiest fortress. Wisely he postponed the assault and marched north into Assyria, already a Median dependency and therefore prepared to accept him without question. Arbela, for so many centuries overshadowed by Ashur and Nineveh, regained its prestige as the new capital of Athura. Cyrus crossed the Tigris below Arbela, and Ashur fell; the gods of Ashur and Nineveh were saved only through refuge behind the walls of Babylon...

By May, Cyrus was ready to proceed against Croesus. The Great Road was again followed through North Syria, which also was detached from Nabu-naid's recent empire, and into Cilicia; on their own initiative, the hitherto independent Cilicians accepted Persian vassalage and as reward were permitted to retain their native kings, who regularly bore the name Syennesis. Through the Cilician Gates the army entered Cappadocia, which was organized as another satrapy, Katpatuka. At the same time, presumably, Armenia received Cyrus as successor to Astyages and henceforth was the satrapy of Armina.

After an indecisive battle in the land of Pteria, the country about the recently excavated Alaca Huyuk, Croesus retired to Sardis...

[p. 40] After but fourteen days of siege, the supposedly impregnable acropolis of Sardis was scaled and Croesus made prisoner (547).

"In May he marched to the land of Lydia. He killed its king. He took its booty. He placed in it his own garrison. Afterward his garrison and the king were in it." Such was the official report given by Cyrus. In actual fact, Croesus followed oriental custom and immolated himself to escape the usual indignities heaped upon a captured monarch before he was put to death...

[p. 45] Now that Nabu-naid had made his alliance with Croesus, Cyrus might continue openly his whittling-away of the Babylonian territory. On his return from Sardis, we should expect, he would take over the remaining portions of Syria yet held by Nabu-naid's soldiers and perhaps demand some expression of loyalty from the Arabs along the border. If Tema was threatened by these operations, this would be one reason why sometime after 545 Nabu-naid reappeared in Babylon...

Meanwhile, Cyrus himself had turned his attention to the as yet unsubdued Iranians of the eastern half of the plateau...

[p. 48] From Bactria, the most eastern of the truly Iranian lands, Cyrus looked across the boundary river, the Cophen, into the territory of their cousins, the Indians...

[p. 49] By these conquests Cyrus doubled the extent, though not the population or the wealth, of his empire. He was strengthened by so enormous an access of fighting men that at last he might venture to attack even Babylon. The natives were ready to welcome any deliverer, foreigner though he might be. By his archaizing reforms, Nabu-naid had alienated the priesthood of Marduk, at whose expense these reforms had been made. Other priests were dissatisfied. Jewish prophets were predicting Babylon's fall and hailing Cyrus as the Lord's Anointed who would grant return to Zion. The whole land was in chaos.

The way thus paved by the disaffected elements of the population, Cyrus made ready to envade the alluvium as soon as he had returned from his eastern campaigns. Before the snows of the winter of 540–539 could fill the passes, he was on the border [of Babylonia].

545. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Vol. 2 (6th ed., rev.; New York: Abingdon, 1915), pp. 573, 574.

[p. 573] When Cyrus reached the city of Upi [Opis] the army of Accad opposed his advance, but whether Bel-shar-usur [Belshazzar], who had commanded it, was now in the van does not appear. The opposition was in vain, and Cyrus drove it before him and

moved southward resistlessly. Sippar was taken, without a blow, ... and Nabonidus fled. Two days later the van of the army of Cyrus entered Babylon, as the gates swung open without resistance to admit it. Cyrus himself was not in command, but had remained in the background while Ugbaru (Gobryas), governor of Gutium, led the advance. Nabonidus was taken in the city, whither he had fled from Sippar...

[p. 574] On the third day of Marcheshwan Cyrus held entry into the city. It was a triumphal entrance, and all Babylon greeted him with plaudits and hailed him as a deliverer. So fickle was the populace, so ready to say, "The king is dead; long live the king."

546. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon According to Cyrus' Account (Cyrus Cylinder)

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 175–178.

[p. 175] Another cuneiform document dealing in a general way with the close of Nabonidus' reign and the establishment of Persian rule in Babylonia is known as the *Cyrus Cylinder*. [Transliterated cuneiform texts, which precede each translated quotation, omitted.] ... [p. 176] (1) *Cyrus Chosen as Universal Ruler*

^{11b} The totality of all lands he (Marduk) surveyed (and) inspected. ¹² He sought a righteous prince according to his heart's desire who would grasp his hands. Cyrus, the king of Anshan, whose name he uttered, he proclaimed for lordship over everything. ¹³ The land of Kutha, the totality of the Umman-Manda he subdued to his feet. The black-headed people, whom he allowed to approach his hands, ¹⁴ he was mindful of in truth and righteousness. Marduk, the great lord, the protector of his people, looked joyfully upon his pious deeds and his righteous heart. ¹⁵ He decreed his march upon his city, Babylon, and caused him to take the road to Babylon. Like a friend and companion he went by his side.

(2) Babylon's Submission to Cyrus

¹⁶ His widespread troops, whose number like the waters of a river is not known, put on their weapons and advanced at his side. ¹⁷ Without encounter and battle he caused him to enter into the midst of Babylon, his city. He saved Babylon from need. Nabonidus, the king who did not venerate him (Marduk) he (Marduk) delivered into his hands (*i.e.* the hands of Cyrus). [p. 177] ¹⁸ All the people of Babylon, the totality of the land of Sumer and Akkad, the princes and governors prostrated themselves unto him (and) kissed his feet. They rejoiced in his sovereignty (and) their countenances shone. ¹⁹ The lord (*i.e.* Cyrus), who through his

might brought the dead to life (and) through destruction and pa-ki-e protected all, they served gladly (and) revered his name...

The rest of the inscription is in the first person with Cyrus as spokesman. He begins with the usual formula, viz., 'I (am) Cyrus, the king of totality, the great king, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the king of Sumer and Akkad, the king of the four quarters (of the world),' etc. This is followed by a passage recounting some of the benefits which accrued from Cyrus' assumption of authority:

(3) Cyrus' Interest in Babylon's Welfare

^{22b} When I had entered into the midst of Babylon is mediate ²³ I took the seat of lordship in the palace of princes amidst jubilation and rejoicing. Marduk, the great lord, the receptive heart of the inhabitants of Babylon..., while I daily attended to his worship. ²⁴ My numerous troops advanced peacefully into the midst of Babylon. I did not permit an enemy [178] in all the land of Sumer and Akkad. ²⁵ The inner part of Babylon and all its cities I cared for in peace; the inhabitants of Babylon.... [I freed] from a yoke which was not fitting. (Asto) their dwellings, ²⁶ I repaired their dilapidation; I removed their ruins. Marduk, the lord, rejoiced on account of my deeds. ²⁷ Unto me, Cyrus, the king who venerates him, and Cambyses, the son (and) offspring of my heart, and unto the totality of my troops ²⁸ he was graciously favorable; in peace before it we gladly praise his lofty divinity...

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines in the cuneiform original.]

547. Cyrus.—Capture of Babylon, Babylonian Record of (Nabonidus Chronicle)

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researchers, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 168–173.

[p. 168] Babylonian literature, as recovered thus far, provides no minute record of the events connected with the capture of Babylon by Cyrus. The *Nabonidus Chronicle* contains the most lengthy cuneiform account of the occurrences which preceded and accompanied the fall of the city. However, the statements in this narrative are so brief that most details are left to the imagination... The sections of the *Nabonidus Chronicle* dealing with the fall of Babylon will now be considered.

(1) New Year's Festival Observed

All authorities agree that the passage about to be quoted represents the beginning of the record of the seventeenth year of Nabonidus' reign. It is highly probable that line 5 began with the words *Sattu 17^{kam}*, 'In the seventeenth year.' The text proceeds thus [transliterated cuneiform text omitted here]:

[p. 169] ⁵ [In the seventeenth year] Nabû came from Borsippa to meet... ⁶... The king entered Eturkalamma... ⁷... The abundance of wine was ample among the [troops]... ⁸... Bêl went forth. They kept the New Year's festival as is right. In the month... ⁹... [the gods] of Maradda, Zababa (Ilbaba) and the gods of Kish, Ninlil, [and the gods of] ¹⁰ Harsagkalamma entered Babylon. Until the end of Elul the gods of Akkad..., ¹¹ who were above the earth and below the earth, entered Babylon. The gods of Borsippa, Kutha... ^{12a} and Sippar did not enter [Babylon].

The above passage contains the only intimation in extant cuneiform literature of Nabonidus' presence in Babylon after his stay at $T \Box mf$ in Arabia. The *Nabonidus Chronicle* asserts that the New Year's festival was neglected in the seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh years on account of Nabonidus' absence from Babylon. His return is indicated in the record of the seventeenth year. Because of his presence in the capital the proper observance of the New Year's festival could take place...

(2) Opis Attacked by Cyrus

In the march of Cyrus' army against Babylon the only real battle of the campaign was fought at Opis [transliteration omitted]:

^{12b}, ¹³ In the month Tishri, when Cyrus fought at Opis on the Tigris river [p. 170] against the troops of Akkad, the people of Akkad ^{14a} he destroyed by means of a conflagration; he put the people to death. (3) Sippar Captured by Cyrus

The account of the capture of Sippar is in the form of a mere statement by the chronicler [transliteration omitted]:

^{14b} On the fourteenth day Sippar was captured without fighting. ^{15a} Nabonidus fled.

(4) Gobryas in Babylon

Babylon fell without a drastic struggle into the hands of Gobryas, the main general of Cyrus [transliteration omitted]:

^{15b} On the sixteenth day of Ugbaru (Gobryas), the governor of Gutium, and the troops of Cyrus without fighting ¹⁶ entered Babylon. Afterwards when Nabonidus returned he was taken captive in Babylon. Until the end of the month the shields ¹⁷, ^{18a} of Gutium surrounded the gates of Esagila. No one's weapon was placed in Esagila or the sanctuaries, and no appointed time was disregarded...

[p. 171] The reference to the fact that the temple Esagila and the other sanctuaries of the city were kept inviolate indicates that the invaders maintained a punctilious regard for the religious scruples of the Babylonians. There was no tendency to run counter to any of the pious customs of those who were called upon to acclaim the new regime. Every impulse which was sacred in the eyes of the people was allowed its due expression. [p. 172] (5) *Cyrus in Babylon*

Cyrus entered Babylon in peace. He reorganized the city politically and restored the religious order of the land [transliteration omitted]:

^{18b} In the month Marchesvan, the third day, Cyrus entered Babylon. ¹⁹, ²⁰ Harinê were carried before him. Peace was established in the city; Cyrus decreed peace for all in Babylon. Gobryas [Gubaru], his governor, placed governors in charge of Babylon. ²¹ From the month Kislev to the month Adar, the gods whom Nabonidus had brought up to Babylon... ^{22a} they returned to their cities.

It should be noted that the entry of Cyrus into Babylon did not take place until seventeen days after the military occupation of the city had been achieved by Gobryas. There had been sufficient time for adjustment to the new situation. If there was a faction in the city which failed to sympathize with Cyrus' aims it was effectually quelled. The Persian king was welcomed by the Babylonians. He reciprocated by proclaiming peace to all in the city. Systematic political control was established under the direction of Gobryas, and the religious policy of Nabonidus was reversed by returning to their proper cities those gods which had been brought to Babylon.

(6) Death and Lamentation

The joyful acclamation of Cyrus by the Babylonians was followed quickly by the death of a prominent personage and a period of mourning [transliteration omitted]:

[p. 173] ^{22b} In the month Marchesvan, on the night of the eleventh, Ugbaru (Gobryas) died. In the month. ²³ ... of the king died. From the twenty-eighth day of the month Adar to the third day of the month Nisan there was weeping in the land of Akkad...^{24a} All the people prostrated their heads.

The original text indicates the 28th day in line 23 instead of the 27th. Several fragmentary lines follow, with an indefinite reference to Cambyses, the son of Cyrus. It seems that Cambyses participated in a New Year's temple ceremony which took place on the fourth day of the month Nisan.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures in the translated text indicate lines of the original. Bracketed words in the text (except [Gubaru] in sec. 5) are in the original. For Ugbaru and Gubaru see *SDACom* 4:816.]

548. Cyrus.—Capture of Babylon by Diverting Euphrates (Greek Account)

SOURCE: Xenophon *Cyropaedia* vii. 5. 10, 13, 15, 16, 26–30; translated by Walter Miller, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943), pp. 265, 267, 269, 271, 273. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 265] 10. Accordingly, he took measurements in a circle round about the city, leaving just enough room by the river for the erection of large towers, and began [p. 267] on either side of the city to dig an immense trench; and the earth from it they threw up on their own side of the ditch. 11. First of all, he began to build towers by the river, laying his foundations with the trunks of date-palms not less than a hundred feet long—and they grow even taller than that. And they were good material for this purpose, for it is a well known fact that date-palms, when under heavy pressure, bend upward like the backs of pack-asses. 12. These he used as "mud-sills," in order that, even if the river should break into his trench above, it might not carry his towers away. And he erected many other towers besides upon the breast-works of earth, so that he might have as many watch-towers as possible.

13. Thus, then, his men were em-employed, while the enemy upon the walls laughed his siege-works to scorn, in the belief that they had provisions enough for more than twenty years.

Upon hearing of this, Cyrus divided his army into twelve parts as if intending each part to be responsible for sentry duty during one month of each year...

15. At last the ditches were completed. Then, when he heard that a certain festival had come round in Babylon, during which all Babylon was accustomed to drink and revel all night long, Cyrus took a large number of men, just as soon as it was dark, and [p. 269] opened up the heads of the trenches at the river. 16. As soon as that was done, the water flowed down through the ditches in the night, and the bed of the river, where it traversed the city, became passable for men...

... They advanced. And of those they met on the way, some fell by [p. 271] 26. their swords, some fled back into their houses, some shouted to them; and Gobryas and his men shouted [p. 273] back to the, as if they were fellow-revellers. They advanced as fast as they could and were soon at the palace. 27. And Gobryas and Gadatas and their troops found the gates leading to the palace locked, and those who had been appointed to attack the guard fell upon them as they were drinking by a blazing fire, and without waiting they dealt with them as with foes. 28. But, as a noise and tumult ensued, those within heard the uproar, and at the king's command to see what the matter was, some of them opened the gates and ran out. 29. And when Gadatas and his men saw the gates open they dashed in in pursuit of the others as they fled back into the palace, and dealing blows right and left they came into the presence of the king; and they found him already risen with his dagger in his hand. 30. And Gadatas and Gobryas and their followers overpowered him; and those about the king perished also, one where he had sought some shelter, another while running away, another while actually trying to defend himself with whatever he could.

31. Cyrus then sent the companies of cavalry around through the streets and gave them orders to cut down all whom they found out of doors.

549. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon by Drawing Off the Euphrates (Greek Account)

SOURCE: *Herodotus* 1. 191; translated by A. D. Godley, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946), pp. 239, 241. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 239] He [Cyrus] posted his army at the place where the river enters the city, and another part of it where the stream issues from the city, and bade his men enter the city by the channel of the Euphrates when they should see it to be fordable. Having so arrayed them and given this command, he himself marched away with those of his army who could not fight; and when he came to the lake, Cyrus dealt with it and with the river just as had the Babylonian queen: drawing off the river by a canal into the lake, which was till now a marsh, he made the stream to sink till its former channel could be forded. When this happened, the Persians who were posted with this intent made their way into Babylon by the channel of the Euphrates, which had now sunk about to the height of the middle of a man's thigh. Now if the Babylonians had known beforehand or learnt what Cyrus was planning, they would have suffered the Persians to enter the city and brought them to a miserable end; for then they would have shut all the gates that opened on the river and themselves mounted up on to the walls that ran along the river [p. 241] banks, and so caught their enemies as in a trap. But as it was, the Persians were upon them unawares, and by reason of the great size of the city—so say those who dwell there—those in the outer parts of it were overcome, yet the dwellers in the middle part knew nothing of it; all this time they were dancing and making merry at a festival which chanced to be toward, till they learnt the truth but too well.

[EDITORS' NOTE: No mention of this is made in the inscriptions; but there is no reason why Cyrus should not have had recourse to this means of entry. The tablets, it must be remembered, were written by

the priestly scribes to magnify the part of Marduk in leading Cyrus into Babylon, and in the interests of Cyrus, to publish to the world how gladly he was welcomed by the people. It would be perfectly in keeping with their style of history to omit reference to the draining of the river. On the other hand, both Herodotus and Xenophon may have gathered information from Babylonian sources. The descriptions of Babylon given by Herodotus, except for the size of the city, have been generally verified by modern excavations, showing that he is a credible authority. These accounts of the draining of the Euphrates by Cyrus are not discredited by the omission of such reference in the tablets. All this may be covered by the statements of both tablets that Cyrus entered without battle; and it would be in harmony with their plan, for the glorification of Cyrus as the chosen deliverer of Marduk's shrine and people, to omit reference to any street fighting after Cyrus' army entered, though they preserve the essential story of the attack upon the citadel.]

550. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon Followed by Peaceful Change of Government

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 50, 51. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

[p. 50] Near the beginning of October, Cyrus fought another battle at Opis on the Tigris and burned the people of Akkad with fire. After this example of frightfulness, his opponents lost courage and on October 11 Sippar was taken without a battle. Nabu-naid [Nabonidus] fled, and on October 13, 539, Gobryas [Ugbaru], governor of Gutium, and the troops of Cyrus entered Babylon without battle. Afterward, when Nabunaid returned to Babylon, he was made prisoner.

The last tablet dated by Nabu-naid is from October 14, the day after Gobryas had captured Babylon, but it was written at Uruk, to which the welcome news had not yet penetrated. In the capital itself business went on as usual, for contemporaries had no realization that with the fall of Babylon an era had come to an end and another had begun. By October 26 at the latest, the scribes were dating by the new ruler as "king of lands." This remained the official titulary during the remainder of the "accession year" and for a part of the first full year of reign.

Babylon was well treated by Gobryas. Until the end of October, the "shields" of Gutium surrounded the gates of Esagila. No man's weapon was set up in Esagila or in the other temples and no appointed ceremony was omitted. On October 29 Cyrus himself entered Babylon. [p. 51] Branches were spread in his path, and he proclaimed peace to everyone in the city. Gobryas [Gubaru] was made satrap of the new province of Babirush [Babylonia], and he appointed subordinate officials; the administrative documents show us that, as a rule, the former officials were retained at their posts.

551. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon, Results of

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 167, 168.

[p. 167] Cyrus' capture of Babylon brought about far-reaching consequences. Its subjugation by Sennacherib and Ashurbanipal had not removed the balance of power from Semitic control, but the triumph of Persia in 539 B.C. introduced a new predominating influence in ancient Oriental developments. That date marks the turning-point in favor of Aryan leadership, a directing force which has maintained itself at the forefront of civilization down to the present day. The victories of Cyrus culminating in Babylon's inclusion in the Persian empire laid the foundation for later historical developments. It is probable that Greek and Roman conquests in the East would have resulted even if domination by Persia had not prepared the way, but the fact remains that Cyrus assumed the rôle [p. 168] of arbiter in Oriental affairs two centuries before the time

of Alexander. For this reason events connected with the fall of Babylon in 539 B.C. merit careful study.

552. Cyrus—Decree for Return of Jews Fulfills Prophecy SOURCE: Ira Maurice Price and others, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, pp. 313, 316, 317. Copyright 1958 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 313] When Babylon fell into the hands of Cyrus, he became ruler of the political, commercial, cultural, and religious center of the world. Cyrus assumed the responsibility of administering its government, of satisfying its diverse population, and of keeping peace with the rest of the territory that he had conquered. The inauguration of this new liberal policy was an epoch in the history of southwestern Asia...

[p. 316] Cyrus inaugurated a policy of generosity toward his new subjects, ... to promote in every way their welfare. As a wise statesman, a shrewd politician, and a kindhearted ruler, he planned methods by which he could better the condition of his peoples. He was ready to espouse their cause almost to the peril of his throne. He revered their gods, and where they had been neglected or desecrated, he was solicitous for their restoration to their [p. 317] former shrines and veneration. Babylon and all its precincts bore evidences of his spirit in the rebuilding and rededicating of many shrines and temples. His own appeals to the gods and his avowed support of them reveal Cyrus as a polytheist of a pronounced type.

It was not a matter of monotheism or of a possible Zoroastrianism that called his attention to the Jews, but other reasons of no mean importance: (1) In addition to the restoration and rehabilitation of captive and dethroned deities, he says "All of their peoples I assembled and restored to their own dwelling places." This definitely stated national policy gives us one reason for the royal proclamation (Ezra 1:2–4) issued in favor of the Jews. (2) It is altogether probable that Cyrus caught up from someone in Babylonia the mission which had been assigned him by the prophets:

"Who says of Cyrus, 'He is my shepherd, and he shall fulfill all my purpose'; saying of Jerusalem, 'She shall be built,' and of the temple, 'Your foundation shall be laid'" (Isa. 44:28).

(3) Palestine had been from time immemorial a buffer state between southwestern Asia and Egypt. To occupy and hold the strong fortress of Jerusalem was the first step toward the conquest of the rival power. If Cyrus could secure that advantage by aiding the Jews to rebuild and hold it, he would be setting up one battlement in the face of Egypt's army.

553. Cyrus, Isaiah's Prophecy Read by (Josephus' Account) SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* xi. 1. 2.; translated by Ralph Marcus, Vol. 6 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 315, 317. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 315] These things [that he was to return the Jews to Jerusalem] Cyrus knew from reading the book of prophecy which Isaiah had left behind two hundred and ten years earlier. For this prophet had [p. 317] said that God told him in secret, "It is my will that Cyrus, whom I shall have appointed king of many great nations, shall send my people to their own land and build my temple." Isaiah prophesied these things one hundred and forty years [see No. 250n] before the temple was demolished. And so, when Cyrus read them, he wondered at the divine power and was seized by a strong desire and ambition to do what had been written; and, summoning the most distinguished of the Jews in Babylon, he told them that he gave them leave to journey to their native land and to

rebuild both the city of Jerusalem and the temple of God, for God, he said, would be their ally and he himself would write to his own governors and satraps who were in the neighbourhood of their country to give them contributions of gold and silver for the building of the temple and, in addition, animals for the sacrifices.

554. Cyrus, Peoples and Gods Restored to Their Homes by, According to the Cvrus Cvlinder

SOURCE: The Cyrus Cylinder, trans. in Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), p. 178. ^{30b} From ... unto Ashur and Susa, ³¹ Agade, Eshnunak, Zamban, Me-Turnu (and)

³⁰⁰ From ... unto Ashur and Susa, ³¹ Agade, Eshnunak, Zamban, Me-Turnu (and) D \Box r including the district of Kutha, the cities beyond the Tigris, whose settlements were established of old, ³²I returned unto their (proper) place the gods who dwelt in them and established (them in) an eternal habitation. All their peoples I assembled and restored (to) their dwellings. ³³And the gods of the land of Sumer and Akkad, whom Nabonidus to the rage of the lord of the gods brought into Babylon, at the command of Marduk, the great lord, unmolested ³⁴I caused to reside in their dwellings, an abiding-place of joy to the heart.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Superior figures represent the lines in the original inscription.]

555. Daniel, as "Third Ruler" in the Kingdom

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 196, 197.

[p. 196] Although Nabonidus was not present in the imperial capital when it yielded to the troops of Cyrus, he was still *regarded as the king of Babylon*. In fact there were those of his subjects who looked upon him as their sovereign until the second month after Babylon fell. Even if it cannot be substantiated by present data derived from cuneiform sources, there is no reason for doubting, while awaiting further evidence, that Belshazzar was acting as coregent when Babylon was captured. On this assumption there were two sovereigns in the kingdom at that time. Nabonidus was the titular head of the nation, but Belshazzar who had been delegated with royal authority by his father, was the second ruler [see No. 213]. The fifth chapter of Daniel is in remarkable harmony with such a state of affairs. It describes a situation in which a man meriting royal favor could be rewarded by being made the third ruler in the kingdom. Different views have been expressed as to the meaning of the phrase 'the third ruler in the [p. 197] kingdom.' The most rational procedure is to interpret it in the light of known circumstances. Cuneiform records have demonstrated conclusively that Nabonidus and Belshazzar functioned as two rulers during most of the former's reign, and there is no positive evidence that this political arrangement did not last until the final days of the Neo-Babylonian empire. That the account in Daniel takes cognizance of this, although not mentioning Nabonidus, may be regarded as indicating a true historical basis for the narrative.⁶⁵⁴ [Note 654: It is clear that Nabonidus was looked upon as the first ruler in the nation and that Belshazzar was regarded as the second. The interpreter of the dream in the fifth chapter of Daniel was given third place in the kingdom... Historical parallels to dual rulership are not wanting.]

556. Daniel, Book of—Accuracy of Daniel 5 SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 199, 200.

[p. 199] The foregoing summary of information concerning Belshazzar, when judged in the light of data obtained from the texts discussed in this monograph, indicates that of all non-Babylonian records dealing with the situation at the close of the Neo-Babylonian empire the [p. 200] fifth chapter of Daniel ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy so far as outstanding events are concerned. The Scriptural account may be interpreted as excelling because it employs the name Belshazzar, because it attributes royal power to Belshazzar, and because it recognizes that a dual rulership existed in the kingdom. Babylonian cuneiform documents of the sixth century B.C. furnish clear-cut evidence of the correctness of these three basic historical nuclei contained in the Biblical narrative dealing with the fall of Babylon. Cuneiform texts written under Persian influence in the sixth century B.C. have not preserved the name Belshazzar, but his r"le as a crown prince entrusted with royal power during Nabonidus' stay in Arabia is depicted convincingly. Two famous Greek historians of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. do not mention Belshazzar by name and hint only vaguely at the actual political situation which existed in the time of Nabonidus. Annals in the Greek language ranging from about the beginning of the third century B.C. to the first century B.C. are absolutely silent concerning Belshazzar and the prominence which he had during the last reign of the Neo-Babylonian empire. The total information found in all available chronologically-fixed documents later than the cuneiform texts of the sixth century B.C. and prior to the writings of Josephus of the first century A.D. could not have provided the necessary material for the historical framework of the fifth chapter of Daniel.⁶⁷¹

[Note 671:] The view that the fifth chapter of Daniel originated in the Maccabaean age is discredited. Biblical critics have pushed back its date to the third century B.C. See Montgomery, *op. cit.*, [J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*], p. 96, on the dating of Daniel 1–6. However, a narrative characterized by such an accurate historical perspective as Daniel 5 ought to be entitled to a place much nearer in time to the reliable documents which belong to the general epoch with which it deals.

557. Daniel, Book of, Difficulties of "Antiochus View" of Daniel's Fourth Kingdom, Pointed Out by Advocate of "Greek View" SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff:

University of Wales Press Board, 1935, Second Impression 1959), pp. 91, 92. Used by permission.

[p. 91] Most of those who in modern times hold the Greek view ["Grecia" as the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2 and 7] adopt the further view that the author—or the interpolator of these chapters—lived in the time of Antiochus, and looked for an immediate catastrophic end of the Greek empire, which, however, failed to materialize...

Not a few of the holders of the Greek view, however, have retained the traditional view of the date and authorship of the book [that is, that the book was written by Daniel in the 6th century B.C.]. To them, therefore, the whole of the visions and their

interpretation constitute true prophecies, and no parts can be treated as vaticinia ex

eventu [predictions from the event]. Upon them, then, just as much as upon the holders of the Roman view of the fourth kingdom, is the duty incumbent of showing exact accordance between the prophecies and the history in which [p. 92] they had their fulfillment. And as little are they able to do so. For the age of Antiochus Epiphanes was in no sense the prelude to the Messianic age, and there was no catastrophic end of the Greek empire in his day.

It has already been noted that some of those who adopt this form of the Greek view of the fourth empire point out that Christ was born at the beginning of the Roman empire, and therefore just after the termination of the Greek empire—which reached its final end with the annexation of the Ptolemaic kingdom [30 B.C.]. They hold that the fifth and enduring kingdom is the Kingdom of Christ, whom they find to be represented by the stone cut without hands out of the mountain. But while in chapter vii the 'son of man' first appears just after the destruction of the fourth beast, in chapter ii it is the impact of the stone upon the feet of the image that brings about its downfall. The birth of Christ can in no way be causally connected with the end of the Greek empire...

Nor can the insolent words of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is held to be the Little Horn, be related to the destruction of the Greek empire, or to the coming of Christ. It was because of the great words of the Little Horn that the doom was pronounced upon the fourth beast, and the enduring kingdom inaugurated. Moreover the Little Horn made war upon the saints, but the victory was given unto them in the possession of the kingdom. But the birth of Christ, and the establishment of His spiritual kingdom amongst men, can in no natural way be explained as the sequel of the acts or words of Antiochus Epiphanes, nor can His kingdom be supposed to have been given to any of the saints with whom Antiochus warred.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The majority of writers on Daniel in past centuries have held that the fourth empire was not Greek but Roman, while in modern times the majority hold the "Greek view," and many of them regard Daniel as a late author who wrote a pseudo-prophecy after the events had occurred. The "Greek view," it should be explained, exists in two forms. The first outlines the four kingdoms as (1) Babylon, (2) Medes and Persians, (3) Alexander's empire, (4) the divided kingdoms succeeding Alexander's; the second sees them as (1) Babylon, (2) Media, (3) Persia, (4) Alexander and his successors. In the first series, the separation of (3) and (4) is historically unjustifiable (see No. 559); and in the second series the insertion of Media after Babylon is erroneous, for Media fell to Cyrus before Babylon did (see No. 544).]

⁶Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

555. Daniel, as "Third Ruler" in the Kingdom

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 196, 197.

[p. 196] Although Nabonidus was not present in the imperial capital when it yielded to the troops of Cyrus, he was still *regarded as the king of Babylon*. In fact there were those of his subjects who looked upon him as their sovereign until the second month after Babylon fell. Even if it cannot be substantiated by present data derived from cuneiform sources, there is no reason for doubting, while awaiting further evidence, that Belshazzar was acting as coregent when Babylon was captured. On this assumption there were two sovereigns in the kingdom at that time. Nabonidus was the titular head of the nation, but Belshazzar who had been delegated with royal authority by his father, was the second ruler [see No. 213]. The fifth chapter of Daniel is in remarkable harmony with such a state of affairs. It describes a situation in which a man meriting royal favor could be rewarded by being made the third ruler in the kingdom. Different views have been expressed as to the meaning of the phrase 'the third ruler in the [p. 197] kingdom.' The most rational procedure is to interpret it in the light of known circumstances. Cuneiform records have demonstrated conclusively that Nabonidus and Belshazzar functioned as two rulers during most of the former's reign, and there is no positive evidence that this political arrangement did not last until the final days of the Neo-Babylonian empire. That the account in Daniel takes cognizance of this, although not mentioning Nabonidus, may be regarded as indicating a true historical basis for the narrative.⁶⁵⁴ [Note 654: It is clear that Nabonidus was looked upon as the first ruler in the nation and that Belshazzar was regarded as the second. The interpreter of the dream in the fifth chapter of Daniel was given third place in the kingdom... Historical parallels to dual rulership are not wanting.]

556. Daniel, Book of—Accuracy of Daniel 5 SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 199, 200.

[p. 199] The foregoing summary of information concerning Belshazzar, when judged in the light of data obtained from the texts discussed in this monograph, indicates that of all non-Babylonian records dealing with the situation at the close of the Neo-Babylonian empire the [p. 200] fifth chapter of Daniel ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy so far as outstanding events are concerned. The Scriptural account may be interpreted as excelling because it employs the name Belshazzar, because it attributes royal power to Belshazzar, and because it recognizes that a dual rulership existed in the kingdom. Babylonian cuneiform documents of the sixth century B.C. furnish clear-cut evidence of the correctness of these three basic historical nuclei contained in the Biblical narrative dealing with the fall of Babylon. Cuneiform texts written under Persian influence in the sixth century B.C. have not preserved the name Belshazzar, but his r"le as a crown prince entrusted with royal power during Nabonidus' stay in Arabia is depicted convincingly. Two famous Greek historians of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. do not mention Belshazzar by name and hint only vaguely at the actual political situation which existed in the time of Nabonidus. Annals in the Greek language ranging from about the beginning of the third century B.C. to the first century B.C. are absolutely silent concerning Belshazzar and the prominence which he had during the last reign of the Neo-Babylonian empire. The total information found in all available chronologically-fixed documents later than the cuneiform texts of the sixth century B.C. and prior to the

writings of Josephus of the first century A.D. could not have provided the necessary material for the historical framework of the fifth chapter of Daniel.⁶⁷¹

[Note 671:] The view that the fifth chapter of Daniel originated in the Maccabaean age is discredited. Biblical critics have pushed back its date to the third century B.C. See Montgomery, *op. cit.*, [J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*], p. 96, on the dating of Daniel 1–6. However, a narrative characterized by such an accurate historical perspective as Daniel 5 ought to be entitled to a place much nearer in time to the reliable documents which belong to the general epoch with which it deals.

557. Daniel, Book of, Difficulties of "Antiochus View" of Daniel's Fourth Kingdom, Pointed Out by Advocate of "Greek View" SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff:

University of Wales Press Board, 1935, Second Impression 1959), pp. 91, 92. Used by permission.
[p. 91] Most of those who in modern times hold the Greek view ["Grecia" as the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2 and 7] adopt the further view that the author—or the interpolator of these chapters—lived in the time of Antiochus, and looked for an immediate catastrophic end of the Greek empire, which, however, failed to materialize...

Not a few of the holders of the Greek view, however, have retained the traditional view of the date and authorship of the book [that is, that the book was written by Daniel in the 6th century B.C.]. To them, therefore, the whole of the visions and their

interpretation constitute true prophecies, and no parts can be treated as vaticinia ex

eventu [predictions from the event]. Upon them, then, just as much as upon the holders of the Roman view of the fourth kingdom, is the duty incumbent of showing exact accordance between the prophecies and the history in which [p. 92] they had their fulfillment. And as little are they able to do so. For the age of Antiochus Epiphanes was in no sense the prelude to the Messianic age, and there was no catastrophic end of the Greek empire in his day.

It has already been noted that some of those who adopt this form of the Greek view of the fourth empire point out that Christ was born at the beginning of the Roman empire, and therefore just after the termination of the Greek empire—which reached its final end with the annexation of the Ptolemaic kingdom [30 B.C.]. They hold that the fifth and enduring kingdom is the Kingdom of Christ, whom they find to be represented by the stone cut without hands out of the mountain. But while in chapter vii the 'son of man' first appears just after the destruction of the fourth beast, in chapter ii it is the impact of the stone upon the feet of the image that brings about its downfall. The birth of Christ can in no way be causally connected with the end of the Greek empire…

Nor can the insolent words of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is held to be the Little Horn, be related to the destruction of the Greek empire, or to the coming of Christ. It was because of the great words of the Little Horn that the doom was pronounced upon the fourth beast, and the enduring kingdom inaugurated. Moreover the Little Horn made war upon the saints, but the victory was given unto them in the possession of the kingdom. But the birth of Christ, and the establishment of His spiritual kingdom amongst men, can in no natural way be explained as the sequel of the acts or words of Antiochus Epiphanes, nor can His kingdom be supposed to have been given to any of the saints with whom Antiochus warred.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The majority of writers on Daniel in past centuries have held that the fourth empire was not Greek but Roman, while in modern times the majority hold the "Greek view," and many of them regard Daniel as a late author who wrote a pseudo-prophecy after the events had occurred. The "Greek view," it should be explained, exists in two forms. The first outlines the four kingdoms as (1) Babylon, (2) Medes and Persians, (3) Alexander's empire, (4) the divided kingdoms succeeding Alexander's; the second sees them as (1) Babylon, (2) Media, (3) Persia, (4) Alexander and his successors. In the first series, the separation of (3) and (4) is historically unjustifiable (see No. 559); and in the second series the insertion of Media after Babylon is erroneous, for Media fell to Cyrus before Babylon did (see No. 544).]

558. Daniel, Book of—Fifth Kingdom of Chapter 2, Catholic View of SOURCE: A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture, on Daniel 2, Appendix 2, p. 627. Copyright 1953 by Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York. Used by permission.

Catholic exegesis has from very early times identified the fifth kingdom symbolized by the stone with the Messianic kingdom. There seems to be an allusion to the Messianic interpretation in Hermas, *Similitudes*, 9, 2.12. The Church has made extensive use of Daniel in the office of Christ the King. The Messianic kingdom is described as a spiritual or divine, universal and eternal kingdom. The destruction of the hostile powers is not necessarily simultaneous, but a time will come when all opposition will be overcome and the Church of Christ will spread over all the earth. The kingdom of Christ must be considered in both its earthly and its heavenly stage. The *sensus plenior* of the prophecy includes all the stages of development of the Church until its consummation in heaven.

Although the coming of the Messianic kingdom is closely associated with the collapse of the fourth kingdom, which we have identified with the Greek empire, we must not take this chronological succession in a strict sense.

559. Daniel, Book of—Four Kingdoms of Chapters 2 and 7—Catholic View, Making the Greek the Fourth

SOURCE: A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture, on Daniel 2, Appendix 1, pp. 626, 627. Copyright 1953 by Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 626] It is universally admitted that the four kingdoms symbolized by the four metals are four historical kingdoms, but there is no agreement about the identification of the kingdoms. The theory prevalent in Catholic exegesis [p. 627] and which is already found in St Jerome (PL 25, 504, 530) identifies them as: 1. Neo-Babylonian; 2. Medo-Persian; 3. Greek; 4. Roman. Non-Catholic commentators, with a few exceptions, identify them as: 1. Neo-Babylonian; 2. Median; 3. Persian; 4. Greek. Amongst recent Catholic interpreters there is a growing tendency to identify them as: 1. Neo-Babylonian; 2. Medo-Persian; 3. Alexander; 4. Alexander's successors...

It is generally agreed that the four kingdoms of ch. 2 are identical with those of ch 7. It is also universally admitted that the first kingdom is the Neo-Babylonian or the reign of Nabuchodonosor, the greatest representative of the Neo-Babylonian dynasty. The fourth kingdom of ch 7 cannot be the Roman empire, because the beast symbolizing it is slain before the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. Even in ch 2 the Messianic kingdom is represented as following the destruction of the statue. The fourth kingdom of ch 7 is certainly the Greek empire, the identification resting mainly on the identity of the fourth beast with the he-goat of ch 8, which symbolizes the Greek empire (8:21). Both beasts are characterized by a small horn growing greater and stronger and making war against the holy people.

While upholding the Greek theory with many Catholic interpreters, we disagree with them in their separation of Alexander's reign from that of his successors. The Jews made no such distinction. For them there was only one Greek empire represented mainly by Antiochus IV. As the horns are a natural feature of the beast, the domination of Alexander's successors must be considered as a part of one empire and not as a separate empire symbolized by a different beast. Moreover, since in ch 8 the Medo-Persian empire is represented as one empire symbolized by one beast, so must it be represented by one beast or by one metal in the other visions. Any attempts therefore, to split up the Medo-Persian empire into two separate and successive kingdoms is against the writer's view of history. For an exhaustive discussion of the various theories, see H. H. Rowley, pp. 61–173, where the view current in Protestant exegesis is strongly defended. [See No. 557n.]

On account of the difficulties which confront all these theories one feels inclined to ask whether the number four is a historical number or rather, to a certain extent, schematic (Junker, p. 9). In fact, Daniel seems to be predicting not a definite number of historical kingdoms, but *all* the historical kingdoms, whatever their number, from Nabuchodonosor to the establishment of the kingdom of God.

560. Daniel, Book of, Increase of Knowledge Concerning

SOURCE: Isaac Newton, *Observations Upon the Prophecies of Daniel, and the Apocalypse of St. John* (London: J. Darby and T. Browne, 1733), part 2, chap. 1, pp. 250, 251.

[p. 250] But in the very end, the prophecy should be so far interpreted as to convince many. *Then*, saith *Daniel*, *many shall run to and fro*, *and knowledge shall be increased*. For the Gospel must be preached in all nations before the great tribulation, and end of the world... An Angel must fly thro' the midst of heaven with the everlasting Gospel to preach to all nations, before *Babylon* falls, and the Son of man reaps his harvest. The two Prophets must ascend up to heaven in a cloud, before the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of *Christ*. 'Tis therefore a part of this Prophecy, that it should [p. 251] not be understood before the last age of the world; and therefore it makes for the credit of the Prophecy, that it is not yet understood. But if the last age, the age of opening these things, be now approaching, as by the great successes of late Interpreters it seems to be, we have more encouragement than ever to look into these things. If the general preaching of the Gospel be approaching, it is to us and our posterity that those words mainly belong: *In the time of the end the wise shall understand, but none of the wicked shall understand*. *Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this Prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein*.

561. Daniel, Book of—Luther on Beast of Daniel 7

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, trans. and ed. by William Hazlitt (London: H. G. Bohn, 1857), p. 327. [See FRS No. 44.]

We must not hold and understand allegories as they sound; as what Daniel says, concerning the beast with ten horns; this we must understand to be spoken of the Roman empire.

562. Dark Day (1780), as Described in a Boston Newspaper

SOURCE: Letter from "Viator," dated May 22, in *The Boston Gazette and the Country Journal*, May 29, 1780, [p. 4].

The observations from the first coming on of the darkness, to four o'clock, P. M. were made by several gentlemen of liberal education at the house of the Rev. Mr. Cutler,

of *Ipswich–Hamlet* [Massachusetts]. There are some things worth noticing before and after this time. The Hemisphere for several days had been greatly obscured with smoak and vapour, so that the Sun and Moon appeared unusually red. On Thursday afternoon and in the evening, a thick cloud lay along at the south and southwest, the wind small. Friday morning early the Sun appeared red, as it had done for several days before, the

wind about south-west, a light breeze, and the clouds from the south-west came over between eight and nine o'clock, the Sun was guite shut in, and it began to shower, the clouds continuing to rise from the south-west and thicken from the thickness of the clouds, and the confusion which attended their motions, we expected a violent gust of wind and rain; the wind however, near the earth, continued small, and it rained but little. About eleven o'clock the darkness was such as to demand our attention, and put us upon making observations. At half past eleven, in a room with three windows, 24 panes each, all open towards the south-east and south, large print could not be read by persons of good eyes. About twelve o'clock the windows being still open, a candle cast a shade so well defined on the wall, as that *profiles* were taken with as much ease as they could have been in the night. About one o'clock a glin of light which had continued 'till this time in the east, shut in, and the darkness was greater than it had been for any time before. Between one and two o'clock, the wind from the west freshened a little, and a glin appeared in that quarter. We dined about two the windows all open, and two candles burning on the table. In the time of the greatest darkness some of the dunghill fowls went to their roost: Cocks crowed in answer to one another as they commonly do in the night: Woodcocks, which are night birds, whistled as they do *only* in the dark: Frogs peeped— In short, there was the appearance of midnight at noonday. About three o'clock the light in the west increased, the motion of the clouds more quick, their colour higher and more brassy than at any time before: There appeared to be quick flashes or coruscations, not unlike the Aurora Borealis. Between three or four o'clock we were out and perceived a strong sooty smell, some of the company were confident a chimney in the neighbourhood must be burning, others conjectured the smell was more like that of burnt leaves. About half past four, our company which had past an unexpected night very cheerfully together broke up. I will now give you what I noticed afterwards. I found the people at the tavern near by very much agitated, among other things which gave them surprise, they mentioned the strange appearance and smell of the rain-water, which they had saved in tubs; upon examining the water I found a light scum over it, which rubbing between my thumb and finger. I found to be nothing but the black ashes of burnt leaves, the water gave the same strong sooty smell which we had observed in the air; and confirmed me in my opinion, that the smell mentioned above was occasioned by the smoak, or very small particles of burnt leaves, which had obscured the Hemisphere for several days past, and were now brought down by the rain: The appearance last mentioned served to corroborate the Hypothesis on which we had endeavoured to account for the unusual darkness. The vast body of smoak from the woods which had been burning for many days, mixing with the common exhalations from the earth and water, and condensed by the action of winds from opposite points, may perhaps be sufficient causes to produce the surprising darkness

The wind in the evening passed round further north where a black cloud lay, and gave us reason to expect a sudden gust from that quarter: The wind brought that body of smoak and vapor over us in the evening (at *Salem*) and perhaps it never was darker since the children of Israel left the house of bondage. This gross darkness held 'till about one o'clock, although the moon had fulled but the day before.

563. Dark Day (1780), as Seen at Sea SOURCE: Letter in *The Independent Chronicle* (Boston), June 15, 1780, [p. 2].

I have also seen a very sensible Captain of a vessel, who was that morning about 40 leagues S.E. of Boston. He says, the cloud which appeared at the West, was the blackest he ever saw. About 11 o'clock there was little rain, and it grew dark. Between one and two he was obliged to light a large candle to steer by.

There had been to this time a gleam, or *glin*, as he called it, in the East: It was now wholly shut in, and the greatest obscuration was between two and three. He further observes, the air was uncommonly thick, and afforded an unusual smell. Between nine and ten at night, he ordered his men to take in some of the sails, but it was so dark they could not find the way from one mast to the other...

Coasters from the Eastward say, the darkness was very inconsiderable farther than Cape Elizabeth...

Various have been the sentiments of people concerning the designs of Providence in spreading this unusual darkness over us. Some suppose it portentous of the last scene. I wish it may have some good effect on the minds of the wicked, and that they may be excited to prepare for that solemn day.

564. Dark Day (1780) — Color of Moon, Coppery Red SOURCE: News item from Providence, R.I., dated May 20, in *The Pennsylvania Evening Post* (Philadelphia), June 6, 1780, p. 62.

For several days past the atmosphere has been remarkably charged with dry smoaky vapours, so that the sun might be viewed easily with the naked eye... The disk of the moon, through the nights of Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday last [May 16, 17, and 18], was of a reddish-copper colour, somewhat resembling her appearance at the time of her being totally eclipsed.

565. Dark Day (1780) — Color of Moon, Like Blood SOURCE: Benjamin Gorton, *A View of Spiritual, or Anti-typical Babylon* (Troy [N.Y.]: the Author, 1808), pp. 72, 73.

[p. 72] The sun was remarkably darkened in 1780, 28 years last May. In Providence, Rhode-Island, it commenced in the forenoon, so that [p. 73]the cows returned from pasture as at evening, and fowls went to roost; candles lighted in order to see to do business; and many people much disturbed in their minds for the event.

At Conway, Massachusetts, they dined by candle-light; and farmers were obliged to leave their sowing, and other work, in the field, for want of light. At Fishkill, New-York, in the afternoon business was, in part, laid by, by reason of darkness; all appeared to be tinged with a yellow hue. This appears to be the first particular sign spoken of apparent to the natural eye immediately: the second is that of the moon's turning to blood; this I have not seen, but, from information, I have reason to believe it did take place between 2 o'clock and day break in the morning of the same night after which the sun was darkened, which was said to appear as a clotter of blood; and it is the more probable, as that night, before the moon appeared, was as dark, in proportion, as the day, and of course would give the moon an extraordinary appearance—not suffering her to give her light. The next in course, it seems, is the falling of the stars from heaven.

[EDITORS' NOTE: He adds accounts of the Lyrid meteoric shower of April 20, 1803.]

566. Dark Day (1780)—Difference in Degree, Extent, and Duration (a

Harvard Professor's Account)

SOURCE: Samuel Williams, "An Account of a Very Uncommon Darkness in the States of New-England, May 19, 1780," in *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences:* to the End of the Year 1783 (Boston: Adams and Nourse, 1785), Vol. 1, pp. 234, 235. [p. 234] The darkness appeared to come on with the clouds that came ... [from the southwest]. The *degree* to which the darkness arose, was different in different places... People were unable to read common print—determine the time of day by their [p. 235] clocks or watches—dine—or manage their domestic business, without the light of candles. In some places, the darkness was so great, that persons could not see to read common print in the open air, for several hours together: but I believe this was not generally the case. The *extent* of this darkness was very remarkable. Our intelligence, in this respect, is not so particular as I could wish: but from the accounts that have been received, it seems to have extended all over the *New-England* states. It was observed as far east as *Falmouth* [Portland, Maine].—To the westward, we hear of its reaching to the furthest parts of *Connecticut*, and *Albany*.—To the southward, it was observed all along the sea-coasts:—and to the north, as far as our settlements extend… With regard to its *duration*, it continued in this place at least fourteen hours: but it is probable this was not exactly the same in different parts of the country.

567. Dark Day (1780), Evening Following

SOURCE: Letter of Samuel Tenney (an eyewitness at Rowley [Mass.?], dated Exeter [N.H.?]), Dec. 1785, in *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Vol. 1, 1792 (Boston: Belknap and Hall, 1792), pp. 95, 97, 98.

[p. 95] You will readily recollect that, previously to the commencement of the darkness, the sky was overcast with the common kind of clouds, from which there was, in some places a light sprinkling of rain. Between these and the earth there intervened another stratum, to appearance of very great thickness. As this stratum advanced the darkness commenced and increased with its progress till it came to its height; which did not take place till the hemisphere was a second time overspread...

[p. 97] The rays, that fortunately effected their passage through the first [stratum], were ... turned out of their direct course, so that they must have struck upon the second very obliquely... The wonder is much greater, that any of them were able to penetrate...

The darkness of the following evening was probably as gross as ever has been observed since the Almighty fiat gave birth to light. It wanted only palpability to render it as extraordinary, as that which overspread the land of Aegypt in the days of Moses... If every luminous body in the universe had been shrouded in impenetrable shades, or struck out of existence, the darkness could not have been more complete. A sheet of white paper held within a few inches of the eyes [p. 98] was equally invisible with the blackest velvet. Considering the small quantity of light that was transmitted by the clouds, by day, it is not surprising that, by night, a sufficient quantity of rays should not be able to penetrate the same strata, brought back by the shifting of the winds, to afford the most obscure prospect even of the best reflecting bodies.

568. Dark Day (1780), Experience in Connecticut Legislature During SOURCE: Timothy Dwight, quoted in *Connecticut Historical Collections*, compiled by John Warner Barber (2d ed.; New Haven: Durrie & Peck and J. W. Barber, 1836), p. 403.

The 19th of May, 1780, was a remarkable dark day. Candles were lighted in many houses; the birds were silent and disappeared, and the fowls retired to roost. The legislature of Connecticut was then in session at Hartford. A very general opinion prevailed, that the day of judgment was at hand. The House of Representatives, being unable to transact their business, adjourned. A proposal to adjourn the Council was under consideration. When the opinion of Colonel [Abraham] Davenport was asked, he answered, 'I am against an adjournment. The day of judgment is either approaching, or it

is not. If it is not, there is no cause for an adjournment: if it is, I choose to be found doing my duty. I wish therefore that candles may be brought.'

569. Dark Day (1780), Experience in Connecticut Legislature During

SOURCE: John Greenleaf Whittier, "Abraham Davenport," in his *Complete Poetical Works* (Cambridge ed.; Boston: Houghton, 1894), p. 260.

'Twas on a May-day of the far old year Seventeen hundred eighty, that there fell Over the bloom and sweet life of the Spring, Over the fresh earth and the heaven of noon, A horror of great darkness.... Men prayed, and women wept; all ears grew sharp To hear the doom-blast of the trumpet shatter The black sky, that the dreadful face of Christ Might look from the rent clouds, not as he looked A loving guest at Bethany, but stern As Justice and inexorable Law.

Meanwhile in the old State House, dim as ghosts. Sat the lawgivers of Connecticut, Trembling beneath their legislative robes. "It is the Lord's Great Day! Let us adjourn," Some said; and then, as if with one accord, All eves were turned to Abraham Davenport. He rose, slow cleaving with his steady voice The intolerable hush. "This well may be" The Day of Judgment which the world awaits; But be it so or not, I only know My present duty, and my Lord's command To occupy till He come. So at the post Where He hath set me in His providence, I choose, for one, to meet Him face to face.— No faithless servant frightened from my task, But ready when the Lord of the harvest calls; And therefore, with all reverence, I would say, Let God do His work, we will see to ours. Bring in the candles."

570. Dark Day (1780), Eyewitness Account of

SOURCE: Thomas's Massachusetts Spy (Worcester), May 25, 1780, [p. 3].

It was the judgment of many that at about 12 o'clock, (the time of the greatest obscurity) the day light was not greater, if so great, as that of bright moon-light... Nor was the darkness of the night less uncommon and terrifying, than that of the day; notwithstanding there was almost a full moon, no object was discernable, but by the help of some artificial light...

This unusual phaenomenon excited the fears and apprehensions of many people. Some considered it as a portentous omen of the wrath of Heaven in vengeance denounced against the land, others as the immediate harbinger of the last day... I conceive that this may be accounted for from natural causes, without derogating from the wisdom and justice of *him*, who made and disposed the various parts of the universe.

571. Dark Day (1780) — Eyewitness Holds That Natural Causes Do Not Invalidate Darkness as a Sign

SOURCE: Sermon by Elam Potter on the "Dark Day," delivered May 28, 1780, in Enfield, Conn., quoted by W. Barber in *The Advent Herald*, March 13, 1844, p. 46.

Perhaps some, by assigning a natural cause of this, ascribing it to the thick vapor in the air, will endeavor to evade the force of its being a sign, but, the same objection will lie against earthquakes being signs, which our Lord expressly mentions as such. For my part, I really consider the darkness as one of the prodig[i]es foretold in the text; designed for our admonition, and warning.

EDITORS' NOTE: There was disagreement among the writers of that time as to the cause of this unparalleled darkness, but agreement as to the extraordinary character of it, and general consistency in the eyewitness accounts of the atmospheric conditions. These descriptions of winds, light rain, cloud layers, as well as smoke and leaf ash from forest fires, are linked, however, with affirmations of the significance of the event as a sign. The above quotation in a journal of the Millerites is indicative of their prophetic application. Similarly, Seventh-day Adventist writers have long held that any suggestion of a natural cause can in no wise militate against the significance of the event as a prophetic fulfillment. The time-honored explanation is that seventeen and a half centuries before it occurred, the Saviour had definitely foretold this twofold sign, saying, "In those days, after that tribulation, the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light" Mark 13:24; and these signs occurred exactly as predicted and at the time indicated so long before their occurrence. It has long been pointed out that it is the fact, and not the cause, of the darkness that is significant in this connection; as also in the case of earthquakes, falling stars, and other events seen as signs of the times. When the Lord would open a path for his people through the sea, he did it by "a strong east wind." Ex. 14:21. Was it for this reason any less miraculous? In like manner, to account for the remarkable darkening of the sun and moon or of the falling of the stars as events in nature is not to discredit them as merciful signs of the approaching end of probationary time.

For articles dealing with either natural means or recurrences of the events, see editorials (by Uriah Smith) in the *Review and Herald*, 17 (Jan. 29, 1861), 84, and 51 (May 23, 1878), 164; J. N. Loughborough, "Signs in the Sun and Stars," *ibid.*, 60 (Dec. 4, 1883), 756, 757; A. Smith, "The Wonders of a Century," No. 16, *ibid.*, 59 (June 20, 1882), 388; D. E. Robinson, "The Wide-Spread Occurrence of the Signs in the Heavens," *ibid.*, 90 (July 24, 1913), 701, 702.]

572. Dark Day (1780) — Eyewitness Sees Natural Causes, Yet the Lord's Doing

SOURCE: [John Kennedy?] Some Remarks on the Great and Unusual Darkness that Appeared on Friday, May 19, 1780 (Danvers, Mass.: E. Russell, 1780), pp. 3, 4.

[p. 3] This uncommon darkness was doubtless produced by the intervention of those clouds [p. 4] from the westward... If it be granted (as doubtless it may) that the late darkness of the sun and moon was from the force of natural causes, moving and operating in an unusual manner, ... yet it will still remain, that the darkness was the Lord's doings, and it is marvelous in our eyes.

Nature's God hath given the power of motion and operation to natural causes, and always co-operates with them, otherwise they would effect nothing: *Clouds and darkness are round about him, stormy winds, hail and snow fulfilling his word.* All the elements are at his disposal ready to obey his sovereign command. *He createth darkness, causeth the vapors to ascend, and doth whatsoever he pleaseth.*

As the late darkness must be allowed to be the effect of Divine Power, from hence it follows, that we should take a suitable notice of such a great and memorable event.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The title page indicates the author as "a Farmer." John Kennedy's name appears only in connection with a three-page section at the end (pp. 14–16). He may or may not be the author of the whole pamphlet.]

573. Dark Day (1780) — Eyewitness Sees Natural Means, With God as "Primary Cause"

SOURCE: Samuel Stearns, Letter in The Independent Chronicle (Boston), June 22, 1780, p. [2].

That this darkness was not caused by an eclipse, is manifest; ... for the moon was more than 150 degrees from the sun all that day...

It was undoubtedly a vast collection of ... particles that caused the late uncommon darkness...

The primary cause must be imputed to Him that walketh through the circuit of Heaven—who stretcheth out the Heaven like a curtain—who maketh the clouds his chariott, who walketh upon the wings of the wind:—It was He at whose voice the stormy winds are obedient—that commanded these exhalations to be collected and condensed together, that with them he might darken both the day and the night; which darkness was, perhaps, not only a token of his indignation against the crying iniquities and abominations of the people, but an omen of some future destruction.

574. Dark Day (1780)—Fanciful Volcanic Theory of Noah Webster SOURCE: Noah Webster, *A Brief History of Epidemic and Pestilential Diseases* (Hartford, [Conn.]: Hudson & Goodwin, 1799), Vol. 2, pp. 91–93.

[p. 91] It is remarkable too that on that very day [May 19, 1780] began a violent eruption of mount Etna...

[p. 92] The smoke of burning forests cannot be the cause... Had the woods from the 40th degree of latitude in America to the 50th been all consumed in a day, the smoke would not have been sufficient to cloud the sun over the territory covered by the darkness on the 19th of May [1780]...

[p. 93] When we connect with these facts, the circumstances that these dark days [he mentions May 19, 1780; October, 1716; Aug. 9, 1732; and Oct. 19, 1762] always occur during or near the time of volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, or the unusual seasons, which accompany pestilence and epidemic diseases of other kinds, we shall be at no loss to charge them to the account of the central fires, or the discharges of electricity.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For recurrences of unusual darkness, see No. 571n. Webster was not illogical in his conclusion that a considerable portion of New England could not have been darkened by a mere "thirty miles of burning forest" (he probably referred to the fire occurring at that time "near Ticonderoga, ... which spread for 30 miles around," reported in *The Independent Ledger* [Boston], June 5, 1780, p. [2]). However, his statement concerning a transcontinental holocaust ten degrees (nearly 700 miles) wide is obviously an exaggeration. In 1950, from a section in western Canada representing only a tiny fraction of the area mentioned by Webster, smoke billowed across the continent for several days, and, under unusual weather conditions, successively darkened numerous localities (for much briefer periods than the famous darkness of 1780), and dimmed vast areas across the country (to a much lesser degree). See Nos. 576–578. The New Englanders of 1780 could not have known the extent of any fires in the western wilderness or the possible distance traveled by the leaf ash and soot that they reported finding on the water (see Nos. 562, 575) on that day of unparalleled darkness. Webster's fanciful theories of electricity, a Mediterranean volcano, or seasons of pestilence lie much farther afield than the conclusions of his less-learned contemporaries who saw God back of the winds and clouds.]

575. Dark Day (1780)—Meteorological Conditions

SOURCE: Nathaniel Adams, *Annals of Portsmouth* (Portsmouth: Published by the author, 1825), pp. 271, 272.

[p. 271] For several weeks previous there had been extensive fires in the woods, and the westerly wind had driven the smoke and cinders, with which the air was charged, all over the country. On the morning of the 19th, the wind came in various directions, but principally from the eastward, and brought with [p. 272] it a thick fog; these counter

currents meeting, stopped the progress of the clouds, and formed different strata of them; and as light is always reflected from the surface, they became more impervious to it, than a more dense cloud, which presents only one surface. The atmosphere was likewise filled with clouds of smoke and cinders, as well as with vapour, which gave them a dirty yellowish hue. Pieces of burnt leaves were continually falling, and "the rain water was covered with a sooty scum." The darkness extended throughout New-England, and was observed several leagues at sea.

576. Dark Day—Unusual Darkness of September, 1950

SOURCE: Clarence D. Smith, Jr., "The Widespread Smoke Layer From Canadian Forest Fires During Late September 1950," *Monthly Weather Review*, 78 (September, 1950), 180, 182.

[p. 180] During the latter part of September 1950, an extensive layer of smoke originated from forest fires in the Canadian Provinces of British Columbia and Alberta. Subsequently it spread over large areas of Canada and the eastern United States. The resulting unusual appearance of the sky and sun and the diminution of normal daylight caused widespread interest among meteorologists and the public alike...

Such widespread smoke from forest fires has been observed in past years. In 1918 forest fires in Minnesota produced smoke which was observed as far away as Texas and South Carolina. The record of dark days in the United States resulting from smoke pollution extends back to 1706 according to Plummer...

[p. 182] The smoke layer was not observed at the same height from place to place and time to time. Also multiple layers were reported by pilots. On September 24 the base was reported variously 12,000 to 14,000 feet over Pennsylvania, and a pilot reported that he was in dense smoke at 17,000 feet over Sault Ste. Marie.

577. Dark Day, Unusual Phenomenon of 1950

SOURCE: Joe Reichler, "Tigers Lose in 10th," *The Washington Post* (AP dispatch dated Sept. 24), Sept. 25, 1950, pp. 11, 13. Used by permission of Wide World Photos, Inc., New York.

[p. 11] The Cleveland Indians [won] a breath-taking, 2–1, victory over the Tigers today, dealing Detroit's pennant hopes a staggering blow...

[p. 13] From start to finish the game was played under the lights. The umpires ordered the huge floodlights turned on a half hour before game time when black overhanging clouds caused almost complete darkness. It was later explained that forest fires in Canada had caused smoke layers rising as high as 16,000 to 20,000 feet. It was the first time an afternoon game was played in its entirety under the lights.

578. Dark Day, Unusual Phenomenon of 1950

SOURCE: News item, *The Washington Post*, Sept. 25, 1950, pp. 1, 9. Copyright 1950 by The Washington Post Co. Used by permission.

[p. 1] Washington was beclouded yesterday by an overcast of smoke that started from smouldering forest fires in far northern Canada and covered the Great Lakes, Ohio Valley and Middle Atlantic regions.

The Weather Bureau here said such phenomena are rare. The smoke blanket's height was estimated at 14,000 feet and higher.

The sun was dimmed in the middle of the day [Sept. 24, 1950] over thousands of square miles of the United States and Canada.

Chickens and birds roosted in [p. 9] the afternoon. Some persons sighting weird red and yellow colorings in the sky feared an atomic bomb had fallen. Some thought it was the end of the world. Others prayed. Ships on the Great Lakes were slowed.

Big-league baseball games in Cleveland and Pittsburgh were played under lights. The smoke blanket extended from Toronto, where the smoke was the thickest, as far south as Fairmont, W. Va. Michigan was blanketed.

Darkness fell almost an hour early over New York's Great White Way.

Weathermen said the smoke combined with unusual weather conditions to achieve the peculiar effect. The boundaries of the smoke bank extended west to Iowa.

Three fourths of Pennsylvania was mantled. Pilots were forced down by "huge clouds of thick yellow smoke." Street lights were turned on.

Panic was reported in southern Ontario. Police switchboards were swarmed with calls from frightened persons who had heard rumors that an atomic bomb had exploded. Some believed a third world war had started. Some began praying, believing the return of Christ was at hand.

Trans-Canada Airlines said their Toronto office messaged that fires in northern Alberta caused smoke to drift at 10,000 to 15,000 feet from northern Alberta east to Hudson Bay, then veer southward all the way from Vancouver, British Columbia, on the west coast, to Cleveland...

The Winnipeg weather bureau said it also believed northern Alberta fires were responsible.

Trans-Canada said its pilots reported visibility was zero in the smoke areas at altitudes below 15,000 feet while above the smoke clouds the sun shone brightly.

579. Dead, Prayers for, in Anglican and Episcopal worship SOURCE: Prayers from the liturgy of "Holy Communion" and "Burial of the Dead," in *The Book of Common Prayer* (Protestant Episcopal edition of 1929), pp. 74, 75, 334, 335, 336.

[p. 74] Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.

Almighty and everliving God, who by thy holy Apostle hast taught us to make prayers, ... we also bless thy holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; beseeching thee to [p. 75] grant them continual growth in thy love and service, and to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. *Amen*...

[p. 334] Then the Minister shall say one or more of the following Prayers, at his discretion.

O God, whose mercies cannot be numbered; Accept our prayers on behalf of the soul of thy servant departed, and grant *him* an entrance into the land of light and joy, in the fellowship of thy saints; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen*...

[p. 335] O Almighty God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, who by a voice from heaven didst proclaim, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord; Multiply, we beseech thee, to those who rest in Jesus, the manifold blessings of thy love, that the good work which thou didst begin in them may be perfected unto the day of Jesus Christ. And of thy mercy, O heavenly Father, vouchsafe that we, who now serve thee here on earth, may at last, together with them, be found meet to be partakers of the inheritance of [p. 336] the saints in light; for the sake of the same thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen*.

580. Dead, Prayers for, in Anglican Ritual

SOURCE: Catherine Marshall, *To Live Again* (Carmel, N. Y.: Guideposts Associates, Inc.), pp. 209, 210. Copyright, 1957, by Catherine Marshall. Used by permission of McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York.

[p. 209] And what of the communion of the saints? It had been corrupted by indulgences. So the Reformed church taught that there was no need for any fellowship of prayer with and for the dead. The inference was that to pray for the dead was a sin.

Yet at least two vestiges of the communion of the saints escaped the wrecking. In the *Book of Common Prayer* are still remnants of this universal practice of the early church... [The sections cited in No. 579 are quoted in part.]

Then there is that one clause in the Creed—"I believe in … the communion of saints"—that somehow survived the Reformation. It comes down to us like a few bars of a half-remembered melody.

When I first became aware of it, I could not escape the feeling that it should mean something special. In my own need for comfort and assurance, I kept groping for something that seemed to be missing in the church's teaching in our day.

581. Dead Sea Scrolls, Attacks on Authenticity of, Unfounded SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 539, 540. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

[p. 539] The discovery of the original group of these scrolls was followed by a series of fantastic onslaughts on their antiquity and even on their authenticity, over the signatures of some well-known scholars in America and Europe, both Christian and Jewish. Only in Palestine, where the [p. 540] finds were too well known to be suspect, was there virtually unanimous agreement about their general age. It is true that such sensational discoveries are always challenged, but in this case the data are so well substantiated that the attacks must be connected with the fact that the new finds disprove the already published views of the attacking scholars.

582. Dead Sea Scrolls, Authenticity of, Now Established SOURCE: [S. H. Hooke], "Notes and News," *PEQ*, 87 (May–October, 1955), 103. Used by permission of Palestine Exploration Fund, London.

The relatively early date and authenticity of the Dead Sea Scrolls now generally considered to have been established by the further discoveries in the Qumran Caves are no longer the subjects of heated controversy, and the shrill protests from Dropsie College have grown faint and remote.

583. Dead Sea Scrolls, Biblical, Scope of Documents

SOURCE: Editorial, "Cataloguing Reveals Scope of Dead Sea Scrolls," *The Christian Century*, 73 (July 25, 1956), 869, citing the *Sun-Times* (Chicago). Copyright 1956 Christian Century Foundation. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

From these fragments [known in 1956] the [Qumrân] library is known to have contained at least 10 copies of Genesis, 10 of Exodus, eight of Leviticus, seven of Numbers, 17 or 18 of Deuteronomy, two of Joshua, three of Judges, four of Ruth, four of Samuel, three of Kings, one of Chronicles, two of Ezra-Nehemiah, two of Job, 15 of Psalms, two of Proverbs, one of Ecclesiastes, one of the Song of Solomon, 10 of Isaiah, four of Jeremiah, three of Lamentations, two of Ezekiel, six of Daniel, and eight of the Minor Prophets [total: 125 or 126 copies].

584. Dead Sea Scrolls, Date of Documents.

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, "Fresh Light on the New Testament," *The Listener*, 52 (Dec. 2, 1954), 955. The evidence seems to me to be now so strong that no dating of these texts [the

Qumran Scrolls] later than A.D. 66–70 is likely to stand.

585. Dead Sea Scrolls—Isaiah Text Similar to Masoretic Text

SOURCE: Millar Burrows. *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 348. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

Some readers may be disappointed that translations of the Isaiah manuscripts are not included [in this edition of the text of the Dead Sea Scrolls]. The fact is that most of the differences between these manuscripts and the traditional Hebrew text do not involve changes of meaning that would be evident in a translation, and the differences that do involve such changes are not sufficiently frequent to justify taking the space for translations of these texts.

586. Dead Sea Scrolls—Original Discovery and Early Investigations SOURCE: Frank Moore Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1958), pp. 3–7. Copyright © 1958 by Frank Moore Cross, Jr. Used by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., and Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 3] The story of the first cave has been obscured by time and legend. This circumstance, it must be confessed, is due less to the faulty memories of the native discoverers than to the fervid imagination of Western writers. Even so, while a full history of the find may never be reconstructed, certain essential facts are well established, partly by cross-examination of tribesmen and their middlemen, partly by subsequent events.

In the spring of the year 1947 two shepherd lads were grazing their mixed flocks of sheep and goats along the foot of the crumbling cliffs that line the Dead Sea in the vicinity of Qumrân. There was nothing unusual about their being in this terrain. The few clans of their tribe, the Ta'ämireh, that still live in "houses of hair" following flocks, customarily use the bubbling springs of Feshkhah immediately south of Qumrân as a watering place, and often in the spring, when the desert turns green for a brief few weeks, may be found in these wild pastures.

[p. 4] According to their account, one of their animals strayed. In searching for it, one of the shepherds, Muhammed *ed-D*îb by name, casually threw a stone into a small, circular opening in the cliff face. Instead of the expected smack of rock against rock, he heard a shattering sound. He was frightened and fled. Later, presumably when the fear of

jinn or hyenas finally gave way to the lure of buried gold, he and his companion Ahmed Muhammed returned and crept into the cave and found decaying rolls of leather in one of a number of strange elongated jars embedded in the floor of the cave. These were the original "Dead Sea Scrolls."

In the year between the Bedouin discovery and the first press releases announcing the discovery to the world, there was confusion, blundering, and intrigue, as is associated often, unfortunately, with spectacular, chance finds. At least one, and probably several clandestine excavations ravaged the cave site; additional materials came to light; there is evidence that a considerable amount of precious material was destroyed in the process. The details of this phase of the vicissitudes of the scrolls of Cave I are most difficult to

establish. In any case, after some of the scrolls (three, according to Ta'ämireh claims) had passed about in the tents of clansmen, they were brought to Bethlehem for sale and fell into the hands of antiquities dealers. At some point they were joined with a portion of the manuscript materials from clandestine excavations. Ultimately one lot came into the possession of the Syrian Orthodox Metropolitan of Jerusalem, a Syrian cobbler [p. 5] of Bethlehem acting as broker; another was purchased by the late E. L. Sukenik for the Hebrew University.

The metropolitan, Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, upon acquiring his lot of manuscripts, was anxious to have them authenticated, or to be more precise, perhaps, evaluated. A series of [p. 6] persons, including reputable scholars, was consulted and given opportunity to examine them. No one, however, who was competent in Hebrew paleography saw the scrolls. The episodes which mark this interlude are quite amusing in retrospect but are best forgotten, perhaps, in kindness to the scholars who failed.

The Syrian scrolls finally were brought to the American School of Oriental Research in February 1948, nearly a year after their discovery. Their antiquity and value were then recognized by a young scholar of the school, John C. Trever, who, together with William Brownlee, began first studies of the lot and systematically photographed it. Some prints of sections of one scroll, the great Isaiah scroll, were immediately dispatched to the distinguished orientalist, W. F. Albright, a leading authority in matters of Jewish paleography. He quickly replied, confirming Trever's judgments of the scrolls, congratulating him on "the greatest discovery of modern times." In the meantime, the Director of the American School, Professor Millar Burrows, had returned after an absence in Iraq to find his staff absorbed with the old leather rolls. He also convinced himself of the extreme age and importance of the new finds, and on April 11, 1948, made the first announcement of the discovery of the manuscripts to the press of the world. Two weeks later (on April 26), Professor Sukenik announced the existence of the Hebrew University collection.

In point of fact, Sukenik had recognized the scrolls for what they were before the metropolitan approached the American School with his collection. In late November, Sukenik was shown fragments in a Jerusalem antiquities shop. His familiarity with Hebrew inscriptions of the period had prepared him as few were prepared for the discovery. He relates, however, that he could scarcely believe what his [p. 7] knowledge and senses told him was true! His delay in announcing the discoveries was occasioned, no doubt, by his reluctance to alert Bedouin and their middlemen to the value of their finds before as much material as possible had been acquired by scientists. The Hebrew University lot was acquired in purchases in November and December 1947. In December, Sukenik also learned of the Syrian collection, and during the following month attempted to arrange its purchase through one Anton Kiraz, a member of the Syrian Orthodox community. Actually, the St. Mark's scrolls came into Sukenik's hands for some days, but negotiations were broken off, presumably after the Syrian monks had approached the scholars of the American School.

Ultimately the four scrolls belonging to the Syrian monastery were smuggled to America by the metropolitan, and after the publication of three of them by the American Schools of Oriental Research in 1950 and 1951, were purchased through indirect channels for the Hebrew University in the summer of 1954. Professor Sukenik's negotiations were thus completed more than six years later; and scrolls which would have sold for a few hundred dollars in 1948 brought a reported \$250,000 in 1954.

587. Dead Sea Scrolls—the Qumran Community and the New Testament

SOURCE: F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1956), pp. 124, 125, 128–132, 134–136. Copyright 1956 by The Paternoster Press, London. Used by permission of the author and of The Paternoster Press.

[p. 124] Did the Qumran community have any influence on Christianity, or at least some contact with it, *before* the dispersal of A.D. 68? If (as seems probable) the Qumran

community was established before the birth of Christ, was Christianity in any way indebted to it? And, more generally, do the Qumran discoveries give us fresh help in understanding the New Testament?

When the discovery of the scrolls was first announced, it was believed by many that their chief importance would lie in the new light which they could throw on the history of the Old Testament text. And, as has been indicated in an earlier chapter, the light which they throw on this field of study is of high value. But with the emergence and examination of so many more docu- [p. 125] ments from the neighbourhood, and the excavation of Khirbet Qumran, the emphasis has changed more and more from the Old Testament to the New Testament side...

Opinions differ widely on the bearing which the Qumran discoveries may have on the rise and early progress of Christianity...

[p. 128] Still, some possibilities are more probable than others. And little can be urged, in terms of probability, against the possibility that John the Baptist at one stage of his career had some contact [p. 129] with the Qumran covenanters or with some other people very like them. At the end of Luke's account of the birth and infancy of John, he says that "the child grew and became strong in spirit, and he was in the wilderness till the day of his manifestation to Israel" (Luke 1:80). The implication of these words is that, for a number of years preceding the start of his baptismal ministry, John, resided in the wilderness of Judaea. Now, if a congenial retreat was found there by a youth who was born in a city of Judaea and was later to be active in the Jordan valley, it would not have been far from the neighbourhood of Qumran. And one who was of priestly birth, as John was, might have found something specially appealing in a movement which attached such importance to the preservation of a pure priesthood.

A further contact between John and Qumran might be looked for in their baptismal teaching and practice... But if that is so, it would follow that John's baptismal doctrine represented a deviation—perhaps a deliberate one—from that of the Qumran covenanters and other Essenes.

John was an ascetic; he came, we are told, "eating no bread and drinking no wine" (Luke 7:33). The Qumran covenanters were ascetics too, but not to that extent. Their food was simple, to be sure, and they ate in moderation, but they did not restrict themselves to locusts and wild honey, as John did. John proclaimed the urgent necessity of repentance, because "The Coming One" was about to execute a purifying judgment with wind and [p. 130] fire. The Qumran covenanters also thought in terms of an imminent judgment, but they were not the only people who did so, and they did not issue a public call to national repentance, as John did…

But even if John did owe some debt to the Qumran community, or to any other Essene group, the ministry by which John made his mark cannot be brought within an Essene framework. He describes himself as a voice crying to Israel:

In the wilderness prepare ye the way of the LORD; Make straight in the desert a highway for our God.

These words of Isa. 40:3 had already been invoked by the Qumran covenanters as divine authority for their withdrawal to the wilderness. But John used them in a new sense... And when "the word of God came to John the son of Zechariah in the wilderness" (Luke 3:2), as it [p. 131] had come to many a prophet before, he learned and proclaimed the necessity of something more than the teaching or action of Qumran. If he had previously been associated with that community or a similar one, it was now time to break with them and follow a new path, marked out for him by God...

If the present state of our knowledge does not permit us to speak more positively about the possible contact between John the Baptist and Qumran, what can be said about Jesus Himself in this regard? John at least was an ascetic; but Jesus, on His own testimony, was not. To those who found fault with John's ministry and His own alike, He said: "John the Baptist has come eating no bread and drinking no wine: and you say, 'He has a demon.' The Son of man has come eating and drinking; and you say, 'Behold, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!" There is no flavour of Qumran about His way of life. Again, John at least is known to have lived in the wilderness before he began his public ministry; so far as we know, Jesus lived in Galilee continuously from His childhood to His baptism, apart from an occasional festival visit to Jerusalem. It was from Nazareth that He came to be baptized by John, and only after that did He retire to the wilderness of Judaea. The forty days that He spent there fasting would not afford much opportunity of initiation into the wisdom of Qumran, if indeed He spent them anywhere in that vicinity. (The traditional site of the temptation is some three miles north-west of Jericho, but that is of no significance.) The temptations which He experienced in the wilderness are usually (and no doubt rightly) explained as temptations to achieve His messianic destiny by other paths than that of the Suffering Servant, marked out for Him at His baptism; and among those other paths which He repudiated the way of Oumran, in certain of its aspects, must be included.

It is easy to go through the recorded teaching of Jesus and list parallels—some of them quite impressive—with what we find [p. 132] in the Qumran texts. This sort of thing has been done already in relation to the Gospels and rabbinic literature. It has long been known that some kind of parallel can be found in the Talmud to practically every element in the ethical teaching of Jesus. It is idle to feel alarm at this, as though the originality of Jesus and the divine authority of Christianity were imperilled by such a recognition. For He accepted the same Biblical revelation as did the Qumran covenanters and the rabbis in the main stream of Jewish tradition, and it would be surprising if no affinity at all were found between their interpretations of that revelation, on which their teachings were based...

[p. 134] Such features of early Christian life as baptism and the breaking of bread, the rules of fellowship laid down in Matt. 18, the community of goods in the primitive Jerusalem church, the government of the group by apostles, elders and financial officers, have their analogues in the Qumran organization. But their significance within the Christian community is controlled by the person and work of Jesus. This Messiah was different from any kind of Messiah expected at Qumran or elsewhere in Israel in those days, and all the accompaniments of messianic expectation had their meaning transformed in the light of His messianic achievement...

[p. 135] Similarly, as we have seen, there can be no comparison between the Aaronic Messiah expected by the Qumran covenanters and the High Priest after the order of Melchizedek who is portrayed in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

But what about the Davidic Messiah—the Messiah of Israel—whom they also expected?

The Davidic Messiah, in Qumran expectation, would arise in the last days to deliver Israel, born from the travail of the righteous community. He would be the victorious captain of the sons of light in the last conflict with the sons of darkness, and in the new age following that victory he would enjoy a position as prince, second only to the priestly Messiah.

In its essentials this expectation of a Davidic Messiah was shared by many other Israelites (probably by the vast majority). And Jesus repudiated this kind of Messiahship as wholeheartedly as He could, from the days of the wilderness temptation right on to His death... [p. 136] If He had envisaged His messianic task as the launching of a holy war, He would have found thousands of enthusiastic and devoted followers. But it is as certain as anything can be that He rejected the whole conception of such a warfare—whether in the immediate Zealot form or in the deferred Qumran form—in favour of the way of the Suffering Servant.

The Qumran covenanters set themselves to fulfil the r"le of the Servant, but they do not appear to have thought of any of their messianic figures as fulfilling it. Jesus, on the other hand, took the fulfilment of the Servant's r"le upon Himself as the very essence of His messianic mission. He combines in His one person the functions of Prophet, Priest and King; Servant of the Lord, Son of Man, and Teacher of Righteousness. In Him the hope of Israel greets its consummation, but in a way which exceeds all expectation.

588. Dead Sea Scrolls—Relation of Essenes to Christianity SOURCE: Frank Moore Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958), pp. 181–184. Copyright © 1958 by Frank Moore Cross, Jr. Used by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., and Gerald Duckworth & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 181] Some few comments on the relation of Essenism to Christianity may be in order, however, in light of the current popular discussion of the scrolls [the Dead Sea Scrolls, from the community at Qumran]. We have discovered the greatest similarities between these in their common apocalyptic point of view. Both were apocalyptic communities which in their common life attempted to bridge the gap between the Old Age and the New Age. There are, however, distinctions to be made between Essene apocalypticism and New Testament eschatology.

The Essene and the Christian live in the Old Age, yet by anticipation in the new. Thus in some sense we can speak of the "overlapping" of the ages in their existence as members of the New Covenant. For the member of the early Church, however, the time is "later." He stands on a new ground. The Messiah has come. He has been raised. The resurrection is not merely an anticipatory event. It shows that the New Age has [p. 182] come...

The legal framework of Judaism, including Essene Judaism is smashed. The New Age is one in which the law is engraved in the heart. The gift of the Holy Spirit anticipated in Essene doctrine—is poured out on the early Church, so that life is Spiritdominated, and a new freedom replaces or rather fulfills the law.

The peculiarly priestly flavor of Essene apocalypticism is largely missing in early Christianity. "The hour is coming when neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the father ... the hour is coming and now is when the true worshipers will worship the Father in spirit and truth." (Jn. 4:21–23.) The destruction of the Temple caused no strain upon early Christianity. The work of the old sacrificial system was completed in Jesus' sacrifice...

Christian eschatology is more directly rooted in Old Testament prophetism, the Essene in Old Testament priestly traditions. The sure signs of the New Age, according to Jesus, were the healing of the sick, the blind seeing, the dead rising, the dumb speaking.

God gathered the poor, the maimed, the abandoned, the sinner into his banquet. The Essene excluded from the eschatological banquet all the unclean, those distorted in body and spirit...

[p. 183] The Christian lived in that "later moment" in the history of redemption when the Gentiles were to be brought into the Kingdom of God. Hence Christianity turned out to the world. The Essenes, of course, looked forward to the day when Israel would atone for the sins of the world and the nations would flow to Jerusalem...

The "event" of Jesus as the Christ, his exaltation, his resurrection, the gift of his Spirit, distinguishes the two eschatological communities. It is possible that the Righteous Teacher of the Essenes was *expected* to return as a Messiah. But for the Church, Jesus had been resurrected as Messiah. The event was past. The New Age was fully begun. The Messiah *had* come, had been resurrected and enthroned, though he would come again in glory.

We should emphasize that the New Testament faith was not a new faith, but the fulfillment of an old faith. The Church is precisely Israel in its own self-understanding. Jesus did not propose to present a new system of universal truths. He came to fulfill the past work of God, to confirm the faith of the fathers, to open the meaning of the Law and Prophets. The New Testament does not set aside or supplant the Old Tes- [p. 184] tament. It affirms it and, from its point of view, completes it. Lines of continuity between Moses and Jesus, Isaiah and Jesus, the Righteous Teacher and Jesus, John the Baptist and Jesus should occasion no surprise. On the contrary, a biblical faith insists on such continuities. The biblical faith is not a system of ideas, but a history of God's acts of redemption.

It is not the idea of redemption through suffering but the "event" of the crucifixion understood as the atoning work of God that distinguishes Christianity. It is not the doctrine of resurrection but faith in the resurrection of Jesus as an eschatological event which forms the basis of the Christian decision of faith. It is not faith that a Messiah will come that gives Christianity its special character, but the assurance that Jesus rules as the Messiah who has come and will come. It is not the hope of a New Creation that lends uniqueness to Christianity, but the faith that Jesus is the New Adam, the first of the New Creation. Finally, it is not a "love ethic" that distinguishes Christianity from Judaism far from it. The Christian faith is distinguished from the ancient faith which brought it to birth in its knowledge of a new act of God's love, the revelation of His love in Jesus' particular life and death and resurrection.

589. Death, Nature of, Misunderstood

SOURCE: Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead* (New York: Macmillan, 1958), p. 15. © 1958 by Oscar Cullmann. Used with the permission of The Macmillan Company and The Epworth Press, London.

IF WE WERE to ask an ordinary Christian today (whether well-read Protestant or Catholic, or not) what he conceived to be the New Testament teaching concerning the fate of man after death, with few exceptions we should get the answer: 'The immortality of the soul.' Yet this widely-accepted idea is one of the greatest misunderstandings of Christianity. There is no point in attempting to hide this fact, or to veil it by reinterpreting the Christian faith. This is something that should be discussed quite candidly. The concept of death and resurrection is anchored in the Christ-event (as will be shown in the following pages), and hence is incompatible with the Greek belief in immortality.

590. Death, What Happens at, According to Westminster Shorter

Catechism

SOURCE: The Westminster Shorter Catechism, 1647, in Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom, (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 684.

Ques. 37. What benefits do believers receive from Christ at death?

Ans. The souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory; and their bodies, being still united to Christ, do rest in their graves till the resurrection.

591. Denominations, in America, Mergers Among

SOURCE: Robert S. Bilheimer, *The Quest for Christian Unity* (New York: Association Press), pp. 39–41. Copyright 1952 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission.

[The following mergers have occurred within confessional groups.]

- [p. 39] 1. In 1911, the Northern Baptist Convention and the Free Baptists merged, the title of the Northern Baptist Convention being retained, although in 1951 it was changed to the *American Baptist Convention*.
- 2. In 1917, the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States, the General Council of the Lutheran Church in the United States, and the United Synod of the South formed the *United Lutheran Church*. [This body is now in process of forming a merger with the American Evangelical Lutheran Church, the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the Finish Evangelical Lutheran Church (Suomi Synod), to be completed in 1962, under the name of the Lutheran Church in America.]
- 3. In 1917, Hague's [i.e., Hauge's] Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Synod, the Synod of the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, and the United Norwegian Lutheran Church in America united to form the *Norwegian Church of America*.
- 4. In 1920, the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church united under the title of *The Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A*. [This body united in 1958 with the United Presbyterian Church as The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.]
- 5. In 1922, the Evangelical Association and the United Evangelical Church united to form *The Evangelical Church*.

6. 1924, the Reformed Church in the U.S. and the Hungarian Reformed in America united under the title *Reformed Church in the U.S.*

- [p. 40] 7. In 1924, the Congregational Churches and the Evangelical Protestant Churches united under the title of *Congregational Churches*.
- 8. In 1930, the Lutheran Synod of Buffalo, the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Iowa and other States, and the Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Ohio and other States united to form the *American Lutheran Church*. [This body united in 1961 with the Evangelical Lutheran Church and the United Evangelical Lutheran Churches to form The American Lutheran Church.]
- In 1939, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and the Methodist Protestant Church united to form *The Methodist Church*... [p. 41] Three mergers have occurred which cross confessional lines:
- 1. In 1931, the Christian Churches [not the "Campbellites," or Disciples; see No. 413, 1743a (ii)] ... and the Congregational Churches united to form the *Congregational Christian Churches* [see editors' note].

- 2. In 1934, the Evangelical Synod of North America and the Reformed Church in the United States united to form the *Evangelical and Reformed Church*. [For a union of this body with the Congregational Christian Churches, see editors' note.]
- 3. In 1946, the Evangelical Church and the United Brethren in Christ united to form the *Evangelical United Brethren Church*.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Two later mergers that crossed confessional lines are the union of the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church to form The United Church of Christ (1957–1961) and the consolidation of the American Unitarian Association and the Universalist Church of America to form the Unitarian Universalist Association (1961). In addition, preliminary action was taken in 1961 in the direction of yet another merger, the largest yet proposed, namely the action taken by the General Assembly of The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., not only to approve the 1960 Blake-Pike proposal (see No. 664), but to enlarge the original proposal to include more than 30 denominations (see No. 665).]

592. Denominations, in America, Reasons for Multiplicity of SOURCE: Robert S. Bilheimer, *The Quest for Christian Unity* (New York: Association Press), pp. 22, 23. Copyright 1952 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 22] All five of the great branches of the Protestant and Orthodox churches have been transplanted to the United States, originally through immigration. Indeed, the great central bloc of Christianity in the United States, exclusive of Roman Catholicism, consists of denominations which are part of these great families. In accounting for the multiplicity of denominations in the U.S.A., we must remember that within each family there are a number of distinct, separately organized, and autonomous denominations. Thus in addition to the Protestant Episcopal Church, there are twenty-one Lutheran churches, thirteen Reformed or Presbyterian bodies, twelve Eastern Orthodox; the remainder, nearly two hundred, come under the head of the "radical" or "free church" branch of protestantism. What has caused these numbers? In part, and perhaps the largest part, national origin is responsible. Thus, Lutherans from Germany, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden have formed separate churches here; Reformed from Holland and Germany and Presbyterians from Scotland, Orthodox from Russia, Greece, Hungary, Romania, have done the same. In part, theological difference has [p. 23] accounted for many denominations, particularly the smaller ones. Offshoots from larger churches have been common, with the result of separate churches which, however, hold almost the same beliefs. Thus, there are thirteen churches in the Reformed or Presbyterian group, twentyfour on the Baptist group, twenty-three in the Methodist group. Racial factors, as well as the influences of sectionalism, particularly the differences between North and South, have added to the divisions.

Some new churches have been formed, many of them around a particular article of Christian doctrine, especially, belief concerning the return of Christ. An especially significant new church, belonging by tradition and present life to the main, central stream of Christianity, is the Disciples of Christ. Although now found in many countries, through missionary work, its origins were in the United States, and its chief strength lies here as well. Originally formed out of a general Presbyterian matrix, the founders and their descendants have held to four cardinal tenets: the absolute supremacy of the Scriptures; a desire for unity among all Christians, providing that this unity is founded on the Scriptures without reference to a creed; the baptism of people who consciously believe, as distinguished from infant baptism; and a congregational form of organization. The Disciples were founded amid the conditions of the frontier.

593 Diet, Diversified, Supplies Adequate Protein From Qualitative Standpoint

SOURCE: Harry J. Deuel, Jr., "Caloric, Vitamin and Mineral Requirements With Particular Reference to Protein Nutrition," chap. 3 in *Proteins and Amino Acids in Nutrition*, ed. by Melville Sahyun, p. 97. Copyright 1948 by Reinhold Publishing Corporation, New York. Used by permission.

From a practical standpoint in human nutrition, these effects of deficient proteins [those lacking certain specific amino acids] are not of great importance. Such proteins are seldom found alone, but they usually occur in a mixture with several other proteins which more or less complement each other. Therefore, when the sources of protein in the diet are fairly well diversified, there is little danger of the protein being inadequate from the qualitative standpoint.

594. Diet—Fat Intake and Disease

SOURCE: Carlos Tejada and others, "Comparative Severity of Atherosclerosis in Costa Rica, Guatemala, and New Orleans," *Circulation* 18 (July, 1958), 96. Copyright 1958 by Grune & Stratton, Inc. Used by permission of the American Heart Association, Inc., New York, and the author.

There is an apparent correspondence between the dietary fat intake, the serum cholesterol levels, Sf 0-12 lipoprotein patterns, and the degree of aortic atherosclerotic lesions as measured by these methods.

595. Diet—Fats, Two Kinds of

SOURCE: W. Henry Sebrell, Jr., "What to Eat to Live Longer," Interview in U.S. News & World Report, 48 (April 11, 1960), 96. Copyright 1960 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington, D.C. Used by permission.

... *Q* What makes fat dangerous?

A Let me try to explain just a little bit about fats:

Fats consist of mixtures of what are called saturated fatty acids and unsaturated fatty acids.

The fats that are high in saturated fatty acids are usually the animal fats—things like beef fat and pork fat—and butter, cream and cheese, that is, the fat from milk. These are usually solid fats. One of the exceptions to this is coconut oil, which also consists largely of saturated fatty acids.

The vegetable fats—such things as peanut oil, corn oil, soybean oil, safflower oil contain varying amounts of polyunsaturated fatty acids. It has been shown that, if you keep the calorie intake under control, and if you reduce the amount of total fat in the diet, and if you make the fat you eat one which contains considerable amounts of polyunsaturated fatty acids, you can lower a high blood cholesterol...

Q What foods will help in lowering a high blood cholesterol?

A As I have indicated, these are the unsaturated fats that contain a high proportion of polyunsaturated fatty acids, found in vegetable fats such as peanut oil, corn oil, soybean oil, safflower oil.

596. Diet, Importance of

SOURCE: W. Henry Sebrell, Jr., "What to Eat to Live Longer," Interview in U.S. News & World Report, 48 (April 11, 1960). 90. Copyright 1960 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington, D.C. Used by permission.

Q Dr. Sebrell, as people grow older, they notice more and more of their friends falling by the wayside in the late 40s or mid-50s. Why? Is there a dangerous age that individuals should be aware of?

A No, there isn't any particularly dangerous age. We see our friends falling by the wayside as we get older mainly from the degenerative diseases these days in this country, and we don't know the causes of many of these diseases.

Is faulty diet a possible cause?

A Diet is one of the most important factors in determining how long an individual lives. We like to say in public health that, while a good diet can't guarantee that you will be in good health, you can't be in the best of health unless you live on a good diet.

Q Why is that?

A It works out in this way: Even though you never suffer acute malnutrition, years and years of improper eating—of dietary indiscretions—will add up to various kinds of damage to your body that will inevitably shorten your life. Especially questionable is the relation to heart disease, of course.

597. Diet, Importance of, in the Formation of Character

SOURCE: Arthur F. Smethurst, *Modern Science and Christian Beliefs* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), Part 2, chap. 3, pp. 147, 148. Copyright 1955 by A. F. Smethurst. Used by permission.

[p. 147] It may well be that the cure for some types of moral wickedness lies not in the philosophical or intellectual sphere, but purely in the biochemical one. Many perversions and defects of human personality can be cured by right and balanced nutrition. This illustrates the wisdom of our forefathers, who recognized the importance of good cooking, [p. 148] and treated food not as something rather undignified to be hurried through without consideration, but as a profound and delicate art and science of the highest standard. Interesting evidence of the effects of under-nutrition has been supplied from time to time by those who for some reason have had to endure privations in this respect; and weighty testimony was given, for example, of the fact that the difficult political situation in Greece immediately after the end of the war was due not so much to political or economic factors, but rather to under-nutrition, reducing the efficient functioning of the brain and causing lack of self-control. It is not impossible that the true cure for most political troubles is proper feeding and carefully balanced dieting!

598. Diet—Knowledge Must Be Put Into Practice SOURCE: Lenna F. Cooper and others, *Nutrition in Health and Disease* (13th ed.), p. 3. Copyright 1958 by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The subject of nutrition is as old as man's search for food, but the science of nutrition is new. We have today a wealth of scientific knowledge about food with fresh concepts and applications. Knowledge of how we use food to nourish our bodies is the result of long years of research in laboratories in many countries, but this alone is not sufficient. Knowledge must be put into action not just by doctors who may prescribe special diets but by every homemaker who cares about the health of her family. Experts apply new discoveries in electronics so that we may enjoy TV by merely pushing a button, but there is no push-button application of nutrition. In contrast, the practical application of new discoveries in nutrition must be made by everyone who chooses his own food.

599. Diet—Lifetime Concept of Good Food Habits Emphasized SOURCE: Charles Glen King, "Trends in the Science of Food and Its Relation to Life and Health," *Nutrition Reviews*, 10 (Jan., 1952), 4. Copyright 1951 by Nutrition Foundation Inc., New York. Used by permission.

It is utterly foolish to emphasize too greatly the role of only one or a few nutrients such as a single mineral, sugar, protein or vitamin, or the nutrition of a single part of the body, such as the hair or skin. That is why nutrition scientists are so heartily in agreement with our trustees in believing that the only reasonable goal in nutrition is a lifetime concept of good food habits.

600. Diet—Mosaic Distinction Between Clean and Unclean Animals (Jewish Doctor on)

SOURCE: Jacob B. Glenn, "The Bible and Modern Medicine," *The Jewish Forum*, 43 (September, 1960), 152, 153. Used by permission.

[p. 152] In discussing the kinds of meat and fish permitted by Mosaic law, medical reasons were given to explain these injunctions. In addition to the non-kosher mammals and fish, a great number of avian animals (birds and fowl) were also strictly forbidden.

In his commentary to the Bible (Lev. XI, 19), Nahmanides (Ha-Ramban) states: "And this is the explanation (*taam*) of the prohibition against certain fowls, because of the cruelty that they possess from birth ... for we find a change in their physiological structure ... and the cardinal characteristic (*simman*) in the fowl is tearing the prev

(*d'risah*) such a bird of prey is forever unclean (*ta'me*) because the Torah has excluded it from the rest, since its blood is heated up to cruelty."

It appears from the above that, on the whole, carniverous [*sic*] animals were prohibited while mainly herbiverous [*sic*] animals (mammals and fowls) were permitted. A list of such animals is given here in some detail:

Aquatic forms of life: (Lev XI:9–10 and Deut. XIV:9, 10) Kosher: Non-kosher:

fish possessing scales and fins	shell covered fish (lobster, oysters, crab[,] star, and jelly-fishes)
Reptiles: all non-kosher (Lev. XI:42)	
Birds: (Lev. XI:13–19 and	d Deut. XIV:11–18)
doves, pigeons,	bat, cuckoo, eagle,
fowl, chicken,	heron, hawk, kite,
duck, turkey,	ostrich, pelican,
goose, quail	raven, stork
Mammals: (Lev. XI:12 & Deut. XIV:4-8)	
bizon [bison], cow,	camel, cat, bear,
ox, ewe, goat, deer,	dog, hare, lizard,
lamb	mouse, mole,
	weasel, swine,
	tortoise
Insects: (Lev. XI:22–23 & Deut. XIV:19)	
locust,	all others
1	

grasshoppers

We may now observe that, according to the precepts of the Torah, there is a definite relationship between the type of animals allowed to be eaten and that not allowed. The biblical concept is that those mammalian and avian animals which are forbidden by Mosaic law contain a factor or factors (physiological) residing within the animal and

rendering it voracious and carniverous. When the meat of such an animal is ingested by the human being, there is the possibility that the animal characteristics and propensities might conceivably enter the human bloodstream (which is [p. 153] the very substance of life) and produce a type of an individual with carniverous characteristics.

A further Biblical conception regarding such animals is the fact that the meat of these animals is tough and not exactly palatable. The process of digestion is definitely prolonged, which process in turn stains the circulatory apparatus, especially the heart and kidneys. The prohibition against consuming carniverous animals was thus another measure for safeguarding the everyday life of the individual and the group, the pivot about which the Mosaic laws apparently revolve. The Torah, *being a Tree of Life*, thus assumes a deeper significance.

We may now ask, what has modern medicine to say about these possible Biblical considerations regarding the dietary laws. Analyzing recent sources and consulting with a few outstanding internists, physiologists and biochemists regarding the physiological effects of many types of proteinous foods on the human being, enabled me to arrive at some workable conclusions:

Of the five essential nutrients in the diet (carbohydrates, fat, protein, minerals, and vitamins), fat and proteins are those which, although vital to the very life of an individual, put a greater demand, strain and stress on the gastro-intestinal tract. The flesh of carnivores, physiologically speaking, further taxes the gastro-intestinal tract. When excessively ingested, protein metabolism on the whole specially taxes the kidneys with untoward symptoms that very often lead to kidney trouble. Furthermore, in the process of protein digestion, there is produced an extra amount of energy known as the *specific-dynamic action of protein* in terms of added caloric output. This specific action of protein is particularly undesirable in warmer or hot climates, where the extra body heat and body dynamism is superfluous.

Physiologically, biochemically and medically there is at present no definite proof that the structure of the protein molecules, whatever their source, differs much one from the other. These protein molecules, the end result of the complicated digestive process, when entering the human circulatory system to serve as building blocks in the constant process of cell growth, do not seem to carry with them genetically-bound determiners of any kind. The protein molecules of the carnivores have as yet not been discovered to be laden with specific characteristics that can be visualized in the strongest microscope.

Consequently, the supposition that the characteristics of a beast or a voracious animal might, when its meat is eaten by humans, be passed on to them, has not yet been proven by medical science.

From the historical point of view and from the day to day observation of human life, individual, group and national, we do learn that perhaps the two potent factors, namely ecological and nutritional, *are* affecting the type, the characteristics and the differentiation among not only races and nations but also among individuals. Physicians and nutritionists know from experience that the very physiognomy of a person is conditioned by the amount and type of food he or she consumes. Diet has definitely shaped the culture and civilization of peoples and brought about diversified concepts of spiritual, moral and ethical concepts. And even though not scientifically or physiologically ascertained as yet, the fact of close relationship existing between the character-pattern of a person and the type of food one eats, is irrefutable.

Abstaining from all the above listed kinds of non-kosher foods undoubtedly was one of the greatest factors in securing the existence of the Jewish people and *insuring its everlasting wholesomeness*. It was the strict adherence to the divinely inspired dietary laws that has actually insulated the Jewish people and made them impervious to the many ravaging diseases caused by the ingestion of non-kosher foods, which undoubtedly carry the seeds of disease and destruction to the human organism.

601. Diet, Mosaic Distinctions in—Scaleless Fishes Poisonous, in Jewish Doctor's Experiment

SOURCE: David I. Macht, "An Experimental Appreciation of Leviticus XI. 9–12 and Deuteronomy XIV 9–

10," Harofé Haivri ("The Hebrew Medical Journal"), 2 (1942), 166, 165. Used by permission.

[p. 166] The most interesting and surprising observation made in connection with the present investigation [see editors' note] was the fact that a toxin action was exerted by extracts from fishes having no scales while extracts of all those possessing them were found to be innocuous.

The results obtained in the pharmacological studies described above are of interest to the student of the Bible, revealing as they do that the Levitical zoological classification of fishes is sound and rational from the standpoint of pharmacology and toxicology because all the poisonous fishes so far studied belong to the group possessing no scales. Physiological extracts from all the species possessing scales exhibited [p. 165] little or not toxicity for either the mice or seedlings employed in the experiments.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The experiment involved intraperitoneal injection of muscle juices from a wide

variety of fishes into white mice, and observation of the comparative growth of *Lupinus albus* seedlings in plant-physiological solutions and in 1% solutions of the muscle suspensions.]

602. Diet—Mosaic Prohibition of Fats, Scientific Basis for (Jewish Doctor on)

SOURCE: Jacob B. Glenn, M.D., "The Bible and Modern Medicine," *The Jewish Forum*, 43 (May, 1960), 74, 75. Used by permission.

[p. 74] We may clearly see that the consumption of fat by the early Hebrews was, if not totally prohibited, discouraged and thought of as being injurious to the body. It was considered that loose fat thwarted mental alertness and integrity of the individual.

It was not, however, until recently that science (biology, biochemistry and medicine) has gone deeply into the very structure of fat and its role in the diet.

Fat is a class of neutral organic compounds (glycerol esters of oleic, palmitic and stearic acids) which are essentially energy yielding and insulating foodstuffs (one gram yielding 9.3 calories) which play a definite and vital role in the digestive processes and also serve as the insulating and covering material for the body and especially its internal organs. Fat is also, along with carbohydrates, proteins, vitamins, and minerals, a vital constituent of the cells themselves, which, in turn, play a vital role in the very physiological and biological processes of the body and mind of the individual.

The excessive accumulation of fat on the abdominal cavity and coverings (fat of the mesentarium) and at the base and apex (tip) of the heart, may produce a hazardous condition for the body. An abundance of fat in these regions may cause a state of heaviness and sluggishness. Too many fat globules in the blood may retard and interfere with normal circulation and cause a strain on the very function of the heart, which is to pump the entire blood volume to and from the lungs for the purpose of maintaining

external and internal respiration—vital processes by which oxygenation of every cell in the body takes place and without which life as we know it on this earth is impossible.

Too much fat may slow up this breathing process which, in turn, limits the range of cellular activity and results in untoward symptoms and disease.

The main danger in fat consumption lies in a constituent of fat cells, which has recently come to the fore in medical research—CHOLESTEROL. This substance is an unsaturated monohydric alcohol of the class of sterols richly found in bile, blood, nervous tissue, egg-yolk, liver, pancreas, and kidney substances. This cholesterol has a definite physiologic function and is vital in certain amounts in the metabolic processes of the body and mind.

It was not until quite recently that medical attention was focused on this, to some extent, still mysterious substance, especially with regard to the common and widely spread disease of the aging human being; namely, arteriosclerosis (hardening of the arteries).

This disease, which may affect even younger individuals, attacks the vascular system by first causing a deposit of cholesterol in the inner layer (there are three layers in each vessel) and then by the formation of calcium in this layer of cholesterol. The vessel thus becomes hard, narrow and brittle. As a direct consequence of this very often slow process, vital parts of the body, such as the heart, the brain, the kidneys, and the lungs may be severely affected. The small vessels supplying the heart itself with blood, the coronary arteries, may become so narrow that oxygenation of the heart-muscle becomes impaired. a condition called *anging pactoris* (now known as coronary insufficience)

impaired—a condition called *angina pectoris* (now known as coronary insufficiency), which manifests [p. 75] itself by seizures of severe chest pains especially after physical and mental exertion and excessive eating and drinking. Clots may be formed in these vessels which may result in partial or total closure of the coronaries, ensuing in death.

When the main artery of the brain, the so-called middle meningeal artery, is affected by this all-destructive arteriosclerotic process, this artery may either burst (apoplexy), inundating large parts of the brain with blood, and thus cut off vital functions of the brain (paralysis), or a clot may form which prevents the circulation of blood in the brain, with the same result.

The arterio-sclerotic heart diseases are actually responsible for the greatest number of deaths in our society. In more recent investigations by professors Dudley White, William Dock and many others, it was established with considerable accuracy that those so-called animal fats (beef, lamb, fowl, etc.) contain great amounts of cholesterol which is fundamentally responsible for the development of arterio-sclerosis, especially among those peoples who consume great amounts of this animal fat. Dr. Dock was able to ascertain the fact that groups like the Yemenites in Israel rarely if ever develop arterio-sclerosis. These people eat hardly any animal fat at all, subsisting mainly on vegetable and olive oils which contain practically no cholesterol. The same is true of Arab groups and many of the Mediterranean peoples. Even though these people may grow stout, they do not seem to develop arterio-sclerotic diseases the way the north-European and American people do.

Thus, the admonition against the consumption of free animal fat in the Mosaic law assumes great significance and attests to the truth of its dietary principles in safeguarding human life.

603. Diet, Mosaic Restrictions on—Diseases Among Pigs

SOURCE: William A. Hagan, Introduction to the Conference, in *The Relation of Diseases in the Lower Animals to Human Welfare, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 48, art. 6 (April 10, 1947), 353, 354. Copyright 1947 by The New York Academy of Sciences. Used by permission of the publishers and the author.

[p. 353] Nearly half of the pigs that are born die before they reach marketable age, and this is true in our country...

[p. 354] The total losses from animal diseases in the United States are probably smaller than in any other major country in the world. These losses are often calculated from the number of deaths, but it is very obvious that death losses represent only a fraction of the total. The principal losses, today, are from various kinds of parasitisms which drain the vitality of our animals and lessen their production, without actually killing them.

604. Diet, Mosaic Rules on—Scientific Aspects (Jewish Doctor on) SOURCE: Jacob B. Glenn, M.D., "Modern Medicine in the Light of Mosaic Law," *The Jewish Forum*, 40 (January, 1958), 1, 2. Used by permission.

[p. 1] With the relatively recent advance of modern medicine, the accumulating scientific data, which is affecting and practically revolutionizing medical progress, appear to substantiate and prove the only and eternal truth, revealed to the greatest Law-giver of all times, *Mosheh Rabbenu*—Moses, our teacher.

The *taryag* (613) precepts of do's and don't's as inscribed in fiery letters in our Book of Life, our Torah Um'sorah, is unalterable and eternal like the earth and the celestial bodies that existed before the creation of our earth.

The Jewish people, destined and ordained to be the eternal people, to carry the name of God Almighty and his sacred laws from the very first day of its birth to the end of the ages, need no confirmation as to the truth and the unchangeable tenets of the Torah. But the understanding of the meaning of our precepts enhances the power, the beauty, the goodness, and the wisdom of the law and renders adherence to the Torah even more complete.

Foods We May Not Eat

Of the aquatic forms of life, the Jew is alone in limiting his food to that kind which is covered with scales and possesses a double pair of fins on its back and abdomen. Lobsters, crabs, clams, shrimps, starfishes, and jelly-fishes are forbidden. It has been known for some time that these last mentioned creatures may harbor injurious and toxic substances which, after entering the gastro-intestinal tract and absorbed by the circulatory system of the human being, spreads throughout the organism. The kind and type of diseases these toxic substances produce are not yet exactly known to medical science, but in laboratory experiments, a definite fact has been established regarding these finless fishes, that of the coli titer. Now, the coli bacteria in themselves are non-disease producing bacteria (they may become, however, pathogene in mixed infections); but the concentration of the coli bacteria in water and in the intestines of animals is used as an indicator for the purity of water and relative sterility of the intestinal flora of the animal.

It was thus established that the non-scaly and non-finned fish revealed an abnormally high coli titer in its intestines, indicating the definite presence of other bacteria and viruses in this animal. Hence, to eat this lobsters and shrimps is to open the door wide for the penetration of the harmful and toxic material into the human body. It is common knowledge that the meat of the pork is extremely injurious to the human body because of the dreaded trichinosis. In spite of the strict supervision by practically all civilized governments in the processing of pork meat, this disease is still rampant, especially in the rural areas.

[p. 2] We Jews may eat the meat only of those animals that chew their cud and the hoofs of which are cloven. Those animals which do not reveal these two outstanding marks, are forbidden. Modern medical thinking proves that the process of digestion in, say the cow, is more complete because, due to the chewing of the cud, the chyle (which is absorbed into the streaming blood from the lymphatic system by the intestinal villae), is more refined and its degree of purity from bacteria which might have entered the animal while eating grass, is higher than the meat of a non-cud chewer. Most of the cud-chewers happen to be cloven-hoofed. And although there is no scientific proof for the purity of the animal due to its being cloven-hoofed, this outward and outstanding sign was coupled with the cud-chewing to render the animal a *b'hema k'sherah*, 'a clean animal.'

Blood

"And ye shall eat no manner of blood" (Lev. [7], verse 26). The Jew is permitted the meat of the animal but not its blood. Aside from the beautiful and sublimely moral principle in the admonition not to eat the very essence of life, there is, in addition, another, more scientific principle embodied in this strict "lo taaseh," 'thou shalt not do.' Outstanding hematologists have found that the circulating blood in humans and animals alike harbor more—if not all—pathogene agents, the bacteria, viruses and certain types of protozoans. Of course, the white blood cells in the circulating blood and in the lymphatic system serve as guards for the protection of the human body in warding off these harmful agents; but the massive concentration of the toxic material in the blood is always potentially dangerous for human consumption.

In this connection, the ritual of "shehitah" assumes a meaningful importance. The drawing of the blood thru severing the jugular veins is not only a performance which completely drains the animal of its blood but also simultaneously provides the means of causing the slaughtered animal to lose blood immediately from the tissues of the brain, with the immediate loss of consciousness. Consequently, there is no pain perception by the animal. The so-called "modern" and "humane" way of stunning the animal with a heavy blow on its head—virtually an electric shock—is certainly, scientifically speaking, much more painful to the animal than the *shehitah* ritual. The blessing which is recited

by the shohet at the time of slaughtering the animal serves a high moral purpose-that of

reducing the seeming cruelty, by the *shohet's* concentration on God Almighty and His absolute power over all creation.

605. Diet—Overeating, a Damaging Practice

SOURCE: Charles Glen King, "Basic Research and Its Application in the Field of Clinical Nutrition," *The [American] Journal of Clinical Nutrition,* 1 (Sept.–Oct., 1952), 2. Copyright 1952 by The Nutritional Press, New York. Used by permission.

Unquestionably, one of the most damaging practices is simply eating too much. **606. Diet**—Protein Adequate From a Sufficiency of Whole Grains and

Legumes

SOURCE: Fredrick J. Stare and George W. Thorn, "Some Medical Aspects of Protein Foods," *American Journal of Public Health*, 33 (Dec., 1943), 1449. Copyright 1943 by American Public Health Association, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

As long as this country has access to a plentiful supply of calories, and a variety of whole grain cereals and legumes, it is most unlikely that *impairment of health* from protein deficiency will ever occur.

607. Diet—Protein Deficiency Unlikely in Adequate Vegetarian Diet SOURCE: D. M. Hegsted, F. J. Stare and others, "Protein Requirements of Adults," *The Journal of Laboratory and Clinical Medicine*, 31 (March, 1946), 282. Copyright 1946 by C. V. Mosby Company, St. Louis, Mo. Used by permission of the publisher and Fredrick J. Stare.

- 7. It is most unlikely that protein deficiency will develop in apparently healthy adults on a diet in which cereals and vegetables supply adequate calories.
- 8. Considering the experimental data presented in this study, the National Research Council's daily recommended allowance of 70 Gm. of protein for an adult weighing 70 kilograms is most generous and could, if necessary, be reduced to 50 Gm. and still provide approximately 30 per cent margin above requirement.
- 9. It should be emphasized that the experimental data and the conclusions of this paper apply to adults in apparent good health and do not consider protein requirements in growth, pregnancy, lactation, or disease.

608. Diet—Protein Requirement Not Increased in Exercise

SOURCE: Fredrick J. Stare and George W. Thorn, "Some Medical Aspects of Protein Foods," *American Journal of Public Health*, 33 (Dec., 1943), 1449. Copyright 1943 by American Public Health Association, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

There are definite psychological problems of convincing a population used to eating a high protein diet that one of much lower protein content, and low in animal protein, will not necessarily impair health. Lumberjacks may demand plenty of red meat to get timber cut, but that demand rests on habit and not on a nutritional or medical basis...

The protein requirement is not increased in exercise, and physical fitness and efficiency are not impaired or improved on low protein diets adequate in other nutrients.

609. Diet—Roman Conquerors Near-Vegetarians

SOURCE: R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, Vol. 3, p. 101. Copyright 1955 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands. Used by permission.

The often over-refined taste of the Romans in the Imperial period led to the improved grinding and sifting of flour which, however, meant the discarding of the nourishing bran. The common people still ate the old-fashioned food and this is particularly true of the army. The soldier's diet was still based on a daily ration of two pounds of barley and wheat, the soldiers carried their own rotary querns and prepared their own flour, which they baked. Beans, pork-fat, beer, wine and oil supplemented this diet. Meat was considered an extra and Scipio still grumbles about the spits, which the soldiers would have to carry in order to roast their own meat. Even during the late Roman Empire a tactician like VEGETIUS still considers meat an "adminiculum", that is an "addition" to the vegetarian diet of the soldier…

The ancient world disposed of certain limited amounts of animal fats such as lard but it depended mainly on olive oil for its supply of fats. Butter, though known, was used in certain religious rites and medical recipes only but not consumed on any large scale.

610. Diet—Shift to Grain Products, Fruits, Vegetables, Predicted

SOURCE: Henry C. Sherman, "The Nutritional Improvement of Life," *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*, 22 (July, 1946), 580. Copyright 1946 by The American Dietetic Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

Undoubtedly, the more open-minded we are in using the guidance of the newer knowledge of nutrition for greater efficiency in food management, the more extensively will we meet our needs through grain products, fruits, vegetables and milk.

611. Diet—Variety, With Fruits and Vegetables

SOURCE: W. Henry Sebrell, Jr., "What to Eat to Live Longer," Interview in U.S. News & World Report, 48 (April 11, 1960), 93. Copyright 1960 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington, D.C.

... Q Is the diet of "meat, potatoes and apple pie" all right?

A Don't put it on those terms. You can't live on steak and potatoes and apple pie. *Q* What does that diet need?

A Add some fruits and vegetables and some cereal and milk. Let's say the normal American diet pattern, made up of the large variety of excellent foods that we, so fortunately, can go in any store and buy—variety is the important thing. But don't eat too much of anything...

612. Diet—Vegetable Proteins Adequate in Varied Diet SOURCE: Samson Wright, *Applied Physiology* (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), p. 1055. Used by permission.

In any mixed diet, even if wholly of plant origin, the proteins are sure to be sufficiently varied to compensate for any individual inadequacies in amino-acid content, if only the total amount of protein is sufficient.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This sentence was italicized in the original paragraph.]

613. Diet—Vegetable Proteins Adequate When Mixed

SOURCE: "New Sources of Protein," *The Lancet*, Vol. 2 for 1959 (Nov. 28, 1959), 957. Used by permission. Formerly vegetable proteins were classified as second-class and regarded as inferior

to first-class proteins of animal origin; but this distinction has now been generally discarded. Certainly some vegetable proteins, if fed as the *sole* source of protein, are of relatively low value for promoting growth; but many field trials have shown that the proteins provided by suitable *mixtures* of vegetable origin enable children to grow no less well than children provided with milk and other animal proteins.

614. Diet—Vegetable Proteins Adequate When Varied

SOURCE: Henry C. Sherman, *Chemistry of Food and Nutrition* (7th ed.), p. 75. Copyright 1946 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

Thus with a knowledge of the nutritional chemistry of the proteins of various foods it becomes relatively easy so to utilize their supplementary relationships that even an inexpensive mixed diet shall be safe from such shortages of individual amino acids as have been illustrated in the feeding experiments with isolated proteins. Also, it becomes important to reform the traditional habit of speaking of "animal protein" as if it alone were efficient in this connection, for we now know that several of the plant proteins are similarly effective.

615. Diet—Vegetable Proteins Satisfactory

SOURCE: Sir Stanley Davidson and others, *Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, p. 732. Copyright 1959 by E. & S. Livingstone Ltd., Edinburgh and London. Used by permission.

It is now known that suitable mixtures of vegetable proteins can replace satisfactorily the animal protein in the diet of the young child.

616. Diet—Vegetable Proteins Used to Improve Diet in Central America

SOURCE: Nevin Scrimshaw, Discussion in the Fifth International Congress on Nutrition, Washington, D.C., Sept. 1–7, 1960, confirmed in a letter of January 6, 1961, to Mrs. Joyce Hopp, Washington, D.C.

When one seeks to improve the protein nutrition in an area, he must find something that is (1) economical to produce and purchase, (2) palatable, (3) culturally acceptable, and (4) easy to introduce into every day diets... The challenge today [is] to supply the protein needs of the world ... not only from animal sources alone for they are too costly of money and land ... but also by combining vegetable proteins in optimum patterns.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Dr. Scrimshaw and associates have developed INCAPARINA, a mixture of vegetable

proteins that is being used with success to supplement the diet of children to prevent *kwashiorkor*, a worldwide protein-deficiency disease.]

617. Diet—Vegetable Source Considered Adequate if Varied and Wellplanned

SOURCE: "Vegetable Diets for Children," in Annotations, *British Medical Journal*, No. 4972 (April 21, 1956), 909. Used by permission.

It seems reasonable to conclude that a varied and well-planned diet, even if derived entirely from vegetable sources, may sometimes be more nutritious than a less well planned diet which contains a little milk and meat.

618. Diet—Vegetarian Diet Recommended to Reduce Cholesterol Level in the Blood

SOURCE: J. M. R. Beveridge, Discussion in the Fifth International Congress on Nutrition, Washington, D.C., Sept. 1–7, 1960, confirmed in a letter of January 5, 1961, to Mrs. Joyce Hopp, Washington, D.C.

If a moderate restriction of foods high in animal fat and in cholesterol together with the introduction of vegetable oil, such as corn oil or safflower oil, is not effective in decreasing plasma lipid levels, then the next obvious step is to get as close as possible to a vegetarian diet.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This statement was made in response to the question, "If you had a high blood cholesterol, what would you do?"]

619. Diet—Vegetarian Diet With Milk Highly Nutritious SOURCE: E[Imer] V[erner] McCollum and others, *The Newer Knowledge of Nutrition* (5th ed., entirely

rewritten), pp. 563, 564. Copyright 1939 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 563] The lacto-vegetarian diet, or combination of vegetable foods and milk, is, however, easy to plan so as to be highly nutritious, and to promote optimal health... [p. 564] Muscle meats are less valuable supplements for vegetable foods than are milk, eggs, and glandular organs, since they are less rich in most of the vitamins, contain a poorly constituted mineral mixture that is low in calcium...

Milk and eggs are the only foods which are designed by nature for the nourishment of the young. Experiment shows that they are excellently constituted for this purpose and are equally valuable for adults.

620. Diet—Vegetarian Diet With Milk or Eggs, Adequate

SOURCE: Lotta Jean Bogert, *Nutrition and Physical Fitness* (7th ed.), pp. 108, 457. Copyright 1960 by W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission of the publisher and the author.

[p. 108] Vegetable proteins, such as those in cereal products, potatoes, and leafy vegetables, have an important value in the diet (especially when eaten in considerable quantities), since the amino acid mixtures they provide supplement those in animal foods. Conversely, a vegetarian diet can be made entirely adequate in quality of proteins by supplementing vegetable proteins with some milk, cheese, or eggs, protein foods which most vegetarians use...

[p. 457] If the foods are wisely chosen, it is possible to have excellent physical development, vigor, and endurance on a vegetarian diet (e.g., some of the Hindu sects).

621. Diet—Vegetarianism and Vascular Disease

SOURCE: Editorial, "Diet and Stress in Vascular Disease," *JAMA*, 176 (June 3, 1961), 806. Copyright 1961 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

Sixty-five years ago, Osler listed heredity, rich diet, alcohol, tobacco and, above all, the "worry and strain of modern life" as the causes of arteriosclerosis and especially of coronary disease. Within a decade, experiments were under way which showed that diets rich in milk solids and egg yolk were related to disease in rabbits; 20 years later American pathologists confirmed Anichkov's experimental arteriosclerosis following upon cholesterol following upon cholesterol feeding. In the past two decades, studies on men have confirmed Snapper's thesis that vegetable oils and low animal fat in the diet caused the striking difference in arterial disease and in venous thrombo-embolism observed in Peiping and in Amsterdam. Thomas' comparison of thrombo-embolic disease and coronary disease in Negroes in St. Louis and in Uganda (matched necropsies of those over 40 years old) indicates that a vegetarian diet can prevent 90 percent of our thrombo-embolic disease and 97 per cent of our coronary occlusions.³ [Note 3: Thomas, W. A., and others: Incidence of Myocardial Infarction Correlated with Venous and Pulmonary Thrombosis and Embolism: Geographic Study Based on Autopsies in Uganda, East Africa, and St. Louis, U.S.A., *Amer J Cardiol* **5:**41–47 (Jan.) 1960.]

622. Diet—Vegetarians Classified

SOURCE: Mervyn G. Hardinge and Frederick J. Stare, "Nutritional Studies of Vegetarians," *The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition*, 2 (March–April, 1954), 74. Copyright 1954 by The Nutritional Press, New York. Used by permission.

It has been estimated by Gallup (1943) that there are two and one-half to three million vegetarians in the United States. These are divided among three widely separate and distinct vegetarian groups. One is found within the ranks of the Catholic Church, the Trappist monks. Their dietary usually includes the use of milk but no meat. Another is sponsored by the Seventh-day Adventist Church, whose health and educational program includes a lacto-ovo-vegetarian diet. The third vegetarian group is heterogen[e]ous in nature, being drawn together by various motives such as nonviolence and animal friendliness. A few persons in each group, mainly among the last, exclude all foods of animal origin and are here referred to as "pure" vegetarians...

Lacto-ovo-vegetarians are here defined as individuals who do not use as food the flesh of animals (meat, poultry, and fish), but do eat such foods as milk, eggs, and products made from or containing milk and eggs. "Pure" vegetarians are those who exclude from their diets all foods of animal origin.

623. Dispensationalism, Critique of

SOURCE: C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America* (Richmond, [Va.]: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 57, 59, 61, 62, 65, 67, 71, 72. Copyright © 1958 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 57] Dispensationalists claim above all to be Biblicists. They are quite confident that their teachings are evident even on the surface of the Scripture. Indeed, the system is so closely identified with the Bible itself that some of its adherents tend to judge the orthodoxy of other Christians by their acceptance or rejection of the system. Lewis Sperry Chafer found it difficult to understand why the significant teaching of Darby and his associates had not gained more general acceptance among conservative Christian scholars. Chafer himself is the first to have written a systematic theology in which dispensational distinctions have been employed as the unique structural and interpretative principle. For him dispensationalism is the norm for theology. He works on the assumption that his dispensational framework is identical with the Biblical structure and that the message of the Bible, therefore, cannot be properly understood unless it is viewed dispensationally. This assumption is open' to question. Can dispensationalism be described as simply Biblicism? Or is the system itself a compound of theological concepts, partly Biblical, which has been used to further interpret the Scriptures? How much has it been read into Scripture and how much out of Scripture? What are the theological emphases which undergird the system? ...

Dispensationalism has never identified itself with any one theological system...

[p. 59] There are, to be sure, important elements of seventeenth-century Calvinism in contemporary dispensationalism, but these elements have been blended with doctrinal emphases from other sources to form a distinct system which in many respects is quite foreign to classical Calvinism. It is probably not going too far to call the dispensationalist system eclectic. For example, its emphasis upon the necessity of a personal experience with Christ, which results in assurance of salvation and in verbal testimony and praise, is akin to Pietism and reflects the influence of revivalism. And certainly its doctrine of the Church is much nearer to the sectarian than to the Reformed tradition. This eclecticism can be accounted for partially by the fact that most of the men who helped to shape the system in America were not trained theologians. As a matter of fact they distrusted theologians, even the most conservative ones, and gloried in their own simplicity and Biblicism.

Taking all this into account, it must still be pointed out that the basic theological affinities of dispensationalism are Calvinistic. The large majority of the men involved in the Bible and prophetic conference movements subscribed to Calvinistic creeds...

[p. 61] The distinctive theological emphases of dispensationalism were developed in a climate of pessimism and reaction. Darby himself, as we have seen, was reacting strongly against the state of affairs in the Anglican Church. In America the mood was similar, but less intense at the outset. The first Believers' Meeting for Bible Study took on the character of a spiritual revival, and in subsequent meetings the inroads of rationalist theology as well as the spiritual lethargy of the churches was a recurring theme. Some teachers said explicitly that premillennialism was a bulwark against rationalist theology. Thus it is not surprising to find that the theological elements which became normative in dispensationalism ran directly counter to the developing emphasis of the "New Theology." This is already evident in the doctrinal statement of 1878 which stressed a rigid theory of verbal and plenary inspiration, the absolute depravity of man and his helplessness to assist in his own salvation, and the sovereign transcendence of the triune God. These are the three tenants which became normative for the dispensationalist system, and we must take a closer look at them.

The last of these three, the sovereign transcendence of God, is the foundational assumption which underlies the very concept of a dispensation. A dispensation is begun when God projects Himself into the historical process and initiates a covenant of His own making with some part of the human race. It ends when He intervenes in judgment because of man's disobedience. While there is a pattern of historical development within the dispensation, no covenant is in any way conditioned by historical processes, nor is it necessarily historically related to the covenants which precede or follow it. The promises

enumerated in the covenants are in the last analysis unconditional, because although man cannot and does not cooperate with God, He fulfills His [p. 62] promises which He sware unto the fathers. He works out His predestined purpose *in* history, but quite apart from it—and one might almost say in spite of it. Each dispensation is set off as a distinct period of time which has little or no organically historical relation to what precedes or follows. Further, God's sovereignty is exercised in the predestination and election of nations and men to a special relationship to Himself. The whole justification for giving the Jews the dominant place in God's future plan is worked out on the ground of their national election. What Israel wishes or does is quite aside from the point. God has chosen them to be His people, so they are His people come what may. The same rigid predestination is applied in this dispensation to the individual believers who have been elected to salvation. Their election is absolutely effective. Working on this assumption, contemporary dispensationalists have elaborated an almost mechanistic theory of eternal security, and have interpreted the New Testament strictly within the framework of this norm...

[p. 65] Finally, the dispensationalists put forward a strict, mechanical theory of verbal inspiration as a bulwark against the inroads of Biblical criticism...

[p. 67] The early spokesmen for dispensationalism ... thought of their system as an apology for orthodox theology, and it seems impossible to understand the dynamic and true significance of the movement unless we see it in its contemporary theological context...

[p. 71] Dispensationalist scholars show little historical self-awareness. This is evident in their facile identification of their own position with the millennialism of the early Church. In their histories of millennialism they give little or no consideration to the special genius of their own position...

[p. 72] Although premillennialism existed in America before dispensationalism, it became vocal and aggressive in its dispensational form through the Bible and prophetic conferences.

624. Dispensationalism, Different From Biblical Doctrine of

Dispensations

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga. *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 288–29. Copyright 1945, by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 288] Christianity recognizes dispensations in the Covenant of Grace or the history of redemption and of revelation. The difference and the unity of the Old and the New Dispensation is embodied, as it were, in the difference and the unity of our Old and our New Testament which together form the one Bible. By Ireneus that [p. 289] unity of the book of the Christians was vigorously maintained in his conflict with the Gnostics...

Subdivision of the dispensations had already been made by Tertullian and Joachim, and multiplication of dispensations had likewise appeared in Origen. Cocceius now took up the former pastime, and the Petersens the latter; and Darby, Scofield, and the Russellites [now Jehovah's Witnesses] followed. The unity of the Covenant was not merely lost sight of, but was actually destroyed in the interest of the diversity of the dispensations. There was room here for almost unlimited display of individual ingenuity, and dispensational schemes and charts multiplied freely...

[p. 290] Every one of these various types of aberration from the truth became possible only through neglect, however unconscious perhaps at first, of the biblical revelation...

The content of Christian eschatology must not merely be drawn exclusively from the Bible, but the content of biblical eschatology must also be interpreted according to the rule of Scripture or the rule of faith and should never be used to alter the rest of the teachings of Scripture. Against this rule modern chiliasts who take it upon themselves to expound Scripture have often sinned grievously. Scofield's note on Hos. 2:2, is only a very mild and moderate illustration of the violence which much modern chiliastic exegesis offers to this rule.

This rule demands also, that within the eschatological field the order of events should be constructed in harmony with Scripture and should not violate its data on that point. This is a matter of harmonizing the Apocalypse with the other eschatological portions of the Bible as much as of paying due regard to the order of [p. 291] events indicated in the Apocalypse itself. Yet arbitrary transpositions in the order of the eschatological events have by no means been rare in chiliastic literature, nor in non-chiliastic eschatological literature either, for that matter. Such transpositions we face in the placement of the New Jerusalem in the millennium instead of in eternity; in the placement of antichrist and of Gog and Magog in temporal proximity; in the placement of a secret rapture before the public appearance of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven; and in the disjunction of the appearance of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven from the overthrow and destruction of antichrist.

Slips like these can be made and often have been made through mere inadvertence. However, when they become incorporated in definite systems to which the continuation of the error is essential, then they can no longer be excused as inadvertent slips; then they become violations of the authority of Holy Writ for which the perpetrators must be held to be strictly accountable. When such playing fast and loose with God's Word is observed in our age of widespread disregard for Scripture, the question naturally arises, whether it perhaps is part and parcel of such disregard. It is imperative, that chiliastic and all eschatological thought be called back and brought back to strict and loyal adherence to the Scriptures in all the beforementioned respects. Unless this demand is met, there is no hope of eliminating the errors and of reaching a better understanding of what our Lord has told us on this subject.

625. Dispensationalism, Dissent From, Concerning Dispensations SOURCE: Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1941). pp. 290–292. © 1941 by L. Berkhof. Used by permission.

- [p. 290] (a) The word "dispensation" (*oikonomia*), which is a Scriptural term (cf. Luke 16:2–4; 1 Cor. 9:17; Eph. 1:10; 3:2, 9; Col. 1:25; 1 Tim. 1:4) is here used [by dispensationalists] in an un-Scriptural sense. It denotes a stewardship, an arrangement, or an administration, but never a testing time or a time of probation.
- (b) The distinctions [between dispensations as periods] are clearly quite arbitrary. This is evident already from the fact that dispensationalists themselves sometimes speak of them as overlapping. The second dispensation is called the dispensation of conscience, but according to Paul conscience was still the monitor of the Gentiles in his day (Rom. 2:14, 15). The third is known as the dispensation of human government, but the specific command in it which was disobeyed and therefore rendered man liable to judgment, was not the command to rule the world for God—of which there is no trace—, but the command to replenish [p. 291] the earth. The fourth is designated the dispensation of promise and is supposed to terminate with the giving of the law, but Paul says that the

law did not disannul the promise, and that this was still in effect in his own day (Rom. 4:13–17; Gal. 3:15–29). The so-called dispensation of the law is replete with glorious promises, and the so-called dispensation of grace did not abrogate the law as a rule of life...

(c) According to the usual representation of this theory man is on probation right along. He failed in the first test and thus missed the reward of eternal life, but God was compassionate and in mercy gave him a new trial. Repeated failures led to repeated manifestations of the mercy of God in the introduction of new trials, which, however, kept man on probation all the time... This representation is contrary to Scripture, which does not represent fallen man as still on probation, but as an utter failure, totally unable to render obedience to God, and absolutely dependent on the grace of God for salvation...

(d) This theory is also divisive in tendency, dismembering the organism of Scripture with disastrous results. Those parts of Scripture that belong to any one of the dispensations are addressed to, and have normative significance for, the people of that dispensation, and for no one else... The Bible is divided into two books, the Book of the Kingdom, comprising the Old Testament and part of the New, addressed to Israel; and the Book of the Church, consisting of the remainder of the New Testament, and addressed to us. Since the dispensations do not intermingle, it follows that in the dispensation of the law there is no revelation of the grace of God, and in the dispensation of grace there is no revelation of the law as binding on the New Testament people of [p. 292] God. If space permitted, it would not be difficult to prove that this is an entirely untenable position.

626. Dispensationalism — Distinctions Between Dispensations Questioned

SOURCE: C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America* (Richmond, [Va.]: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 132–134. Copyright © 1958 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 132] The dispensationalist interpretation is built on an inadequate concept of the nature of language and its use. In seeking to uphold the supernatural quality of the Biblical narrative it has assumed that the Biblical language is like the language of a science textbook; that is, that its terms have a fixed meaning from beginning to end. Recently one of the most distinguished scholars in the dispensationalist school stated that there is no essential difference between the language of the Bible and a medical dictionary... Unwittingly perhaps, they have foisted upon the Bible their own assumptions and have on the basis of these assumptions read out of the Bible their own dispensational distinctions. It is very easy to demonstrate that even the word *oikonomia*, translated "dispensation" in the New Testament, does not mean what they interpret it to mean.

Perhaps an even more serious question is raised by the dispensationalist teaching that certain parts of the Bible apply almost exclusively to national Israel and not to Christians. It has been the deep conviction of the Church from its beginning that the whole Bible, including the Old Testament, is the Christian's book and speaks of Christ...

[p. 133] Ever since the time of the Apostle Paul it has been the general understanding of Christians that there are different kinds of commands and instructions in the Old Testament and that not all of them apply directly to the Church. None of us would try to regulate our lives by all of the laws given in Exodus 21–23. The very concept of progressive revelation implies that there will be elements in the earlier revelation which may be outmoded and superseded by later revelation. Thus the Old Testament has been

conceived as a *preparation* for Christ and His Church. But dispensationalism goes further than this and practically denies that the Old Testament has any relation to the Church at all. It teaches that the Church is not visualized in the Old Testament; that there is no historical relation between the people of God under the Old Covenant and the New; that the major part of the Old Testament revelation is *law* which is diametrically opposed to the revelation of grace in the Epistles of the New Testament. The Old Testament is a Jewish book for Israel under the Old Covenant and under the millennial covenant yet to come. Thus the Old Testament prophecies have no reference at all to the Church and no fulfillment through it.

This dispensational distinction is pressed even further, so that Jesus' life and teachings are lost to the Church. Jesus is said to have lived and taught as a Jew under the dispensation of law. Indeed, He is not the founder of the Church. In His teachings He was offering the Kingdom to the Jews; therefore His teachings do not have any direct application to the life of the Church. They represent law, and the Church is living under grace. Scofield does admit that the Sermon on the Mount has "beautiful moral application" to the Christian life, but its immediate point of reference [p. 134] is the Jewish Kingdom which is to be established during the millennium. Here, interestingly enough, the old question of Jesus versus Paul meets us in new guise, and according to the dispensational solution the Church must be satisfied with Paul. The New Testament writings which are directed to the Church are the Epistles and certain passages from the Gospel of John...

According to dispensational teaching the Church is a spiritual fellowship of those who have been called to participation in Christ. Its visible boundaries cannot be discerned by man. It has no organizational structure. It is, to use Darby's words, a "heavenly body." It is to be carefully distinguished from Christendom or the organized church. There is a very sound element in this emphasis upon the spiritual quality of the Church's life, but when it is emphasized so exclusively that the reality of the Church's earthly existence is denied, great harm can result.

627. Dispensationalism — Expectation of World Evangelization by Jews in 31/2 Years

SOURCE: Alexander Reese, *The Approaching Advent of Christ* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., [1937]), pp. 268, 269. Used by permission.

[p. 268] When Darbyists [Plymouth Brethren] are expounding doctrines like the deity and the humanity of our Lord, His atoning death on the cross, His bodily resurrection, His session at the right hand of God, His priestly ministry in the heavenly sanctuary, the justification of the sinner by grace, and his complete deliverance through union with the risen Christ, there is gratifying unanimity among them. With one voice they set forth the truth of Scripture magnificently; Kelly's *Notes on Romans* drew [p. 269] praise from the authors of the most notable exegetical work in fifty years. The explanation of this unanimity is that they were expounding the central truths of the Christian revelation...

But when they came to the teaching of prophecy the unanimity forsook them. Why? Because their exegesis now, instead of adhering to the main emphasis of Scripture, and basing itself on careful and obvious deductions from clear texts, was shot to pieces by idle speculation, by the adoption of innovations like the Secret Rapture, and the prodigious missionary tour of the world in 1,260 days, by an army of half-converted Jews... Without the Holy Ghost [see editors' note] in the soul [they] will do in 1,260

days what the whole Christian Church has been unable to do in 1,900 years—evangelize the world, and convert the "overwhelming majority" of the inhabitants of the world to God. This declaration of Scofield's works out at about a million converts a day; and this

at a time when, *ex hypothesi*, the Holy Spirit is in heaven, Antichrist is raging here below, and the elect evangelists are torn between the Imprecatory Psalms and the Sermon on the Mount!

[EDITORS' NOTE: The full-fledged dispensationalist theory assumes the removal of the Holy Spirit from the earth with the "rapture" of the church, before this supposed period.]

628. Dispensationalism, Origin and Leading Exponents of SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 48, 49. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 48] A little over seventy-five years ago, there arose a type of premillennialism which has exercised great influence both in England and America. Originating with the Plymouth Brethren and associated especially with the names of J. N. Darby (1800–1882) and William Kelly (1821–1906), this particular premillennial interpretation has been known as [p. 49] dispensationalism, and has come to be exclusively identified with premillennialism in the minds of the masses of American evangelicals.

629. Dispensationalism, Separates Law From Grace. SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 27–29. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 27] Dr. C. I. Scofield, in his "Scofield Reference Bible," page five, lists seven dispensations... [p. 28] Such a division might in itself be unobjectional were it not for the fact that Dr. Scofield declares that each dispensation represented a different way in which God tested man's obedience. The greatest objection to the scheme, however lies in the fact that Dr. Scofield claims that, during the dispensation of promise, Abraham and his descendants were under a covenant of grace as heirs to the promises given to Abraham, but that at Sinai, Israel *rashly* accepted the law in place of the covenant of promise! This put law in place of grace! From that time on they forfeited the state of grace and lived in the state of law! Grace again came into the picture at Calvary, while in the kingdom in the future, law again will take the place of grace.

Now this teaching that under the law men did righteously and so *became* righteous, while under grace they are *declared* to be righteous for the sake of Christ's righteousness which is clothed upon them, raises the question at once as to how the Old Testament saints were saved. The notes of Dr. Scofield would necessitate declaring that they were saved by keeping the law. Fortunately Dr. Scofield is not consistent on this point for he elsewhere declares that grace is the only way of salvation. However, the position taken sets the dispensation of law squarely over against the dispensation of grace, and so contradicts one of the central teachings of the Bible.

As a corollary of this disjunction between law and grace, the ultra-dispensationalists declare that the primary application of certain parts of Scripture is to the people of different dispensations. Thus the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer are said to be not primarily for the people of this age, the church age, but for the kingdom age. The epistle are the parts of the Bible [p. 29] which concern the church age, the age of grace. Some even go so far as to say that only the Pastoral Epistles particularly concern the people of this age. Others declare that the Gospels, particularly the Gospel of Matthew, do not primarily concern us, while all of them would declare that since we are now under grace and not under law, we need not trouble ourselves with the ten commandments!

The effect of such teaching is of course to lead Christians to think that it is unnecessary for them to keep the Lord's Day holy. In Korea it has been used by some Korean Christians as an excuse for bowing at shrines dedicated to the sun goddess, the mythical ancestress of the Japanese emperor, even though they admit that it breaks both the first and second commandments. Few would go so far as to claim that they have liberty to break the sixth and seventh commandments, though the position taken would seem to allow even that.

630. Dispensationalism — Theory of Two Kingdoms ("of God" and "of Heaven"), Summarized

SOURCE: Summary from L. S. Chafer in George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, 50–52. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 50] The *magnum opus* of dispensational eschatology will be found in Lewis Sperry Chafer's *Systematic Theology*, where the entire range of theology is interpreted in the light of dispensational eschatology. From this work we extract the following interpretation of the kingdom of God.

Two specific realms must be considered: the kingdom of God which includes all intelligences in heaven or on earth who are willingly subject to God, and the kingdom of heaven which is the manifestation of the kingdom of God at any time of God appears on earth in various forms or embodiments during the centuries.

- 1. There was first of all the kingdom in the Old Testament theoracy in which God ruled over Israel in and through the Judges.
- 2. The kingdom was covenanted by God as he entered into unconditional covenant with David and gave to Israel its national hope of a permanent earthly kingdom (II Samuel 7).
- 3. The kingdom was predicted by the prophets as a glorious kingdom for Israel on earth when the Messianic Son of David would sit on David's throne and rule over the nation from Jerusalem.
- 4. The kingdom was announced by John the Baptist, Christ and the apostles. The Gospel of the Kingdom (Matt. 4:23; 9:35) and the proclamation that the kingdom of heaven was at hand (Matt. 3:2; 4:17; 10:7) consisted of a legitimate offer to Israel of the promised *earthly* Davidic kingdom, designed particularly for Israel. However, the Jewish nation rejected their King and with him the kingdom.
- [p. 51] 5. Because of Israel's rejection, the kingdom was postponed until the second advent of Christ. The millennial kingdom was offered to Israel, rejected, and postponed; but it will be instituted on earth after Christ's return. Since the kingdom was postponed it is a great error to attempt, as is so commonly done, to build a kingdom on the first advent of Christ as its basis, for according to the Scriptures the kingdom which was offered to Israel was rejected and is therefore delayed, to be realized only with the second advent of Christ.
- 6. The kingdom, because it was rejected and postponed, entered a mystery form (Matt. 13) for the present age. This mystery form of the kingdom has to do with the church age when the kingdom of heaven is embodied in christendom. God is now ruling on the earth in so far as the parables of the mystery of the kingdom of heaven require. In this mystery phase of the kingdom good and evil mingle together and are to grow together until Christ returns.
- 7. The kingdom is to be re-announced by a Jewish remnant of 144,000 in final anticipation of Messiah's Return. At the beginning of the great tribulation which occurs

immediately before the return of Christ, the church will be raptured, taken out of the world, to be with Christ. An election of Israel is then sealed by God to proclaim throughout all the world the Gospel of the Kingdom (Matt. 24:14); i.e., that the Davidic kingdom, the kingdom of heaven, is about to be set up.

8. The millennial kingdom will then be realized as christ returns in power and glory at the conclusion of the tribulation. Then Israel, which has been gathered from its dispersion throughout the earth to her covenanted land, Palestine, will recognize the returning Christ as her Messiah, will accept him as such, and will enter the millennial kingdom as the covenant people.¹⁹ [Note 19: *Cf.* Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology*, I, pp. 44–45; VII, pp. 223–225. There are seven stages in each of these passages but they do not coincide; we have therefore conflated them. For a more detailed description, *cf.* V. pp. 333–358.]

[p. 52] An almost innumerable volume of books and pamphlets has been produced by adherents of this dispensational position during the past several decades. While Bible teachers differ among themselves about many of the details of the portrayal, there will be found a basic agreement on the stages of the kingdom as Dr. Chafer has traced them.

631. Dispensationalism — Theory of Two Kingdoms Unjustified SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 101, 102, 104, 106, 130–132. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdman Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 101] The phrase "kingdom of God" is found uniformly in the gospels of Mark, Luke and John. In Matthew, the "kingdom of God" occurs but four times; elsewhere, the "kingdom of heaven" (literally, the kingdom of the heavens) appears in some thirty-three places.

The occurrence of these two phrases in Matthew has been employed [by dispensationalists] in the attempt to prove that Jesus offered to the Jewish nation the earthly, Davidic kingdom, which was rejected and therefore postponed until Christ comes again. According to this view the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven are not the same. The difference is that "the kingdom of heaven is always earthly while the Kingdom of God is as wide as the universe and includes as much of earthly things as are germane to it." ⁴ [Note 4: Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology* (Dallas, Texas: Seminary Press, 1958) IV, p. 26.] The kingdom [p.102] of God is the over-all rule of God while the kingdom of God in its earthly manifestation...

According to this view, the gospel of the kingdom which Jesus preached throughout Galilee (Matt. 4:23, 9:35) is not the announcement that God is about to bring to men a means of salvation by which they may become spiritually subjects of the King; it was rather the *bona fide* offer of the earthly Davidic kingdom to the nation Israel...

[p. 104] This understanding of the kingdom of heaven has its most important consequences in the interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew 5–7. While this sermon has a "beautiful moral application to the Christian," its literal and primary application is to be to the future earthly kingdom and not to Christian life…

[p. 106] It is immediately obvious that a system which takes this greatest portion of Jesus' teaching away from the Christian in its direct application must receive a penetrating scrutiny. This is the reason the dispensational interpretation of the kingdom concerns us so vitally. When Christians will not use the Lord's Prayer because it is given for the kingdom age and not for the present age, we must test carefully the validity of the position. These are not unimportant peripheral matters, but the heart of the teachings of our Lord...

[p. 130] We are under no obligation to distinguish between the phrases the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven, to find in the former the overall, universal rule of God and in the latter the rule of God as it concerns the earth. The data in the Gospels indicate that the two terms are interchangeable, and the difference between them is one of linguistic idiom and not of meaning.

Furthermore, we are not to suppose that Jesus offered to the Jews the earthly Davidic kingdom which was postponed because they rejected it and that in its place came the "mystery form" of the kingdom of heaven. Some interpretation of this [p. 131] sort may be necessary if one conceives of the kingdom only as the future realm in which the will of God is perfectly done. When the kingdom is interpreted in its true philogical sense, as the reign of God, manifested among men in the person of the Savior-King, demanding of men a decision by which they enter into that spiritual realm when God's reign is realized and thus are prepared to enter the future eschatological manifestation of the kingdom, we are delivered from the exceptical and theological difficulties which adhere to the "postponed kingdom" theory. Nothing was postponed. It was not God's purpose that the fullness of the kingdom should then come, nor did Jesus offer such a kingdom to men. It is preserved for the consummation. But in the meantime, God is preparing a people who submit themselves here and now to his sovereign reign and so find a new righteousness, an inner righteousness of the heart, the very righteousness of God. Such persons experience the reign of God, the kingdom of God, here and now. To them the kingdom is a present, spiritual reality. The powers of the future kingdom have been realized in present experience. This reign of God, inaugurated by Christ, calls into being a new people. The Jewish people rejected this kingdom, and it was therefore taken from them, who by history, background, and religion ought to have been the "sons of the kingdom" (Matt. 8:12), and was given to a people who would receive it and manifest the righteousness which the kingdom must require (Matt. 21:43). This is the Church, the body of those who have accepted the Christ and so submitted themselves to the reign of God.

As the messiahship of Christ involved two phases, a coming in humility to suffer and die, and a coming in power and glory to reign, so the kingdom is to be manifested in two realms: the present realm of righteousness or salvation when men may accept or reject the kingdom, and the future realm when the powers of the kingdom shall be manifested in visible glory. The former was inaugurated in insignificant beginnings [p. 132] without outward display, and those who accept it are to live intermingled with those who reject it until the consummation. Then the kingdom will be disclosed in a mighty manifestation of power and glory. God's kingdom will come; and the ultimate state will witness the perfect realization of the will of God everywhere and forever.

632. Divorce, Catholic View on

SOURCE: John L. Thomas, *The Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family* (Garden City, N. Y.: Hanover House), pp. 69–71. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

[p. 69] The marriage bond exists between one man and one woman and is indissoluble. These two qualities of unity and indissolubility are sometimes called the laws or essential properties of marriage. They are clearly implied in the definition of marriage we have just developed, so that their rejection signifies a rejection of this definition. Although some degree of marital infidelity has perhaps always existed even in the most Christian societies, the quality of unity has never been questioned among Christian nations with the exception of a few sects such as the Mormons. The quality of indissolubility, on the other hand, was rejected in the Eastern Orthodox Church starting around the ninth century, and by the Protestant groups at the Reformation. Hence these two qualities merit further consideration...

[p. 70] The quality of indissolubility signifies that the marriage bond cannot be dissolved by any merely human authority; that is, it cannot be dissolved by the will of the contracting parties or by the authority of the state. As we shall point out later, Catholics maintain that the Pope, as the Vicar of Christ, has the power to dissolve the bond under certain conditions. The Catholic doctrine of indissolubility is drawn from three sources: reason, Scripture, and the sacramental nature of Christian marriage...

[p. 71] It is commonly objected that the doctrine of indissolubility places an excessive burden on unhappily married individuals. The sufferings of these "victim" cases are usually cited in defense of divorce. Such cases clearly deserve our sympathy, and we must do all that we can to lighten their burden, but we reject divorce as a solution precisely because it will increase rather than decrease the number of unhappy couples in society. Proponents of divorce cite these victim cases without paying attention to the unhappiness created by easy dissolution of the bond. In the final analysis we maintain that the family can best achieve its social purposes if it is based on an indissoluble bond. Since the social or common good takes precedence over the good of an individual, the marriage bond is indissoluble by its very nature.

633. Divorce, Revised Position of Westminster Confession on SOURCE: George S. Hendry, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960). pp. 208, 209. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 208] C[onfession of] F[aith] XXVI,5 [XXIV,5 in earlier edition.] It is the divine intention that persons entering the marriage covenant become inseparably united, thus allowing for no dissolution save that caused by the death of either husband or wife. However, the weaknesses of one or both partners may lead to gross and persistent denial of the marriage vows so that marriage dies at the heart and the union becomes intolerable; yet only [p. 209] in cases of extreme, unrepented-of, and irremediable unfaithfulness (physical or spiritual) should separation or divorce be considered. Such separation or divorce is accepted as permissible only because of the failure of one or both of the partners, and does not lessen in any way the divine intention for indissoluble union.

634. Doctrine, Need of

SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *Beyond Personality* (1948), pp. 1, 2. Copyright 1945 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 1] Everyone has warned me not to tell you what I'm going to tell you in these talks. They all say 'the ordinary listener doesn't want Theology; you give him plain practical religion.' I have rejected their advice. I don't think the ordinary listener is such a fool. Theology means 'the science of God,' and I think any man who wants to think about God at all would like to have the clearest and most accurate ideas about Him which are available. You're not children: why should you be treated like children?

In a way I quite understand why some people are put off by Theology. I remember once when I'd been giving a talk to the R.A.F., an old, hard-bitten officer got up and said, 'I've no use for all that stuff. But, mind you, I'm a religious man too. I *know* there's a God. I've *felt* Him: out alone in the desert at night: the tremendous mystery. And that's just why I don't believe all your neat little dogmas and formulas about Him. To anyone who's met the real thing they all seem so petty and pedantic and unreal!' Now in a sense I quite agreed with that man. I think he'd probably had a real experience of God in the desert. And when he turned from that experience to the Christian creeds, I think he *was* really turning from something quite real to something less real. In the same way, if a man has once looked at the Atlantic from the beach, and then goes and looks at a map of the Atlantic, he also will be turning [p. 2] from something more real to something less real: turning from real waves to a bit of coloured paper. But here comes the point. The map *is* only coloured paper, but there are two things you have to remember about it. In the first place, it is based on what hundreds and thousands of people have found out by sailing the real Atlantic. In that way it has behind it masses of experience just as real as the one you could have from the beach; only, while yours would be a single isolated glimpse, the map fits all those different experiences together. In the second place, if you want to go anywhere, the map is absolutely necessary. As long as you're content with walks on the beach, your own glimpses are far more fun than looking at a map. But the map's going to be more use than walks on the beach if you want to get to America.

635. Doctrine, Place of, in Christian Life SOURCE: George S. Hendry, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 13, 14. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 13] Faith has often been compared to a journey, or a pilgrimage. Doctrine may then be compared to a map. No one would suppose he had reached his destination merely because he had located it on the map, or traced the route that leads to it. Yet the map is an indispensable aid to any traveler in unfamiliar country. And just as the map is right when it enables the traveler to reach the [p. 14] end of his journey, so doctrine is right when it enables the pilgrim to reach "the end of his faith." (See 1 Peter 1:9.) Like the traveler himself, it is justified by faith. But it is never "infallible and irreformable." Although the main features of the landscape remain unchanged from age to age and will appear on every map, building and road developments and improvements in the art of cartography call constantly for the production of new maps to assist the traveler to make the journey under the conditions which exist in his own day-and not under those which existed at the time of his father or his grandfather. If it is true that "New occasions teach new duties; Time makes ancient good uncounth," new insights derived from faithful study of the Word of God, and new conditions under which the journey of faith has to be made, require that the maps of doctrine, which did good service to our forefathers in their journey, must be revised and amended if they are to fulfill that service for us.

636. Doctrine, True, How to Find (Protestant and Catholic Views on) SOURCE: John Adam Moehler, *Symbolism*, trans, by James Burton Robertson (5th ed.; London: Gibbings & Company, 1906), p. 277.

The main question, which we have now to answer, is this: how doth man attain to possession of the true doctrine of Christ; or, to express ourselves in a more general, and at once more accurate manner, how doth man obtain a clear knowledge of the institute of salvation, proffered in Christ Jesus? The Protestant says, by searching Holy Writ, which is infallible: the Catholic, on the other hand, replies, by the Church, in which alone man arrives at the true understanding of Holy Writ.

637. Dragon, Poetic Allusions to, in the Old Testament

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955), pp. 63, 64. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 63] There are many references to a conflict between [p. 64] YHWH and the dragon of chaos, Tehom, Rahab, or Leviathan, in later poetical books of the Bible, notably in Isaiah, Job, and the Psalms. Most of these passages date from shortly before or after the time of the Babylonian Exile (roughly speaking), and must be considered as poetical imagery drawn from contemporary Canaanite (Phoenician) literature (which was, of course, also written in Hebrew), in the same way that Milton drew from classical mythology in his "Paradise Lost." ... [See Nos. 315, 316.]

As already observed, it cannot be accidental that these allusions are all found in poetical passages, and that there is not the slightest hint of similar ideas in the early chapters of Genesis.

638. Dragon—Roman Military Symbol

SOURCE: Trebellius Pollio, *The Two Gallieni*, in *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae* viii. 6; translated by David Magie, Vol. 3, (London: William Heinemann, 1932), p. 33. Reprinted by permission of Harvard University Press and the Loeb Classical Library.

On each side of him [the emperor Gallienus] were borne five hundred gilded spears and one hundred banners, besides those which belonged to the corporations, and the flags of auxiliaries [literally, "dragons"] and the statutes from the sanctuaries and the standards of all the legions.

639. Dragon—Symbol on Roman Military Standards

SOURCE: Claudian, "Panegyric on the Third Consulship of the Emperor Honorius," lines 138–140; translated by Maurice Platnauer, Vol. 1 (London: William Heinemann, 1932), p. 281. Reprinted by permission of Harvard University Press and The Loeb Classical Library.

These raise standards adorned with flying eagles, or with embroidered dragons or writing serpents.

640. Drugs, Beverages as Purveyors of

SOURCE: Robert S. Carroll, *What Price Alcohol?* p. 22. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

The habit of artificial assistance—artificial, mark the word—begins with many in response to a sense of need for an early morning change in feeling. It is coffee, stronger and stronger, more and more frequently, with some; multiplied cups of tea with others; caffeinized drinks at the soda fountain or easily available in the home refrigerator; and the rapidly growing resort to nicotine. Let us look straightway at the penalty of all this. The coffee, the tea, the caffeinated drink, the cigarette, or other form of tobacco—each is a drug purveyor. Each, so far as it changes the body-sensation from discomfort to any degree of tranquility, is artificial, and each carries its penalty.

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

642. Earth, Fallen, God's Regard for, Illustrated

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 15–19. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 15] It may give us a fresh perspective on life, if for a few moments we shed the limitations of earthbound thinking, and detach ourselves deliberately from modern pressures and problems. Let us pretend for a little while; the pretense may be fanciful, but it may help us to let the real truth break over us afresh.***

Once upon a time a very young angel was being shown round the splendors and glories of the universes by a senior and experienced angel. To tell the truth, the little angel was beginning to be tired and a little bored. He had been shown whirling galaxies and blazing suns, infinite distances in the deathly cold of interstellar space, and to his mind there seemed to be an awful lot of it all. Finally he was shown the galaxy of which our planetary system is but a small part. As the two of them drew near to the star which we call our sun and to its circling planets, the senior angel pointed to a small and rather insignificant sphere turning very slowly on its axis. It looked as dull as a dirty tennis ball to the little angel whose mind was filled with the size and glory of what he had seen.

"I want you to watch that one particularly," said the senior angel, pointing with his finger.

"Well, it looks very small and rather dirty to me," said the little angel. "What's special about that one?"

"That," replied his senior solemnly, "is the Visited Planet."

" 'Visited'?" said the little one. "You don't mean visited by-"

[p. 16] "Indeed I do. That ball, which I have no doubt looks to you small and insignificant and not perhaps overclean, has been visited by our young Prince of Glory." And at these words he bowed his head reverently.

"But how?" queried the younger one. "Do you mean that our great and glorious Prince, with all these wonders and splendors of His Creation, and millions more that I'm sure I haven't seen yet, went down in Person to this fifth-rate little ball? Why should He do a thing like that?"

"It isn't for us," said his senior, a little stiffly, "to question His 'why's,' except that I must point out to you that He is not impressed by size and numbers as you seem to be. But that He really went I know, and all of us in Heaven who know anything know that. As to why He became one of them ... How else do you suppose could He visit them?"

The little angel's face wrinkled in disgust.

"Do you mean to tell me," he said, "that He stooped so low as to become one of those creeping, crawling creatures of that floating ball?"

"I do, and I don't think He would like you to call them 'creeping crawling creatures' in that tone of voice. For, strange as it may seem to us, He loves them. He went down to visit them to lift them up to become like Him."

The little angel looked blank. Such a thought was almost beyond his comprehension.

"Close your eyes for a moment," said the senior angel, "and we will go back in what they call Time."

While the little angel's eyes were closed and the two of them moved nearer to the spinning ball, it stopped its spinning, spun backward quite fast for a while, and then slowly resumed its usual rotation.

"Now look!" and as the little angel did as he was told, there appeared here and there on the dull surface of the [p. 17] glove little flashes of light, some merely momentary and some persisting for quite a time.

"Well, what am I seeing now?" queried the little angel.

"You are watching this little world as it was some thousands of years ago," returned his companion. "Every flash and glow of light that you see is something of the Father's knowledge and wisdom breaking into the minds and hearts of people who live upon the earth. Not many people, you see, can hear His Voice or understand what He says, even though He is speaking gently and quietly to them all the time."

"Why are they so blind and deaf and stupid?" asked the junior angel rather crossly.

"It is not for us to judge them. We who live in the Splendor have no idea what it is like to live in the dark. We hear the music and the Voice like the sound of many waters every day of our lives, but to them—well, there is much darkness and much noise and much distraction upon the earth. Only a few who are quiet and humble and wise hear His Voice. But watch, for in a moment you will see something truly wonderful."

The Earth went on turning and circling round the sun, and then, quite suddenly, in the upper half of the globe there appeared a light, tiny, but so bright in its intensity that both the angels hid their eyes.

"I think I can guess," said the little angel in a low voice. "That was the Visit, wasn't it?"

"Yes, that was the Visit. The Light Himself went down there and lived among them; but in a moment, and you will be able to tell that even with your eyes closed, the light will go out."

"But why? Could He not bear their darkness and stupidity? Did He have to return here?"

"No, it wasn't that," returned the senior angel. His [p. 18] voice was stern and sad. "They failed to recognize Him for Who He was—or at least only a handful knew Him. For the most part they preferred their darkness to His Light, and in the end they killed Him."

"The fools, the crazy fools! they don't deserve—"

"Neither you nor I nor any other angel knows why they were so foolish and so wicked. Nor can we say what they deserve or don't deserve. But the fact remains, they killed our Prince of Glory while He was Man amongst them."

"And that, I suppose, was the end? I see the whole Earth has gone black and dark. All right, I won't judge them, but surely that is all they could expect?"

"Wait. We are still far from the end of the story of the Visited Planet. Watch now, but be ready to cover your eyes again."

In utter blackness the Earth turned round three times, and then there blazed with unbearable radiance a point of light.

"What now?" asked the little angel shielding his eyes.

"They killed Him, all right, but He conquered death. The thing most of them dread and fear all their lives He broke and conquered. He rose again, and a few of them saw Him, and from then on became His utterly devoted slaves."

"Thank God for that!" said the little angel.

"Amen. Open your eyes now; the dazzling light has gone. The Prince has returned to His Home of Light. But watch the Earth now."

As they looked, in place of the dazzling light there was a bright glow which throbbed and pulsated. And then as the Earth turned many times, little points of light spread out. A few flickered and died, but for the most part the lights burned steadily, and as they continued to watch, in [p. 19] many parts of the globe there was a glow over many areas.

"You see what is happening?" asked the senior angel. "The bright glow is the company of loyal men and women He left behind, and with His help they spread the glow, and now lights begin to shine all over the Earth."

"Yes, yes," said the little angel impatiently. "But how does it end? Will the little lights join up with one another? Will it all be light, as it is in Heaven?"

His senior shook his head. "We simply do not know," he replied. "It is in the Father's hands. Sometimes it is agony to watch, and sometimes it is joy unspeakable. The end is not yet. But now I am sure you can see why this little ball is so important. He has visited it; He is working out His Plan upon it."

"Yes, I see, though I don't understand. I shall never forget that this is the Visited Planet..."

Imaginary? Fanciful? Certainly, but a good deal truer than some of our current modern thinking. For in the eyes of the Eternal World this little planet is of the highest importance simply because it is the Visited Planet. We may not realize it at all, but we are right plumb in the middle of a vast drama, a tremendous battle between light and darkness. The whole core and essence of the Christian Faith, which many of us hold so lightly, is that Light Himself visited our darkness, scaled down to fit the human scene... Today, and every day that we live in the here-and-now, we are part of the vast Experiment, the agelong Battle, whose stage and testing ground is the planet which we call the Earth.

643. Earthquake, Lisbon, Described by Eyewitness SOURCE: Letter of ship captain to ship's owners, dated Lisbon, Nov. 19, [1755], in Thomas Hunter, *Historical Account of Earthquakes* (Liverpool: R. Williamson, 1756), pp. 72–74.

[p. 72] Almost all the Palaces and large Churches were rent down, or Part fallen, and scarce one House of this vast City is left habitable. Every Body that was not crushed to Death ran out into the large Places, and those near the River ran down to save themselves by Boats, or any other floating Convenience, running, crying, and calling to the Ships for Assistance; but whilst the Multitude were gathered near the River-side, the Water rose to such a Height that it overflow'd the lower Part of the City, which so terrified the miserable and already dismayed Inhabitants, who ran to and for with dreadful Cries, which we heard plainly on Board, that it made them believe the Dissolution of the World was at Hand, every one falling on his Knees, and intreating the Almighty for his Assistance...

[p. 73] By two o'Clock the Ships Boats began to ply, and took Multitudes on board... The Fear, the Sorrow, the Cries and Lamentations of the poor Inhabitants are inexpressible; every one begging Pardon, and embracing each other; crying, forgive me Friend, Brother, Sister! Oh! what will become of us! neither Water nor Land will protect us, and the [p. 74] Third Element, Fire, seems now to threaten our total Destruction! as in Effect it happened.

The Conflagration lasted a whole Week.

644. Earthquake, Lisbon, Most Spectacular of Earlier Times SOURCE: G. A. Eiby, *About Earthquakes* (New York: Harper, 1957), pp. 141, 142. Copyright 1957 by G. A. Eiby. Used by permission. [p. 141] By far the most spectacular earthquake of earlier times was that of Lisbon, in 1755. This has some claim to be regarded as the greatest earthquake on record. If it is possible to believe reports, the felt area, which was certainly more than 700 miles in radius, extended from the Azores to Italy, and from England to North Africa. A source of confusion in the reports of this shock, which makes it difficult to judge the real extent of the felt area, was the widespread occurrence of seiches, ... wave movements in ponds and lakes...

Oscillations of this kind were observed in France, Italy, Holland, Switzerland, and England, and reports of the movements even came from Norway and Sweden, at a distance of nearly 1800 miles from the epicentre. In those countries, however, the shock was certainly not felt...

[p. 142] In 1755, the damage to Lisbon itself was very great. At that time, the city had about 230,000 inhabitants, nearly 30,000 of whom were killed, according to conservative estimates. Great numbers of people were in the churches, for it was All Saints' Day, and the time of the first Mass. The shock was followed by a tsunami ["tidal wave"] about twenty feet in height, and by fire.

The disaster shocked all Europe, and the moralists and the wiseacres were not slow to make capital of it.

645. Earthquake, Lisbon, Probably Most Famous of All

SOURCE: Perry Byerly, "*Earthquakes,*" *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1961 ed.), Vol. 7, p. 848. Copyright 1961 by Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago. Used by permission.

Probably the most famous of all earthquakes is that which destroyed Lisbon on Nov. 1, 1755. There were three great earthquakes (the first was the largest) at 9:40 A.M., 10 A.M. and at noon. The main shock lasted six to seven minutes, an unusually long duration. Within six minutes at least 30,000 people were killed, all large public buildings and 12,000 dwellings were demolished. It was a church day, and great loss of life occurred in the churches. A fire followed which burned for six days. A marble quay at the riverside disappeared into the river bottom laden with people. Alexander von Humboldt stated that the total area shaken was four times that of Europe.

646. Earthquake, Lisbon, Recognized as Sign of Last Days

SOURCE: John Biddolf, *A Poem on the Earthquake at Lisbon* (London: W. Owen, 1755), lines 187–196, p. 9. Who can with curious Eye this Globe survey,

And not behold it tott'ring with Decay;

All Things created God's Designs fulfill,

And nat'ral Causes work his destin'd Will.

And that eternal Word, which cannot lie,

To mortals hath reveal'd in Prophecy,

That in these latter Days such Signs should come,

Preludes and Prologues to the gene'ral Doom.

But not the Son of Man can tell that Day;

Then lest it find you sleeping, watch and pray

647. Easter, Not Appointed by the Apostles

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, pp. 130, 131.

[p. 130] The aim of the apostles was not to appoint festival days, but to teach a righteous life and piety. And it seems to me that just as many other customs have been established in individual localities according to usage. So also the feast of Easter came to

be observed in each place according to the individual peculiarities of the peoples inasmuch as none of the apostles legislated on the matter. And that the observance originated not by legislation, but as a custom the facts themselves indicate. In Asia Minor most people kept the fourteenth day of the moon, disregarding the sabbath: yet they never separated from those who did otherwise, until Victor, bishop of Rome, influenced by too ardent a zeal, fulminated a sentence of ex-communication against the Quartodecimans in Asia...

[p. 131] The Quartodecimans affirm that the observance of the fourteenth day was delivered to them by the apostle John: while the Romans and those in the Western parts assure us that their usage originated with the apostles Peter and Paul. Neither of these parties however can produce any written testimony in confirmation of what they assert.

648. Easter—Origin of Name

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1958), p. 211. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

The English word Easter and the German Ostern come from a common origin

(*Eostur, Eastur, Ostara, Ostar*), which to the Norsemen meant the season of the rising (growing) sun, the season of new birth. The word was used by our ancestors to designate the Feast of New Life in the spring. The same root is found in the name for the place

where the sun rises (East, *Ost*). The word Easter, then, originally meant the celebration of the spring sun, which had its birth in the East and brought new life upon earth. This symbolism was transferred to the supernatural meaning of our Easter, to the new life of the Risen Christ, the eternal and uncreated Light.

Based on a passage in the writings of Saint Bede the Venerable (735), the term Easter

has often been explained as the name of an Anglo-Saxon goddess (*Eostre*), though no such goddess is known in the mythologies of any Germanic tribe. Modern research has made it quite clear that Saint Bede erroneously interpreted the name of the season as that of a goddess.

649. Easter, Symbols of—Origin

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1958), pp. 233, 236, 237. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 233] EASTER EGG. The origin of the Easter egg is based on the fertility lore of the Indo-European races. To our pre-Christian ancestors it was a most startling event to see a new and live creature emerge from a seemingly dead object. The egg to them became a symbol of spring. Long ago in Persia people used to present each other with eggs at the spring equinox, which for them also marked the beginning of a new year.

In Christian times the egg had bestowed upon it a religious interpretation, becoming a symbol of the rock tomb out of which Christ emerged to the new life of His resurrection. There was, in addition, a very practical reason for making the egg a special sign of Easter joy, since it used to be one of the foods that were forbidden in Lent. The faithful from early times painted Easter eggs in gay colors, had them blessed, ate them, and gave them to friends as Easter gifts...

[p. 236] EASTER BUNNY. The Easter bunny had its origin in pre-Christian fertility lore. Hare and rabbit were the most fertile animals our forefathers knew, serving as symbols of abundant new life in the spring season. The Easter bunny has never had

religious symbolism bestowed on its festive usage, though its white meat is sometimes said to suggest purity and innocence. The Church has never performed special blessings for rabbits or hares, and neither in the liturgy nor in folklore do we find these animals linked with the spiritual meanings of the sacred season. However, the bunny has acquired a cherished role in the celebration of Easter as the legendary producer of Easter eggs for children...

[p. 237] EASTER HAM...

It is an age-old custom, handed down from pre-Christian times, to eat the meat of this animal on festive occasions. Thus the English and Scandinavians ate boar meat and the Germans and Slavs roast pork on Christmas Day. Also, in many parts of Europe roast pork is still the main dish at weddings and on major feast days. Hungarians eat roasted piglets on New Year's Day. The French Canadians have their traditional pork pie on festive occasions. At Easter, smoked or cooked ham, as well as lamb, has been eaten by most European nations from ancient times, and is the traditional Easter dish in America, too. The first records on the liturgical blessing of Easter ham date from the tenth century.

650. Easter Controversy, Cause of

SOURCE: James F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland*, Vol. 1, pp. 211, 212. Copyright 1929 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 211] It is probable that the primitive Christians kept the Pasch on the [p. 212] 14th of Nisan as determined by the Jewish authorities, and regarded it as the anniversary of the crucifixion. But they also observed the first of every seven days, the Jewish week, as a holy day in commemoration of the resurrection. It would seem that gradually a shifting of emphasis took place until in the second century it was generally accepted that the great annual solemnity of the Pasch was the commemoration not of the crucifixion but of the resurrection. Accordingly the majority of Christians celebrated the Pasch not on the 14th of Nisan but on the Sunday which fell on, or first after, that date. The churches of the Roman province of Asia, however, followed the older custom, keeping the Pasch on the 14th of Nisan, whatever the day of the week. The controversy became acute towards the end of the second century, and the observants of the 14th of Nisan, hence called Quartodecimans [Fourteenthers], were finally excommunicated.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The word Pasch is from the Hebrew word for Passover, *pesach*. The name of the Christian Easter festival in some European languages is derived from this Hebrew root. For the nature of the Easter controversy see No. 651.]

651. Easter Controversy, Definition of

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, 1st ed., p. 137. Copyright 1953 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

An acute early controversy, one which ran concurrently with those aroused by Gnosticism, Marcionism, and Montanism, was over the time for the celebration of Easter. Although our first certain notice of Easter is from the middle of the second century, that festival, commemorating the resurrection of Christ, was presumably observed by at least some Christians from much earlier times.

Differences arose over the determination of the date. Should it be fixed by the Jewish passover and be governed by the day of the Jewish month on which that feast was set regardless of the day of the week on which it fell? This became the custom in many of the churches, especially in Asia Minor. In contrast, many churches, including that of Rome, celebrated Easter on the first day of the week, Sunday. It was the first day of the week when Christ rose from the dead and which because of that fact was early observed as the

Lord's Day. Disputes also developed over the length of the fast which was to be observed preceding Easter in commemoration of the crucifixion and as to whether Christ's death occurred on the fourteenth or on the fifteenth day of the Jewish month of Nisan.

In various parts of the Empire, probably not far from the end of the second century, synods met to decide the issue. In general the consensus was for Sunday, but in Asia Minor the bishops held to the other method of reckoning. Thereupon Victor, Bishop of Rome in the last decade of the second century, sought to enforce uniformity by breaking off communion with the dissenting bishops and churches. Irenaeus expostulated with Victor on the ground that the differences in practice had long existed without causing a breach in unity. Ultimately the observance of Easter on Sunday prevailed and probably the prestige of Rome was thereby enhanced. Yet the controversy, called Quartodecimanian from the fourteenth day of Nisan, long remained an unpleasant memory.

652. Easter Controversy—Differences in Early Commemoration of Easter

SOURCE: Jules Lebreton and Jacques Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church*, trans. by Ernest C. Messenger, Vol. 2, bk. 3, chap. 17, sec. 1, pp. 718, 719. Copyright 1946, 1947 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Burns and Oates Ltd., London.

[p. 718] The Asiatics commemorated Easter on the 14th Nisan, whatever the day of the week; the Romans celebrated it on the Sunday which followed the 14th Nisan. This diversity of dates involved a diversity of rites and of feasts: Easter was for the Asiatics the day of the death of the Lord; they fasted on that day, even if it fell on a Sunday, and broke bread only in the evening, the solemnity ending with the Eucharist and the agape. The Romans, on the contrary, devoted three days to the memory of the death and resurrection of Christ, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, the two first being days of mourning and fasting; the vigil between Saturday and Sunday prepared them for the feast of the Resurrection, celebrated on the Sunday.

This difference in liturgical usage was the more awkward because of the fact that there were a fair number of Asiatics in the Roman community...

[p. 719] The Church could not maintain indefinitely a duality of usages which involved not only a diversity of dates but also a divergence in interpretation of the paschal festival. As Baumstark has said, "on the one hand Easter Sunday was lacking, on the other, Good Friday; in Asia the Pasch was the crucifixion of Christ, in Rome it was his Resurrection."

653. Easter Controversy—Earlier Tolerance of Differences in Practice SOURCE: Irenaeus, Letter to Victor, quoted in Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* v. 24. 12–15; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 509, 511. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 509] The controversy is not only about the day, but also about the actual character of the fast; for some think that they ought to fast one day, others two, others even more, some count their day as forty hours, day and night. And such variation of observance did not begin in our own time, but much earlier, in the days of our predecessors who, [p. 511] it would appear, disregarding strictness maintained a practice which is simple and yet allows for personal preference, establishing it for the future, and none the less all these lived in peace, and we also live in peace with one another and the disagreement in the fast confirms our agreement in the faith... Among these too were the presbyters before Soter, who presided over the church of which you are now the leader, I mean Anicetus and Pius

and Telesphorus and Xystus. They did not themselves observe it, nor did they enjoin it on those who followed them, and though they did not keep it they were none the less at peace with those from the dioceses in which it was observed when they came to them, although to observe it was more objectionable to those who did not do so. And no one was ever rejected for this reason, but the presbyters before you who did not observe it sent the Eucharist to those from other dioceses who did.

654. Easter Controversy—Earliest Contender for Sunday

SOURCE: *The Book of the Popes* (*Liber Pontificalis*), trans. by Louise R. Loomis, Sect. XI, Pius I, pp. 14, 15. Copyright 1916 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 14] While he [Pope Pius I, c. 142–c. 154] was bishop [of Rome], his brother Hermas wrote a book in which he set forth the commandment which the angel of the Lord delivered to him, coming to him in the garb of a shepherd and commanding him that [p. 15] the holy feast of Easter be observed upon the Lord's day.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The only extant book of Hermas is called the *Pastor*, or *Shepherd*, of Hermas (ANF, vol. 2, pp. 9–58). It does not mention the Lord's day or Easter. The above extract is from the early section of *The Book of the Popes*, which was composed in the sixth century from earlier records. It was probably written no earlier than A.D. 530.]

655. Easter Controversy—Eastern Insistence on Nisan 14 (Polycarp) SOURCE: Irenaeus, Letter to Victor, quoted in Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* v. 24, 16, 17; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Campbridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 511, 513. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 511] When the blessed Polycarp was staying in Rome in the time of Anicetus, though they disagreed a little about some other things as well, they immediately made peace, having no wish for strife between them on this matter [Easter]. For neither was Anicetus [bishop of Rome c. 157-c. 168] able to persuade Polycarp not to observe it [on Nisan 14], inasmuch as he had always done so in company with John the disciple of our Lord and the other apostles with whom he had associated; nor did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, for he said that he ought to [p. 513] keep the custom of those who were presbyters before him. And under these circumstances they communicated with each other, and in the church Anicetus yielded the celebration of the Eucharist to Polycarp, obviously out of respect and they parted from each other in peace, for the peace of the whole church was kept both by those who observed and by those who did not.

[EDITORS' NOTE: *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, under "Pope," Vol. 12 (1911), p. 273, lists the early bishops of Rome, beginning about A.D. 100, as: Evaristus, Alexander I, Sixtus I, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius I, Anicetus.]

656. Easter Controversy—Eastern Insistence on Nisan 14 (Polycrates) SOURCE: Polycrates, Letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, quoted in Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* v. 24. 2–8; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. I (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Press, 1949), pp. 505, 507, 509. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 505] Therefore we keep the day undeviatingly, neither adding nor taking away, for in Asia [Minor] great luminaries sleep, and they will rise on the day of the coming of the Lord, when he shall come with glory from heaven and seek out all the saints. Such were Philip ... and two of his daughters... [p. 507] There is also John, who lay on the Lord's breast... And there is also Polycarp at Smyrna, both bishop and martyr, and Thraseas, both bishop and martyr, from Eumenaea... [Also] Sagaris, ... Papirius, ... and Melito... All these kept the fourteenth day of the passover according to the gospel, never swerving, but following according to the rule of the faith. And I also, Polycrates, the least of you all, live according to the tradition of my kinsmen, and some of them have I followed. For seven of my family were bishops and I am the eighth, and my kinsmen ever kept the day when the people put away the leaven. Therefore, brethren, I who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord and conversed with brethren from every country, and have studied all holy Scripture, am not afraid of threats, for they have said, who were greater than I, "It is better to obey God rather than men." ...

And I could mention the bishops who are present whom you required me to summon, and I did so. If I should write their names they would be many multitudes; and they knowing my feeble [p. 509] humanity, agreed with the letter, knowing that not in vain is my head grey, but that I have ever lived in Christ Jesus.

657. Easter Controversy—Roman Bishop (Victor) Excommunicates Observers of Nisan 14

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* v. 24, 9–11; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 509. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Victor, who presided at Rome, immediately tried to cut off from the common unity the dioceses of all Asia [Minor], together with the adjacent churches, on the ground of heterodoxy, and he indited letters announcing that all the Christians there were absolutely excommunicated. But by no means all were pleased by this, so they issued counterrequests to him to consider the cause of peace and unity and love towards his neighbours. Their words are extant, sharply rebuking Victor. Among them too Irenaeus, writing in the name of the Christians whose leader he was in Gaul, though he recommends that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection be observed only on the Lord's day, yet nevertheless exhorts Victor suitably and at length not to excommunicate whole churches of God for following a tradition of ancient custom [that is, the observance of Easter on Nisan 14 instead of consistently on Sunday].

658. Easter Controversy—Settlement at Council of Nicaea,

Constantine's Report of

SOURCE: Constantine's Letter to the Churches Respecting the Council at Nicaea, quoted in Eusebius. *The Life of Constantine*, bk. iii, chaps. 18, 19, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. I, pp. 524, 525.

[ch. 18, p. 524] At this meeting the question concerning the most holy day of Easter was discussed, and it was resolved by the united judgment of all present, that this feast ought to be kept by all and in every place on one and the same day. For what can be more becoming or honorable to us than that this feast from which we date our hopes of immortality, should be observed unfailingly by all alike, according to one ascertained order and arrangement? And first of all, it appeared an unworthy thing that in the celebration of this most holy feast we should follow the practice of the Jews [that is, by celebrating it at the time of the Jewish Passover, on a Jewish calendar date, Nisan 14], who have impiously defiled their hands with enormous sin, and are, therefore, deservedly afflicted with blindness of soul... Let us then have nothing in common with the detestable Jewish crowd: for we have received from our Saviour a different way. A course at once legitimate and honorable lies open to our most holy religion. Beloved brethren, let us with one consent adopt this course [that is, the celebration of the resurrection, always on a Sunday], and withdraw ourselves from all participation in their baseness. For their boast is absurd indeed, that it is not in our power without instruction from them to observe these things... Being altogether ignorant of the true adjustment of this question, they sometimes celebrate [p. 525] Easter twice in the same year [because the Jewish calendar year, being lunar, is slightly shorter than the solar year]... How

grievous and scandalous it is that on the self-same days some should be ... present at banquets and amusements, while others are fulfilling the appointed fasts. It is, then, plainly the will of Divine Providence (as I suppose you all clearly see), that this usage should receive fitting correction, and be reduced to one uniform rule...

[ch. 19] Since, therefore, it was needful that this matter should be rectified, so that we might have nothing in common with that nation of parricides who slew their Lord: and since that arrangement is consistent with propriety which is observed by all the churches of the western, southern, and northern parts of the world, and by some of the eastern also: for these reasons all are unanimous on this present occasion in thinking it worthy of adoption. And I myself have undertaken that this decision should meet with the approval of your Sagacities, in the hope that your Wisdoms will gladly admit that practice which is observed at once in the city of Rome, and in Africa; throughout Italy, and in Egypt, in Spain, the Gauls, Britain, Libya, and the whole of Greece; in the dioceses of Asia and Pontus, and in Cilicia, with entire unity of judgment... In fine, that I may express my meaning in as few words as possible, it has been determined by the common judgment of all, that the most holy feast of Easter should be kept on one and the same day.

659. Eastern Churches (Eastern Orthodox Churches) SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 549–551.

[p. 549] *History.*—The Holy Eastern Orthodox Church, known historically as the "Eastern Catholic," in modern times as the "Greek Catholic," the "Eastern Catholic Church," the "Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Church," and popularly as the "Greek Church," is the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Byzantine Empire. It has always been known as the Old Church, the church of the first Christian era, of the time of the Oecumenical Councils, and considers herself to be the direct heir of the true conserver of this old Holy Church.

In the first period of the development of the Orthodox Church, during the first five centuries, Orthodox Christianity received its basis and direction. The basic truths, the basic forms or constitution, and the foundations of the cult of the Orthodox Church were set forth by the great occumenical Church Fathers during this period.

Two important historical events, the rise of papal Rome and the advance of Mohammedanism, held the church's chief attention during the second period, which extended from the fifth to the eleventh century. These two forces threatened the integrity and the existence of the Eastern Church. The heathen Slavs, and the iconoclastic controversy caused more unrest during this troubled period, which finally led to the separation between eastern Christianity and papal Rome.

During the third period, from the eleventh to the nineteenth century, the advancing waves of the Mohammedan storm swept over and destroyed the southeastern empires of the Byzantines, the Bulgarians, the Serbs, and the Roumanians. At the same time, the monstrous flow of Tartars swept over Russian orthodox territory, threatening the existence of eastern civilization and eastern Christianity. Here the church's iron endurance and its capacity to sacrifice for the faith had a double result—eastern Christianity maintained its own existence, and also secured immunity and safety for the Christianity of the west...

The Orthodox Church consists of a number of so-called autocephalic or autonomic churches, the oldest of which are the four eastern patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The World War and the resulting national and

political changes have left their mark in many alterations in various churches of orthodoxy, a depressing example of which being that the external substance of the patriarchate of Constantinople, the Mother Church of all orthodox churches, is now reduced to a ruin and shadow. As a parallel to the political changes in the former Russian Empire, the Orthodox Churches in Poland, Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, separated from the Russian Church and instituted themselves as free (autonomous) churches. Thus on the one hand is disintegration and on the other individual unification.

These different organizations, although independent of each other ecclesiastically, agree in doctrine, and essentially, in form of worship, and together constitute what is called the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church.

Of the 11 bodies comprising the Eastern Orthodox Churches in the United States, 8 the Albanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Roumanian, Russian, Serbian, Syrian, and Ukrainian are headed by a bishop or archbishop under the spiritual jurisdiction of the mother church in their ancestral homelands. The remaining three organizations—the American Holy Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, the Apostolic Episcopal Church (The Holy Eastern Catholic and Apostolic Orthodox Church), and the Holy Orthodox Church in America, whose distinguishing characteristic is that the liturgy is conducted in English—were formed to meet the needs of American-born descendants of foreign lineage.

[p. 550] *Doctrine.*—The doctrine of the Eastern Orthodox Catholic Churches is founded on the Holy Scriptures, the Holy Traditions, and the dogmatic decisions of the seven Ecumenical Councils. The Holy Scriptures are interpreted strictly in accordance with the teachings of the seven Ecumenical Councils and the Holy Fathers. The Niceo-Constantinopolitan Creed is held only in its original authoritative form without the Roman-Latin addition of the "filioque" phrase. Recognizing Christ as the only head of the earthly as well as the heavenly church, they do not accept the dogma of the Pope as the special representative or Vicar of Christ on earth, and the infallible head of His earthly church. According to their teaching, infallibility belongs to the whole assembly of true believers, to the "Ecclesia," or church, which is represented by its council legally called together and whose decisions are confirmed by the consensus of the church.

They believe in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone; honor Mary as the mother of God, and honor the nine orders of angels and the saints; do not define as dogma the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, but hold the true Catholic doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ. They reject the doctrine of the surplus merits of the saints and the doctrine of indulgences. They reverence relics of the saints, pictures of holy subjects, and the cross, but forbid the use of carved images. They accept seven sacraments—baptism, anointing (confirmation or chrismation), communion, penance, holy orders, marriage, and holy unction. Baptism of either infants or adults by threefold immersion is recognized as the only proper form, although other forms are accepted of necessity or in the case of converts who have previously been baptized. The sacrament of anointing with "chrism," or holy oil, is administered immediately after that of baptism and the chrismated infant or adult is thereafter a full communicant in the Eucharist.

The doctrine of transubstantiation is taught. In the Eucharist, leavened bread is used, being consecrated and soaked in the consecrated chalice and then received by all members of the Eastern Orthodox Churches after confession and absolution. Children under 7 years of age, however, receive the sacrament without confession. Holy unction is

administered to the sick, and not alone to those in danger of death. The church rejects the doctrine of purgatory, but believes in the beneficial effect of prayer for the dead by the living and for the living by the dead. It rejects the doctrine of predestination and considers that for justification both faith and works are necessary.

In the Eastern Orthodox Catholic Church, membership has two distinct but frequently confused meanings. All persons who have been baptized in the church and received the sacrament of chrismation (confirmation) which immediately follows baptism, are communicant members of the church, participating in the sacrament of the Eucharist. Parish membership, however, is counted more frequently by males over 21 than by communicants, because the head of each family is the voting member of the parish congregation. This fact gives rise to confusion and uncertainty of statistics of all Eastern Orthodox Churches.

Organization.—There are three orders of the ministry—deacons, priests, and bishops. The deacons assist in the work of the parish and in the service of the sacraments. Priests and deacons are of two orders, secular and monastic. Marriage is allowed to candidates for the diaconate and the priesthood, but is forbidden after ordination. The episcopate is, as a rule, confined to members of the monastic order. A married priest, should his wife die, may enter a monastery and take the monastic vows, and is eligible to the episcopate. The parishes are, as a rule, in the care of the secular priests.

Monks and nuns are gathered in monastic establishments or are scattered out in missionary work. In some monastic colonies the members live in communities, while in others they lead a secluded, hermitical life, each in his own cell. There is but one order, and the vows for all are the same—obedience, chastity, prayer, fasting, and poverty.

The organization for the general government of the different Eastern Orthodox Churches varies in different countries. In general, there is a council at the head of which, as president, is a bishop elected by the ecclesiastical representatives of the people. Historically, and at present in some cases, this presiding bishop is called the patriarch, and has special colleagues and officers for the purpose of governing his flock. The largest or most important of the bishoprics connected with the patriarchate, or synod, are called "metropolitan sees," though the title now carries with it no special ecclesiastical authority. In early times, both the clergy and the laity of the local churches had a voice in the election of bishops, priests, and deacons, but of late that right has been much restricted, and at pres- [p. 551] ent the priests and deacons are usually appointed by the bishops, and the bishops are elected by the clergy.

The service of the Eastern Orthodox Churches is solemn and elaborate. It is essentially that of the earlier centuries of Christianity, and is most fully and completely observed in the monasteries. There are no sculptured images and no instrumental music, although there are pictorial representations of Christ, the apostles and saints, and scenes in Bible history. The most important service is the divine liturgy, the chief part of which is the celebration of the Eucharist.

660. Eastern Churches—Greek Archdiocese of North and South America (Greek Orthodox Church)

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 572, 573.

[p. 572] *History*. During the period from 1890 to the World War the number of Greeks immigrating to the United States increased greatly. Some came from Greece, some from the Greek islands of the Aegean Sea, Dodecanese, and Cyprus, and others

form Constantinople, Smyrna, and other parts of Asia Minor. They were largely unmarried men, or, if married, they had left their families behind them and had scattered over the country, those from the same section usually keeping together.

As they became to a certain extent permanent residents, and especially as they were joined by their families, they felt the need of religious services, particularly in case of marriage, sickness, and death. Accordingly, application was made by the communities to the ecclesiastical authorities of their own sections, and priests were sent to this country, sometimes by the Holy Synod of Greece and sometimes by the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. These priests formed churches in the larger centers and also congregations in places within easy reach, which they visited more or less regularly as convenient.

[p. 573] As in the case of the early Russian churches, there was at first no central organization, each priest holding his ecclesiastical relation with the synod or patriarchate which sent him to this country. In 1908 the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople resigned its ecclesiastical relations to the Greeks in America in favor of the Holy Synod of Greece, which had decided to send to America a Greek (Hellenic) bishop.² [Note 2: ...In view of the very general use of the term "Greek" to describe the entire Eastern Orthodox Church in all its branches, the term "Hellenic" is used to designate specifically the Eastern Orthodox Church of Greece, governed by the Holy Synod of Greece and to the Greeks of Constantinople governed by the Ecumenical Patriarchate.]

Yet the first serious effort to organize the Greek churches of America was made only in 1918, when Bishop Alexander, of Rodostolou, was sent to America by the Synod of Greece as the first bishop and synodical delegate.

According, however, to the holy canons of the Eastern Orthodox Church, the spiritual jurisdiction and supervision over the Orthodox Churches in the Diaspora belong to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople; and the transfer of its rights to the Church of Greece by an act, known as the Tome of 1908, was only provisional and due only to certain special considerations. But, as soon as conditions changed, the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, in March 1922, revoked the measure, took again the churches in the Diaspora under its direct canonical supervision and, in May 1922, by a synodical and patriarchal act, known as the Founding Tome of 1922, established the Greek (Orthodox) Archdiocese of North and South America, consisting of four bishoprics, and promoted Bishop Alexander (formerly of Rodostolou) to the rank of Archbishop of North and South America.

In August of the same year the Second General Convention of the Archdiocese of America convened in New York and adopted the constitution of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, based on the patriarchal Tome of 1922. After this constitution was ratified by the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, the bishops of Chicago, Boston, and San Francisco were elected by the provincial conventions of each diocese.

In 1930, owing to certain dissatisfaction and divisions in the church, the Greek bishops in America—with the exception of the bishop of San Francisco—were translated to various dioceses in Greece, and a new Archbishop of America was appointed, The Most Reverend Athenagoras, formerly Metropolitan of Corfu, Greece, who came here in February 1931.

The Greek parishes in America have been all united under the new Archbishop. The former dioceses were suspended and a new constitution, with slight changes, was granted by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Archbishop Athenagoras retained the Right Reverend Callistos, Bishop of San Francisco, as his assistant bishop.

The Fourth General Convention of the Archdiocese, held in the New York, in November 1931, adopted the new constitution and a number of bylaws for the various activities and departments of the archdiocese.

Doctrine and Organization. The Greek Archdiocese of North and South America is in accord with other Eastern Orthodox churches in doctrine; its polity and worship, while in principle the same as in those churches, vary somewhat in form to meet the peculiar needs.

There are about 250 organized congregations and churches under the jurisdiction of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America. There are also about 50 missions and parishes of the Ukrainian Orthodox Diocese, recognizing the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and affiliated with the archdiocese, under Right Reverend Bishop Bohdan.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 1,200,000 (YAC, 1961, p. 245).]

661. Eastern Churches—Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 587-590.

[p. 587] *History*... [p. 588] The Russian Church is the only branch of the Eastern Orthodox Church that has undertaken in recent years any foreign missionary enterprise. It has developed quite extensive missions in Siberia, Japan, and China, but its great work has been the care of the churches in America.

[p. 589] In 1759 a Russian merchant, named Glotoff, baptized several Aleuts of Umnak Island. Fifteen years later Schelehoff, the organizer of a company for fur trading in Alaska, baptized 40 Aleuts of Kodiak Island. In 1792, at his request, the Holy Synod sent to Alaska a special mission consisting of eight monks, who established their headquarters at Kodiak and built the first Eastern Orthodox Church in America. In the course of 2 years 12,000 natives were baptized, and almost every hamlet had its church or chapel. During succeeding years a number of additional missionaries were sent from Russia, both to care for the Russians and to do missionary work among the natives...

After the change of political rule, accompanying the sale of Alaska to the United States, many Russians returned to their own country, and with them a large number of priests or missionaries...

In 1872 the see was removed from Sitka to San Francisco, where there were already quite a number of Russians, Serbians, and Greeks. In 1888 Bishop Vladimir came from Russia, remaining until 1891, when he was succeeded by Bishop Nicholas, whose stay was noted for two important features: (1) An exceptional development of religious activity in Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, ... (2) the enlarging of the eparchy to include Canada and the Eastern States of the United States, thus opening a new period in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States.

In the more recent immigration, large numbers have come from the old Austria-Hungary, especially from the former Galicia and Poland, who belonged to what are known as the Uniat churches... About the same time the immigration from Russia proper increased, and soon purely Russian parishes were formed in New York and Chicago, although in the former city there was an Orthodox Russian Church in existence as far back as 1876. In 1905 the episcopal see was transferred from San Francisco to New York City and the mission was elevated to the rank of an archdiocese with an archbishop and two vicar bishops, one for the diocese of Alaska and the other for the Syrian Mission having its headquarters in the Diocese of Brooklyn, headed by an Arabic-speaking bishop of the Russian jurisdiction.

[p. 590] With the growth of the archdiocese, two additional vicar bishoprics— Pittsburgh and Canada—were added, and the church remained under the administration of these five prelates until after the World War.

The history of the Russian Church in America since the World War and the Russian Revolution has reflected the uncertainty and persecutions characteristics of this period in the church of Russia. As ... mentioned [on p. 588], the pseudo-Sobor of 1923 in Moscow had declared communism essential to Christianity, and the adherence to the Soviets obligatory; it then had appointed a pseudo synod, which delegated to America an unfrocked priest, formerly of the Russian-American clergy, with the title of metropolitanarchbishop, head of the Russian Church in America. That man, armed with all credentials of the pseudo synod, instituted legal proceedings and obtained possession of the Russian St. Nicholas Cathedral, New York City, which was the see of the ruling bishop. At that time in Russia, Patriarch Tikhon and his lawful administration were imprisoned and otherwise isolated by the Soviets; therefore no direct legal evidence could be obtained from them as to the authority or even the existence of the regular church administration in America, which remained faithful to the rules and canons of the Russian Orthodox Church. This is how an agent of the Soviet supporting faction of the church won possession of the Russian Cathedral in America. He has, however, virtually no followers either among the clergy or the laity.

Metropolitan Platon, the then actual ruling bishop of the Russian Church in America, was forced to move his see from the Cathedral, New York City, to the new cathedral, which was offered to him by Trinity Parish of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City. It was one of Trinity's chapels which was rebuilt and transformed into a Russian Cathedral, and now houses also the office of the Metropolitan Council, governing body of the church.

Seeing the impossibility of any further connections with Moscow controlled by Communism, Metropolitan Platon, in an epistle published in 1933, proclaimed the Russian Orthodox Church in North America to be temporarily autonomous. It so remains now.

In 1934, after the death of Metropolitan Platon, an all-American Sobor of the church was convoked in Cleveland, Ohio. Theophilus, Archbishop of San Francisco, was elected Metropolitan and head of the Russian Church in America and Canada...

Doctrine and Organization. The general doctrine of the Russian Orthodox Church is in accord with that of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, as given in the General Statement of this publication [see No. 659].

In the United States the Autonomous Russian Orthodox Church [now known as the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America] is governed by a metropolitan elected to that office for life by an all-American Conclave, or Sobor... That Sobor ... consists of all bishops and of delegates elected from all parishes...

The 10 Russian bishops in America form a council of bishops, with power to rule upon matters of doctrine. That council is also being convened periodically.

The permanent governing body is the Metropolitan Council, consisting of clerical and lay members elected by the all-American Sobor, and/or appointed by the Metropolitan. That council, however, has but consultative power, its decisions becoming effective only after they are approved by the Metropolitan.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Membership (1957), 755,000 (YAC, 1961, p. 254).]

662. Ecumenical Movement, Brief History of

SOURCE: Editorial, "To a Greater Christian Church," *Life*, 49 (Dec. 19, 1960), 24. Copyright 1960 by Time, Inc. Used by permission.

What is the ecumenical movement? Swelling for 50 years, its broken thunder is now heard on every Christian shore. It is a series of incomplete but mounting efforts to end what one of the movement's founders, the late Bishop Charles H. Brent, called "the sin and disaster of sectarianism." It is an attempt to restore meaning to the Bible's prescription of "one fold, one shepherd," to expunge the sad irony in the words of the hymn: "We are not divided, all one body we." It would reknit the raveled garment of Christian worship on the twin assumptions that Jesus Christ (the head of all Christian churches) wants this done, and that a united church can better advance His cause than the present scandalous fragmentation.

At its most ambitious, the ecumenical movement aspires to heal the thousand-yearold break between Rome and the Eastern Orthodox churches on the one hand, and the later breach between these and the Protestant denominations on the other. Pope John's recent gestures toward the Ecumenical Patriarch in Istanbul and the Archbishop of Canterbury have added a glitter of hope to this dream.

Only dreamers expect anything like the monolithic unity which the Christendom of the Middle Ages seems to present to nostalgic modern minds. With its increasing claims to its own infallibility, and its near-deification of the Virgin, the Roman Church becomes less accessible to any reunion; the Orthodox churches are no less certain of their unique claim to truth; and few Protestants are ready to sacrifice their special knowledge of God through the Bible. But despite these deep doctrinal differences, these three chief branches of Christianity are on much friendlier terms than they used to be. Their spokesmen are able to meet in serious dialogue without thinking of each other as antichrists; they have learned to know what they believe in common and why they disagree. And these contacts and peaceful dialogue are one result of the ecumenical movement.

It began (not counting 19th Century foreshadowings) at Edinburgh in 1910, in the first of many interdenominational conferences whose subsequent landmarks are Stockholm (1925), Lausanne (1927), Edinburgh and Oxford (1937), Amsterdam (1948) and Evanston (1954). Its memorable names, potential saints of a great church to come, are Bishop Brent, John R. Mott, Archbishop Temple and Archbishop Söderblom, to name only a few and none now alive. Its chief organ is the World Council of Churches, founded in 1948, which includes 178 Protestant, Anglican and Orthodox groups in 50 countries. It conducts a continuous scouting party into all obstacles and paths to union.

The main currents in the ecumenical movement are presently two; minimalists and maximalists... The former would gladly settle for a closer comity, or loose federation, among existing churches. The latter seek the reunion of all churches into one. Although maximalists have no solution to the great East-West and Reformation schisms, they can point to an extraordinary accumulation of modern mergers within the Protestant world.

The United Church of Canada, which joined 8,000 parishes of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational churches in 1925, is now Canada's largest church, with little or no remaining trace of its original three-way separation. The Church of South India (1947) was even more of a landmark, for it also includes Anglicans, whose episcopal polity is harder to reconcile with congregational church government.

Lesser and more local mergers take place yearly. U.S. Lutherans, for example, are reducing their sects from 16 to 11, largely because the original ethnic or language reasons for division have been worn away by time.

663. Ecumenical Movement—Catholic Hopes for Protestant Reunion With Rome

SOURCES: Gustave Wiegel, *A Catholic Primer on the Ecumenical Movement*, pp. 50, 51, 64, 66. Copyright 1957 by The Newman Press, Westminster, Md. Used by permission.

[p. 50] He [the Catholic] does not want the World Council to continue in definitive existence. He wants it to bring all of its churches into the Catholic Church. He considers the Council good and grace-inspired insofar as [p. 51] it will bring the "other sheep" into the fold of the one Shepherd, visibly represented by His one vicar. He does not at all consider it good if it will only serve to stabilize the alienation of the "other sheep." ...

[p. 64] As long as the Catholic is Catholic and the Protestant is Protestant, there is only one way to union—the conversion of one to the views of the other. If that should happen, either Catholicism or Protestantism would disappear. There can never be a Catholic-Protestant Church, or even a Catholic-Protestant fellowship of churches. This is the basic fact. It does not good to anyone to hope that this fact will somehow sublimate into something thinner...

[p. 66] The Catholic must say to the Protestant that the [Catholic] Church was substantially right, and therefore any endeavor toward reunion will be a return to her unreconstructed, unreformed unity.

664. Ecumenical Movement—Church Union — Blake-Pike Merger Proposal (1960)

SOURCE: *Crusader*, 16 (January, 1961), 2. Copyright 1961 by the American Baptist Convention. Used by permission.

A proposal to merge Episcopal, United Presbyterian in the USA, Methodist and United Church of Christ communions into a single 18-million member denomination exploded like a bomb on American Protestants on Dec. 4 [preceding the National Council of Churches Triennial Assembly]. It was advanced by Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church in the USA, in a sermon delivered at the 11 a.m. worship service in Grace Cathedral, San Francisco. The overture was endorsed immediately by his host, the Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of California.

As conceived by Dr. Blake, the new church would be both "*reformed and catholic*". In using the word "catholic," he said he referred to "those understandings of faith and order, of church and sacraments which are catholic in contrast to the protestant or evangelical practices and understandings."

In using the word "reformed," he called on "those of the catholic tradition ... to accept and to take to themselves ... all that nearly 500 years of reformation has contributed to the renewal of Christ's church."

Dr. Blake said that the proposal looked "ultimately to the reunion of the whole of Christ's church." In a subsequent TV interview, Bishop Pike referred to the Roman Catholic Church and added: "We cannot leave out of our consideration this largest of our Christian communities."

In attempting to vault the stumbling blocks which have derailed previous merger talks, Dr. Blake proposed that the reunited church would: (1) have "visible and historical continuity with the church of all ages" by providing for "the consecration of all its bishops by bishops and presbyters both in the apostolic succession and out of it …"; (2) confess the faith set forth in the Apostles' and Nicene creeds; (3) administer the sacraments "truly as means of grace," not merely as symbolic memorials; (4) accept "the right place of tradition" so as to allow for a continuing reformation of the church; (5) adopt a semi-democratic form of government; (6) "recapture the brotherhood and sense of fellowship of all its members and ministers"; and (7) accept "a wide diversity of theological formulation … and a variety of worship and liturgy."

665. Ecumenical Movement—Church Union—"Catholic, Reformed, Evangelical" Merger

SOURCE: Harold E. Fey, "Catholic, Reformed, Evangelical," editorial correspondence in *The Christian Century*, 78 (June 7, 1961), 702, 703. Copyright 1961 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

[p. 702] The ... 173rd General Assembly [of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.] broadened the proposal that Dr. Blake made last December in Grace Episcopal Cathedral, San Francisco, and then adopted it by a nearly unanimous vote. Moreover, it set up a negotiating committee ... "to explore the establishment of a united Church truly Catholic, truly Reformed and truly Evangelical." ...

The amendments proposed by the committee clarify and broaden the original proposal that the United Presbyterian General Assembly and the Protestant Episcopal General Convention, which meets in September [see No. 1266n.], invite the Methodist Church and the United Church of Christ "to enter into organic union." ...

[p. 703] The invitation was also broadened by inviting the general assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, U.S. [Southern], and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church to discuss the "reunion of the Presbyterian churches in this nation" or to participate in the Catholic, Reformed, Evangelical negotiations as negotiators or observers. Finally, the stated clerk is instructed to "communicate with all the other churches with whom this church is in ecumenical relations." ...

Thus the General Assembly proposal begins with a proposal to one church but widens step by step to include more than 30 denominations.

666. Ecumenical Movement—Church Union Proposal "Not for Us," Say American Baptists

SOURCE: Editorial, "Not For Us," *Crusader*, 16 (January, 1961), 2. Copyright 1961 by the American Baptist Convention. Used by permission.

Very frankly, this union proposal [to unite the 18 million members of for churches, the United Presbyterian, U.S.A., [Episcopal, Methodist, and United Church of Christ] is not for, us. American Baptists are not opposed to church union when it occurs happily and naturally, especially at grass root levels. But neither do we have a "must-merge" complex. We do not believe that combining weaknesses will produce strength; or that denominational divisions are necessarily scandalous; or that bigness of itself will produce power...

For many years now it has been customary at ecumenical gatherings for participants to confess the sin of division...

But we do not feel guilty for wearing denominational clothes so long as our heart beats with those of our fellow Christians... Differences in background, understanding and temperament produce "denominations" among psychologists, scientists and historians who must depend upon fallible human interpretations. Why should it be otherwise in religion?

Are American Baptists [see No. 194] second-class Christians because we feel this way?

667. Ecumenical Movement—Hindrances to Protestant and Catholic Union

SOURCE: Karl Barth, in "Protestant-Roman Unity: 25 Scholars' Views," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 29. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

Certain indications seem to point to a possible, perhaps already operative, inner renewal in today's Roman Catholic church. The holy Scriptures are being read and studied, are being expounded academically and also in preaching with greater delight and accuracy than before. In connection therewith is a deepened attention to Jesus Christ, only Lord and Saviour, as the center and object of all church life and teaching. And we must not fail to appreciate a more earnest understanding of God's free grace and therefore of the sinner's justification by faith alone among some forward-moving Roman Catholic theologians, efforts toward a more kerygmatic form of the mass. If and how all this will some day lead to a change with reference to a new interpretation of the Roman Catholic concepts of the mediatorial role of the virgin Mary and of the saints; of the merit of tradition; of the authority of the church, and particularly of the pope; and above all of the sacraments we cannot contemplate at the moment. In our opinion even the best Roman Catholics in no case could and would be expected simply to put aside these peripheral considerations. But neither can we expect them to find those central truths (Scripture, Christ, grace) better preserved and better championed in our Protestant churches than in their own. We ourselves would need to be, think, teach, and live more evangelically, if our Protestantism is to have any attraction whatever for today's Roman Catholic Christianity that perhaps is newly seeking the gospel. On the other hand, we cannot therefore suppress our estrangement in view of peripheral matters of the Roman Catholic system (Mary, the church, the pope, the sacraments) as they have come to us thus far, inasmuch as we cannot conceive how they (these peripheral matters) can be joined to the central teachings. Therefore church unity between Rome and us cannot vet be in prospect today, but there is possibly a new brotherly discussion concerning what can unite Rome and us, and concerning that which always must divide Rome and us. At the same time we must reckon with the strange possibility that some day it might be apparent that what must and could unite Rome and us is comprehended in certain Roman spheres just as well, if not better, than in large segments of our own Protestant constituency.

668. Ecumenical Movement—Protestant-Catholic "Confrontation" SOURCE: K. E. Skydsgaard, "On Dialogues Between Roman Catholic and Evangelical Lutheran Theologians," *Lutheran World*, 7 (September, 1960), 128, 129. Used by permission.

[p. 128] The idea of two, or perhaps even more, churches, divided from one another, was totally foreign to the reformers; to call a church "Lutheran" was an abomination to Luther himself. There was only one holy, catholic and apostolic church in which a terrible struggle had continually to be fought, because the true Christian church, the

regnum dei is always assailed by the false church, the regnum diaboli. In this instance, the false church was represented by the names "Rome" and "the papacy." with their abuses and false doctrine. In the opinion of the reformers, it was their God-given task to fight not against the one church but against Rome and yet the break came, not at once, but, so to speak, in stages, until various church groups, isolated from one another, the socalled confessions, resulted as more or less finished products. However, even the formation of independent churches or confessions which differ from one another not only theologically but sociologically, politically and culturally, has never led to a situation in which the "confessional question" has been resolved or in which the wounds caused by these breaks have been healed. The problem of Roman Catholic versus Evangelical Lutheran has not been solved to this very day. Behind all attempts to resolve this puzzle lay, and still lies, a mystery which cannot be explained by theological interpretations, regardless how profound they might be. On both sides the painful awareness of the division of Christendom has continued in varying degrees, but yet in such a way that the bitterness of the break and the vulnerability in mutual relationships have never been overcome. We, on both sides, can never forget that our individual existence as churches occurred through a break of great depth, accompanied by angry conversations and mutual accusations. We cannot forget that the man who stood in the foreground in this matter was officially excommunicated by Rome and that this very man regarded the pope as the anti-Christ. The power of the papacy never, as Luther had hoped, diminished, nor was the "Lutheran heresy," as was hoped from the Roman side, merely an ephemeral German affair of short duration. Instead, events took a quite different course...

[p. 129] The fact that a lively confrontation between Roman Catholic and Lutheran theology is taking place today cannot be denied, and is a cause for rejoicing. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that discussions of like intensity, such a mutual questioning and exchange, have never taken place between the confessions since the Reformation...

But unity can mean different things. There can never be unity at any price. There can never be unity merely for the sake of unity. Such a unity could be a miracle of the anti-Christ. It might be a completely false unity which God himself would destroy in his power and his grace.

669. Ecumenical Movement—Protestant-Catholic "Dialogue" SOURCE: Kenneth Dole, "Theologians Talk of Church Unity," *The Washington Post*, Oct. 8, 1960, p. B11, quoting from *Lutheran World*, 7 (Sept., 1960), 129. Used by permission.

A "dialogue" has been going on between Roman and non-Roman thinkers, especially in Europe, which at least is leading to better understanding, according to the Rev. Dr. K. E. Skydsgaard of Copenhagen, a Lutheran.

He says "the present lively confrontation between Roman Catholic and Lutheran theology ... is a cause for rejoicing." He notes it is not exaggerated to say "discussions of like intensity, such as mutual questioning and exchange, have never taken place between the confessions since the Reformation."

670. Ecumenical Movement—Protestant Hopes for Catholic Agreement on Religious Liberty

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 94. Used by permission.

In view of the above comparison of Roman Catholic and ecumenical statements on religious liberty, we think that, generally speaking, the *doctrinal* accord between ecumenism and this stream of Roman Catholic thought on the matter is highly satisfactory. We believe also that, once this Roman Catholic opinion ceases to be only *one of several* admitted within Catholic orthodoxy and becomes *the official attitude* of the Church itself, a *practical* agreement with the Roman Catholic Church on the real exercise of religious liberty in all countries will be possible. And we sincerely hope that that time is not so far away as many fear.

It is most unfortunate that the question of religious freedom has so frequently been treated in a general atmosphere of suspicion and distrust, so far as the doctrine and attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is concerned...

It should be an important task of the ecumenical movement and of the World Council of Churches in particular, to substitute for this general distrustful attitude a truly ecumenical spirit of charity and understanding.

671. Ecumenical Movement—Protestant Yearning for Catholic Cooperation Expressed

SOURCE: Ernst Kinder, "Protestant-Roman Catholic Encounter an Ecumenical Obligation," *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. VII (July, 1955), p. 339. Used by permission.

Any ecumenical thought and action, which definitely excluded the Roman Catholic Church because of the difficulties involved, would no longer be truly ecumenical; it would be pan-Protestant and anti-Roman, which is something entirely different!

672. Ecumenical Movement, Roman Catholic Interest in SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, "The Issues Which Divide Us," in *American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View*, ed. by Philip Scharper, p. 117. © 1959 by Sheed and Ward, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

Much of the interest in ecumenical Christianity centers on the World Council of Churches, a group comprising almost all of the significant branches of non-Roman Christianity. Fr. Edward Duff, a Jesuit, has written an excellent book on the social thought of the World Council, and a French priest, Canon Gustav Thiels, has written a doctrinal history of the ecumenical movement.⁸⁵ [Note 85: Duff, *The Social Thought of the World Council of Churches* (Association Press, 1956); Thiels, *Histoire doctrinale du Mouvement OEcumenique* (Louvain, 1955).] In a discussion of the latter volume, Roger Mehl, a French Protestant philosopher, comments:

The ecumenical movement today has valuable collaborators among Roman Catholic theologians. It also means that within a few years the World Council of Churches has succeeded in compelling recognition and has acquired real and indisputable authority... The word "ecumenical" is no longer inacceptable to the Roman Catholic Church; Rome recognizes that the non-Roman churches and confessions present a theological problem... Every page [of Thiel's [*sic*] book] reopens the conversation between Rome and the World Council of Churches, even when all hope had sometimes been lost of being able to continue it.⁸⁶ [Note 86: In "The Ecclesiological Significance of the World Council from a Roman Catholic Standpoint," *The Ecumenical Review*, April 1957, pp. 240, 241, 252.]

Let no one think, however, that in this ecumenical interchange, Protestants and Catholics are easily going to resolve their differences.

673. Ecumenical Movement—Roman Catholic Participation in, Only if Given the Presidency

SOURCE: Leon Cristiani, *Heresies and Heretics*, trans. by Roderick Bright, p. 140. © 1959 by Hawthorn Books, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The Catholic Church has thus no difficulty in closely combining the passionate desire for Christian unity and the certainty that this unity is only possible in the unity of faith, communion and government that she has always preserved through nineteen centuries. This unity is not only her dearest treasure but is the sacred property of the Holy Spirit, who has willed it and protected it, and forms the only hope of mankind. Perhaps one day the Catholic Church will take part in an ecumenical assembly, if she is given the presidency and if to begin with her divine right of directing the universal Church is recognized. And that is obviously the meaning of this declaration by Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, concerning the Assembly at Evanston: "The Catholic Church can take no part in any organization in which the delegates of numerous sects gather in council or conference to discuss on an equal footing the subject of the nature of the Church of Christ or of the nature of her unity."

674. Ecumenical Movement—Symptom of Decay

SOURCE: Editorial, "To a Greater Christian Church," *Life*, 49 (Dec. 19, 1960), 24. Copyright 1960 by Time, Inc. Used by permission.

Does this mean that church mergers are just another symptom of the decay or attenuation of Christian belief? Is Protestantism more "ecumenical" because it is less sure or serious about its own theologies? In many cases, this is regrettably true.

675. Ecumenical Movement — World Council of Churches SOURCE: Robert S. Bilheimer, *The Quest for Christian Unity* (New York: Association Press), pp. 58, 59.

Copyright 1952 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission. [p. 58] What is this World Council of Churches? We shall deal with its more external characteristics in a later chapter. Here we are concerned to indicate what the World Council of Churches represents, as it were, in the development of the history of the Christian church, and to suggest that in the realm of action, that is, of commitment made by the churches, it is in a sense parallel to the common message which the churches can

present together. The World Council of Churches is a council, and it is composed of churches. As a council, it has no authority over its constituent member churches. Its authority is wholly moral, and in this lies a part of its true significance. This is to say that the World Council has influence according to the intrinsic weight of the truth which is statements and actions may contain. Its authority does not rest upon coercion of any type, except the coercion of truth. Its deliberations, its actions, and its programs are effective only insofar as they make an impression upon the Christian mind and conscience of its members. It is thus, in the sweep of church history, the modern development of the ancient conciliar theory of church government. That theory involved the power of the council over the constituent parts. The conciliar theory embodied in the World Council does not involve power, but provides a structure within which statements and actions may be arrived at in common and may make their own impact upon the churches. As one speaks of the World Council, it must be remembered always that it is a council of churches; there is no substance to the World Council, or for that matter any true council of churches, except

the [p. 59] substance provided by its members. Reduced to its most basic form, therefore,

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

the World Council is the permanent framework within which the churches may arrive at common positions and carry through common programs of action. These common positions and actions stand and are effective by virtue of such intrinsic authority of truth as they may be given by the Holy Spirit.

The World Council is therefore in no sense a superchurch. It is not a Protestant Vatican. It cannot force any member to do what that member does not want to do, nor to believe what it does not want to believe. The World Council cannot negotiate unions among churches. Neither is it able nor does it try to advocate any one theory of church unity. It does not push forward any particular means by which the churches can achieve greater unity.

Nevertheless, the World Council is a structure in which churches have made a commitment to stay together. If the fact that the World Council rests upon moral authority only is the first point in its fundamental significance, the commitment made by the churches to stay together is the second. This commitment, made by *churches*, has profound implications. It means that any one and all of the 148 churches, by agreeing to join with other churches, thereby recognize those other churches in some sense to be churches. It does not mean that every one must recognize the others as full and true churches. It does mean, and it has been explicitly recognized that it does mean, that in some sense every member church recognizes every other member church as a church.

676. Efficacy, of Holy Spirit, Hampered by Ecclesiasticism and Tethered in Impotence

SOURCE: Henry P[itney] Van Dusen, *Spirit, Son and Father* (New York: Scribner, 1958), pp. 27, 125, 126. © 1958 by Henry p. Van Dusen. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. 27] Indeed, we may detect a parallel to what I have elsewhere ventured to call "the logic of spiritual vitality," re-enacted again and again in the pilgrimage of the Christian Church, whereby a period of intense and creative religious renewal is unfailingly succeeded by an aftermath of gradually diminishing spiritual vigor but increasing theological and organizational rigidity, then by a time of comparative sterility—until revival bursts forth afresh, and the curve of descending life and power is re-enacted...

[p. 125] The fate of the Holy Spirit at the hands of the theologians and Church officials across the centuries ... is, on the whole, a pathetic and tragic story...

[p. 126] The Holy Spirit has always been troublesome, disturbing because it has seemed to be unruly, radical, unpredictable. It is always embarrassing to ecclesiasticism and baffling to ethically-grounded, responsible durable Christian devotion. And so it has been carefully taken in hand by Church authorities, whether Catholic or Protestant, and securely tethered in impotence.

677. Egypt, Kings of, During the Probable Period of Moses SOURCE: Merill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 144, 145. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 144] Moses was born about 1520 B.C. [that is, 1525 if the Exodus is to be dated in 1445 (see *SDADic*, "Moses")], probably during the reign of Thutmose I, whose daughter, the famous Hatshepsut, may well have been the royal personage who discovered the infant among the flags by the riverside (Ex. 2:5–10).

Since Thutmose I left no surviving legitimate male heir to the throne, his daughter Hatshepsut was in line for succession. But being prevented by her sex from succeeding as king, she possessed no more than the right to convey the crown by marriage to her husband and to secure the succession to her children. To circumvent a dynastic dilemma and to prevent the loss of the crown to another family, Thutmose I was obliged to marry his daughter to her younger half-brother, a son by a lesser marriage, who took the throne as Thutmose II.

But the legitimate marriage of Thutmose II, like that of his father, failed to supply a male heir to the throne. Again steps had to be taken to safeguard the survival of the dynasty. Thutmose II, accordingly, named as his successor a young son by a minor wife. Appointing the lad as coregent and strengthening his claim to the throne by marrying him to his half-sister, Thut- [p. 145] mose II's daughter by Hatshepsut, the young prince ascended the throne and was crowned as Thutmose III. But he was not destined for some time to assume the reins of office. Hatshepsut, his stepmother and mother-in-law (by marriage to Hatshepsut's daughter), not only assumed the kingship during Thutmose III's minority, but refused to surrender her regency even after the king became of age.

From the first the energetic queen announced her intention of reigning as a man. Her brilliant reign was characterized by remarkable prosperity and great building enterprises and did not come to an end until about 1486 B.C., when, upon her death the restive and jealous Thutmose III ascended to the throne and forthwith obliterated or destroyed all her monuments. If the plaster with which he covered them had not fallen away, much less would be known of his remarkable stepmother.

The death of Hatshepsut and the accession of Thutmose III doubtless inaugurated the last and most severe phase of the oppression of Israel. The new monarch was one of the greatest foreign conquerors in Egyptian history. In numerous victorious campaigns in Syria-Palestine, he pushed the frontiers of Egypt to the Euphrates River. Lists of his conquests in Asia include many familiar Bible names such as Kadesh, Megiddo, Dothan, Damascus, Hamath, Laish, Geba, Taanach, Carmel, Beth-Shemesh, Gath, Gerar, Ekron, Gezer and Bethshan. Little must the powerful empire builder have realized that in despoiling Palestine and breaking down the strongholds of the Amorites, he was preparing them for the conquest of the land by the humble Hebrew slaves, who were even then toiling under the fierce lash of his taskmasters by the Nile.

678. Egypt, Kings of—Thutmose IV's "Dream Inscription" SOURCE: Thutmose IV, Inscription on the "Sphinx" trans. in James B. Pritchard, ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (2d ed.), p. 449. Copyright 1955 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

One of these days it happened that the King's Son Thut-mose came on an excursion at noon time. Then he rested in the shadow of this great god [see editor's note]. Sleep took hold of him, slumbering at the time when the sun was at (its) peak. He found the majesty of this august god speaking with his own mouth, as a father speaks to his son, saying: "See me, look at me, my son, Thut-mose I am thy father, Harmakhis-Khepri-Re-Atum. I shall give thee my kingdom... Thou shalt wear the southern crown and the northern crown on the throne of Geb, the crown prince (of the gods). Thine is the land in its length and its breadth, that which the Eye of the All-Lord illumines. Provisions are thine from the midst of the Two Lands and the great tribute of every foreign country. The time is long in years that my face has been toward thee and my heart has been toward thee and thou hast been mine. Behold, my state was like (that of) one who is in *need*, and my whole body was going to pieces. The sands of the desert, that upon which I had been, were encroaching upon me; (but) I waited to let thee do what was in my heart, (for) I knew that thou art my son and my protector. *Approach* thou! Behold, I am with thee; I am thy guide."

When he had finished these words, then this king's son *awoke*, because he had heard these [*words*] ... and he understood the speech of this god. (But) he set silence in his heart, (for) [he] said: "... Come, let us go to our house in the city. They shall protect the offerings to this god which ye will bring to him: cattle, ..., and all green things."

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The "god" was the famous Sphinx, in whose shadow the king's son (later Thutmose IV) rested. The stela bearing this inscription still stands between the great paws of this statue. For the possible Biblical significance of this inscription, see No. 723; also *SDADic* "Exodus," p. 332. and fig. 145.]

679. Egypt, Religion of—Immortality (for the Pharaoh) in Oldest

Writings

SOURCE: Josephine Mayer and Tom Prideaux, eds., *Never to Die: The Egyptians in Their Own Words* (New York: The Viking Press, 1938), pp. 42–44. Copyright, 1938, by Josephine Mayer and Tom Prideaux. Used by permission.

[p. 42] The oldest literature yet known in the world is the Pyramid Texts of which "The Deceased's Journey" is a part. It descends from writing as remote as the thirty-fifth century B.C. Inscribed for the Pharaoh on the inside wall of his pyramid tomb, these words had magical power to help him secure immortality...

[p. 43] A ramp to the sky is built for him

That he may go up to the sky thereon.

He goeth up upon the smoke

Of the great exhalation.

He flieth as a bird,

And he settleth as a beetle

On an empty seat on the ship of Re.

"Stand up, get thee forth, that he may sit in thy seat."

He roweth in the sky in thy ship, O Re!

And he cometh to the land in thy ship, O Re!

When thou ascendest out of the horizon,

He is there with his staff in his hand,

The navigator of thy ship, O Re! ...

[p. 44] He hath gone up into the sky

And hath found Re,

Who standeth up when he draweth nigh unto him.

He sitteth down beside him,

For Re suffereth him not to seat himself on the ground,

Knowing that he is greater than Re.

He hath taken his stand with Re

In the northern part of the sky,

And hath seized the Two Lands like a king.

680. Egypt, Religion of—Immortality—Osiris Myth

SOURCE: George Andrew Reisner, *The Egyptian Conception of Immortality* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912), pp. 75, 76, 78, 81, 82, 84, 85. Copyright 1912 by George Andrew Reisner. Used by permission of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

[p. 75] To sum up, the essential idea of the Egyptian conception of immortality was that the ghost or spirit of the man preserved the personality and the form [p. 76] of the man in the existence after death; that this spirit had the same desires, the same pleasures, the same necessities, and the same fears as on earth. Life after death was a duplicate of life on earth...

[p. 78] As a part of the magical provisions of the dead, the Osiris myth, probably built up in explanation of old rites, was drawn into the belief in a future life, and apparently at the beginning *solely for the benefit of the king*. ... The earth-god Osiris, god of the living, had died and had been brought to life as god of the dead. So, also, the earth-king, the Horus, the son of Ra, must die, but he also would live again in the other world and share the throne of Osiris...

[p. 81] Feudalism [during the Middle Empire] extended the possibilities of heaven to the great nobles. In the New Empire, the royal power was gradually absorbed by the priestly organization of the national religion—the religion of Amon-Ra; and the principle comes into practice that any priest having the necessary knowledge could obtain for himself an exceptional place in the future life. The Osirian burial customs spread even among the people...

[p. 82] All but the poorest burials [in the Ptolemaic period] bear direct evidence of their character as Osiris burials...

[p. 84] The priests of the Osiris-Isis religion made their bid to the classical world. They offered immortality by initiation. Learn the proper rites, learn the master words, and secure eternal life among the great gods. It was a religion for the exceptional man down to the last; it required training and knowledge. Even in its most popular form in the Ptolemaic period, a specially instructed class was required, who sold for money [p. 85] the benefits of their knowledge, and men took rank in their security of future life according to their means.

Not until Christianity came, offering eternal life free and without price, did the common people find at last a road open to equal immorality with the great men of the earth.

681. Egypt, Religion of — Sun-god Amon-Re

SOURCE: H. Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 22. Copyright 1948 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

This more than local, this really nation-wide foundation of advanced theological thought is especially clear in the rise of the supreme god of the Egyptian Empire, Amon-Re. Its premise is a multiplicity of answers: the air no less than the sun was seen to exemplify creative power. Thebes, the capital of the empire, from time immemorial had worshiped the god Amon, the "Hidden One," manifest in the wind which "bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth." But Amon, the wind, was also, as breath, the mysterious source of life in man and beast. Now the Thebans, in common with all Egyptians, acknowledged the power in the sun, the god Re. And in the second millennium B.C. the belief spread that this god who ruled the days and the seasons and Amon, the "Hidden One," were one and the same, Amon-Re. The validity of two traditional answers to the question as to where lay the source of existence was not impaired, but the recognition that the two answers were identical, that the creative power of air and the creative power in the sun were one, was more fruitful than any line of thought followed in former times. If this was syncretism, it was also the closest approach to the worship of a supreme and universal god known within the scope of Egyptian polytheism.

682. Egypt, Religion of—Sun Worship and Immortality

SOURCE: Jaroslav Cerny, Ancient Egyptian Religion (London, W. 1.: Hutchinson, 1952), pp. 82, 83. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 82] The king had become the son of the sun-god $R\bar{e}$, an after death he joined his father in heaven to accompany him in his boat on his daily journey across the sky. It is quite natural that the common folk who, though never [p. 83] calling themselves sons of $R\bar{e}$, believed themselves to be $R\bar{e}$'s creations, soon adopted the fate of the king.

What was it in the sun-religion that appealed so strangely to the Egyptian? It was partly that he saw the supreme importance of the sun, with its light and warmth, to the life of man and the whole of nature; Egyptians were aware that the sun was necessary to life and that without the sun there would be no earthly life. But this observation of a fact can hardly explain the final predominance of the solar religion. The cause of its victory lies rather in the supposed parallel which the Egyptian believed to exist between the life of the sun and that of man; and to the benefit and pleasure which he derived from the existence and daily course of the sun he added considerable comfort respecting his own existence after death.

The sun rises in the mornings, shines all day and disappears in the evening on the western horizon. But this disappearance is only apparent and temporary, for the sun has not ceased to "live", the best proof being that it reappears the next morning after having spent the night in an invisible world. The Egyptians formed the conviction that human life is a close parallel to the course of the sun: man is born like the sun in the morning, lives his earthly life and dies, like the sun, which emits its life-giving rays to the whole day and sets in the evening; but the analogy requires that his death should not be final, and that in a certain sense it does not take place at all. Man continues to live after the so-called death in a world outside his perception, and as a logical corollary, will at some time be born again to a new life.

683. End of the World, Belief in, Revived With Nuclear Age SOURCE: Wesner Fallaw, "Atomic Apocalypse," *The Christian Century*, 63 (Sept. 25, 1946), 1148. Copyright 1946 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

The Christian view of history makes inescapable a doctrine of events beyond history. God's will is to be worked out in time and beyond time. The kingdom of heaven is within you and within time; it is also beyond you, though you be a saint, and it is beyond the condition of earth as we have known earth. A new heaven and a new earth, when all things that are will have passed away and old things will have been made new—these conditions are possible only after world's end. What the nature of this end will be no man can say.

Christians normally reckon with eschatology [the doctrine of "last things"]. It was Christian abnormality which ignored eschatology for so long... The normality which the atomic blasts over Japan brought back to Christian believers consists of the rightness, the correctness, of not only contemplating but also *expecting* world's end.

684. End of the World, the Effect of Belief in SOURCE: Wesner Fallaw, "Atomic Apocalypse," *The Christian Century*, 63 (Sept. 25, 1946), 1146–1148. Copyright 1946 Christian Century Foundation. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

[p. 1146] A function of Christian is to make preparation for world's end. For generations this fundamental aspect of the Christian faith has been ignored or relegated to the subconscious. But now eschatology confounds us at the very center of consciousness...

The early Christians had a program of action which they followed while awaiting the expected early end of the world. True, it was a spontaneous rather than a systematized

program. But it was far-reaching. They not only worshiped together and strengthened one another in the belief that Jesus Christ would return and care for them while all things were being finished; they also liquidated their possessions, holding earthly goods in common and serving each person, particularly the orphan and the widow, according to need. These first century Christians were in training for life in a new world. Joy in the Lord of heaven and earth quite overcame anxiety about the cessation of one kind of life and the beginning of another.

The fact that these Christian were mistaken in their belief that some among them would still be alive when all things were finished is unimportant. What is of primary importance for us is the fact that they so strengthened each other in the faith that they could rejoice over the certainty they had that the world was about to end. And no less important for us is the cue which their conduct provides. Awaiting the end which they deemed a new beginning, they were constructively active serving their fellows, putting human need foremost and thrusting property far down the scale in value. Possessions were nothing more than means to an end, tools with which to enrich human life, tangible devices by which man could evidence his otherwise intangible love of God.

One might almost say categorically that there exists a sure test to determine whether or not any given person is a Christian-this: The Christian is not anxious about tomorrow-the scientist's likely day of world's end; rather, the [p. 1147] Christian is joyful over the prospect of God's new era wherein more justice will be realized than the most loving of men are able to achieve, no matter how they exalt the value of persons, serving them devotedly, and subordinating material values...

In the event that the present turbulent period is prolonged by nations' successfully retaining their tenuous sovereignty, we face increasing tensions, fears, eignty, we face increasing tensions, fears and spiritual blight until, goaded beyond endurance, others than Christians will also begin to cry, "O Lord, come quickly!" ...

[p. 1148] The world is sick. But there is a sickness unto life, as successful termination of crisis always attests. In this Christians find joy. But because they share the sickness of the world unto death, they must be nurtured and trained to minister uniquely as God's purposes move toward realization beyond time.

685. End of the World, Foreseen by Jesus

SOURCE: Henri d'Espine, Lecture given before the Friends of Protestant Thought, quoted in Gazette de

Lausanne, Feb. 18, 1944, p. 3.

Far from mentioning anything like the progressive improvement of the world; Jesus on the contrary, foresees the end of it, preceded by an aggravation of evil which is to be a sign announcing the return of Christ. And this is the veritable object of the Christian hope that runs through all the pages of the New Testament and which the Apocalypse sets forth in a grandiose fresco before the persecuted church.

686. End of the World—Koran Statements on "the (Final) Hour"

SOURCE: Koran, Suras and verses as indicated, in The Holy Qur-an, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), references as indicated. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

Sura vii. 185, 187, Vol. 1, p. 397

Do they [who reject the signs] see nothing 185. In the government of the heavens

And the earth and all That God hath created? (Do they not see) that It may well be that Their term is nigh Drawing to an end? In what Message after this Will they then believe? ...

- 187. They ask thee about The (final) Hour—when Will be its appointed time? Say: "The knowledge thereof Is with my Lord (alone): None but He can reveal As to when it will occur." Sura xxi. 1, Vol. 2, p. 822
- Closer and closer to mankind Comes their Reckoning: yet they Heed not and they turn away. Sura xxxvii. 170–175, Vol. 2, p. 1214
- 170. But (now that the Qur-ān Has come), they reject it: But soon will they know!
- Already has Our Word Been passed before (this) To Our Servants sent (by Us),
- 172. That they would certainly Be assisted,
- 173. And that Our forces,— They surely must conquer.
- 174. So turn thou away From them for a little while,
- 175. And watch them (how They fare), and they soon Shall see (how thou farest)! Sura xxxix. 68–70, Vol. 2, pp. 1257, 1258

[p. 1257] 68. The trumpet will (just) Be sounded, when all That are in the heavens And on earth will swoon, Except such as it will Please God (to exempt). Then will a second one Be sounded, when, behold, They will be standing And looking on!

- 69. And the Earth will shine With the glory of its Lord: The Record (of Deeds) Will be placed (open); The prophets and the witnesses Will be brought forward; And a just decision Pronounced between them; And they will not Be wronged (in the least).
- 70. And to every soul will be Paid in full (the fruit)
- [p. 1258] Of its deeds; and (God) Knoweth best all that They do. Sura liv. 1–3, Vol. 2, p. 1454
- 1. The Hour (of Judgment) Is nigh, and the moon Is cleft asunder.
- 2. But if they see A Sign, they turn away, And say, "This is (But) transient magic."
- They reject (the warning) And follow their (own) lusts But every matter has Its appointed time. Sura lxxix. 42–45, Vol. 2, p. 1685
- 42. They ask thee About the Hour,—'When Will be its appointed time?'
- 43. Wherein art thou (concerned) With the declaration thereof?
- 44. With thy Lord is The Limit fixed therefor.
- 45. Thou art but a Warner For such as fear it.

687. End of the World, Niebuhr on

SOURCE: Reinhold Niebuhr, *Faith and History*, pp. 235, 236. Copyright 1949 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and James Nisbet, Ltd., London.

[p. 235] The New Testament envisages a culmination of history which is not, literally speaking, within time-history. It looks forward to a final judgement and a general resurrection, which are at once both the fulfillment and the end of history. They imply an end in the sense of *Finis*; but the end in the sense of *Telos*, that is, as the moral and spiritual culmination of the meaning of history, is not within history itself. We have called attention to the significance of the symbol of the Anti-Christ at the end of history,

as indicative of the belief in New Testament that history remains open to all possibilities of good and evil to the end...

[p. 236] The New Testament looks toward the end of history with faith and hope, rather than with fear, despite its anticipation of increased antinomies and contradictions between good and evil in history. Fear has been banished by the faith that this final climax, as well as the whole drama of history, is under a sovereignty of divine love, which has been revealed in Christ.

688. Eschatology, Increased Emphasis on, in Recent Years SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 45, 46. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 45] Eschatology has been a matter of great concern to conservative Christians. In fact, it has become in recent years one of the most emphasized doctrines in Scriptures. There has arisen a profound interest in understanding the prophetic teachings of the Bible because of the sorry plight into which the world has fallen in the last two generations. While the humanistic, naturalistic, and rationalistic philosophies have been faced by the acute problem of finding the meaning of history in a world in which the catastrophes of [p. 46] the last thirty-five years seem to be without meaning, the evangelical believer has found a ground of confidence in the world-view of the Scriptures that God is indeed the Lord of history because the Son of God who lived on earth is to appear again on the earth to bring history to a victorious and glorious consummation. If this is true, it is at once evident that the nature of the events which will attend the return of Christ is of the utmost importance. Among those who accept this biblical teaching, several distinct positions have been maintained which involve different interpretations of the kingdom of God.

689. Eschatology, Study of, Dangers in

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 291, 292. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 291] No one would wish to forbid specialized study of some detail of biblical eschatology [the doctrine of "last things"] for fear that such specialized study would tend to throw the special eschatological subject out of focus as compared with the whole of eschatology. An inquiry into the millennium is, of course, nothing but just such a specialized study in the field of eschatology. Nor would one ever want to ban the study of eschatology as a whole for the reason that such study tends to see the importance of its subject out of proportion to the rest of [p. 292] God's revealed truth. But the danger may grow beyond proper bounds, and against this one must guard.

What increases the danger beyond the normal degree, is one or the other or both of two factors. If in such study our hearts are not primarily interested in the Savior and Lord Whose second coming is the central theme of all eschatology, if we carry not with us into such study the living appreciation of His incarnation and atoning death and glorious resurrection as the eternal Son of God, our danger is bound to be abnormally great. And if we begin to ask all kinds of questions suggested by human curiosity concerning subjects about which God has not deemed it necessary and wise to give us fuller information than the Bible contains, we shall be tempted to allow the play of our imagination to fill the places which God has left blank. In the eschatological field such blind spots and vacant places are perhaps more frequent than in any other doctrinal field.

690. Essenes, Strictness of, in Sabbath Observance

SOURCE: Josephus *War* ii. 8. 9; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 379. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

They [the Essenes] ... are stricter than all Jews in abstaining from work on the seventh day.

691. Evangelical Bodies—Evangelical Covenant Church of America SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1574, 1575.

[p. 1574] *History*. The great number of immigrants from Sweden, who during the latter half of the nineteenth century arrived in the United States of America, had in their homeland been connected with the Lutheran State Church of Sweden. On arriving in this country they, as a rule, organized Swedish Lutheran churches in their respective communities. Later on these churches organized the Augustana Synod, which affiliated itself with the Lutheran General Council.

A considerable number of the immigrants, however, had in their homeland experienced a spiritual awakening during the great revivals that stirred the Swedish nation during the nineteenth century. As a direct result of these revivals, laymen began to preach the gospel, and a free church movement developed within the state church of Sweden, a movement that was bitterly opposed by some of the clergy of the state church. Nevertheless, the free church movement gained strength, and mission societies and congregations were organized in various parts of Sweden. The Christians, who had thus been influenced by said revival movements, upon their arrival in America did not fully enjoy the spiritual atmosphere of the Swedish Lutheran churches in this country. For that reason they soon organized other churches that were more in harmony with the ideas prevalent in the free church movement in Sweden. In 1873 some of these churches organized the Swedish Lutheran Mission Synod, and in 1884 other churches of the same character organized the Swedish Lutheran Ansgarius [p. 1575] Synod. These two organizations labored side by side for about 10 years. Efforts were made, however, to unite these groups, and in February 1885 the Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant of America was organized in Chicago for the purpose of uniting the churches of the lastnamed synods as well as some other independent churches that had sprung up in the meantime. In 1937 the official name was changed to Evangelical Mission Covenant Church of America

Doctrine. In doctrine, the Evangelical Mission Covenant Church of America is strictly evangelical. The Bible is accepted as the word of God and the only infallible guide in matters of faith, doctrine, and practice. The Lutheran conception of the teachings of the Bible is generally accepted, but full freedom is given to those holding other views in doctrinal matters. The Mission Covenant has not accepted any articles of faith as binding for the churches of the organization.

Organization. In church government, the Mission Covenant is essentially congregational, the local church having full freedom to arrange its own affairs.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In 1957 the name was changed to the Evangelical Covenant Church of America. The membership in 1959 was 59,396 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 49, 254).]

692. Evangelical Bodies—Evangelical United Brethren Church (Formed in 1946 by Union of the Evangelical Church and the United Brethren in Christ)

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 626, 627; part 2, pp. 1632, 1633.

[a. The Evangelical Church]

[p. 626] *History*. The great religious awakening which took place in the United States at the close of the eighteenth century was at first largely confined to the English-speaking

communities. It was inevitable, however, that others should feel the effect of the new spirit; and a number of leaders arose, through whose influence varying types of religious life developed, eventuating in different church organizations. Among them was Jacob Albright, who was born in Pottstown, Pa., in 1759, and died in 1808. Baptized in infancy, and confirmed in the Lutheran communion, he was later converted under the influence of a Reformed minister; but coming into connection with the Methodists, he declared his adherence to them and was licensed to exhort. Albright, who had begun to preach in 1796, felt called upon to devote himself particularly to work among the German people. It had not been his purpose to found a new church.

It was not until 1803 that an ecclesiastical organization was effected at a general assembly held in eastern Pennsylvania, when Mr. Albright was set apart as a minister of the gospel and ordained as an elder.

His training in the Methodist Episcopal Church influenced him in organizing the new movement, and many characteristic Methodist features, such as the circuit system and the itinerancy, were adopted. The first field of operations included the counties of Bucks, Berks, and Northampton, and extended into portions of Northumberland and Centre counties. The first annual conference was held in Lebanon County, Pa., in November 1807. Albright was elected bishop, [p. 627] and articles of faith and the book of discipline were adopted, but a full form of church government was not devised for some years. The first general conference convened in Buffalo Valley, Union County, Pa., in October 1816, at which time the denomination took the name Evangelical Association.

Although, in the beginning, the activities of the church were carried on in the German language only, the scope was soon widened by taking up work in the English language also; and of late years English has become the dominant language, practically displacing the German. The denomination spread into the Central States, and throughout the Northern and Western States from New England to the Pacific coast, and north into Canada.

For some years the missionary idea, which has always been a dominant purpose of the denomination, found its expression in local work; but in 1839 a general missionary society was organized, and a woman's society followed in 1883. In 1854 the church first reached out to Europe, and commenced an important work both in Germany and Switzerland. In 1876 Japan was occupied, and since then missions have been established in China, Russia, Poland-Latvia, and Africa. As early as 1815, a church publishing house was founded, and what is said to be the oldest German religious paper in the United States, Der Christliche Botschafter, was founded in 1836.

A division, in 1891, resulting in the organization of the United Evangelical Church, took from the denomination a large number of ministers and members.

Both denominations continued their separate existence until the end of the second decade of the separation when the growing conviction that the two churches should be reunited began to find articulate expression. The General Conference of the Evangelical Association of 1907 and that of the United Evangelical Church in 1910 took definite steps-toward a reapproachment by the appointment of commissions on church union and federation. These commissions, after a series of meetings, agreed upon a partial basis of union in 1918, which basis was ratified by the General Conference of the United Evangelical Church in 1918 and by the General Conference of the Evangelical Association in 1919.

Commissions were again appointed which, in joint session in 1921, completed the basis of union; it was submitted to the annual conferences of both denominations, receiving the required constitutional majority in both churches. At a special session of the General Conference of the Evangelical Association, and at a regular session of the General Conference of the United Evangelical Church, meeting simultaneously during the month of October 1922, the adoption of the Discipline and the Basis of Union was consummated, and on October 14, 1922, in the General Conference of the Evangelical Church. This church is not one of the Lutheran bodies.

Doctrine. In doctrine the Evangelical Church is Arminian, and its articles of faith correspond very closely to those of the Methodist Episcopal Church. They emphasize the divinity as well as perfect humanity of the Son of God and the true divinity of the Holy Ghost; and hold that the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments reveal the will of God so far as is necessary for salvation. Christian perfection is defined as "a state of grace in which we are so firmly rooted in God that we have instant victory over every temptation the moment it presents itself, without yielding in any degree; in which our rest, peace, and joy in God are not interrupted by the vicissitudes of life; in which, in short, sin has lost its power over us, and we rule over the flesh, the world, and Satan, yet in watchfulness." Entire sanctification is the basis of this perfection, which, however, constantly admits of a fuller participation in divine power and a constant expansion in spiritual capacity.

Organization. The polity of the Evangelical Church is connectional in form. Bishops are elected by the General Conference for a term of 4 years, but are not ordained or consecrated as such... The General Conference, which meets quadrennially, has been, since 1839, a delegated body... The annual and quarterly conferences correspond to the similar bodies in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

[b. The United Brethren in Christ]

[p. 1632] *History*. Among the serious conditions facing the churches of America in the early part of the eighteenth century were the lack of church buildings, church organization, and especially the dearth of able spiritual ministers.

In general, moral conditions were deplorable. In 1746 Rev. Michael Schlatter, a Swiss by birth, was sent as a missionary to the German Reformed churches in Pennsylvania, although under the general direction of the Synod of Holland. In 1751 he returned to Europe to present an appeal for further aid and additional missionaries. Six young men responded to his presentation of the need in the new colonies. Among them was Philip William Otterbein, who was born in the duchy of Nassau, Germany, in 1726, and who had already had some experience in pastoral work. The company arrived in New York in July 1752 and Otterbein soon found a field of labor with the congregation at Lancaster, Pa., at that time the second in importance among the German Reformed churches of the Colonies.

Early in his pastorate at Lancaster, Otterbein passed through a deep personal religious experience which led him to insist upon the necessity of a deeper inward spirituality on the part of his people. This was not always acceptable at that period, barren as it was in spiritual life.

About this time Otterbein came into personal relations with Martin Boehm, a preacher of the Mennonite communion, who had passed through a similar religious experience. They conducted evangelistic work among the scattered German settlements

of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. This was regarded as being irregular by their fellow ministers and resulted in Otterbein's accepting a call in 1774 to an independent congregation in Baltimore. For the next 15 years Otterbein and Boehm conducted their evangelistic labors among the German-speaking communities, holding 2 days' "great meetings." Other ministers of like spirit associated themselves with these men. Under their preaching converts multiplied rapidly, but church organizations were not yet formed, many of the converts uniting with English-speaking churches.

A meeting was held by these evangelistic preachers in 1789. During the next 10 years similar councils convened at irregular times. These ministers did not then intend to form a separate denomination, but in obeying the call of God to win souls and stand for a spiritual church membership they were inevitably drawn closer and closer together until the year 1800, when a conference was held in Frederick County, Md., and a distinct ecclesiastical body was formed under the name "United Brethren in Christ." Thirteen ministers were in attendance at this important at this important conference. Otterbein and Boehm were elected as bishops, and they were continuously reelected to the bishopric until the death of Boehm in 1812 and of Otterbein in 1813. Thus it will be seen that this new organization was in no sense a schism from any other body, but was the natural development on the part of German-speaking congregations desiring a deeper spiritual life and strong emphasis on evangelism.

Bishop Asbury, of the Methodist Church, and Bishop Otterbein, of the United Brethren Church, came into close relationship, but the two bodies they represented remain distinct, and no specific effort to unite the forces was ever made.

The fact that those who joined in forming the United Brethren Church represented different forms of church life necessitated concessions on the part of all. The reformed churches practiced infant baptism, and the Mennonites regarded believers' baptism by immersion as the only correct form. The result was that each generously conceded to the other freedom to follow personal convictions as to the form of baptism and the age of persons baptized.

During the first decade of the nineteenth century preaching places were established west of the Allegheny Mountains, in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.

The first General Conference was held in 1815 near Mount Pleasant, Pa., when a form of discipline was adopted. Up until this time all the churches had used the German language in their services; but the use of English was increasing, and [p. 1633] the conference held in 1817 ordered the confession of faith and book of discipline to be printed in both German and English.

0The Church of the United Brethren in Christ early took a positive position on questions of moral reform. It placed in its discipline in 1821 a declaration in condemnation of slavery; and in 1841 definite action was taken against the drinking of ardent spirits and the manufacture and sale of alcoholic drinks.

The General Conference of 1889 revised the confession of faith and the constitution of the church. A few of the delegates believed that this revision was unconstitutional. They withdrew and formed small communion of their own.

The past three deceased have been characterized by intensive development of colleges, a theological seminary, homes and orphanages, and missionary agencies.

Much emphasis has been placed on religious education, the promotion of Christian stewardships, and systematic giving through the benevolence budget.

The church is a member of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and is cooperating with other Protestant bodies in State, national, and international relationships.

Doctrine. In doctrine the church is Arminian. Its confession of faith, consisting of 13 brief articles, sets forth the generally accepted view of the Trinity, the authority of the Scriptures, justification and regeneration, the Christian Sabbath, and the future state. Concerning the sacraments, it holds that baptism and the Lord's Supper should be observed by all Christians, but the mode of baptism and the manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper are left to the judgment of the individual. The question of the baptism of children is left to the choice of parents. Emphasis is laid upon a life of prayer and devotion to Christ and His cause...

Organization. Pastoral charges consist of one or more local churches which hold monthly official meetings and quarterly conferences. Annual conferences are composed of ministers and lay delegates in equal numbers. The General Conference is composed of ministers and lay delegates in equal numbers, elected by the members of the churches in their respective conferences.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Evangelical United Brethren Church had in 1959 a membership of 749, 788 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 254). Its government is Methodistic.]

693. Evangelism—Meaning of Term Evangelical

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 11. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

What is an evangelical? An evangelical is a Christian "holding or conformed to what the majority of Protestants regard as the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, such as the Trinity, the fallen condition of man, Christ's atonement for sin, salvation by faith, not works, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost." A subsidiary definition is "in a special sense, spiritually minded and zealous for practical Christian living, distinguished from merely orthodox." Another secondary definition is "seeking the conversion of sinners, as evangelical labors or preaching."

694. Evangelicalism, New Defined

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Theological Education," *Bulletin of Fuller Theological Seminary*, 4 (Oct., Nov., Dec., 1954), 4. Used by permission of the author.

The new evangelicalism embraces the full orthodoxy of fundamentalism in doctrine but manifests a social consciousness and responsibility which was strangely absent from fundamentalism. The new evangelicism concerns itself not only with personal salvation, doctrinal truth and an eternal point of reference but also with the problems of race, of war, of class struggle, of liquor control, of juvenile delinquency, of immorality, and of national imperialism. It even faces the question of creeping socialism and asks, is it Christian? The new evangelicalism believes that orthodox Christians cannot abdicate their responsibility in the social scene.

695. Evangelicalism, Revival of

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 13. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

Is evangelicalism reviving? Is it emerging to challenge the theological world today? A new respect for the evangelical position is evidenced by the emergence of scholars whose works must be recognized. Westminster Press recently published a trilogy on *The Case for Liberalism, The Case for Neo-Orthodoxy,* and *The Case for Orthodoxy*. Here Protestant orthodoxy was again recognized as a live option. Great publishing houses today are not only willing to publish bold by evangelical scholars, but several are actively seeking such books.

This may be due to a change in the intellectual climate of orthodoxy. The younger orthodox scholars are repudiating the separatist position, have repented of the attitude of solipsism, have expressed a willingness to re-examine the problems facing the theological world, have sought a return to the theological dialogue and have recognized the honesty and Christianity of some who hold views different from their own in some particulars.

696. Evangelicalism, With Fundamentalism SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 13. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

Evangelical theology is synonymous with fundamentalism or orthodoxy. In doctrine the evangelicals and the fundamentalist are one. The evangelical must acknowledge his debt to the older fundamentalist leaders. It is a mistake for an evangelical to divorce himself from historic fundamentalism as some have sought to do. These older leaders of the orthodox cause paid a great price in persecution, discrimination, obloquy, and scorn which they suffered at the hands of those who under the name of modernism repudiated biblical Christianity. For deceased these fundamentalists were steadfast to Christ and to biblical truth regardless of the cost. They maintained the knowledge of orthodox Christianity through Bible schools, radio programs, Christian conferences, and Bible conferences. In the true New Testament sense, they were witnesses, or martyrs...

Let it be repeated that there is a solidarity of doctrine between fundamentalism and evangecalism. They accept the inspiration and dependability of the Bible, the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the creation and fall of man, the vicarious atonement by Christ on Calvary, justification by faith and not by works, regeneration and sanctification by the Spirit, the spiritual unity of the Church, the evangelical, educational, and societal mission of the Church, and the kingdom of Christ experiential, ethical, and eschatalogical [*sic*]. The evangelical and the fundamentalist could sign the same creed.

697. Evolution—Belief in Supernatural Defended SOURCE: A. E. Wilder Smith, quoted with editorial comment, in *Christianity Today*, 4 (June 20, 1960), 21,

22. copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

[p. 21] Dr. A. E. Wilder Smith, pointedly criticizes an address by harvard paleontologist Dr. G. G. Simpson to the American Association for the Advancement of Science on "The World into Which Darwin Led Us" (printed in *Science*, Apr. 1, 1960).

Dr. Simpson spurned belief in the supernatural as a warping superstition. The world and man, he holds, have evolved from the nonliving, and "it is in the highest degree improbable that anything in the world exists specifically for his [man's] benefit." The Harvard scientist brushes aside "the world of higher superstition" and reports that, when polled in Chicago, a panel of highly distinguished international experts, considered imminent the experimental production of live in the laboratory, and one panelist contended that this result has already been achieved.

It is remarkable that so few American scientists of stature bother to confute such views. The effort of American Scientific Affiliation, titled *Evolution and Christian Thought Today* (1960), one of the few works by contemporary scientists espousing Christian theism, grapples with the naturalistic bias.

Dr. Wilder Smith, of the faculty of the Pharmological Institute in Bergen, notes the resemblance of Dr. Simpson's argument, in tone and substance, to literature on the same

subject originating behind the Iron Curtain and "regularly sent gratis from Eastern Berlin for some reason." He continues:

The interpretation of the Chicago poll is interesting and typical for this type of thought. A highly distinguished international panel considered the experimental production of life in the laboratory as imminent. It is the *interpretation* of this information which interests me most, namely that, because this is the case, therefore life was not created by a Creator, who therefore can be dismissed from our thoughts as non-existent.

If the above statement is interpreted with scientific disinterestedness, exactly what does it prove? Surely nothing more than that, with the necessary interference from outside, life may result in a previously lifeless system. That the interference from outside in this case takes the form of changing and controlling the experimental conditions no one doubts. What has, however, been rather overlooked, not only in Dr. Simpson's article but also generally, is the rather obvious fact that, in scientific experiments of this kind, a scientific mind or intelligence at the back of the experiment is the absolute prerequisite for any hope of achieving success. Otherwise, the highly specific ordering of material and conditions will not occur-at least certainly not quickly enough to outstrip the decomposition processes running counter to life's synthetic necessities. Even to give the various separate parts of, say, a virus system to an oratorio singer or a ploughboy would scarcely be expected, at least among those skilled in the art, to produce the desired experimental objective, namely life. The requirements to set the reaction off are much too specific—this we do know. It is plain scientific nihilism to attempt to replace the carefully planned scientific experiment by the soup stock pot and say that billions of years will do what the planned experiment can do but with the greatest difficulty, effort, and planning. The scientists knows that careful hard work (involving complex thought processes, experience, and intelligence, if you wish) and planning represent the basic necessary exogenous interference in a system, if we are to hope to achieve life from lifeless material. Dare we, as scientist, maintain that delicate reac- [p. 22] tions just 'happened' in the past, when we know that in the present, scientific experience has never given the slightest basis for hope of success, unless reaction conditions are meticulously, progressively, and sometimes rapidly adjusted, often in a way chance will not take care of except by undue statistical weighing? And further, the greater the efforts to achieve life synthetically, the greater has the complexity of the problem proved to be. It is just this mounting intellectual effort which has reflected so beautifully and conclusively the mounting refinement in experimental technique required for success, which is just another way of saying that the known intellectually-controlled physical interference from outside necessary to ignite life from the previously lifeless is continually mounting.

Living things are known today to be very much more complex than was thought only a few years ago, to say nothing of thoughts on this subject during Darwin's lifetime. The mounting complexity brings diminishing possibility for chance ever to have been the Creator. The more laboratory technique is improved and used in the effort to produce life synthetically, the less likelihood is there of this.

All this leads quite simply to something very much approaching the Christian position so much attacked, even though obliquely, in Dr. Simpson's article. This position simply states that interference from outside took place in matter in the past, resulting in the conferment of order in certain forms of matter to produce life as we know it. In principle, this position corresponds to that which every scientist takes in attempting to attain life in the lifeless in the laboratory; the method is the same in both cases—intellectually exogenously controlled physical interference with matter. Who does the ordering or interfering is immaterial in principle, the main thing is that scientific method has confirmed the mandatory role of exogenous ordering of matter, if life from the lifeless is to be achieved. That this does not occur within our experience endogenously is obvious and as the known complexity of life processes increases so do the statistical possibilities of spontaneous or endogenous ordering to the necessary grade decrease. Man was not there at the start to do the experiment, but why deny that any experimenter did the experiment, when all scientific method demands some sort of an experimenter?

Indeed, the Christian position goes further than this and maintains that the Mind behind Creation endowed his creature with some creative abilities similar to, even though vastly smaller than, his own. It goes even further along this line in calling man a god in some respects. If, however, man succeeds in modern laboratories sometimes, in a small way, in thinking the Creator's synthetic experiments through again after him, why should this fact be interpreted to prove that, therefore, the Creator does not exist, as indeed Dr. Simpson seems to think? I must confess, I do not follow the logic of this position. If someone succeeds in repeating and confirming my published experiments, who, in the name of Science, would interpret this feat as proof positive that I do not exist, that I never did the experiments and therefore need never be reckoned with?

It seems to me, therefore, that Dr. Simpson's nomenclature with respect to 'higher superstitions celebrated weekly in every hamlet in the United States' is not only rather lacking in Christian grace and tolerance (surely desirable properties cherished by Christians and others) but is without scientific basis—for the word superstition would no longer be correct if these celebrations were soundly founded on fact.

698. Evolution—Cosmogony—Nebular Hypothesis Falls to the Ground SOURCE: Harold [Frederic] Richards, *The Universe Surveyed*, pp. 106, 107. Copyright 1937 by D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 106] The [nebular] hypothesis falls to the ground because the planets possess nearly all (97%) of the total angular momentum of the solar system although their total mass is insignificant (a tenth of one per cent) in [p. 107] comparison with that of the sun. For this and other reasons a theory of gradual evolution must be abandoned in favor of a catastrophic action which formed the planets by violence and gave them their great angular momentum at the expense of a body *outside the solar system*.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The author has not abandoned the evolutionary origin of the earth for a nonevolutionary origin; he has simply abandoned one hypothesis in favor of another. The nebular hypothesis was replaced about 1900 by the planetesimal hypothesis, and later by the tidal hypothesis, both of which employ "catastrophic action" to explain the origin of the planets from matter drawn from the sun by a near collision (by one view, a "grazing collision") with an unknown star from outside the solar system a sufficient number of millions of years ago. However, as the once-comfortably complete nebular hypothesis collapsed long ago in the face of increased knowledge, the newer hypotheses have become less and less adequate to accommodate all the known facts. Today the experts admit that no present theory comes anywhere near giving a satisfactory account of the formation of the solar system. Yet they hold to the idea of an evolutionary process. Olivier remarks ("Cosmogony", *The Encyclopedia Americana*, Vol. 8, p. 36) that "we have every reason to believe" that the system rose by "orderly evolution of some sort."]

699. Evolution — Cosmology — Use of Term "Principle" in Certain Contexts Derided

SOURCE: Herbert Dingle, "Science and Modern Cosmology," a presidential address given in 1953 before the Royal Astronomical Society, London, *Science*, 120 (Oct. 1, 1954), 515. Reprinted from *Science* by permission.

I shall refer to the "cosmological principle" as the *cosmological assumption* and to the "perfect cosmological principle" as the *cosmological presumption*, reserving the right, when the "absolutely perfect cosmological principle" makes its appearance, to introduce the terms *first* and *second* cosmological presumption.

Now we have here a remarkable and a very serious phenomenon. I have no time to discuss the meaning of science, so I will here assert of it only that which I think will command universal assent, namely, that *no statement about the universe, or nature, or experience, or whatever term you prefer for the object of scientific investigation shall be made*—let alone advanced as a fundamental principle—*for which there is no evidence.* What we are faced with now is the quite different claim that *any statement may be made about it that cannot immediately be refuted.* It seems that if you are attracted by an idea for which there is no evidence, all you have to do is to call it a "principle," and then no evidence is needed. We are told that matter is being continually created, but in such a way that the process is imperceptible—that is, the statement cannot be disproved. When we ask why we should believe this, the answer is that the "perfect cosmological principle" requires it. And when we ask why we should accept this "principle," the answer is that the fundamental axiom of science requires it. This we have seen to be false, and the only other answer that one can gather is that the "principle" must be true because it seems fitting to the people who assert it. With all respect, I find this inadequate...

We have, then, the strange position that in cosmology two impostors have usurped the throne of science, worn her crown, and taken her name. Whereas the source and final court of appeal in science is experience, that of one impostor is personal taste, and that of the other, pure reason. Neither is, of course, new: it was one of the triumphs of the scientific philosophy in the 17th century to have apparently routed them both.

700. Evolution, Darwin Not Originator of Concept

SOURCE: John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, pp. 201, 202. Copyright 1954 John Dillenberger & Claude Welch, 1958 Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. 201] The idea of "evolution" was certainly not originated by Darwin. It had been suggested by early Greek philosophers, and it had been championed (in various forms) by Hegel and Comte earlier in the nineteenth century. The significance of Darwin's work was threefold. 1) He supplied a vast amount of data to show that at least within certain areas of the biological world, there had been gradual evolution from simpler to more complex organisms. That is, he proved the notion of organic evolution to be true in so far as any scientific hypothesis is capable of such proof. 2) He offered a plausible suggestion as to how the development from simpler to more complex forms took place, viz., by "natural selection," by the survival of the best adapted forms in the struggle for existence. Among the multitude of variations which appeared in the production of offspring, those strains persisted which were best suited for the struggle against the environment—these were "superior" strains which could successfully compete for existence with similar organisms. The gradual accumulation of such varia- [p. 202] tions resulted in the appearance of new species. 3) Darwin used this theory to account for the origin of the human race.

701. Evolution, Effects of Belief in

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), pp. 109, 110, Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

[p. 109] A tragedy of university life in the last generation was the mood of sophisticated indecision. Encouraged by the analogy of scientific doubt, the pre- [p. 110] dominant attitude on questions of ultimate life purpose and of public policy alike was one of openminded and easygoing tolerance. Fanaticism was regarded as the one real sin, and many professors were noted for their artful fence-straddling on matters of supreme importance. At the same time, encouraged by the analogy of biological evolution, there came into great vogue the doctrine that all true progress, whether of individual or society, was accomplished gradually, by minute increments of advance. This gradualism encouraged the easygoing tendency to avoid decisive commitments, to be content with slight inclinations in the direction of truth and right, and at all times to keep open convenient ways of retreat.

702. Evolution—Evolutionist Labels as Superstition Other Explanations of Origins

SOURCE: George Gaylord Simpson, "The World Into Which Darwin Led Us," *Science*, 131 (April 1, 1960), 974. Copyright 1960 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Used by permission.

A world in which man must rely on himself, in which he is not the darling of the gods but only another, albeit extraordinary, aspect of nature, is by no means congenial to the immature or the wishful thinkers. That is plainly a major reason why even now, a hundred years after *The Origin of Species*, most people have not really entered the world into which Darwin led—alas!—only a minority of us. Life may conceivably be happier for some people in the older worlds of superstition. It is possible that some children are made happy by a belief in Santa Claus, but adults should prefer to live in a world of reality and reason.

Perhaps I should end on that note of mere preference, but it is impossible to do so. It is a characteristic of this world to which Darwin opened the door that unless *most* of us do enter it and live maturely and rationally in it, the future of mankind is dim, indeed—if there is any future.

703. Evolution—Fossils "Out of Place" in the Supposed Evolutionary Time Order

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 206–209. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 206] Numerous fossils have been found grossly out of place in the time scale [of the geologic strata], despite all its built-in safeguards. Furthermore, many creatures supposedly primitive have persisted to the present day, including many which apparently skipped all the way from very early periods to the present without leaving any traces in the intervening periods.

It is not at all uncommon for the smaller fossils on which rock identification is commonly based to be found out of place in the ex- [p. 207] pected sequences...

[p. 208] But these anomalies are more or less trivial compared to the numerous cases in which "old" formations are found resting con- [p. 209] formably on "young" formations. These phenomena are found almost everywhere in hilly or mountainous regions and have been attributed to "thrust-faulting". The concept is that great segments of rock strata have been somehow separated from their roots and made to slide far over adjacent regions. Subsequent erosion then modifies the transported "nappe" so that the young strata on top are removed, leaving only the older strata superposed on the stationary young rocks beneath. There are various modifications of this concept, but all are equally difficult to conceive mechanically. As we have seen, many show little or no actual physical evidence of such tremendous and catastrophic movement.

704. Evolution—Geologic Series of Strata (Circular Reasoning) SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 205, 206. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 205] One receives the impression from geological textbooks that the [p. 206] strata are essentially harmonious everywhere, with the oldest on the bottom, each stratum succeeded in turn by one representing the next period. Of course this is not so, and everyone familiar with the facts recognizes that it is not so. The geologic time series is built up by a hypothetical superposition of beds upon each other from all over the world... The "fossil successions" constitute the only real basis for the arrangement. And this means, in effect, that organic evolution has been implicitly assumed in assigning chronological pigeon-holes to particular rock systems and their fossils...

And yet this succession of fossil organisms as preserved in the rocks is considered as the one convincing proof that evolution has occurred! And thus have we come round the circle again.

But even this carefully erected system is found to have numerous contradictions in it [see No. 703].

705. Evolution—Gorilla Not Man's Cousin

SOURCE: [John] Ambrose Fleming, *The Origin of Mankind* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott Ltd. [1935]), p. 75. Used by permission.

The up shot of it all is that we cannot arrange all the known fossil remains of supposed "man" in a lineal series gradually advancing in type or form from that of any anthropoid ape, or other mammal, up to the modern and now existing types of true man. Any supposition or statement that it can be done, and is true, is certainly incorrect.

It is entirely misleading and unspeakably pernicious to put forward in popular magazines or other publications read by children pictures of gorillas or chimpanzees labelled "Man's cousin" or "Man's nearest relative," or to publish perfectly imaginary and grotesque pictures of a supposed "Java man" with brutish face as an ancestor of modern man, as is occasionally done. Those who do such things are guilty of ignorance or deliberate misrepresentation. Neither is it justifiable for preachers in the pulpit to tell their congregations that there is general agreement amongst scientific men as to the evolutionary origin of Man from an animal ancestor.

706. Evolution—Life, Origin of, Evolutionist's Conjecture on SOURCE: George Gaylord Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution* (1960), pp. 14, 15. Copyright 1949 by Yale University Press. Used by permission of Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn, and Oxford University Press, London.

[p. 14] The origin of life was necessarily the beginning of organic evolution and it is among the greatest of evolutionary problems...

Recent work in biochemistry, and especially studies of cell structure and physiology, of viruses, and of gene action are converging hopefully on this mystery... Yet these studies show that there is no theoretical difficulty, under conditions that may well have existed [p. 15] early in the history of the earth, in the chance organization of a complex of carbon-containing molecule capable of influencing or directing the synthesis of other units like itself. Such a unit would be, in barest essentials, alive... Even more impressive is the suggestion that this first form of life was a "protogene" which, after the chance basic chemical combination into an organization capable of reproduction and of mutation, was slowly developed by mutation into the gene combinations of organisms more indisputably alive in the full sense.

There is, at any rate, no reason to postulate a miracle. Nor is it necessary to suppose that the origin of the new processes of reproduction and mutation was anything but materialistic... Once this point is established the origin of life is stripped of all real mystery, regardless of whether it proves possible in a brief time in a modern laboratory to repeat the event that occurred in the course of millions of years when the earth was young.

707. Evolution—Life, Production of, in Laboratory—Evolutionists Speculates on Possibility

SOURCE: Sidney W. Fox, "How did Life Begin?" *Science*, 132 (July 22, 1960), 207. Copyright 1960 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Reprinted from *Science* by permission.

The question "How did life begin?" focuses attention upon subtle but important differences between the verb *begin*, used intransitively, and the verb *start*, used transitively. We assume that someone some day will succeed in producing a cell which metabolizes and reproduces itself and its metabolic pattern in such a manner that no experts will disagree with the conclusion that the unit is alive. When that occurs, a chemical evolutionist will have *started* life, whereas that from which are descended *began*. Will we be able, then, to say that the experimental demonstration reveals how life began? At first glance the answer seems to be negative. It should be possible, however, when life has been synthesized, to determine the latitude of each of the conditions

required for synthetic life, and perhaps the latitude of some of them before life is started... When the full scope of conditions necessary for the synthesis of life is determined, it should be possible to judge whether these are conditions associated with the current earth, with what we believe to have been the prebiological earth, and with conditions prevailing on other planets.

A related thought is that life may be beginning now. Although we can with certainty say only that life arose at least once, there is increasing reason to believe that life can, or even must, arise in many places at many times... There is of course no assurance that life is beginning now on the earth; the point is that we have less reason to exclude this possibility than we had formerly.

708. Evolution—Life, a Spontaneous Generation of, Held Impossible SOURCE: George Barry O'Toole, *The Case Against Evolution* (New York: Macmillan, 1926), pp. 142, 143.

[p. 142] Waiving the possibility of an *a priori* argument, by which abiogenesis might be positively excluded, there remains this one consideration, which alone is scientifically significant, that, so far as observation goes and induction can carry us, the living cell has absolute need of a vital origin and can never originate by the exclusive agency of the physicochemical forces native to inorganic matter. If organic life exists in simpler terms than the cell, science knows nothing of it, and no observed process, simple or complicated, of inorganic nature, nor any artificial synthesis of the laboratory, however ingenious, has ever succeeded in duplicating the wonders of the simplest living cell.

In fact, the very notion of a chemical synthesis of living matter is founded on a misconception. It would, indeed, be rash to set limits to the chemist's power of synthesizing organic compounds, but living protoplasm is not a single chemical compound. Rather it is a complex system of compounds, enzymes and organelles, coördinated and integrated into an organized whole by a persistent principle of unity and finality. Organic life, to say nothing at all of its unique dynamics, is a morphological as well as a chemical problem; [p. 143] and, while it is conceivable that the chemist might synthesize all the compounds found in dead protoplasm, to reproduce a single detail of the ultramicroscopic structure of a living cell lies wholly beyond his power and province...

With the chemist, analysis must precede synthesis, and it is only after a structural formula has been determined by means of quantitative analysis supplemented by analogy and comparison, that a given compound can be successfully synthesized. But living protoplasm and its structures elude such analysis. Intravitous staining is inadequate even as a means of qualitative analysis, and tests of a more drastic nature destroy the life and organization, which they seek to analyze.

709. Evolution—Living Protoplasm, Difficulty of Artificial Production of, Admitted

SOURCE: William Seifriz, *Protoplasm*, p. 528. Copyright 1936 by the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The question whether or not living protoplasm can be artificially produced is one upon which many biologists have speculated and usually energetically answered in the negative. We must grant the possibility of doing it, with sufficient knowledge, but he who claims that protoplasm can be made in the laboratory, now or at some later time, might better ask a child to construct a chronometer.

710. Evolution—Limits of Mutational Changes

SOURCE: Richard B. Goldschmidt, "Evolution, as Viewed by One Geneticist," *American Scientist*, 40 (January, 1952), 94. Copyright 1952 by The Society of the Sigma Xi, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

Nobody thus far has produced a new species or genus, etc., by macromutation. It is equally true that nobody has produced even a species by the selection of micromutations.

In the best-known organisms, like *Drosophila*, innumerable mutants are known. If we were able to combine a thousand or more of such mutants in a single individual, this still would have no resemblance whatsoever to any type known as a species in nature.

[EDITORS' NOTE: What one scientist calls a species another may call a variety, race, or sub-species. Hence many scientists affirm that new species *are* being formed in one way or another. Ernst Mayr (*Systematics and the Origin of Species*, 1942) is one of a number of scientists who have reacted against the modern habit of applying the term to small groups classified by minute differences (as, for example, the six "species" of coyote in the United States). He holds that many so-called species should be considered races. The creationist, though accustomed to new breeds or varieties, is inclined to think of species as large groups, distinguished from one another by obvious differences.]

711. Evolution—Mistakes of Nonevolutionists in Dealing With Statements of Those Who Disagree With One Form of Theory

SOURCE: John W. Klotz, *Genes, Genesis, and Evolution*, pp. 9–11. Copyright 1955 by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Used by permission.

[p. 9] Some form of evolution is accepted by almost all biologists today. It would be difficult to point to a biologist of national or international repute who does not accept evolution in one form or another. The theory is still very much alive and will continue to be alive for the foreseeable future.

It is not difficult to understand why the erroneous idea that evolution is on the discard has become current. For one thing, we have tended to overemphasize the statements of biologists who have disagreed with one form of the theory of evolution, and inadvertently we have given the impression that they were disagreeing with evolution itself. It is true, of course, that scientists are by no means agreed on the details of evolution. Probably there are about as many [p. 10] theories of evolution as there are biologists. It is this disagreement among the scientists that has been called to our attention so repeatedly and has led us to the idea that scientists were repudiating evolution. Because a man has questioned some phase of Darwinism or has perhaps repudiated it entirely, we have gotten the idea that he was repudiating evolution entirely and championing the Genesis account. But these men whom we quote are still evolutionists, although they may disagree with one another...

[p. 11] Another mistake that has been made in dealing with evolution is that of misrepresenting evolution and what the evolutionists say. This, of course, is not deliberate. Sometimes it is due to a misunderstanding of scientific terminology [see No. 710n.]. In other cases it is due to a mistaken zeal and enthusiasm. Strawmen are set up and then knocked down. Ideas that have been repudiated many years ago are revived, and great delight is taken in showing the fallacies of these ideas, fallacies and erroneous conclusions which long ago were pointed out by the scientists themselves.

712. Evolution, Scientists in Disagreement With Present Theories of SOURCE: Everett C. Olson, "Morphology, Paleontology, and Evolution," in *The Evolution of Life*, ed. by Sol Tax (Vol. I of *Evolution After Darwin*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 523 Copyright 1960 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the publisher.

During the years of 1958 and 1959 the work of Charles Darwin has been reviewed and analyzed in great detail; the progress of thought about evolution has been

summarized, collated, and related to disciplines far afield from biology; and the future has been explored. In general, it would seem, we feel that the charge implicit in the *Origin of Species* has been well carried out and that much that is to be known about evolution is, at least in broad outlines, now known. There are, of course, degrees of difference in evaluation of successes, from healthy skepticism to confidence, that the final word has been said, and there are still some among the biologists who feel that much of the fabric of theory accepted by the majority today is actually false and who say so. For the most part, the opinions of the dissenters have been given little credence. This group has formed a vocal, but little heard, minority.

These exists, as well, a generally silent group of students engaged in biological pursuits who tend to disagree with much of the current thought but say and write little because they are not particularly interested, do not see that controversy over evolution is of any particular importance, or are so strongly in disagreement that it seems futile to undertake the monumental task of controverting the immense body of information and theory that exists in the formulation of modern thinking. It is, of course, difficult to judge the size and composition of this silent segment, but there is no doubt that the numbers are not inconsiderable. Wrong or right as such opinion may be, its existence is important and cannot be ignored or eliminated as a force in the study of evolution.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: A scientist's disagreement with "the fabric of theory accepted by the majority" must not be interpreted as his disavowal of his belief in evolution as a method. For mistakes nonevolutionists make in this direction, see No. 711.]

713. Evolution—Sudden Appearance of New Systematic Groups,

Differing Evolutionist Views on

SOURCE: George Gaylord Simpson, *The Major Features of Evolution*, pp. 360, 361. Copyright 1953 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 360] Among the examples [of fossil occurrences cited as indications of evolutionary phenomena on lower and intermediate levels] are many in which, beyond the slightest doubt, a species or a genus has been gradually transformed into another. Such gradual transformation is also fairly well exemplified for subfamilies and occasionally for families, as the groups are commonly ranked. Splitting and subsequent gradual divergence of species is also exemplified, although not as richly as phyletic transformation of species (no doubt because splitting of species usually involves spatial separation and paleontological samples are rarely really adequate in spatial distribution). Splitting and gradual divergence of genera is exemplified very well and in a large variety of organisms. Complete examples for subfamilies and families also are known, but are less common.

In spite of these examples, it remains true, as every paleontologist knows, that *most* new species, genera, and families and that nearly all new categories above the level of families appear in the record suddenly and are not led up to by known, gradual, completely continuous transitional sequences. When paleontological collecting was still in its infancy and no clear examples of transitional origin had been found, most paleontologists were anti-evolutionists. Darwin (1859) recognized the fact that paleontology then seemed to provide evidence against rather than for evolution in general or the gradual origin of taxonomic categories in particular. Now we do have many examples of transitional sequences. Almost all paleontologists recognize that the discovery of a complete transition is in any case unlikely. Most of them find it logical, if not scientifically required, to assume that the sudden appearance of a new systematic

group is not evidence for special creation or for saltation, but simply means that a full transitional sequence more or less like those that are known did occur and simply has not been found in this instance.

Nevertheless, there are still a few paleontologists, and good ones (e.g., Spath 1933; Schindewolf, 1950a), who are so impressed by how much has been found that they conclude that most, at any rate, of what has not been found never existed, and there are some neontologists, also some good ones (e.g. Clark, 1930; Goldschmidt, 1940), who accept [p. 361] this interpretation. It is thus still too soon for the rest of us to take the discontinuities of the paleontological record for granted.

714. Evolution—Sudden Appearance of Varied Fossil Animals, a Puzzle to Evolutionists

SOURCE: George Gaylord Simpson, "The History of Life," in *The Evolution of Life*, ed. by Sol Tax (Vol. I of *Evolution After Darwin*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960) p. 144. Copyright 1960 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the publisher.

Precambrian fossils are ... widely scattered in place and time and do not constitute a continuous or, as yet, even a particularly enlightening record. Equally scattered but rather numerous animals have been reported from the Precambrian, but all are in serious doubt. There is in every reported instance question as to whether the claimed fossils really are organic, or are animals, or are of truly Precambrian age (Schindewolf, 1956). The best evidence—and it is not impressive—is of trails that may have been made by wormlike animals.

Then, with the beginning of the Cambrian, unquestionable, abundant, and quite varied fossil animals appear. The suddenness can be exaggerated, for the various major groups straggle in through the Cambrian, a period of some 75 million years, and the following Ordovician. There is also some question whether the beds defined as the base of the Cambrian, just because they do contain varied animal remains, are everywhere synchronous. Nevertheless, the change is great and abrupt. This is not only the most puzzling feature of the whole fossil record but also its greatest apparent inadequacy.

Darwin was aware of this problem, even more striking in his day than in ours, when it is still striking enough. He said of it: "The case at present must remain inexplicable; and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained" (Darwin, 1872, chap. X). His fear was that the abrupt appearance of many fairly advanced animals in the Cambrian might negate the whole idea of evolution. Only a few near the lunatic fringe of science would now draw such a conclusion, but a problem still remains. Darwin's "case" is still not clearly explained with sufficient positive evidence. Is it explicable on principles illustrated by the Cambrian and later record, or must we consider our usable record as a mere tag-end from which we cannot infer principles operative during much the greater part of the whole history?

715. Evolution—Sudden Appearance of Wholly Modern Phyla, a Problem to Evolutionists

SOURCE: Daniel I. Axelrod, "The Evolution of Flowering Plants," In *The Evolution of Life*, ed. By Sol Tax (Vol. 1 of *Evolution After Darwin*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 227. Copyright 1960 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the publisher.

The evolution of flowering plants presented Darwin with a series of problems which could not be answered satisfactorily until an adequate number of fossil floras had been found, described, and analyzed and until certain basic principles of geology, paleontology, ecology, climatology, and evolution had been discovered which would illuminate the relations shown by the fossil floras. Although great progress has been made along these lines during the past century, the data in hand even now provide only partial answers to most of the problems considered by Darwin. In particular, these included the "abominable mystery," surrounding their early evolution, notably their center of origin, their ancestry, and their "sudden appearance" in the Middle Cretaceous as a fully evolved, wholly modern phylum.

716. Evolution, Theologian's Objection to

SOURCE: Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1953), pp. 184, 185. Copyright 1941 by Louis Berkhof. Used by permission.

- From the point of view of the theologian the greatest objection to this theory [p. 184] a. [of the evolutionary descent of man from the lower animals] is, of course, that it is contrary to the explicit teachings of the Word of God. The Bible could hardly teach more clearly than it does that man is the product of a direct and special creative act of God. rather than of a process of development out of the simian stock of animals. It asserts that God formed man out of the dust of the ground, Gen. 2:7. Some theologians, in their eagerness to harmonize the teachings of Scripture with the theory of evolution, suggest that this may be interpreted to mean that God formed the body of man out of the body of the animals, which is after all but dust. But this is entirely unwarranted, since no reason can be assigned why the general expression "of the dust of the ground" should be used after the writer had already described the creation of the animals and might therefore have made the statement far more specific. Moreover, this interpretation is also excluded by the statement in Gen. 3:19, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground: for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." This certainly does not mean that man shall return to his former animal state. Beast and man alike return again to the dust. Eccl. 3:19, 20. Finally, we are told explicitly in 1 Cor. 15:39 that "All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one flesh of men, and another flesh of beasts." As to the spirit of man the Bible teaches explicitly that it came directly from God, Gen. 2:7, and therefore cannot be regarded as a natural development of some previously existing substance. In perfect harmony with this Elihu says, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almightv giveth me life," Job 33:4 Furthermore, Scripture also teaches that man was at once separated from the lower creation by an enormous chasm. He at once stood on a high intellectual, moral, and religious level, as created in the image of God and was given dominion over the lower creation, Gen. 1:26, 27, 31; 2:19, 20; Ps. 8:5, 8. By his fall in sin, however, he fell from his high estate and became subject to a process of degeneration which sometimes results in bestiality. This is quite [p. 185] the opposite of what the evolutionary hypothesis teaches us. According to it man stood on the lowest level at the beginning of his career, but slightly removed from the brute, and has been rising to higher levels ever since.
- b. The second great objection is that the theory has no adequate basis in well established facts. It should be borne in mind that, as was pointed out before, the evolutionary theory in general, though often represented as an established doctrine, is up to the present time nothing but an unproved working hypothesis, and a hypothesis that has not yet given any great promise of success in demonstrating what it set out to prove. Many of the most prominent evolutionists frankly admit the hypothetical character of their theory. They still avow themselves to be firm believers in the doctrine of descent, but do not hesitate to say that they cannot speak with any assurance of its method of operation.

717. Evolution—Uniformitarianism Inadequate; Biblical Catastrophism Harmonizes the Facts

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, p. 439. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The present widely accepted system of uniformitarianism in historical geology, with its evolutionary basis and bias, has been shown to be utterly inadequate to explain most of the important geologic phenomena. Present rates and processes simply *cannot* account for the great bulk of the geologic data. Some form of catastrophism is clearly indicated by the vast evidences of volcanism, diastrophism, glaciation, coal and oil and mineral deposits, fossilization, vast beds of sediments, and most of the other dominant features of the earth's crust. When this fact is once recognized, it can then be seen that even the supposed evidences of great geologic age can be reinterpreted to correlate well with the much more impelling evidences of violent and rapid activity and formation.

But if present processes cannot be used to deduce the earth's past history (and this fact is proved not only by the failure of geological uniformity but even more by the impregnable laws of conservation and deterioration of energy), then the only way man can have certain knowledge of the nature of events on earth prior to the time of the beginning of human historical records, is by means of divine revelation. And this is why the Bible record of Creation and the Flood immediately becomes tremendously pertinent to our understanding, not only of the early history of the earth but also of the purpose and destiny of the universe and of man.

We have, therefore, sought to show how the outline of earth history provided by the early chapters of Genesis, as well as by the related passages from other parts of the Bible, actually provides a scientifically accurate framework within which all the verified data of geology and geophysics fit together remarkably well. The great Deluge of Noah's day is seen to account for a large portion of the sedimentary rocks of the earth's crust and indirectly for the glacial and other surface deposits which resulted from the change in earth climates at the time of the Flood. The reader may judge for himself whether the evidence truly warrants this reorientation of geological philosophy.

718. Existentialism, Brief Definition of Term

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 57. Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

Existentialism is the belief that the truth most worth having is not grasped by objective knowledge or carefully defined ideas, but by a man's own passionately involved existence. Whereas scientists and most philosophers exhort us to seek truth by detached, dispassionate objectivity, the existentialists direct us rather to subjectivity, to taking sides, to living life in its full-blooded depths. Objective knowledge, they insist, is abstract, speculative, and, so far as the most basic questions of our personal existence are concerned, impossible. If we seek answers to our ultimate questions by rational investigation, we shall only withdraw further and further from the reality we seek to know. That reality cannot be "known" in the scientific sense, for our concepts can apprehend only essences, not existence. Existence, however, can be encountered and apprehended by faith.

719. Existentialism, Classes of, Defined

SOURCE: Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism*, pp. 14–18, 21, 22. Copyright 1947 by The Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 14] What is meant by the term *existentialism*?

Most people who use the word would be rather embarrassed if they had to explain it, since, now that the word is all the rage, even the work of a musician or painter is being [p. 15] called existentialist...

Actually, it is the least scandalous, the most austere of doctrines. It is intended strictly for specialists and philosophers. Yet it can be defined easily. What complicates matters is that there are two kinds of existentialist; first, those who are Christian, among whom I would include Jaspers and Gabriel Marcel, both Catholic; and on the other hand the atheistic existentialists, among whom I class Heidegger, and then the French existentialists and myself. What they have in common is that they think that existence precedes essence, or, if you prefer, that subjectivity must be the starting point.

Just what does that mean? Let us consider [p. 16] some object that is manufactured, for example, a book or a paper-cutter: here is an object which has been made by an artisan whose inspiration came from a concept. He referred to the concept of what a paper-cutter is and likewise to a known method of production, which is part of the concept, something which is, by and large, a routine. Thus, the paper-cutter is at once an object produced in a certain way and, on the other hand, one having a specific use; and one can not postulate a man who produces a paper-cutter, essence—that is, the ensemble of both the production routines and the properties which enable it to be both produced and defined—precedes existence. Thus, the presence of the paper-cutter or book in front of me is determined. Therefore, we have here a technical view of the world whereby it can be said that production precedes existence.

When we conceive God as the Creator, He is generally thought of as a superior sort of artisan. Whatever doctrine we may be considering, whether one like that of Descartes or that [p. 17] of Leibnitz, we always grant that will more or less follows understanding or, at the very least, accompanies it, and that when God creates He knows exactly what He is creating. Thus, the concept of man in the mind of God is comparable to the concept of paper-cutter in the mind of the manufacturer, and, following certain techniques and a conception, God produces man, just as the artisan, following a definition and a technique, makes a paper-cutter. Thus, the individual man is the realization of a certain concept in the divine intelligence.

In the eighteenth century, the atheism of the *philosophes* discarded the idea of God, but not so much for the notion that essence precedes existence. To a certain extent, this idea is found everywhere; we find it in Diderot, in Voltaire, and even in Kant. Man has a human nature; this human nature, which is the concept of the human, is found in all men, which means that each man is a particular example of a universal concept, man. In Kant, the result of this universality is that the wildman, the natural man, as well as the bourgeois, are circumscribed by the same definition and have [p. 18] the same basic qualities. Thus, here too the essence of man precedes the historical existence that we find in nature.

Atheistic existentialism, which I represent, is more coherent. It states that if God does not exist, there is at least one being in whom existence precedes essence, a being who exists before he can be defined by any concept, and that this being is man, or, as Heidegger says, human reality. What is meant here by saying that existence precedes essence? It means that, first of all, man exists, turns up, appears on the scene, and, only afterwards, defines himself. If man, as the existentialist conceives him, is indefinable, it is because at first he is nothing. Only afterward will he be something, and he himself will have made what he will be. Thus, there is no human nature, since there is no God to conceive it. Not only is man what he conceives himself to be, but he is also only what he wills himself to be after this thrust toward existence...

[p. 21] The existentialists say at once that man is anguish. What [p. 22] that means is this: the man who involves himself and who realizes that he is not only the person he chooses to be, but also a law-maker who is, at the same time, choosing all mankind as well as himself, can not help escape the feeling of his total and deep responsibility.

720. Existentialism, Classified

SOURCE: John Macquarrie, *An Existentialist Theology* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 16. Copyright 1955 by John Macquarrie. Used by permission of the publisher and Student Christian Movement Press Ltd., London.

Existentialism is not a philosophy but a type of philosophy, and a type so flexible that it can appear in such widely differing forms as the atheism of Sartre, the Catholicism of Marcel, the Protestantism of Kierkegaard, the Judaism of Buber, and the Orthodoxy of Berdyaev.

721. Existentialism, Defined

SOURCE: Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1959), pp. 37, 38. Copyright 1959 by Daniel Day Williams. Used by permission.

[p. 37] It was the Danish religious thinker, Søren Kierkegaard, who in the last century gave one of the profoundest analyses of the soul-sickness of anxious and guilt-ridden man. Kierkegaard is one of the major influences on Christian theology today. His analysis of anxiety is still classic, as Rollo May shows in his recent work on *Anxiety*. Mention of Kierkegaard leads us from psychology to philosophy for his thought is the most important single source of the modern philosophy of "existentialism" which looks upon man's existence as a finite, dying creature as the central clue to an interpretation of the world. The power of existentialism is that it [p. 38] expresses in philosophical terms man's loneliness, his ultimate fears, his sense that time does not bring progress, his uncertainty about eternal realities. For existentialism man's freedom is the source both of his humanity and of his despair. He must find the courage to take his existence into his own hands and dare to live his life out in a world which threatens him on every side.

Kierkegaard's existentialism was Christian. Man's problem is his relationship to God, and his salvation is God's forgiveness. In contrast, much of modern existentialism like that of Sartre, is atheistic. As has been said for this philosophy, instead of God's creating the world out of nothing, man must create the world out of nothing. In Martin Heidegger's philosophy the question about God appears to be left open. The starting point is still man in his finitude, hurled into a situation he did not choose, faced with the threat of "non-being," and needing desperately to find the courage to assert his own freedom in authentic human existence.

722. Existentialism, Relation of Gospel Content to Our Experience Explained by

SOURCE: Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1959), p. 65. Copyright 1959 by Daniel Day Williams. Used by permission.

The answer which Bultmann himself gives as to how the content of the Gospel can be related to our experience is derived from existentialist philosophy, especially from themes which Martin Heidegger has stressed. Man's creaturely existence with its encircling boundary line of death plunges him into an anxiety which he cannot overcome

by any reliance on his own resources. Heidegger identifies this human state with guilt. Bultmann makes plain that it is guilt before God because it is refusal to accept our creaturely condition with gratitude to its giver. What man needs is the destruction of any understanding of himself which makes him rely on his own goodness or knowledge. He needs courage to venture into the unknown future in spite of all the threats to the meaningfulness of his life. The Gospel declares that God has overcome death and guilt. This is what the resurrection of Jesus Christ means. God offers man a new selfunderstanding in which life is lived from God as center. In that new life we have courage to face any future.

723. Exodus — Probable Historical Background

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 140–143. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 140] Beside extreme views [of the date of the Exodus], ... only two principal views exist. The first places the event around 1441 B.C. [1445 in *SDACom*] in the reign of Amenhotep II of the Eighteenth Dynasty; the second place it about 1290 B.C. in the reign of Rameses II of the Nineteenth Dynasty...

Any view of the Exodus is vexed with difficulties...

[p. 141] But it is quite clear from a careful survey of all the Scriptural evidence, including the whole time scheme underlying the Pentateuch and the early history of Israel through the period of the Judges to the time of Solomon, that the Old Testament places Moses and the period of the Exodus around the middle of the fifteenth century B.C. rather than a full century and a half later in the first half of the thirteenth century B.C. ... W. F. Albright gives 922 B.C. as the date of Solomon ruled forty years (1 Kings 11:42), the fourth year of his reign would be variously computed—958 B.C. (Albright), 967 B.C. (Thiele) and 962 B.C. (Begrich). Taking the year 961 B.C., which cannot be far wrong, we arrive at 1441 B.C. as the date of the Exodus [*SDACom* has 1445; see editors' note below]...

Those who ... [in dating the Exodus later], by a century and a half or two centuries, shorten the period of the Judges, ... virtually rule out the possibility of fitting the Biblical chronology into the frame of contemporary history...

[p. 142] This date [the mid-15th-century date for the Exodus] falls very probably in the opening years of the reign of Amenhotep II (1450–1425 B.C.), son of the famous conqueror and empire builder, Thutmose III (1482–1450 B.C.)⁹ [Note 9: The dates ... are approximate.] One of the greatest of all the Pharaohs, Thutmose III furnishes an ideal figure for the Pharaoh of the Oppression. According to the Biblical record Moses waited for the death of the great oppressor before returning to Egypt from his refuge in Midian (Ex. 4:19). The Exodus took place not very long afterward in the reign of Amenhotep II...

In the contemporary records of Amenhotep II no references, of course, occur to such national disasters as the ten plagues or the loss of the Egyptian army in the Red (Reed) Sea, much less to the escape of the Hebrews. But this circumstance was to be expected. The Egyptians were the last people to record their misfortunes...

If Amenhotep II was the reigning Pharaoh of the Exodus, his eldest son was slain in the tenth plague, "which smote all the firstborn ..." (Ex. 12:29)...

[p. 143] It is clear from this ancient record [the "dream inscription"; see No. 678] that Thutmose IV was not Amenhotep's eldest son, since his hopes of succession to the throne were apparently remote... In short the possibility is at least open that the heir apparent died in the manner recounted in the Bible.

The general historical situation made the Exodus possible toward the beginning of the reign of Amenhotep II...

The picture of Thutmose III as the great oppressor of the Israelites is quite credible. He was a great builder and employed Semitic captives in his vast construction projects. Many of his building operations were supervised by his vizier, named Rekhmire...

Semitic foreigners are significantly found among the brickmakers and bricklayers [pictured] on Rekhmire's tomb. [In the accompanying inscription] ... the taskmasters warn the laborers, "The rod is in my hand; be not idle." ¹¹ [Note 11: P. E. Newberry, *The Life of Rekhmara* (1900), p. 38; James Henry Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, Vol. II, sect. 758f.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: Unger takes 961 B.C. for Solomon's fourth year and arrives at 1441 B.C. for the Exodus by subtracting 480 years (based on 1 Kings 6:1). This is not far from the date of 1445 adopted tentatively in *SDACom* (1:191, 192) and *SDADic* ("Chronology," II, 2).]

724. Exodus, Route of, to Sinai

SOURCE: *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*, ed. by George Ernest Wright and Floyd Vivian Filson (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956), pp. 38, 39. Copyright 1956 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 38] There has been considerable debate as to where the Hebrews went after entering the wilderness, since Mount Sinai or Horeb (it was called by both names) has not been located with certainty. The Sinai peninsula is triangular in shape, 260 miles long and 150 miles wide at the north... [To the south] is the apex of the peninsula with its mass of granite mountains, the highest of which rise some 8,000 feet above sea level. Among these mountains were the ancient copper and turquoise mines to which the Egyptians sent regular expeditions. Here also is the traditional site of Mount Sinai where Moses received the Law and bound the people together in a joint covenant with the Lord. The tradition that this is the Mount Sinai of Israel is at least fifteen hundred years old, and it is difficult to see how the tradition could have arisen if it did not have some historical basis. In addition, it is possible to point to several stations along the route to this area which correspond to those mentioned in the Bible, but it is not possible to do this for any other route through the peninsula...

[p. 39] Among the first springs on the ancient road to the Sinai mines is 'Ain

Hawârah This, therefore, is probably Marah, the first station of the Israelite journey which was reached after three waterless days in the wilderness (v, D–4; Ex. 15:22ff.). The next oasis to the south is in the *Wâdī Gharandel*, which corresponds to the Biblical Elim where twelve springs and seventy palm trees are said to have existed (v, D–4; Ex. 16:1; Num. 33:9). The next stages of the journey took them along the Red Sea, and thence inland to the Wilderness of Sin and to Dophkah (Num. 33:10–12). The exact route at this point depends upon the location of Dophkah... While various mountains in the neighborhood have been identified with the Biblical Mount Sinai, the most probable location is the range designated at v, F–5 ..., of which the chief peak is called *Jebel*

Mûsā, "Mountain of Moses."

[EDITORS' NOTE: There are alternative identifications for several of these localities; and the mountain traditionally known as Sinai has two peaks, *Jebel Musa* and *Ras eş–Şafşafeh*. The latter fits the

specifications of the Biblical narrative better than the former, which has generally been identified as the Mount of Moses. For a discussion of these localities, see the articles "Exodus" and "Wilderness Wandering" in *SDADic*.

Map v of the Atlas, referred to on p. 39, appears also in SDACom, Vol. 1, facing p. 577.]

725. Exodus—Wilderness Wandering

SOURCE: Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1954), pp. 38, 39. Copyright 1954 by Cornell University. Used by permission.

[p. 38] Until recently the Bible has been virtually the only source for the history of the wandering in the Wilderness. As a result, the significance of this stage in Israel's history has been minimized, when its very authenticity has not been questioned.

A central feature of the Biblical account is the movable Tabernacle, or Tent of Meeting, around which the political and religious life of the wandering Hebrews revolved. This institution used to be regarded as a late fiction, projected back into the past. Recently, however, archaeological and literary parallels have been accumulating which not only explain the origin of this structure and institution in the wilderness of Sinai, but also clarify its history as the "Tent of the Lord" as Shiloh, following the conquest of Canaan. It was ultimately replaced by the Temple which David planned and Solomon built.

Much the same thing happened in the case of the Ark, the acacia chest in which, according to tradition, Moses placed and kept the two stone tablets recording the Ten Commandments. Furthermore, the traditional route of the Wandering, as described in the books of Exodus and Numbers, accords well with the topography of Sinai and with what has been learned of the location of the copper and turquoise mines which were being worked and garrisoned in the thirteenth century B.C. These garrisoned sites, in the hands of the Egyptians, appear to have been situated at just [p. 39] those points which the Hebrews were careful to avoid in their trek through Sinai.⁴ [Note 4: F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Tabernacle," *Biblical Archaeologist*, X (Sept., 1947), 45–68.]

726. Extreme Unction. Council of Trent on

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIV (Nov. 25, 1551), On the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, Canons 1 and 4, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919). Vol. 2, pp. 169, 170.

[p. 169] Canon I. If any one saith, that Extreme Unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed Apostle James; but is only a rite received from the Fathers, or a human figment: let him be anathema...

[p. 170] Canon IV. If any one saith, that the Presbyters of the Church, whom blessed James exhorts to be brought to anoint the sick, are not the priests who have been ordained by a bishop, but the elders in each community, and that for this cause a priest alone is not the proper minister of Extreme Unction: let him be anathema.

727. Ezra and Nehemiah, Chronological Order of

SOURCE: Cyrus H. Gordon, *The World of the Old Testament* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958), p. 276. Copyright 1953 by Ventnor Publishers, Inc., Copyright © 1958 by Cyrus H. Gordon. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Ezra, on his mission to stabilize the Judean community, was accompanied on the long road to Jerusalem by some 1,760 Babylonian Jews including not-too-enthusiastic Levites (8:15.) and other Temple servitors like the Nethinim (verse 20). The community they found in Judah was pious but badly off. The few well-to-do were concerned with worldly affairs and were entirely too intimate with those outside the fold, including the Samaritans. Ezra decided on a reform that included the putting aside of foreign wives and their children. This brought on the hostility of the non-Judeans, notably of the

Samaritans. Thus it became imperative to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem (cf. Ezra 4:13, 21) against the possibility of attack. But Rehum, the Governor of Samaria, together with his associates and subjects, convinced Artaxerxes that the walls were preparative to rebellion and to the cessation of paying taxes to the King. The upshot was that the walls of Jerusalem were wrecked anew... (See Nehemiah 1:3.)

Late in 446 (?), Nehemiah,² a Jew highly placed in the Persian court, heard of the sorry state of affairs in Jerusalem. He appealed to the King, who dispatched him there as Governor of Judah... Nehemiah ... was a practical, clear-headed and model layman with the desire and power to help the church. He reached Jerusalem in 445 (?) and, after examining the dilapidated walls, summoned the leaders of the people and inspired them to begin enthusiastically the arduous task of reconstruction.

[Note 2: I follow the traditional view that Ezra's mission preceded Nehemiah's. However the sequence and chronology of the two leaders have been hotly contested by inconclusive arguments on both sides. The subject is covered with objectivity and full documentation by H. H. Rowley, "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume*, I, Budapest, 1948, pp. 117–49. My adherence to the older view is not prompted by tradition alone. More cogent are considerations arising from the fact that the practical administrator Nehemiah would be needed to straighten out the failure of the impractical scribe Ezra, rather than vice versa.]

728. Ezra and Nehemiah—Two Views of Dating

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955), pp. 102, 104. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 102] Two theories about the relative order of Ezra and Nehemiah are held by competent scholars; Catholics and Protestants, conservatives and liberals are found on both sides of the discussion...

[p. 104] While no recent discovery has conclusively settled the debate with regard to the priority of Ezra or Nehemiah, the writer maintains the order Nehemiah—Ezra with increasing conviction.

2

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

729. Faith and Works, Luther on

SOURCE: Louis L. Snyder, ed., *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 74–76. Copyright © 1958 by Rutgers, The State University. Used by permission.

[p. 74] "The just shall live by faith" (Rom. 1:17). For the Word of God cannot be received and honored by any works, but by faith alone. Hence it is clear that, as the soul needs the Word alone for life and justification, so it is justified by faith alone and not by any works. For if it could be justified by any other means, it would have no need of the Word, nor consequently of faith...

The first care of every Christian ought to be, to lay aside all reliance on works, and strengthen his faith alone more and more, and by it grow in the knowledge, not of works, but of Christ Jesus, who has suffered and risen again for him; as Peter teaches, when he makes no other work to be a Christian one. Thus Christ, when the Jews asked Him what they should do that they might work the works of God, rejected the multitude of works, with which He saw that they were puffed up, and commanded them one thing only, saying: "This [p. 75] is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom He hath sent, for him hath God the Father sealed" (John 6:27, 29)...

But you ask how it can be the fact that faith alone justifies, and affords without works so great a treasure of good things, when so many works, ceremonies, and laws are prescribed to us in the Scriptures. I answer: Before all things bear in mind what I have said, that faith alone without works justifies, sets free, and saves.

And now let us turn to the other part, to the outward man. Here we shall give an answer to all those who, taking offense at the word of faith and at what I have asserted, say: "If faith does everything, and by itself suffices for justification, why then are good works commanded? Are we then to take our ease and do no works, content with faith?" Not so, impious men, I reply; not so. That would indeed really be the case, if we were thoroughly and completely inner and spiritual [p. 76] persons; but that will not happen until the last day, when the dead shall be raised. As long as we live in the flesh, we are but beginning and making advances in that which shall be completed in a future life. On this account the Apostle calls that which we have in this life, the first fruits of the Spirit (Rom. 8:23). In future we shall have the tenths, and the fullness of the Spirit. To this part belongs the fact I have stated before, that the Christian is the servant of all and subject to all. For in that part in which he is free, he does not works, but in that in which he is a servant, he does all works. Let us see on what principle this is so...

True are these two sayings: Good works do not make a good man, but a good man does good works. Bad works do not make a bad man, but a bad man does bad works. Thus it is always necessary that the substance or person should be good before any good works can be done, and that good works should follow and proceed from a good person. As Christ says: "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither *can* a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit" (Matt. 7:18). Now it is clear that the fruit does not bear the tree, nor does the tree grow on the fruit; but, on the contrary, the trees bear the fruit and the fruit grows on the trees...

Here is the truly Christian life; here is faith really working by love; when a man applies himself with joy and love to the works of that freest servitude, in which he serves other voluntarily and for naught; himself abundantly satisfied in the fullness and riches of his own faith.

730. Falling of Stars (1833), Astronomer's Eyewitness Description of

SOURCE: Denison Olmsted, "Observations on the Meteors of November 13th, 1833," *The American Journal of Science and Arts*, 25 ([Jan.?] 1834), 363, 365, 366, 386, 393, 394.

[p. 363] The morning of November 13th, 1833, was rendered memorable by an exhibition of the phenomenon called SHOOTING STARS, which was probably more extensive and magnificent than any similar one hitherto recorded...

Probably no celestial phenomenon has ever occurred in this country, since its first settlement, which was viewed with so much admiration and delight by one class of spectators, or with so much astonishment and fear by another class...

[p. 365] The reader may imagine a constant succession of fire balls, resembling sky rockets, radiating in all directions from a point in the heavens, a few degrees south—east of the zenith, and following the arch of the sky towards the horizon... The balls, as they travelled down the vault, usually left after them a vivid streak of light, and just before they disappeared, exploded, or suddenly resolved themselves into smoke. No report or noise of any kind was observed, although we listened attentively...

The spectator was presented with meteors of various sizes and degrees of splendor: some were mere points, but others were larger and brighter than Jupiter or Venus; and one, seen by a credible witness before the writer was called, was judged to be nearly as large as the moon. The flashes of light, although less intense than lightning, were so bright as to awaken people in their beds. One ball that shot off in the northwest direction, and explo- [p. 366] ded a little northward of the star Capella, left, just behind the place of explosion, a phosphorescent train of peculiar beauty...

[p. 386] The meteors began to attract notice by their unusual frequency or brilliancy, from *nine to twelve o'clock* in the evening, were most striking in their appearance, from *two to five*, arrived at their maximum, in many places, about *four* o'clock, and continued till rendered invisible by the light of day...

[p. 393] The meteors moved either in right lines, or in such apparent curves as, upon optical principles, can be resolved into right lines...

[p. 394] The meteors, as seen by most observers, appeared to proceed from a fixed point in the heavens... Those who marked its position among the fixed stars, observed it to be in the constellation Leo, in which it appeared stationary, accompanying that constellation in its diurnal progress.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Olmsted's characterization of the 1833 shower as the most magnificent hitherto recorded is still true, for no shower has equaled it since. Fisher in 1934 said it was "the most magnificent meteor shower on record" (W. J. Fisher, "The Ancient Leonids," *The Telescope*, 1 [October, 1934], 83).]

731. Falling of Stars (1833)—a Billion Shooting Stars

SOURCE: Peter M. Millman, "The Falling of the Stars," The Telescope, 7 (May–June, 1940), 57.

To understand the use of the word shower in connection with shooting stars we must go back to the early morning hours of Nov. 13, 1833, when the inhabitants of this continent [of North America] were in fact treated to one of the most spectacular natural displays that the night sky has produced. This was a real shower of shooting stars in every sense of the word [see No. 742n]. For nearly four hours the sky was literally ablaze... [Careful scientific accounts indicate that] more than a billion shooting stars appeared over the United States and Canada alone.

732. Falling of Stars (1833), Described as "Stars Falling"

SOURCE: W. J. Fisher, "The Ancient Leonids," The Telescope, 1 (October, 1934), 79, 80.

[p. 79] In the early morning of November 13, 1833, the people of the United States were waked by early risers to turn out and see the stars fall. And fall they did—silently,

singly, in bursts and sheaves, tiny [p. 80] ones and balls like the moon. All the observers saw that the meteors darted away from a single point in the sky; the meteors "were like the ribs of a gigantic umbrella."

733. Falling of Stars (1833)—Extent of Shower

SOURCE: Denison Olmsted, Letters on Astronomy, Addressed to a Lady: in Which The Elements of the Science Are Familiarly Explained in Connexion With Its Literary History (1840 ed.), pp. 348, 349.

[p. 348] The shower [of meteors on Nov. 12–13, 1833] pervaded near- [p. 349] ly the whole of North America, having appeared in nearly equal splendor from the British possessions on the north to the West-India Islands and Mexico on the south, and from sixty-one degrees of longitude east of the American coast, quite to the Pacific Ocean on the west. Throughout this immense region, the duration was nearly the same...

Soon after this remarkable occurrence, it was ascertained that a similar meteoric shower had appeared in 1799, ... on the morning of the twelfth of November; and ... on the morning of the same thirteenth of November, in 1830, 1831, and 1832.

734. Falling of Stars (1833), Like Crab Apples Shaken From Tree SOURCE: J. T. Buckingham, "The Meteoric Shower," *The New-England Magazine*, 6 (Jan.–June, 1834), 47, 48.

[p. 47] Neither language, nor the pencil, can adequately picture [p. 48] the grandeur and magnificence of the scene [the meteoric shower of Nov. 13, 1833]... It may be doubted, whether any description has surpassed, in accuracy and impressiveness, that of the old negro in Virginia, who remarked—"It is awful, indeed, sir,—it looked like ripe crab-apples falling from the trees, when shaking them for cider."

735. Falling of Stars (1833), Observed in California SOURCE: Robert G. Cleland, *This Reckless Breed of Men*, pp. 292, 293. Copyright 1950 by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 292] The great meteor shower of the night of November 12–13, 1833, ... found Walker's company camped in the lonely expanse of the San Joaquin Valley, and for hours "the air appeared to be completely thickened with meteors falling toward the earth." ... The horses tried re- [p. 293] peatedly to stampede; and until Walker explained the nature of the phenomenon, some of the superstitious trappers were probably as panic-stricken as the frantic horses.

736. Falling of Stars (1833), Pictured in American Indian Records SOURCE: Garrick Mallery, "Picture-Writing of the American Indians," [U.S.] Bureau of Ethnology, *Tenth Annual Report ... to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1888–'89* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893), p. 723. [FRS No. 103.]

The five winter counts [chronological records in picture writing naming each year (winter) by an outstanding event] next cited all undoubtedly refer to the magnificent meteoric display of the morning of November 13, 1833, which was witnessed throughout North America and which was correctly assigned to the winter corresponding with that of 1833–'34. All of them represent stars having four points, except The-Swan, who draws a globular object followed by a linear track.

<< figure 1219 goes here>>

Fig. 1219.—It rained stars. Cloud-Shield's Winter Count, 1833–'34. White-Cow-

Killer calls it "Plenty-stars winter."

<<figure 1220 goes here>>

Fig. 1220.—The stars moved around. American-Horse's Winter Count, 1833–'34 shows one large four-pointed star as the characterizing object and many small stars, also four-pointed.

<< figure 1221 goes here>>

Fig. 1221.—Many stars fell. The-Flame's Winter Count, 1833–'34. The character shows six stars above the concavity of the moon.

<< figure 1222 goes here>>

Fig. 1222.—Dakotas witnessed magnificent meteoric showers; much terrified. The-Swan's Winter Count, 1833–'34.

Battiste Good calls it "Storm-of-stars winter," and gives as the device a tipi with stars falling around it. This is presented in Fig. 1223. The tipi is colored yellow in the original and so represented in the figure according to the heraldic scheme.

737. Falling of Stars (1833)—Prophetic Description Fulfilled

SOURCE: [Henry Dana Ward], in The New York Journal of Commerce, Nov. 14 [i.e. 16], 1833, p. [2].

At the cry, "look out of the window," I sprang from a deep sleep, and with wonder saw the East lighted up with the dawn, and METEORS. ... I called to my wife to behold; and while robing, she exclaimed: "See how the stars fall" I replied, "That is the wonder;" and we felt in our hearts, that it was a sign of the last days. For, truly, "the stars of heaven fell *unto the earth*, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken by a mighty wind."—Rev. 6.13... This language of the prophet has always been received as metaphorical... [It] was literally fulfilled in the phenomenon of vesterday, so as no man before yesterday had conceived to be possible that it should be fulfilled... And how did they fall? Neither myself nor one of the family heard any report; and were I to hunt through nature for a simile. I could not find one so apt to illustrate the appearance of the heavens as that which St. John uses in the prophecy, before quoted. "It rained fire" says one.—Another, "it was like a shower of fire." Another, "it was like the large flakes of falling snow, before a coming storm, or large drops of rain before a shower." I admit the fitness of these for common accuracy; but they come far short of the accuracy of the figure used by the prophet. "The stars of heaven fell unto the earth;" they were not sheets, or flakes, or drops of fire; but they were what the world understands by the name of "Falling Stars;" and one speaking to his fellow in the midst of the scene, would say; "See how the stars fall;" and he who heard, would not pause to correct the astronomy of the speaker, any more than he would reply, "the sun does not move," to one who should tell him, "the sun is rising." The stars fell "Even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." Here is the exactness of the prophet. The falling stars did not come, as if from several tress shaken, but from one: those which appeared in the east fell toward the East; those which appeared in the north fell toward the North; those which appeared in the west fell toward the West; and those which appeared in the south, (for I went out of my residence into the Park,) fell toward the South; and they fell, not as the *ripe* fruit falls. Far from it. But they *flew*, they WERE CAST, like the unripe fruit, which at first refuses to leave the branch; and, when it does break its hold, flies swiftly, strait off, descending; and in the multitude falling some cross the track of others, as they are thrown with more or less force. Such was the appearance of the above phenomenon to the inmates of my house. I walked into the Park with two gentlemen of Pearl Street, feeling and confessing that, this scene had never been figured to our minds by any book or mortal, save only by the prophet.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract is taken from the semiweekly edition, dated Saturday morning, Nov. 14, but Saturday was 16th, and page 2 (probably from the daily) is dated the 15th. Henry Dana Ward, an Episcopal minister, who later became an associate of William Miller (see Millerites), is identified as the author of the extract in the Millerite journal *Signs of the Times*, 6 (Oct. 11, 1843), 62, 63.]

738. Falling of Stars (1833) Regarded as Forerunner of the Last Day SOURCE: *The Portland* [Maine] *Advertiser* (semiweekly ed.), Nov. 29, 1833, p. 2 (col. 1, dated Nov. 27), quoting *The Old Countryman* as reprinted in the New York Star.

Old Countryman, published in that city [New York], ... is a weekly paper, heretofore devoted to English news—to "flash, frolic and fun;" a kind of sporting chronicle, but the editor [Henry J. Pickering] has turned from "his flash, frolic and fun," and prognosticates seriously as follows:—

We pronounce the Raining Fire which we saw on Wednesday morning last an awful *type*—a sure forerunner—a merciful sign of that great and dreadful day which the inhabitants of the earth will witness when the SIXTH SEAL SHALL BE OPENED.

That time is just at hand—described not only in the *New* Testament but in the *Old;* and a more correct picture of a *fig tree casting its leaves when blown by a mighty wind,* it was not possible to behold...

Many things *now* occurring upon the earth tend to convince us that we are in the *latter days*. This exhibition we deem to be a type of an awful day fast hurrying upon us. This is our sincere opinion; and what we think we are not ashamed to tell.

739. Falling Stars (1833), Regarded as Sign of Second Advent SOURCE: Frederick Douglass, *Life and Times of Frederick Douglass* (New York: Pathway Press, 1941), p. 117. (Original edition 1855.)

I witnessed this gorgeous spectacle, and was awe-struck. The air seemed filled with bright descending messengers from the sky. It was about daybreak when I saw this sublime scene. I was not without the suggestion, at the moment, that it might be the harbinger of the coming of the Son of Man; and in my then state of mind I was prepared to hail Him as my friend and deliver. I had read that the "stars shall fall from heaven," and they were now falling. I was suffering very much in my mind... I was looking away to heaven for the rest denied me on earth.

740. Falling of Stars (1833), Seen as Shower From Meteor Swarm With a Period of 33 Years

SOURCE: W. J. Fisher, "The Ancient Leonids." The Telescope, 1 (October, 1934), 80-82, 84.

[p. 80] Among the widespread multitudes who turned out in the small hours [of Nov. 13, 1833, to "see the stars fall"] there were some scientific observers, who saw not only the divergence point (known since then as the radiant of those meteors), but also noted that it rose as the hours passed, remaining fixed in the Sickle of the constellation Leo. One of these scientific men, Professor Denison Olmsted of Yale College, collected all the observations, qualitative and quantitative, that press reports and correspondence could bring in, to make a paper for the American Journal of Science. This paper [see No. 730] was the beginning of meteoric astronomy, and the radiant was its capital discovery. This radiant Olmsted interpreted to mean that the fiery paths of the meteors were really parallel lines in the high atmosphere...

[p. 81] Since the radiant of the November shower is in Leo, we call them [these meteors] Leonids. Also it was immediately noted that brilliant meteor showers had been observed in Europe on November 13, 1831, and November 12, 1832; the great traveler von Humboldt had seen one at Cumana in Venezuela on November 12, 1799, and the first government astronomer of the United States, Andrew Ellicott, had seen one in the Florida Straits on the same night. Re- [p. 82] search showed that, like the meteors of 1833, this shower of 1799 was observed over a great range in latitude and longitude, so

that neither was a local phenomenon. Almost the same day of the month in 1833, 1832, 1831, 1799; the widespread areas of observation; and the general observation at widely separated points of identical celestial positions for the radiant of 1833, independent of the hour—these facts urged upon all minds that here was a new realm of planetary astronomy, that we had the sun, the planets, the comets, the asteroids, and now the innumerable little meteors and their swarms as members of the solar system...

[H. A. Newton of Yale] collected all available reports of star showers, and reduced their apparitions to the sidereal year of 1850. He found ... thirteen dates, from 902 A.D. to 1833 A.D., agreeing with November 11–14, 1850—our Leonids... [p. 84] Newton deduced that the cycle of the Leonids is 33.25 years.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The question has often been asked: How can an event in nature, especially a recurrent one, be regarded as a sign, or fulfillment of prophecy? In the columns of the *Review and Herald* a century ago (Jan. 29, 1861, p. 84) Uriah Smith editorially commented that an event can be identified as such when it notably fulfills the specifications of the prophecy at the time predicted, regardless of the number of occurrences at other times. He gave this explanation again, in regard to the darkening of the sun, in an editorial of May 23, 1878, p. 164. See No. 571n, where reference is made to later articles by other writers setting forth the view that the "what" and "when" of fulfillment outweigh the "how" and "how many." Some of these writers also contended that the validity of the "signs" (plural) is even strengthened by their repetition and distribution over various parts of the world. They cite as an example the unprecedented series of notable Leonid star showers, which included those seen in 1799 in South America and in 1832 and 1866 in Europe and parts of Asia and Africa, in addition to those seen in 1833 and 1867 in North America. The peak of this series was the incomparable shower of 1833.]

741. Falling of Stars (1833)—Subsequent Returns of Same Meteor Swarm, Then Shift of Orbit Away From Earth

SOURCE: James C. Hickey, *Introducing the Universe* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1952), pp. 85, 86. Used by permission of the publishers and Dodd, Mead & Company, New York.

[p. 85] Not until 1833 was it proved that meteors in general—those that vanish after a brief flash as well as those that reach the earth only partially consumed—had a cosmical origin, though observations by two German students, Brandes and Benzenberg, had suggested this as early as 1798. On November 12 [-13], 1833, there occurred a shower of shooting stars which startled observers over a wide area in the Americas and brought stark fright to thousands. The meteors fell so thickly that they were likened to snowflakes in a storm. Several careful watchers noted that they seemed to radiate from a point in the constellation of Leo. It was soon proved that this radiant was the direction in space from which the meteors came. They travelled in parallel lines, the apparent spreading being an effect of perspective. If the radiant had been a point in the atmosphere, its posi- [p. 86] tion would have changed when seen from widely separated stations. It did not change, therefore the meteors must come from outside the atmosphere. Because the radiant was in Leo the meteors were soon called Leonids.

Examination of records showed that unusual displays of mid-November meteors had occurred at intervals of about thirty-three years. Astronomers concluded that the particles which caused these showers travelled about the sun in a broad elliptical path extending out beyond the orbit of Uranus. Meteors are strung all along this track, but in one place there is a great swarm of them. The earth crosses the track annually in November and always gathers in a few Leonids; about three times in a century it used to encounter the main swarm.

On the basis of historical research and theoretical work it was confidently predicted that there would be another great Leonid display in 1866. Europe did have a shower in

November of that year, but it was less brilliant than the one of 1833. In 1867 another display was seen in the United States. The reason why showers occurred in two successive years was that the Leonid swarm was of such great length that it took more than twelve months to cross the earth's orbit, so our globe had an opportunity to plough through it twice.

There were great hopes for 1900, but to the intense disappointment of astronomers nothing happened that year. In 1901 there was a fair showing, but it was far below expectations. The mathematicians sharpened their pencils and went to work on the problem. They decided that the main swarm of the Leonids had been switched off its old course by the gravitational attraction of Jupiter, Saturn and Uranus, so that it no longer crossed the orbit of the earth. They were confirmed in this opinion when the Novembers of 1933 and 1934 passed with no display worthy to be called a shower. Such is the story of the lost Leonids.

Average distance Meteors per hour Between Individual Particles Shower One Observer Leonids, 1833 60,000 20 miles " 1866 6,000 45 " " 1931 80 200 " 4.000 35 " Andromedes, 1872 " 1855 12.000 25 " Giacobinids, 15,000 25 " 1933 Perseids 50 200 " [average year] 10 400 " Average night [no shower]

742. Falling of Stars (1833), Unmatched by Later Meteor Showers SOURCE: Peter M. Millman, "The Falling of the Stars," *The Telescope*, 7 (May–June, 1940), 60.

[EDITORS' NOTE: A meteor "shower" is not necessarily a spectacular tempest of falling stars like the incomparable one of 1833. Millman explains that in ordinary usage it means any fall of meteors, regardless of numbers, encountered as the earth intercepts one of the numerous swarms of meteoric particles that travel in orbits around the sun (p. 59). Shower meteors are characterized by (1) the appearance of radiating from a single area in the sky, (2) occurrence on the same date (or several successive days) each year, and (3) speed and color characteristic of the particular shower—the swifter meteors being hotter, and therefore brighter, than those of slower swarms (Reginald L. Waterfield, *A Hundred Years of Astronomy*, p. 475).]

743. Falling of Stars (1866)—Return of Leonid Meteors Seen in Beirut SOURCE: Henry Harris Jessup, *Fifty-Three Years in Syria*, Vol. 1, pp. 316, 317. Copyright 1910 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 316] On the morning of the 14th [of November, 1866, at Beirut, Lebanon], at three o'clock, I was roused from a deep sleep by the voice of one of our young men calling: "The stars are all coming down." ... The meteors poured down like a rain of fire. Many of them were large and vari-coloured, and left behind them [p. 317] a long train of fire.

One immense green meteor came down over Lebanon seeming as large as the moon, and exploded with a loud noise, leaving a green pillar of light in its train. It vain to attempt to count them and the display continued until the dawn when their light was obscured by the King of Day... The Mohammedans gave the call to prayer from the minarets, and the common people were in terror.

744. Falling of Stars (1866)—Return of Leonid Meteors Seen in England

SOURCE: The Times (London), Nov. 15, 1866, p. 8.

In the night between Tuesday and yesterday they who chose to watch, and were not discouraged by the doubts of astronomers, were rewarded with a spectacle which cannot be imagined or forgotten... First one meteor then another shot across the sky... Then they appeared faster than he [the spectator] could count them... Some struck the sight, like sparks from a forge, everywhere at once. Some seemed to fall, over trees or houses, bright to the last, but with the ruddy hues of the lower atmosphere. Look where we would it was the same... The heavens seemed alive with this unwonted host. There were times when it seemed as if a mighty wind had caught the old stars, loosed them from their holdings, and swept them across the firmament. The OLYMPIAN [Jove] Himself might have been supposed on his throne launching his bolts against an offending or forgetful world.

745. Falling of Stars (1899 and 1933 Leonids), Hit-and-miss Recurrence of Leonids

SOURCE: Reginald L. Waterfield, *A Hundred Years of Astronomy* (London: Duckworth, 1938), pp. 474, 475. Used by permission.

[p. 474] In 1899 an unfortunate thing happened. An astronomical prediction to which the press had given the widest publicity completely failed to come off... The expected event was the return of the great shooting star shower of 1833 and 1866. Records of many of its returns at this same interval had been traced back to A.D. 902 and there had seemed no reason to suppose that it should now suddenly fail. It is true that Johnstone Stoney and A. M. W. Downing, Superintendent of the Nautical Almanac Office, had realized the possibility of disappointment and issued a warning to that effect... It appeared from the investigations of these authors that the portion of the swarm we had traversed in 1866 had in the meantime suffered considerable deflection at the hands of Saturn and Jupiter. But whether on this account the shower would fail to materialize, would clearly depend on the volume of space which the main swarm occupied—a point on which there was complete ignorance.

Since the disaster of 1899 astronomers have approached the prediction of shooting star showers with greater humility...

[In 1933 the orbit of the swarm] had again been deflected by the planets, so that it once more lay close to the earth's orbit. But as there was a considerable interval between the arrival of the swarm and the arrival of the earth at the crossing point, it was impossible to say whether a super-display of shooting stars would occur: everything would depend on the unknown extension of the swarm. Actually the November shower of 1933 and of the years preceding and following it were only slightly above the [annual] average. There is, however, no reason to suppose that the swarm, which for upwards of a thousand years has periodically terrified or delighted humanity, has worn itself out. It is simply a question of "hit or miss"; and though we [p. 475] *missed* the last two times, we may have better luck in 1966 or 1999.

746. Falling of Stars (1899 and 1932 Leonids)—Return Showers Unpredictable

SOURCE: Fletcher G[uard] Watson, *Between the Planets* (rev. ed.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 95–97. Copyright 1941, 1956 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 95] This great display [of November 12–13, 1833] and the others that occur from time to time present some of the most interesting but tantalizing information we have about the occupants of interplanetary space. We know nothing of these [swarms of particles] ... until we collide with them and have a great meteor shower. Even afterward we cannot accurately trace their paths through space to predict when we may encounter them again, for when between the planets they are invisible to us. The earth is playing a game of cosmic blindman's buff with them; only if by chance we meet one of these swarms of particles does a brilliant meteor shower result, otherwise we go swinging around the sun, completely ignorant of where or how the meteor swarms are moving...

[p. 96] Astronomers and laymen alike were anticipating [in the 1899 return of the Leonid meteors] the greatest display of celestial fireworks of their lives. Alas! they were disappointed. Between 1866 and 1899 the meteors passed near both Saturn and Jupiter; these planets pulled the particles aside so that the earth passed through only the fringes of the swarm. As 1932 approached and the possibility of another shower was apparent, [p. 97] many people hoped that some perturbation had swung the particles into their previous orbit. As in 1899, the meteors came at the rate of one a minute, but compared to the earlier displays this was disappointing. It is not likely that we shall again witness great displays from this stream. The earth is a mere speck in space, which the meteors can easily pass without striking. The chances that as the perturbations change the meteors' orbit they will again collide with the earth are about equal to the chance that a searchlight capriciously playing over a crowd will again shine on a particular person.

747. Famine, in Syria in Reign of Claudius

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* ii. 8; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 127. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Caius had not completed four years of sovereignty when Claudius succeeded him as Emperor. In his time famine seized the world (and this also writers with a purpose quite other than ours have recorded in their histories), and so what the prophet Agabus had foretold, according to the Acts of the Apostles, that a famine would be over the whole world, received fulfillment.

748. Fasting, in Lent, Differing Customs of

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 131.

The fasts before Easter will be found to be differently observed among different people... Some wholly abstain from things that have life: others feed on fish only of all living creatures: many together with fish, eat fowl also, saying that according to Moses, these were likewise made out of the waters. Some abstain from eggs, and all kinds of fruits: others partake of dry bread only; still others eat not even this: while others having fasted till the ninth hour, afterwards take any sort of food without distinction. And among various nations there are other usages, for which innumerable reasons are assigned.

749. Federated Churches

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 689-691.

[p. 689] *History*. The Federated Church represents one of the forms under which two or more churches in a community have united for the joint prosecution of their work. The organization of united churches of the various types in rural and village communities is an interesting phase of religious development upon which some light is thrown by the census of religious bodies. The consolidation of church activities in places where the maintenance of two or more churches was found to be impracticable, or at least ineffective, is due largely to two factors, namely, the changes that are taking place in the ideals of church service and changes in local economic conditions.

While at one time in the development of the church denominational rivalries were so intense as to preclude organic union on any basis, today less emphasis is placed on ancient creeds and other historic causes of separation. Further- [p. 690] more, the conviction is growing among all denominations that the message of the gospel is in part social, as well as individual.

This change is well expressed by a modern church historian: "Not a rescue by individual salvation only, but the establishment of a reign of righteousness among men, has become increasingly the ideal ***. Emphasis is therefore placed on service in preventative and reformatory effort." This ideal makes possible the union of two or more churches under certain circumstances, where a narrow adherence to creeds might widely separate them.

Changing economic conditions have fostered the new attitude, especially in the rural regions. The outlook of country people has been broadened by the enlarged opportunities afforded by better transportation facilities, consolidated schools, rural free delivery of mail, and the increased use of the telephone and radio. Not the least of the factors contributing toward this closer relationship is the campaign of education in community spirit which has been conducted by various social welfare agencies.

When, therefore, by reason of changes occasioned by the flow of population from country to city, reduced local economic prosperity, or increased cost of church maintenance, an organized religious body becomes too weak to be effective, union with another local church in like circumstances seems the natural and logical step. The result has been the rise of the united churches in various forms.

In 1906 and 1916 these churches were included, without discrimination, in the data for Independent Churches. However, in 1926, a definite segregation was made and the Federated Churches were given separate presentation.

As here used, the term "united church" indicates a church whose membership, either regular or associate, is composed of elements representing different denominations, the elements in some cases being organized churches and in others individuals. The four types or groups of united churches found in the United States, as reported to the Census of Religious Bodies, in the order of their importance, are:

- 1. *Denominational united*, a type in which one or more of the uniting churches has given up its denominational allegiance in order to merge with another church and has accepted the denominational connection with the other.
- 2. *Federated*, a type in which each of the combining units retains its connection with its own denominational body.

- 3. *Undenominational*, a type in which union results in an organized church not connected with any denominational body.
- 4. *Affiliated,* a type resembling the undenominational church in control of its local affairs, but having an attenuated connection with a denominational body, usually for ministerial supply and distribution of benevolences only.

first and fourth groups are more or less closely identified with their denominations, their statistics have been included in the denominational totals. The third, or undenominational group, has been included in the statistics for Independent Churches.

erated Churches, however, since each maintains relations with more than one of the established denominations, cannot well be consolidated with any denominational group, and they are therefore given independent presentation in this report. There is further reason for making these churches the subject of a special presentation in that the federation of churches is of particular interest as affording a solution to a vexing problem—the problem of what to do with those churches in a rural group which are too weak to be efficient and yet are staunchly loyal to their denominations.

The term "community church" is not employed as a classifying term in the census reports, because a study of the word disclosed that its use was ambiguous, more than half a dozen different usages being noted. The same diversity in use was found in regard to the term "union church."

Federated Churches are those made up of two or more denominational organizations, each maintaining a separate membership and perhaps some separate activities. The Federated Church acts as one body, however, in the holding of religious services and, usually, in the maintenance of a Sunday school and in most or all social activities. The different denominational units of which the Federated Church is composed are closely identified with their respective denominations, not only by retention of their distinctive membership, but also by the common practice in each unit of recognizing its missionary obligations and sending to its own denominational board contributions for home and foreign missions, etc., and [p. 691] of keeping such property as it may own in the hands of its own trustees. They are united for local purposes only, in calling and paying a minister, in the holding of services, and in maintaining a common Sunday school. The distinguishing characteristics of this type of church are, therefore, that the two or more units enter into an agreement to conduct most of their activities as a single church, but to preserve the organic integrity of each denominational group.

The first Federated Church is said to have been formed in Massachusetts in 1887. Its formation appears to have been due to economic pressure, as the two churches which united were unable to finance their operations separately and made the experiment of joining for local activities. The experiment proved successful.

Church leaders who were alarmed at the overchurched situation in the rural sections of New England were quick to recognize the possibilities of this type of united church and not only lent their influence to prevent the organization of additional competing churches, but actively cooperated in the formation of Federated Churches. In fact, it is stated that the first Federated Church in Vermont, organized in 1899, was formed at the suggestion of denominational leaders. Both official and local leadership have played important parts in the organizing of this type of church, but it is probable that local necessity and a deeper sense of the church's responsibility for its immediate environment have been the determining factors in a majority of cases. Federated Churches were formed at first only in New England, but by the year 1912 they had spread to many other parts of the country. The schedules returned for the 1936 census show 508 Federated Churches, located in 42 States of the Union. Of the total number reporting, 244, or 48 percent, were found in New England and the Middle Atlantic States, and 184, or 36.2 percent, in the North Central States. Thirty-three such churches were located in the Pacific States, while 26 were in the South and 21 in the Mountain States.

Of the whole number, only 82 churches, or less than 17 percent, were reported as being located in urban territory, which includes all cities or incorporated places having 2,500 inhabitants or more in 1930, while 426 churches, or more than 83 percent, were in rural territory, which comprises the remainder of the country.

Doctrine. Each unit, or constituent part, of the Federated Church retains in its entirety the doctrine of the denominational body to which it adheres; and the membership requirements of each unit correspond exactly to those of the denomination.

Organization. In order to function as a single body, the Federated Church has, besides officials of the ordinary church of the denominational type, a joint committee which is in charge of the general activities of the church. This committee is generally representative of the units comprising the church, although in some churches it is selected without reference to such representation. Frequently important officers, such as elders and deacons, are chosen by the units separately.

In many Federated Churches the minister is chosen alternately from the different denominations represented by the units constituting the church; in others there is an agreement to procure the minister from one denomination only; while still others agree to disregard the denomination of the minister in making a choice.

Sunday schools are generally held in common. Of the 508 Federated Churches reporting to the Census Bureau, 484 reported Sunday schools, which were almost always held jointly.

The great majority of the churches have two denominational units only, as, for example, a Congregational unit and a Methodist unit. About 10 percent of the total number have three denominational units, but the churches composed of more than three such units are comparatively few.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1936), 88,411 (YAC, 1961, p. 254).]

750. Flood, Babylonian Account of, in Gilgamesh Epic

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 68, 70, 71. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 68] The next great mythological text to be described is that generally known as the Epic of Gilgamesh. This also, like the Enuma Elish, has had a long literary history, and its Akkadian form, which rests upon Sumerian sources, may be assigned to the beginning of the second millennium B.C. The poem consists of twelve tablets, some of which are in a fragmentary condition; the best-preserved is the eleventh tablet containing the well-known Babylonian version of the Flood myth...

[p. 70] The death of Enkidu causes Gilgamesh to set out on the quest for some way of escaping his friend's fate and avoiding the terrible doom of death. According to ancient tradition the only mortal who had been granted the gift of immortality by the gods was his ancestor Utnapishtim, the sole survivor of the Flood. Gilgamesh now determines to find Utnapishtim and learn from him the secret of immortality. Tablets IX to XI contain

the account of the adventures which befell Gilgamesh on his perilous journey in search of Utnapishtim...

Thus Gilgamesh arrives at last at 'the mouth of the rivers', the place which the gods had assigned to Utnapishtim and his wife for their eternal dwelling; he lays before his ancestor the object of his quest and asks how he had acquired the gift of immortality. In answer, Utnapishtim relates to him the story of the Flood, and it should be noted here that the Assyrian version which has become the standard form of the myth differs in many details from what we know of the earlier [p. 71] Sumerian version which is connected with the creation myth. Utnapishtim tells Gilgamesh that when he dwelt in the ancient city of Shurippak the gods decided to destroy mankind by a flood [see No. 751]. The plan was supposed to be secret, but Ea, being friendly to mankind, revealed the secret by repeating the words of the gods to the reed-hut, which passed them on to Utnapishtim. Acting on Ea's instructions Utnapishtim built a ship of strange shape and dimensions, for it would seem to have been a perfect cube; it had six decks, and its floor plan was divided into nine parts; but it is possible that the measurements relate to the hold of the ship.

Some scholars have held that in shape the ship was like a giant *kuffah*, or circular boat such as has been used for transport on the Euphrates from time immemorial. Utnapishtim gathered into the ship his possessions, his family, and all kinds of cattle and wild beasts. The Flood lasted seven days, till 'all of mankind had returned to clay'. The ship grounded on Mt. Nisir, and after waiting seven days Utnapishtim sent out in succession a dove, a swallow, and a raven. When the raven did not return Utnapishtim opened the ship and let out all its living freight; he then offered sacrifices, and we are told that the gods smelled the savour of the sacrifices and gathered like flies about the sacrificer.

Then follows a description of the scene in the assembly of the gods, where Ishtar laments the destruction of her people, and blames Enlil for the Flood; she swears by her necklace of lapis never to forget the days of the Flood. Enlil is enraged at the escape of some of mankind, and accuses Ea of having betrayed the secret of the gods. Ea appeases Enlil, and Enlil then declares that Utnapishtim and his wife shall be like the gods and live for ever at the mouth of the rivers. Here ends Utnapishtim's story of the Flood; he then goes on to tell Gilgamesh that his quest is hopeless, and shows him that he cannot even contend with sleep, how much less with death. The circumstances under which Utnapishtim had been granted immortality are unique and cannot be repeated.

751. Flood, a Babylonian Account of, in Gilgamesh Epic (Text) SOURCE: Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (2d. ed., 1954), pp. 1, 13–15, 80–88. Copyright 1949 by The University of Chicago. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 1] The Gilgamesh Epic, The longest and most beautiful Babylonian poem yet discovered in the mounds of the Tigro-Euphrates region, ranks among the great literary masterpieces of mankind. It is one of the principal heroic tales of antiquity and may well

be called the *Odyssey* of the Babylonians...

[p. 13] It has long been recognized that the Gilgamesh Epic constitutes a literary compilation of material from various originally unrelated sources, put together to form one grand, more or less harmonious, whole...

[p. 14] When this process of compilation began, and when the "first edition" of the Gilgamesh Epic appeared, cannot be stated with [p. 15] certainty. The tablets of the Ninevite recension, which forms the main base of our knowledge of the epic, date from

the reign of Ashurbanipal, i.e., from the seventh century B.C.; the fragment from the city of Ashur is probably two or three hundred years older; while the pieces discovered at Hattusas belong approximately to the middle of the second millennium B.C. The oldest portions of the epic are the Meissner fragment and the two tablets now in the museums of the University of Pennsylvania and Yale University; these tablets are inscribed in Old Babylonian and therefore go back to the First Babylonian Dynasty. But even these are probably copies of older originals... The date of the composition of the Gilgamesh Epic can therefore be fixed at about 2000 B.C. But the material contained on these tablets is undoubtedly much older, as we can infer from the mere fact that the epic consists of numerous originally independent episodes, which, of course, did not spring into existence at the time of the composition of our poem but must have been current long before they were compiled and woven together to form our epic...

- [p. 80; Extract from Tablet XI]:
- 8. Utnapishtim said to him, to Gilgamesh:
- 9. "Gilgamesh, I will reveal unto thee a hidden thing,
- 10. Namely, a secret of the gods will I tell thee.
- 11. Shurippak—a city which thou knowest,
- 12. [And which] is situated [on the bank of] the river Euphrates—
- 13. That city was (already) old, and the gods were in its midst.
- 14. (Now) their heart prompted the great gods [to] bring a deluge.
- 15. [There was (?)] Anu, their father;
- 16. Warlike Enlil, their counselor;
- 17. Ninurta, their representative;
- 18. Ennugi, their vizier;
- 19. Ninigiku, (that is,) Ea, also sat with them.
- 20. Their speech he repeated to a reed hut:
- 21. 'Reed hut, reed hut! Wall, wall!
 - [p. 81] 22. Reed hut, hearken! Wall, consider!
- 23. Man of Shurippak, son of Ubara-Tutu!
- 24. Tear down (thy) house, build a ship!
- 25. Abandon (thy) possessions, seek (to save) life!
- 26. Disregard (thy) goods, and save (thy) life!
- 27. [Cause to] go up into the ship the seed of all living creatures.
- 28. The ship which thou shalt build,
- 29. Its measurements shall be (proportionately)
- 30. Its width and its length shall be equal.
- 31. Cover it [li]ke the subterranean waters.'
- 32. When I understood this, I said to Ea, my lord:
- 33. '[Behold], my lord, what thou hast thus commanded,
- 34. [I] will honor (and) carry out.
- 35. [But what] shall I answer the city, the people, and the elders?'
- 36. Ea opened his mouth and said,
- 37. Speaking to me, his servant:
- 38. 'Thus shalt thou say to them:
- 39. [I have le]arned that Enlil hates me,
- 40. That I may no (longer) dwell in yo[ur ci]ty,

- 41. Nor turn my face to the land of Enlil.
- 42. [I will therefore g]o down to the *apsû* and dwell with Ea, my [lor]d.
- 43. [On] you he will (then) rain down plenty;
- 44. [... of b]irds (?), ... of fishes.
- 45. [...] harvest-wealth.
- 46. [In the evening the leader] of the storm(?)
 - [p. 82] 47. Will cause a wheat-rain to rain down upon you.'
- 48. As soon as [the first shimmer of mor]ning beamed forth,
- 49. The land was gathered [about me].
- 50.–53. (Too fragmentary for translation)
- 54. The child [brou]ght pitch,
- 55. (While) the strong brought [whatever else] was needful.
- 56. On the fifth day [I] laid its framework.
- 57. One $ik\hat{u}$ was its floor space, one hundred and twenty cubits each was the height of its walls;
- 58. One hundred and twenty cubits measured each side of its deck.
- 59. I 'laid the shape' of the outside (and) fashioned it.
- 60. Six (lower) decks I built into it,
- 61. (Thus) dividing (it) into seven (stories).
- 62. Its ground plan I divided into nine (sections).
- 63. I drove water-stoppers into it.
 - [p. 83] 64. I provided punting-poles and stored up a supply.
- 65. Six *shar* of pitch I poured into the furnace,
- 66. (And) three *shar* of asphalt [I poured] into it.
- 67. Three *shar* of oil the basket-carriers brought:
- 68. Besides a *shar* of oil which the saturation (?) (of the water-stoppers) consumed,
- 69. Two *shar* of oil [which] the boatman stowed away.
- 70. Bullocks I slaughtered for [the people];
- 71. Sheep I killed every day.
- 72. Must, red wine, oil, and white wine,
- 73. [I gave] the workmen [to drink] as if it were river water,
- 74. (So that) they made a feast as on New Year's Day.
- 75. I [...] ointment I put my hands.
- 76. [...] ... the ship was completed.
- 77. Difficult was [the ...].
- 78. ... above and below.
- 79. [...] ... its two-thirds.
- 80. [Whatever I had I] loaded aboard her.
- [p. 84] 81. Whatever I had of silver I loaded aboard her;
- 82. Whatever I [had] of gold I loaded aboard her;
- 83. Whatever I had of the seed of all living creatures [I loaded] aboard her.
- 84. After I had caused all my family and relations to go up into the ship,
- 85. I caused the game of the field, the beasts of the field, (and) all the craftsmen to go (into it).

- 86. Shamash set for me a definite time:
- 87. 'When the leader of the sto[rm(?)] causes a destructive rain to rain down in the evening,
- 88. Enter the ship and close thy door.'
- 89. That definite time arrived:
- 90. In the evening the leader of the sto[rm(?)] caused a destructive rain to rain down.
- 91. I viewed the appearance of the weather;
- 92. The weather was frightful to behold.
- 93. I entered the ship and closed my door.
- 94. For the navigation (?) of the ship to the boatman Puzur-Amurri
- 95. I intrusted the mighty structure with its goods.
- 96. As soon as the first shimmer of morning beamed forth,
- 97. A black cloud came up from out the horizon.
- 98. Adad thunders within it,
- 99. While Shullat and Hanish go before,
- 100. Coming as heralds over hill and plain;
- 101. Irragal pulls out the mooring posts;
- 102. Ninurta comes along (and) causes the dikes to give way;
- [p. 85] 103. The Anunnaki raised (their) torches,
- 104. Lighting up the land with their brightness;
- 105. The raging of Adad reached unto heaven
- 106. (And) turned into darkness all that was light.
- 107. [...] the land he broke (?) like a po[t (?)].
- 108. (For) one day the tem[pest blew].
- 109. Fast it blew and [...].
- 110. Like a battle [it ca]me over the p[eople].
- 111. No man could see his fellow.
- 112. The people could not be recognized from heaven.
- 113. (Even) the gods were terror-stricken at the deluge.
- 114. They fled (and) ascended to the heaven of Anu;
- 115. The gods cowered like dogs (and) crouched in distress (?).
- 116. Ishtar cried out like a woman in travail;
- 117. The lovely-voiced Lady of the g[ods] lamented:
- 118. 'In truth, the olden time has turned to clay,
- 119. Because I commanded evil in the assembly of the gods!
- 120. How could I command (such) evil in the assembly of the gods!
- 121. (How) could I command war to destroy my people,
- 122. (For) it is I who bring forth (these) my people!
- 123. Like the spawn of fish they (now) fill the sea!'
- 124. The Anunnaki-gods wept with her;
- 125. The gods sat bowed (and) weeping.
- 126. Covered were their lips ...
- 127. Six days and [six] nights
- 128. The wind blew, the downpour, the tempest, (and) the flo[od] overwhelmed the land.
- 129. When the seventh day arrived, the tempest, the flood,
- 130. Which had fought like an army, subsided in (its) onslaught.

[p. 86] 131. The sea grew quiet, the storm abated, the flood ceased.

- 135. I opened a window, and light fell upon my face.¹⁹² [Note 192: On the transposition of this line see Schott in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, XLII, 139–40.]
- 132. I looked upon the sea, (all) was silence,
- 133. And all mankind had turned to clay;
- 134. The ... was as level as a (flat) roof.
- 136. I bowed, sat down, and wept,
- 137. My tears running down over my face.
- 138. I looked in (all) directions for the boundaries of the sea.
- 139. At (a distance of) twelve (double-hours) there emerged a stretch of land.
- 140. On Mount Nisir the ship landed.
- 141. Mount Nisir held the ship fast and did not let (it) move.
- 142. One day, a second day Mount Nisir held the ship fast and did not let (it) move.
- 143. A third day, a fourth day Mount Nisir held the ship fast and did not let (it) move.
- 144. A fifth day, a sixth day Mount Nisir held the ship fast and did not let (it) move.
- 145. When the seventh day arrived,
- 146. I sent forth a dove and let (her) go.
- 147. The dove went away and came back to me;
- 148. There was no resting-place, and so she returned.
- 149. (Then) I sent forth a swallow and let (her) go.
- 150. The swallow went away and came back to me;
- 151. There was no resting-place, and so she returned.
- 152. (Then) I sent forth a raven and let (her) go.
- 153. The raven went away, and when she saw that the waters had abated, [p. 87] 154. She ate, she flew about, she cawed, (and) did not return.
- 155. (Then) I sent forth (everything) to the four winds and offered a sacrifice.
- 156. I poured out a libation on the peak of the mountain.
- 157. Seven and (yet) seven kettles I set up.
- 158. Under them I heaped up (sweet) cane, cedar, and myrtle.
- 159. The gods smelled the savor,
- 160. The gods smelled the sweet savor.
- 161. The gods gathered like flies over the sacrificer.
- 162. As soon as the great goddess arrived,
- 163. She lifted up the great jewels which Anu had made according to her wish:
- 164. 'O ye gods here present, as surely as I shall not forget the lapis lazuli on my neck,
- 165. I shall remember these days and shall not forget (them) ever!
- 166. Let the gods come near to the offering;
- 167. (But) Enlil shall not come near to the offering.
- 168. Because without reflection he brought on the deluge
- 169. And consigned my people to destruction!'
- 170. As soon as Enlil arrived
- 171. And saw the ship, Enlil was wroth;
- 172. He was filled with anger against the gods, the Igigi:
- 173. 'Has any of the mortals escaped? No man was to live through the destruction!'
- 174. Ninurta opened his mouth and said, speaking to warrior Enl[il]:
- 175. 'Who can plan things without Ea?

- 176. For Ea alone understands every matter.'
- 177. Ea opened his mouth and said, speaking to warrior Enlil:
- 178. 'O warrior, thou wisest among the gods!
- [p. 88] 179. How, O how couldst thou without reflection bring on (this) deluge?
- 180. On the sinner lay his sin; on the transgressor lay his transgression!
- 181. Let loose, that he shall not be cut off; pull tight, that he may not ge[t (too) loose].
- 182. Instead of thy sending a deluge, would that a lion had come and diminished mankind!
- 183. (Or) instead of thy sending a deluge, would that a wolf had come and dim[inished] mankind!
- 184. (Or) instead of thy sending a deluge, would that a famine had occurred and [destroyed] the land!
- 185. (Or) instead of thy sending a deluge, would that Irra had come and smitten mankind!
- 186. (Moreover,) it was not I who revealed the secret of the great gods;
- 187. (But) to Atrahasis I showed a dream, and so he learned the secret of the gods.
- 188. And now take counsel concerning him.'
- 189. Then Enlil went up into the ship.
- 190. He took my hand and caused me to go aboard.
- 191. He caused my wife to go aboard (and) to kneel down at my side.
- 192. Standing between us, he touched our foreheads and blessed us:
- 193. 'Hitherto Utnapishtim has been but a man;
- 194. But now Utnapishtim and his wife shall be like unto us gods.
- 195. In the distance, at the mouth of the rivers, Utnapishtim shall dwell!'
- 196. So they took me and caused me to dwell in the distance, at the mouth of the rivers."

752. Flood—Babylonian Accounts of

SOURCE: John Bright, "Has Archaeology Found Evidence of the Flood?" *BA*, 5 (December, 1942), 60, 61. Used by permission.

[p. 60] Most of the diverse traditions of a Deluge have come to us wholly independent of archaeology, collected chiefly through the labors of students of folklore and comparative religion. But our knowledge of the most important of all, the Babylonian (or more properly the Sumerian) we owe almost entirely to archaeology...

- 1. That the Babylonians had a story of the flood similar [*sic*] in its details to the Genesis story has been known since ancient times through the writings of Berossus. Berossus was a Babylonian of the third century B.C. who composed a history of his own country on the basis of records and traditions at his disposal. Although his actual work has not survived, fragments of it have been quoted in the writings of later Greek historians. Among these fragments is the Babylonian story of the Flood, in which the adventures of the hero, Xisuthrus, are closely parallel to those of the Biblical Noah.
- 2. It was not, however, until the English excavators at Nineveh in 1853 stumbled upon what turned out to be the palace and library of Asshurbanapal (king of Assyria in the seventh century B.C.) that an ancient version of the story was found. Among the many thousands of tablets of every description there was the Gilgamesh Epic, a long poem in

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

twelve tablets, one of which was the Babylonian story of the Deluge. The discovery of this tablet was first announced by George Smith in 1872 and created unprecedented excitement in the scholarly and religious world.

This story bears the closest resemblance, albeit with numerous differences in detail, to Gen. 6–9... [See Nos. 750, 751.] Another fragment of the same story, also found at Nineveh, differs in that the hero is called Atrakhasis.

[p. 61] 3. The above account presumably dates from the reign of Asshurbanapal (668–626 B.C.) and is thus considerably later than the oldest Hebrew version of the same narrative. But by the end of the last century the discovery of bits of several older versions had forced the conclusion that the text in Asshurbanapal's library was but a copy of much more ancient originals [see No. 750]...

How then did the Hebrews in Palestine get their Flood tradition? Two alternates present themselves. (1) They learned it form the Canaanites in Palestine, who, in turn, learned it from Mesopotamia [*sic*]. While this view has been generally held by scholars, it is becoming increasingly difficult. We now know a great deal about the early traditions of the Canaanites, and as far as we now know they had no tradition anything like this. (2) The second alternative now appears increasingly more probable—the ancestors of the Hebrews in Palestine brought the story with them when they migrated from Mesopotamia in the Patriarchal Age.

The story in Genesis 6–9 is thus but one among many, and is clearly related to yet older traditions. But the most significant thing about it is not its historical antecedents or its archaeological basis. Its actual significance lies in its religious outlook. In Genesis the Flood is not caused by mere chance or the whim of capricious, brawling gods. It is brought about by the One God in whose hands even natural catastrophe is a means of moral judgment. In the Biblical story alone is a relation between the Flood and the moral order of our world clearly drawn.

753. Flood, Babylonian and Hebrew Accounts of —Relationship SOURCE: Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (2d ed., 1954), pp. 267–269. Copyright 1949 by The University of Chicago. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 267] The arguments which have been advanced in support of the contention that the biblical account rests on Babylonian material are quite indecisive.

Finally, there is a third way of accounting for the analogies between the Hebrew and the Babylonian versions of the deluge, viz., that they revert to a common source of some kind. This source need not at all have sprung from Palestinian soil but may very well have originated in the land of Babylonia, where, indeed, the Book of Genesis localizes the home of postdiluvian mankind (11:1–9) and whence Abraham emigrated to Palestine (11:27–12:5). Such a source is a very distinct possibility, especially since we know that a number of different deluge versions were current in the Tigro-Euphrates area; but for the present, at least, this explanation can be proved as little as the rest...

[p. 268] As in the case of the creation stories, we still do not know how the biblical and Babylonian narratives of the deluge are related historically. The available evidence proves nothing beyond the point that there is a genetic relationship between Genesis and the Babylonian versions. The skeleton is the same in both cases, but the flesh and blood and, above all, the animating spirit are different. It is here that we meet the most farreaching divergences between the Hebrew and Mesopotamian stories. The main Babylonian flood legend, in particular, is "steeped in the silliest polytheism," to quote the words of Dillmann. The gods are divided in their counsel, false to one another and to man; they flee in consternation to the highest heaven and cower like dogs in their distress; they quarrel and lie and gather over the sacrificer like a swarm of hungry flies! In the Babylonian accounts the moral or ethical motive is almost completely absent... At any rate, in the Babylonian stories it is nowhere emphasized that the gods were actuated by moral ideals or that the flood was a divine visitation on human corruption. Rather, considering that the gods were intent on destroying the whole human race without discrimination between the just and the unjust, it is apparent that the gods were prompted more by caprice than by a sense of justice. It is true, the deluge hero was saved by a friendly deity because of his piety; but that was done clandestinely, through trickery, and against the decree of the gods in council.

In the biblical story, on the other hand, the flood is sent by [p. 269] the one omnipotent God, who is just in all his dealings with the children of men, who punishes the impenitent sinner, even if it means the destruction of the world, but who saves the just with his powerful hand and in his own way. In Genesis the deluge is clearly and unmistakably a moral judgment, a forceful illustration of divine justice meting out stern punishment to a "faithless and perverse generation" but delivering the righteous.

754. Flood, Babylonian Story of, and the Old Testament Differences SOURCE: Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (2d ed., 1954), pp. 224–230. Copyright by The University of Chicago. Reprinted by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 224] The most remarkable parallels between the Old Testament and the Gilgamesh Epic—in fact, the most remarkable parallels between the Old Testament and the entire corpus of cuneiform inscriptions from Mesopotamia—are found in the deluge accounts of the Babylonians and Assyrians, on the one hand, and the Hebrews, on the other. With the study of this material we therefore enter a field which, a priori, should prove most fruitful in our examination of the genetic relationship between the Mesopotamian records and our Old Testament literature. Here, if anywhere, we should expect to find evidence enabling us to decide the question whether any part of the Old Testament has been derived from Babylonian sources...

The Book of Genesis, consonant with Hebrew monotheism, attributes the sending of the deluge to the one and only true God recognized in the Old Testament, while the cuneiform tablets represent a multitude of divinities as engaged in bringing about this fearful catastrophe. In the Sumerian inscription from Nippur it is stated that the deluge was decreed by the assembly of the gods. But their decision, even though evidently approved by all, at least formally, did not receive the wholehearted support of all the divinities of the pantheon...

[p. 225] As the cause for the cataclysm, the Old Testament emphasizes the moral depravity of the human race. Man could have averted this unparalleled destruction of life if he had conformed his ways to the will of his Maker, but instead of that he followed his own inclinations. The whole bent of the thoughts of his heart was never anything but evil. The earth was corrupt before God and was filled with violence because of man, for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth (Gen. 6:1–13).

In the Gilgamesh Epic the reason for the deluge is not nearly so apparent as it is in the Book of Genesis. The opening lines of the flood story contained in the epic state simply that the heart of the great gods prompted them to bring a deluge (Tablet XI:14). From this passage one might get the impression that the flood was due to divine caprice. But

according to Ea's speech toward the close of the account, where he reprimands Enlil for this thoughtless and unjustifiable destruction, the flood was sent because of the sin of man...

[p. 226] In the Book of Genesis the deluge is a righteous retribution for the sins of the ungodly, while pious Noah and his family are spared, with the full knowledge and the express purpose of Him who sent the flood... But in the cuneiform inscriptions the destruction is intended for all alike, for the just as well as for the unjust, without any exception whatsoever... Had it not been for Ea's intervention, Enlil, in his rashness, would have destroyed [p. 227] all human and animal life without discrimination and thus would have defeated the very purpose for which, according to the Babylonian creation stories, mankind and the animals had been created, viz., to supply the wants of the gods.

Whether Enlil, like Jupiter in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (i. 250ff.), had planned a new creation of men after the deluge is not indicated in any of the Babylonian flood stories at our disposal. But, whatever may be said about the wisdom of Enlil's scheme, there was little justice in it...

[p. 228] The manner in which the impending cataclysm was announced to the deluge hero in the Babylonian stories differs widely from the way in which it was revealed to Old Testament Noah... [p. 229] Utnapishtim was not told expressly, in the Gilgamesh Epic, that a deluge would be sent in which all mankind was to perish, but he was told enough so that he could draw the necessary conclusions. This revelation was made not only without the knowledge of Enlil, the real author of the flood, but it was also quite contrary to his plan, according to which "no man was to live through the destruction" (Tablet XI:173).

In Genesis, on the other hand, Noah apparently received a direct communication; there is no indication that the will of God was conveyed to him through the medium of a dream. Furthermore, the disclosure was made by the Lord himself, and was therefore in [p. 230] full accord with his purpose. The God who caused the flood also saved his faithful servant by informing him of the approaching catastrophe and by ordering the building of an ark. However, all available accounts agree that the impending peril was divinely announced to the hero of the deluge.

The Period of Grace

According to Gen. 6:3, man was granted a period of grace extending over one hundred and twenty years, during which he had an opportunity to amend his sinful ways and to avert the threatened destruction (cf. 1 Pet. 3:20). There is no mention in the biblical text that the intended punishment was announced to Noah's contemporaries. But that this was done may be taken for granted; for, had it not been disclosed to mankind, there would have been little meaning in giving them a period of grace, particularly since they were apparently permitted to go unpunished during all this time. And since Noah was the only person who had found favor in the sight of God, it is an obvious conclusion that he was intrusted with the task of communicating the decision of God to his fellowmen (cf. II Pet. 2:5).

In the Gilgamesh Epic there was no thought of granting mankind an opportunity to repent. There the planned destruction of the human race was a zealously guarded secret of the gods. It was such an inviolable secret that even as great a divinity as Ea did not dare to communicate it directly to his favorite, Utnapishtim, but felt compelled to resort to a subterfuge, by warning the latter in a dream from which he could guess the contents

of the gods' decree. And when Utnapishtim, in his dream, inquired of his divine overlord what he should answer his fellow-citizens when asked about the purpose of the building and provisioning of the boat, Ea instructed him to deceive them, lest they should learn the truth and likewise escape.

755. Flood, Biblical and Babylonian Accounts of

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, Archaeology and the Old Testament, pp. 70, 71. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 70] Both the Hebrew and the Babylonian Account Go Back to a Common Source of Fact, Which Originated in an Actual Occurrence. This view seems clearly the correct explanation of the genetic affiliations between them. A. T. Clay's conclusion is significant:

Assyriologists, as far as I know, have generally dismissed as an impossibility the idea that there was a common Semitic tradition, which developed in Israel in one way, and in Babylonia in another. They have unreservedly declared that the Biblical stories have been borrowed from Babylonia, in which land they were indigenous. To me it has always seemed perfectly reasonable that both stories had a common origin among the Semites, some of whom entered Babylonia, while others carried their traditions into Palestine.⁶³ [Note 63 gives the source as A. T. Clay, *The Origin of Biblical Traditions. Yale Oriental Series*, XII (1923), p. 150.]

[p. 71] Archeological excavations have not only revealed that Mesopotamia had wellknown traditions of a universal flood, but evidence uncovered from Syrian-Palestinian sites and from the Amarna Letters show that when the Israelites entered Canaan they found people there in close touch with the Babylonian civilization out of which Abraham their progenitor came and using the Babylonian language and script is a lingua franca. The Hebrews scarcely lived an isolated life, and it would be strange indeed if they did not possess similar traditions as other Semitic nations.

These common traditions among the Hebrews are reflected in the true and authentic facts given them by divine inspiration in their sacred writings. Moses very likely was conversant with their traditions. If he was, inspiration enabled him to record them accurately, purged of all their crude polytheistic incrustations and to adapt them to the elevated framework of truth and pure monotheism. If he was not, the Spirit of God was able to give him the revelation of these events apart from the need of any oral or written sources. In either case supernatural inspiration was equally necessary, whether to purge the perverted polytheistic tradition and refine it to fit the mold of monotheism or to give an original revelation of the authentic facts apart from oral or written sources.

756. Flood, Extensive Traditions of SOURCE: John Bright, "Has Archaeology Found Evidence of the Flood?" *BA*, 5 (December, 1942), 56, 58, 59. Used by permission.

[p. 56] The Hebrews were by no means the only ancient people who preserved a tradition of a great Deluge. Indeed, such a story is to be found in a hundred varying forms in countries as far separated as Greece, Mesopotamia, India, Malaya, Polynesia, and the Western Hemisphere—where it is diffused from Tierra del Fuego (islands off the southern tip of South America) to the Arctic Circle. (A useful compilation of these stories is in Frazer's *Folklore in the Old Testament*, 1923. pp. 46–143.) No two of these accounts are alike in detail, and most of them bear but the faintest resemblance to Genesis 6–9. Yet common to most of them is the recollection of a great flood which in the ancient past covered all, or a great part of the earth, and in which all but a select few were drowned. These few it may be added, usually escaped in a boat or by taking refuge on a high mountain or in a tree. While some of the stories are no doubt exaggerations of local

catastrophes such as pluvial inundations, tidal waves and the like, and others perhaps false inferences from such phenomena as marine fossils found far from the sea, it is difficult to believe that so remarkable a coincidence of outline as exists between so many of these widely separated accounts can be accounted for in this way. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that many of them are recollections of a common event, or at least are diffused from a common tradition...

Have the excavations in ancient cities uncovered evidences of the flood?

[p. 58] ... The Mesopotamian flood strata, then, represent purely local inundations of the type which still occur when the Euphrates River bursts its banks.

We are at least able to conclude, then, that either Mesopotamian archaeology has yielded no trace of Noah's Flood, or else the Genesis narrative is but an exaggeration of a flood of purely local significance. But this latter alternative is difficult to hold in the light of the wide diffusion of the Flood tradition. Unless we are to explain the remarkable [p. 59] similarity between Flood stories from lands as far removed from one another as India and America on the basis of pure coincidence, some diffusion of tradition from a common original, or originals, must be assumed.

757. Flood—Fossils Buried by Violence in Moving Sediments SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, p. 275. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Fishes are found in profusion in the Devonian, often great sedimentary "graveyards," indicating violent deposition, and often in fresh-water deposits. It is obvious that fish do not normally die and become fossilized in such conditions as these but usually are either destroyed by scavengers or float on the surface until decomposed. The whole aspect of the fossil fish beds bespeaks violent burial in rapidly moving deltaic sediments.

758. Flood—Geological Facts Versus Interpretations of Them SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, p. 118. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The decision then must be faced: either the Biblical record of the Flood is false and must be rejected or else the system of historical geology which has seemed to discredit it is wrong and must be changed...

But this [latter] position need not mean at all that the actual observed data of geology are to be rejected. It is not the facsts of geology, but only certain interpretations of those facts, that are at variance with Scripture. These interpretations involve the principle of uniformity and evolution as a framework for the historical evaluation of the geological data. But, historical geology is only one of the many branches of geologic science.

759. Flood—Geological Uniformity or Catastrophe? SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, p. 137. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The claim is merely made that it is *possible* to interpret geology in terms of slow processes acting over long time periods—not that it is *necessary* to do so. One may, in fact, read at length in Lyell and in works of the other early uniformitarian geologists without finding more than essentially this claim. *Uniformitarianism, in other words, has simply been assumed, not proved. Catastrophism has simply been denied, not refuted.*

But as a matter of fact it is not even true that uniformity is a *possible* explanation for most of the earth's geologic formations, as any candid examination of the facts ought to reveal.

760. Flood—Not a Local Event in Mesopotamia

SOURCE: John Bright, "Has Archaeology Found Evidence of the Flood?" *BA*, 5 (December, 1942), 57, 58. Used by permission.

[p. 57] At Ur Woolley found a continuous occupation from the Early Dynastic back through the Obeid period. In the middle of the Obeid level he found a stratum of river mud or deposit some ten feet thick—conclusive proof that a deluge had interrupted the occupation of the place, at least temporarily, during the fourth millennium. Woolley is confident that he has here the evidence of Noah's flood (see, for example, his *Ur of The Chaldees*, 1929, p. 29) and his assurance is enthusiastically shared by most of the popular handbooks which deal with the subject.

(It may be of interest to point out also that Woolley seems to have dug some five pits in all down through the early strata of occupation at Ur, but in only two of them did he find evidence of the flood. The logical inference from such a situation is that the flood in question simply did not cover the whole city of Ur, but only a part of it. [p. 58] ... Therefore its importance as a historical catastrophe has been vastly over-emphasized by the excavator for reasons which are unfortunately all too obvious.—[Woolley's] Editor.)

Do any of these levels [at Ur and elsewhere] represent the Flood of Genesis 6–9? It would appear that the answer must be made in the negative. There are several reasons for this. (1) No two of the inundation levels as yet discovered can be dated in the same period (unless it be those at Ur and Nineveh, and even this is far from certain). (2) Further, all seem to be inundations of a purely local character. Sites nearby show no evidence of flooding at all... (3) It should also be noted that at Ur, at least, the levels both before and after the flood level were of the same general civilization. In other words there is no such break in the continuity of culture as would occur if a deluge of giant proportions wiped out an entire population. The Mesopotamian flood strata, then, represent purely local inundations of the type which still occur when the Euphrates River bursts its banks.

We are at least able to conclude, then, that either Mesopotamian archaeology has yielded no trace of Noah's Flood, or else the Genesis narrative is but an exaggeration of a flood of purely local significance. But this latter alternative is difficult to hold in the light of the wide diffusion of the Flood tradition.

761. Flood, Rocks Stratified by

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 258, 265. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 258] One thing seems absolutely certain, if the Biblical record of the Flood is true, as we strongly affirm it to be; the Noachian Deluge was a cataclysm of absolutely enormous scope and potency and must have accomplished an immense amount of geologic work during the year in which it prevailed over the earth. There seems no reasonable alternative to either rejecting the Bible account as of no historical value whatever or else acknowledging the fact that many of the earth's present rock strata must have been produced by the Flood ...

[p. 265] The picture then is of awesome proportions. The vast "waters above the firmament" poured forth through what are graphically represented in the Scriptures as the "floodgates of heaven," swelling the rivers and waterways and initiating the erosion and transportation of vast inland sediments. At the same time, waters and probably magmas were bursting up through the fractured fountains of the great subterranean deep. In the seas, these "fountains" not only belched forth their waters and volcanic materials, but the

corresponding earth displacements must have been continually generating powerful tsunamis ["tidal waves"].

This tremendous complex of forces, diastrophic and hydrodynamic, must beyond any question have profoundly altered the antediluvian topography and geology of the earth's crust. Powerful currents, of all directions and magnitudes and periods, must have been generated and made to function as agents of immense eroding, transporting, and depositional potency. Under the action of this combination of effects, almost any sort of deposit or depositional sequence becomes possible and plausible. An immense variety of sediments must finally have been the result, after the Flood had run its course.

762. Flood, Versus Uniformitarianism and Evolution. SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 328, 329. Copyright 1961 by

The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission. [p. 328] The Flood itself appears to have been due to a combination of meteorologic and tectonic phenomena. The "fountains of the great deep" emitted great quantities of juvenile water and magmatic materials, and the "waters above the firmament," probably an extensive thermal atmospheric blanket of water vapor, condensed and precipitated torrential rains for a period of forty days.

We realize that such a thorough reorganization of the geologic data raises many questions and must be subject to modification and revision in many details. Nevertheless, we believe that this type of analysis comes much more realistically to grips with all the basic data than does the commonly accepted theory of uniformitarianism.

But the latter theory will undoubtedly die hard, mainly because it is the chief bulwark of evolutionism, and evolution is the great "escape mechanism" of modern man. This is the pervasive philosophic principle by which man either consciously or sub-consciously seeks intellectual justification for escape from personal responsibility to his Creator and escape from the "way of the Cross" as the necessary and sufficient means of his personal redemption.

Numerous objections will, therefore, be raised to our exposition of Biblicalgeological catastrophism, most of them ostensibly on the basis that various types of deposits and geologic phenomena are difficult to reconcile with Biblical chronology...

[p. 329] The data actually at hand in such cases can be understood quite satisfactorily in terms of Biblical catastrophism. But, in the last analysis, it is likely that on questions so fundamental and basically emotional and spiritual as these, each man will continue to believe as he "wants" to believe. We can only show that those who want to believe the Bible can do so in full confidence that the actual data of geology are consistent with such a belief, even though the apparent weight of scholarly opinion for the past century has been on the side of those who want to believe otherwise.

763. Foot Washing, and Maundy Thursday

SOURCE: Paul Tschackert, "Foot-Washing," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 4, pp. 339, 340. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 339] *Foot-washing:* A religious ceremony practised at various times in different branches of the Church. The use of sandals among the Eastern natives required frequent washing of the feet, and to perform this office for others was considered a mark of hospitality. At the Last Supper Jesus washed the feet of his disciples (John xiii. 5–10) to indicate that he who was not purified by him had no part with him. The postapostolic age understood the example thus given to be mandatory. Augustine (*Epist. ad Januarium*)

testifies that it was followed on Maundy Thursday by the Church of his day. St. Bernard in his sermon *De coena Domini* recommends foot-washing as "a daily sacrament for the remission of sins." In the Greek Church also it was regarded as a "mystery." Yet it nowhere became a general, public, solemn, ecclesiastical act...

The Church of England at first carried out the letter of the command [evidently the "Mandatum," the washing of the feet of twelve men by a priest or bishop on Maundy Thursday]; but the practise afterward fell into disuse. The Anabaptists declared most decidedly in favor of foot-washing, appealing to John xiii. 14, and also to 1 Tim. v. 10, considering it as a sacrament instituted by Christ himself, "whereby our being washed by the blood of Christ and his example of deep humiliation is to be impressed upon us" (Confession of the United Baptists or Mennonites, 1660). The Moravians with the love-feasts revived also the foot-washing, yet without strictly enforcing it or confining it to Maundy Thursday. It was performed not only by the leaders toward their followers, but also by the latter among themselves, during the singing of a hymn explanatory of the symbol. This prac- [p. 340] tise was finally abolished by the Moravian Synod in 1818.

764. Foot Washing, Annual Observance of, in Holy Week SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), p. 195. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

The ancient rite of the *Mandatum*, the washing of the feet ... is prescribed by the rules of the Roman Missal...

From ancient times, all religious superiors, bishops, abbots, and prelates, performed the Maundy; so did the popes at all times. As early as 694 the Synod of Toledo prescribed the rite. Religious superiors of monasteries washed the feet of those subject to them, while the popes and bishops performed the ceremony on a number of clergy or laymen (usually twelve). In medieval times, and in some countries up to the present century, Christian emperors, kings, and lords washed the feet of old and poor men whom they afterward served at a meal and provided with appropriate alms.

In England, the kings used to wash the feet of as many men as they themselves were years old. After the Reformation, Queen Elizabeth I still adhered to the pious tradition; she is reported to have used a silver bowl of water scented with perfume when she washed the feet of poor women on Maundy Thursday. Today, all that is left of this custom in England is a distribution of silver coins by royal officials to as many poor persons as the monarch is years old.

765. Foot Washing, at Last Supper, Luther on

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, trans. and ed. by William Hazlitt (London: H. G. Bohn, 1857), p. 98. [FRS No. 44.]

The reason that Christ washed not his own, but his disciples' feet, whereas the highpriest in the law washed not others' but his own, was this: the high-priest in the law was unclean, and a sinner like other men, therefore he washed his own feet, and offered not only for the sins of the people, but also for his own. But our everlasting High-priest is holy, innocent, unstained, and separate from sin; therefore it was needless for him to wash his feet, but he washed and cleansed us, through his blood, from all our sins.

Moreover, by this his washing of feet he would show, that his new kingdom which he would establish should be no temporal and outward kingdom, where respect of persons was to be held, as in Moses' kingdom, one higher and greater than the other, but where one should serve another in humility, as he says: "He that is greatest among you, let him

be your servant;" which he himself showed by this example, as he says, John, xiii.: "If I your Lord and Master have washed your feet, then ought ye to wash one another's feet."

766. Foot Washing—Catholic Writer Recognizes Biblical Command SOURCE: John Milner, Letter 11, To James Brown, Esq., in his *The End of Religious Controversy in a Friendly Correspondence Between a Religious Society of Protestants, and a Roman Catholic Divine* (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1897), p. 90.

If any intelligent Pagan, who had carefully perused the New Testament, were asked, which of the ordinances mentioned in it, is most explicitly and strictly enjoined? I make no doubt but he would answer that it is, *The washing of feet*. To convince yourself of this, be pleased to read the first seventeen verses of St. John, c. xiii. Observe *the motive* assigned for Christ's performing the ceremony, there recorded; namely, his "love for his disciples:" next *the time* of his performing it; namely, when he was about to depart out of this world: then *the stress* he lays upon it, in what he said to Peter, *If I wash thee not thou hast no part, with me:* finally, *his injunction,* at the conclusion of it, *If I your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet*. I now ask, on what pretence can those who profess to make *Scripture alone* the rule of their religion, totally disregard this institution and precept? Had this ceremony been observed in the church when Luther and the other first Protestants began to dogmatize, there is no doubt but they would have retained it: but, having learnt from her that it was only figurative, they acquiesced in this decision, contrary to what appears to be the plain sense of Scripture.

767. Foot Washing, Zinzendorf on

SOURCE: A. G. Spangenberg, Leben des Herrn Nicolaus Ludwig Grafen und Herrn von

Zinzendorf und Pottendorf (Life of Lord Nicolaus Ludwig ... Zinzendorf), part 3, ([Barby]: [n.n.], 1772), chap. 3, sec. 8, pp. 548, 549. German.

[p. 548] Jesus washed the feet of His disciples and expressly said: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also ought to wash one another's feet," etc. He [Zinzendorf] took these words as they read, and was of the opinion that in a living church of Christ, foot washing could not rightfully be omitted... He was confirmed in this opinion by the excuses of certain separatistically inclined people who abstained from the Lord's Supper and, upon being reminded that it was established by Christ, he used to answer: "If all establishments originated by Him should be retained, why, then, not footwashing which the Lord commanded in plain words? ...

[p. 549] I have, as it is well known, introduced foot washing again; and it has been with me until this hour one of the most agreeable and respectable acts.

768. Forgeries and Interpolations, Ancient Complaints of

SOURCE: Rufinus, *Epilogue to Pamphilus the Martyr's Apology for Origen*, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 3, pp. 422, 426.

[p. 422] Whenever they [the heretics] found in any of the renowned writers of old days a discussion of those things which pertain to the glory of God so full and faithful that every believer could gain profit and instruction from it, they have not scrupled to infuse into their writings the poisonous taint of their own false doctrines; this they have done, either by inserting things which the writers had not said or by changing by interpolation what they had said, so that their own poisonous heresy might more easily be asserted and authorized by passing under the name of all the church writers of the greatest learning and renown; they meant it to appear that well-known and orthodox men

had held as they did. We hold the clearest proofs of this in the case of the Greek writers; and this adulteration of books is to be found in the case of many of the ancients; but it will suffice to adduce the testimony of a few...

[p. 426] Origen in his letter complains with his own voice that he has suffered such things at the hands of the heretics who wished him ill, and similar things have happened in the case of many other orthodox men among both the dead and the living, and ... in the cases adduced, men's writings are proved to have been tampered with in a similar way.

769. Forgeries and Interpolations—Ignatius' Epistles SOURCE: *Introductory Note* [from early Edinburgh edition] to *The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians,* in *ANF*, Vol. 1, pp. 46, 47.

[p. 46] The epistles ascribed to Ignatius have given rise to more controversy than any other documents connected with the primitive Church. As is evident to every reader on the very first glance at these writings, they contain numerous statements which bear on points of ecclesiastical order that have long divided the Christian world; and a strong temptation has thus been felt to allow some amount of prepossession to enter into the discussion of their authenticity or spuriousness. At the same time, this question has furnished a noble field for the display of learning and acuteness, and has, in the various forms under which it has been debated, given rise to not a few works of the very highest ability and scholarship. We shall present such an outline of the controversy as may enable the reader to understand its position at the present day.

There are, in all, fifteen Epistles which bear the name of Ignatius. These are the following: One to the Virgin Mary, two to the Apostle John, one to Mary of Cassobelae, one to the Tarsians, one to the Antiochians, one to Hero, a deacon of Antioch, one to the Philippians; one to the Ephesians, one to the Magnesians, one to the Trallians, one to the Romans, one to the Philadelphians, one to the Smyrnaeans, and one to Polycarp. The first three exist only in Latin: all the rest are extant also in Greek.

It is now the universal opinion of critics, that the first eight of these professedly Ignatian letters are spurious. They bear in themselves indubitable proofs of being the production of a later age than that in which Ignatius lived. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome makes the least reference to them; and they are now by common consent set aside as forgeries, which were at various dates, and to serve special purposes, put forth under the name of the celebrated Bishop of Antioch.

But after the question has been thus simplified, it still remains sufficiently complex. Of the seven Epistles which are acknowledged by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.*, iii. 36), we possess two Greek recensions, a shorter and a longer. It is plain that one or other of these exhibits a corrupt text, and [p. 47] scholars have for the most part agreed to accept the shorter form as representing the genuine letters of Ignatius...

But although the shorter form of the Ignatian letters had been generally accepted in preference to the longer, there was still a pretty prevalent opinion among scholars, that even it could not be regarded as absolutely free from interpolations, or as of undoubted authenticity.

770. Forgeries and Interpolations, Used as Authority

SOURCE: John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, "The Vatican Council," in his *History of Freedom and Other Essays*, ed. by John Neville Figgis and Reginald Vere Laurence (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909), p. 513. Used by permission.

The resources of mediaeval learning were too slender to preserve an authentic record of the growth and settlement of Catholic doctrine. Many writings of the Fathers were interpolated; others were unknown, and spurious matter was accepted in their place. Books bearing venerable names-Clement, Dionysius, Isidore-were forged for the purpose of supplying authorities for opinions that lacked the sanction of antiquity.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Certain patristic interpolations and forged documents contributed to the growth and acceptance of the exaggerated claims of the papacy. As a former Jesuit points out: "For instance, the Roman theologians for centuries appealed to the false decretals [see No. 884] and to the interpolated text of

St. Cyprian's De Unitate Ecclesiae as to authentic documents witnessing to the belief of the universal Church with regard to the Papacy, and the learned never dared call in question such momentous evidences, though on other and reasonable grounds well inclined to do so." (Giorgio Bartoli, The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910], p. 105).]

771. French Revolution—Calendar, Described

SOURCE: "French Republican Calendar," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1961 ed., Vol. 9, pp. 804, 803. Copyright 1961 by Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago. Used by permission.

[p. 804] By the new [French Republican] calendar the year of 365 days was divided into 12 months of 30 days each, every month being divided into three periods of ten days, each of which were called *decades*, and the tenth, or last, day of each decade being a day of rest... Five days of the 365 ... were set aside for national festivals and holidays and

were called *Sans-culottides*. They were to fall at the end of the year, *i.e.*, on the five days between Sept. 17 and 21 inclusive... [The extra leap-year day] was to be the last of the

Sans-culottides...

The republican ... [calendar] was officially discontinued on Jan. 1, 1806. [p. 803, Sections from Table:]

			An III 1794- 95
Ι		22 Sept.	1794
Vendeémiaire			
I Brumaire		22 Oct.	"
I Frimaire		21 Nov.	"
I Nivoése		21 Deéc.	"
I Pluvioése		20 Janv.	1795
I Ventoése		19 Feévr.	"
I Germinal		21 Mars	"
I Floreéal		20 Avr.	"
I Prairial		20 Mai	"
I Messidor		19 Juin	"
I Thermidor		19 Juil.	"
I Fructidor		18 Aouét	"
I Sans- culottides	17 Sept.	1795	
6 "		22 "	"
772. Fren	ch Revolution.—Calendar,	Establishment of	

SOURCE: Duvergier, trans. in John Hall Stewart, ed., *A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution*, pp. 508, 509, 511, 512 (Duvergier, v. 6, pp. 208, 209, 294–301). Copyright 1951 by The Macmillan Company and used with their permission.

[p. 508] Decree Establishing the French Era

5 October, 1793 (14 Vendémiaire, Year II) ...

[Translator's note:] The first serious step in revising the calendar was taken with the passing of the present decree, which should appeal to modern advocates of calendar reform. It represented an attempt to abolish a terminology and chronology associated with the Christian religion, to apply the decimal system to time calculations, and to inject further into the daily life of Frenchmen those principles of simplicity, order, and uniformity which were so characteristic of most of the revolutionary creations.

- *1.* The French era shall date from the establishment of the Republic on 22 September, 1792, of the common era, the day when the sun reached the true autumnal equinox ...
- 2. The common era is abolished for civil uses.
- *3.* The beginning of every year is established at midnight, beginning the day on which the true autumnal equinox falls for the Paris Observatory.
- [p. 509] 4. The first year of the French Republic began at midnight, 22 September, 1792, and ended at midnight, separating 21 from 22 September, 1793.
- 5. The second year began on 22 September, 1793, at midnight...
- 7. The year shall be divided into twelve equal months, of thirty days each, after which five days, not belonging to any month, follow to complete the ordinary year; such days shall be called *complementary days*.
- 8. Each and every month shall be divided into three equal parts, of ten days each, called *décades*, and distinguished from one another as first, second, and third...
- 11. The day, from midnight to midnight, shall be divided into ten parts or hours, each part into ten others, and so on up to the smallest commensurable portion of its duration. The present article shall be effective for public documents only from the first day of the first month of the third year of the Republic...

[p. 511] Decree Establishing the New Calendar

24 November, 1793 (4 Frimaire, Year II). ...

[Translator's note:] In this definitive decree, the work on the revolutionary calendar was completed. The first eight and the last six articles have been omitted here because they are identical with the corresponding articles of the decree of 5 October. The two articles and the instruction here reproduced are significant because they introduced the new terminology for the months and for the extra days at the end of the year...

The calendar lasted until 1806. Its ultimate failure may be ascribed partly to its antireligious character, partly to the fact that it reduced the number of days of rest in each month, but chiefly to the reluctance of the people to take the trouble to learn and use the new system. [Text of decree, p. 512]

9. The names of the days of the d,cade shall be *primidi*, *duodi*, *tridi*, *quartidi*, *quintidi*,

sextidi, septidi, octidi, nonidi, décadi.

The names of the months shall be for the Autumn, vendémiaire, brumaire, frimaire;

for the Winter, nivôse, pluviôse, ventôse; for the Spring, germinal, floréal, prairial; for

the Summer, messidor, thermidor, fructidor.

The last five days shall be called the *sans–culottides*.

10. The ordinary year shall receive one day more, as the position of the equinox necessitates, in order to maintain the coincidence of the civil year with the celestial

movements. Said day, called *day of the Revolution*, shall be placed at the end of the year, and shall constitute the sixth of the *sans–culottides*.

The period of four years, at the end of which such addition of a day is ordinarily necessary, shall be called *the franciade*, in memory of the Revolution which, after four years of effort, has guided France to republican government.

The fourth year of the *franciade* shall be called *sextile*.

773. French Revolution—"Dechristianization" Movement, 1793— Contemporary Account

SOURCE: E. L. Higgins, *The French Revolution as Told by Contemporaries* (Boston: Houghton, 1938), pp. 329, 330. Copyright 1938 by E. L. Higgins. Used by permission.

(Durand de Maillane [Histoire de la Convention nationale (Paris, 1825)], 181–182.)

[p. 329] The changing of the calendar was the prelude to the abolition of Christianity. The commune proposed this impious act to the Convention, and the Convention, becoming a party to it, decreed the replacement of the Catholic cult by the cult of Reason. This deplorable scandal, addresses in honor of atheism, and indecent abjurations, for the most part forced, figured in the official report sent to the authorities and to the armies. The poet Chénier composed a hymn in which, as a faithful disciple of Voltaire, he made open warfare upon the religion of Jesus Christ.

The Convention decreed the singing of Ch, nier's hymn in the metropolitan church, acclaiming the new Goddess of Reason. The rest of this hymn may be judged by the first strophe:

"Descends, ô Liberté fille de la nature.

Le peuple a reconquis son pouvoir immortel

Sur les pompeux débris de l'antique imposture;

Ses mains relèvent ton autel."

I failed to witness the more than scandalous scenes in the Church of Notre Dame, where an actress of the opera was worshipped as a divinity, and I must say that most of the members of the Convention refused to be present at this. A large number even stopped attending the Assembly after the Bishop of Paris was brought to the bar to declare that he was an impostor, that he had never been anything else, and that the people were rejecting Christianity. His example was followed by priests and Protestant ministers in the Convention, who mounted the tribune to abdicate their religious offices. Some of the deputies became so disgusted and indignant that they ceased to appear in this dishonored Convention. The Montagnards perceived their absence, however, [p. 330] and forced them to return. They were compelled to listen daily to the most scandalous addresses, and to the recital of profanations committed by the imitators of the commune in the departments.

774. French Revolution — "Dechristianization" Movement, 1793— Destruction of Religious Objects

SOURCE: Alphonse de Lamartine, History of the Girondists, Vol. 3 (New York: Harper, 1850), p. 298.

In La Vendée, the representatives Lequinio and Laigrelot persecuted even the wax merchants who furnished the candles for the ceremonies of worship. At Nantes large piles lighted upon the public place, burned the statues, images, and sacred books. Deputations of patriots came at each sitting of the Convention to bear as tribute the spoils of the altar. The towns and neighboring villages of Paris ran occasionally to bring also to the Convention, upon chariots, reliquaries of gold—mitres, chalices, pyx, patera, and chandeliers of their churches. Banners planted in this heap of spoils piled up in irregular masses were inscribed—*Destruction of fanaticism* The people were avenged by their power to insult what they had so long adored: confounding the Deity himself in their resentments against his worship.

775. French Revolution — "Dechristianization" Movement, 1793—Goddess of Reason

SOURCE: Alphonse de Lamartine, History of the Girondists, Vol. 3 (New York: Harper, 1850), pp. 298, 299.

[p. 298] The Commune [of Paris] desired to replace the ceremonies of religion by other spectacles, to which the people flocked as they do to all novel sights. The profanation of sacred places—the parody of mysteries—the *éclat* of pagan rites—were the attractions to these pomps. It was believed that after many ages there was now a sweeping out of these dark vaults, and that a flood of light, liberty, and reason was entering.

But sincerity of purpose was utterly wanting at these *fêtes*. There was no adoration at these meetings—no soul at these ceremonies. Religions do not spring up in the marketplace at the voice of legislators or demagogues. The religion of Chaumette and the Commune was merely a popular opera transferred from the theater to the tabernacle.

The inauguration of this worship took place at the Convention on the took place at the Convention on the 9th of November. Chaumette, accompanied by the members of the Commune, and escorted by a vast crowd, entered the apartment to the sounds of music and the chorus of patriotic hymns. He conducted by the hand one of the handsomest courtesans of Paris, the idol being half covered with a long blue vail... Lequinio presided.

Chaumette, advancing toward him, raised the vail which covered the courtesan, and her beauty striking the multitude, he exclaimed, "Mortals recognize no other divinity than Reason, of which I present to you the loveliest and purest [p. 299] personification."

776. French Revolution — "Dechristianization" Movement, 1793— Sacrilege at Lyon

SOURCE: Aimé Guillon de Montléon, *Histoire de la ville de Lyon pendant la révolution* ("History of the City of Lyon During the French Revolution") (Baudoin, Paris: 1824), Vol. 2 (Vol. 10 of Collection des Memoires relatives à la Évolution Française), pp. 346, 347. The second portion is taken from the translation in E. L. Higgins, *The French Revolution as Told by Contemporaries* (Boston: Houghton, 1938), p. 330. Copyright 1938 by E. L. Higgins. Used by permission.

[p. 346] Our proconsuls suppressed, beginning early at 8 o'clock, the vestiges of Catholic religion Lyon still adhered to in the rites of the clergy ... The cult of these priests was abolished; and the temples ... passed into the hands of most brazen ungodly. But Chalier's bust, crowned with flowers, was already set on a palanquin covered with the tricolor. Beside the bust were placed an urn, supposedly holding his ashes, and a pigeon with which he supposedly amused himself in his prison. Four Jacobins of Paris [p. 347] lifted the triumphal palanquin to their shoulders. A horde of clubmen and lewd women followed shouting: "Down with the aristocrats, long live the Republic, long live the guillotine" They were followed by a group of bandits carrying sacred vessels waving them in the air as drunk lewd women and enraged demons would do. Amid the throng was an ass dressed in a cope and wearing a mitre on his head and some other objects of the Catholic cult on his back; a crucifix, the Bible, and the gospel were attached to his tail...

[Higgins, p. 330] The infamous procession, preceded by warlike music, filed through the city and finally came to a halt at the Place des Terreaux before an altar of turf that had been prepared. The image and urn of Chalier were respectfully deposited; the audience knelt around about them in a circle; and the three representatives came forward one after another to kneel before the fetish and address to it in loud tones their individual invocations...

After these three orisons a brazier was lighted; the audience ceremoniously surrounded it; and the Gospel and crucifix were detached from the donkey's tail and thrown into the flames. The donkey was then given something to drink from the chalice, what, I do not know; and the wafers of the Host, which were said to have been consecrated, were trampled under foot.

777. French Revolution — Religious Restrictions Relaxed SOURCE: John Adolphus, *The History of France*, Vol. 2 (London: George Kearsley, 1803), pp. 316, 318, 319.

[p. 316] Religion also occupied a conspicuous share in the deliberations of the legislative bodies. The horrors experienced by catholic priests during the reign of terror were exchanged only for a more tranquil, though not less systematic, persecution under the system of philosophy. None of the laws which imposed oaths and declarations on professors of all persuasions, even on those whose tenets did not allow them to take an

oath, were repealed; but, instead of *noyades* and the *guillotine*, the fashionable penalties of *seclusion* and *deportation* were applied. As reporter of a committee, to which the revision of the laws respecting public worship and its ministers had been referred, Camille Jourdan made a most able and luminous statement [17th June] of the wrongs and oppressions to which an unoffending body of men had been subjected; and proved, that, under pretence of preserving freedom, the different legislatures had taken from all the adherents of the catholic faith the essentials requisite to freedom of worship; and he particularly instanced the laws for preventing the use of bells, as precluding the possibility of convoking the people in large districts, and depriving them of one integral part of that form of worship to which the majority of the nation were attached...

[p. 318] Dubruel [26th June] moved a resolution for repealing the laws which inflicted the penalty of deportation or seclusion on those priests who refused to take the oaths, and those which subjected to penalties all who harboured such priests...

[p. 319] Finally, laws were framed, in conformity to Dubruel's propositions. Priests were exempted from all obligatory forms, except a promise of submission to the government of the French republic.

778. Friday—Moslem Day of Worship, but Not of Rest (Koran on) SOURCE: *The Holy Qur-an*, Sūra lxii. 9–10, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 2, pp. 1547, 1548. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 1547] 9. O ye who believe
When the call is proclaimed
To prayer on Friday
(The Day of Assembly),
[p. 1548] Hasten earnestly to the Remembrance
Of God, and leave off
Business (and traffic).⁵⁴⁶²
That is best for you

If ye but knew 10. And when the Prayer Is finished, then may ye Disperse through the land, And seek of the Bounty Of God: and celebrate The Praises of God Often (and without stint):

That ye may prosper.

[Note 5462:] The idea behind the Muslim weekly "Day of Assembly" is different from that behind the Jewish Sabbath (Saturday) or the Christian Sunday. The Jewish Sabbath is primarily a commemoration of God's ending His work and resting on the seventh day (Gen. ii. 2; Exod. xx. 11: We are taught that God needs no rest, nor does He feel fatigue (ii 255). The Jewish command forbids work on that day but says nothing about worship or prayer (Exod. xx. 10); our ordinance lays chief stress on the remembrance of God. Jewish formalism went so far as to kill the spirit of the sabbath, and call forth the protest of Jesus: "the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" (Mark ii. 27). But the Christian Church, although it has changed the day from Saturday to Sunday, has inherited the Jewish spirit: witness the Scottish Sabbath; except in so far as it has been secularised. Our teaching says: 'When the time for Jumu'a Prayer comes, close your business and answer the summons loyally and earnestly, meet earnestly, pray, consult and learn by social contact: when the meeting is over, scatter and go about your business.'

[EDITORS' NOTE: Note 5462 is not part of the Koran; it represents simply the view of the translator.]

779. Friends (Quakers)

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 705–707.

[p. 705] *History*. The religious situation in England during the first half of the seventeenth century has been described as "a hurly-burly of religious polemics." The civil war, the unsatisfactory social and business conditions, the rival claims of the adherents of the different ecclesiastical forms and creeds, and the discussions as to the respective rights of pastors and people caused thoughtful men of the country to become utterly dissatisfied with church and state, and, indeed, with almost every existing institution.

It was in the midst of this period, in 1624, that George Fox was born, in Fenny Drayton, Leicestershire. He was a sober-minded serious youth, and early had his mind turned to religious matters. After severe mental and spiritual struggles, he was led to emphasize the spiritual side of Christianity. While external forms of religion were not ignored, he taught the necessity of divine power within the man to enable him to live according to the will of God, the direct communication of this will to the individual believer in Christ, and the necessity of a perfect consistency between the outward life and the religious profession. This was unfamiliar teaching to most persons in that day of rigid adherence to creeds and of great formalism in religious observances. Fox soon gathered around him a band of preachers who, with himself, spread their doctrines far and wide in Great Britain, and later extended their missionary efforts to Ireland, the Continent of Europe, the West Indies, and North America, in which countries, particularly America, they gained many adherents. It does not seem to have been their intention to establish a new branch of the church, but, almost before they knew it, an organization had developed.

At first they called themselves "Children of Truth" or "Children of Light," also "Friends of Truth," and finally the name which was given to them was the "Religious Society of Friends," to which was frequently added "commonly called Quakers." This last name was applied to them by a justice in response to an address, in which George Fox called on him to "tremble at the Word of the Lord."

[p. 706] Many of the extreme charges against them, as, for example, those with regard to the disturbance of public worship, were greatly exaggerated. At the same time their refusal to attend the services of the Established Church, to support it by the payment of tithes, or to take oaths of any kind, and their uncompromising attitude toward much of the religious preaching of the day created a great deal of bitterness against them and brought upon them severe persecution. Heavy fines were imposed upon them; their property was confiscated; and, worst of all, they were subjected to long imprisonments in the horrible jails of the time. Nevertheless, they increased in numbers, until by the close of the seventeenth century they were one of the most important bodies of dissenters in England.

With the cessation of persecution, about the beginning of the eighteenth century, the Friends relaxed their missionary zeal, paid more attention to the discipline of their members, and gradually settled down into a comparatively quiet existence. So far, however, was this discipline carried, in its minute supervision of the actions of members, that their numbers declined, and some have expressed a wonder that the society continued to exist at all. About the middle of the nineteenth century a new movement began, and since that time the great majority of the Friends have either dropped or modified many of the old customs and external forms.

The first recorded visit of any Quakers to America was that of two women, Ann Austin and Mary Fisher, who arrived in Massachusetts from the Barbados in 1656. They were immediately put under arrest, subjected to a brutal examination to see whether they were witches, and finally shipped back to Barbados. Two days after their departure a vessel arrived with eight more Quakers, and these were forcibly returned to England. Severe laws were enacted and heavy penalties provided for those who knowingly brought into the community that "cursed sect of heretics lately risen up in the world which are commonly called 'Quakers,' who take upon them to be immediately sent of God and infallibly assisted by the Spirit to speak and write blasphemous opinions, despising government and the order of God in church and commonwealth," etc. Notwithstanding these laws, the Quakers continued to come, and at last the situation improved, although it was not until 1724 that their appeals to the Royal Privy Council in England were sustained. A few years later laws were enacted in their favor.

The Friends had almost as trying an experience in Virginia as in Massachusetts, and they suffered certain persecutions in Connecticut. In Rhode Island, however, they were received more cordially and were held in high regard, several of the early Governors being members of the society. In New York, New Jersey, and Maryland there were many Friends. The culmination of their influence was reached in Pennsylvania, under the charter given to William Penn in return for a debt due by the Crown to his father, Admiral Penn.

The society continued to grow during the first half of the eighteenth century but drew more within itself in view of the general disturbances resulting from the colonial wars and the political situation, and Friends were discouraged from membership in the assembly or from holding any public office. These conditions led to the establishment, in 1756, of the first "meeting for sufferings" in America, whose object was to extend relief and assistance to members of the society who might suffer from the Indians or other enemies on the frontier, and in general to look out for the interests of the society. The relation of the Friends to the Indians was one of cordial interest, following the position taken not only by William Penn, but also by George Fox.

With regard to slavery, the early attitude of the Friends was one of toleration, although they insisted that the slaves should be treated humanely. A development, however, was inevitable, and in 1688 the German Friends, at a meeting in Germantown, Pa., protested against the "traffic in the bodies of men" and considered the question of the "lawfulness and unlawfulness of buying and keeping Negroes." The question continued to be agitated, and, chiefly through the efforts of John Woolman, in 1758, the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting directed a "visitation" of all who held slaves and decided that all who should "be concerned in importing, selling, or purchasing slaves" should be forbidden to sit in meetings held for deciding matters of discipline. In 1776 slaveholders were to be "disowned" if they refused to manumit their slaves, and by the close of the eighteenth century personal ownership of slaves by acknowledged members of the society had ceased, except where slaves were held by trustees and State laws did not allow them to be set free. In the transition, however, care was taken that feeble or incapable persons should not suffer.

In the disturbances that preceded the Revolution the Friends were in hearty sympathy with the desire of their fellow citizens to obtain redress of grievances, [p. 707] but since, from religious principle, they took no part in warlike measures, and refused to serve in the Army, or to pay taxes levied for warlike purposes, they were subjected to very great misapprehension and suffering, and their property was often seized to pay for recruits or for the meeting of taxes. Some, indeed, supported the Revolution actively. These were disowned or seceded and were known as the "Free" or "Fighting" Quakers. This small body soon dwindled away. After the close of the war the Friends loyally sustained the new government.

The early part of the nineteenth century was marked by divisions on doctrinal points, resulting in separations more or less serious. The most important of these was that popularly known as the "Hicksite" in 1827–28. This was followed by the "Wilburite" in 1845 and the "Primitive" a little later.

During the years following there was a period of considerable ministerial activity, ministers traveling up and down the country, visiting the congregations and holding meetings, to some extent, with the public.

As the slavery question came up more prominently the Friends appeared in the front rank of the antislavery forces, and their poet, John Greenleaf Whittier, did perhaps as much as anyone to make current the Quaker conception of Christianity. As the Civil War drew on, they endeavored to maintain their ground in favor of peace, although not a few members of the different branches were found in the Army. The close of the war brought relief, and a Peace Association of Friends in America was organized, which put lecturers into the field, issued tracts, and started a monthly publication, the Messenger of Peace. It is to be noted that the movement for international arbitration received perhaps its strongest impulse from the annual gatherings at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., under the auspices of a Friend.

During the past two or three decades, chiefly as a result of the Five Years Meeting, there has been a strong tendency toward greater unity of effort in the fields of home and foreign missions, Bible schools, education, evangelistic work, philanthropy, and social reform. This is true of all branches of the society. The relations to other bodies of

Christians have become closer, and Friends have joined with other churches in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and similar organizations.

Doctrine. The Orthodox Friends, who are by far the most numerous branch, [they were in 1936; see editors' note], have never adopted a formal creed. Their doctrine agrees in all essential points with the doctrine of the great body of the Christian Church, but they differ from other denominations in the following important respects: (1) The great importance attached to the immediate personal teaching of the Holy Spirit, or "Light Within," or "Inner Light"; (2) the absence of all outward ordinances, including baptism and the Supper, on the ground that they are not essential, were not commanded by Christ, and, moreover, tend to draw the soul away from the essential to the nonessential and formal; (3) the manner of worship and appointment of ministers; (4) the doctrine of peace or nonresistance, in accordance with which no Friend can consistently fight or directly support war.

Organization. The organization of the Society of Friends includes monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, each being a purely business organization. The monthly meeting is either a single congregation, or includes two or more congregations, called variously, weekly, local, or preparative meetings. The monthly meetings in a certain district combine to form a quarterly meeting, and the quarterly meetings in a wider territory constitute a yearly meeting.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This general statement for the Friends is given in the 1936 *CRB* under "Society of Friends (Orthodox)." However, there is not now any body of Friends identical with this group. There have been combinations and recombinations, and at the present time the largest two organizations are the Five Years Meeting of Friends, with a 1959 membership of 68,399, and the Religious Society of Friends (General Conference), with a 1958 membership of 31,473 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 54, 55, 255).]

780. Fundamentalism — Origin of Name

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 36. Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

"Fundamentalism" is an effort to reaffirm the fundamentals of the Christian faith, in vigorous reaction and protest against liberal theology. The name is taken from a series of twelve booklets entitled *The Fundamentals* of which about three million copies were distributed throughout the English-speaking world by two wealthy laymen, Milton and Lyman Stewart. The series constituted a popular defense of conservative Protestantism.

781. Fundamentalism, Sketch of

SOURCE: Bernhard W. Anderson, *Rediscovering the Bible* (New York: Association Press, 1951,) pp. 14–17. Copyright 1951 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 14] The reaction [to modernism] came in the form of a movement known as fundamentalism. Beginning during the period 1910–20 on an organized interdenominational basis, it was led by conservative Protestants who felt that "modernists" were "throwing out the baby with the bath" in their streamlining of the Christian faith. The historian will point out precedents for this movement in the sterile orthodoxy which set in shortly after the outburst of the Protestant Reformation, and in the decadent [p. 15] Calvinism which persisted in America, especially in rural areas, throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Fundamentalism as such, however, is a distinctly twentieth century phenomenon, and is properly regarded as essentially a reactionary protest against the excesses of the modernizing of the Bible. Precipitated by the crisis occasioned by the introduction of the theory of evolution, it was aimed at restoring and preserving the fundamentals of the Faith. The movement gained national and even international attention through the "heresy" investigation of Harry Emerson Fosdick in 1923, and the infamous Scopes "monkey" trial at Dayton, Tennessee, in 1925 where the anti-evolution case was championed eloquently by William Jennings Bryan. Even yet, fundamentalism is a powerful force in the American religious scene. Young people become familiar with crusading fundamentalism through the "Youth for Christ" movement or, on the college campus, through the "Inter-Varsity Fellowship."

The key "fundamental" of the faith, according to this group, is the inerrancy of Scripture. In the words of a representative statement, it is "an essential doctrine of the Word of God and our standards that the Holy Spirit did so inspire, guide, and move the writers of the Holy Scripture as to keep them from error." This means that the words of the Bible are the very words of God himself. The writers of the Bible were mere passive secretaries who mechanically transcribed the divine words, these words being the media for conveying the thoughts of the Infinite Intelligence who knows everything past, present, and future. Because God is literally the author of Holy Scripture, the whole Bible "from cover to cover" is held to be absolutely infallible…

[p. 16] To the credit of fundamentalism it should be said that these [p. 17] conservative Christians have been sincere and devout in their attempt to defend the fundamentals of Christianity behind a Maginot line of biblical literalism. As we have observed, liberalism tended to veer away from the main stream of evangelical Christianity and to become a "modernism" carried along by the current of secularism. Thus one may say that fundamentalists, in their dogmatic way, have been making a valid protest against a secularized Christianity which failed to remember Paul's advice: "Be not conformed to this world..." The protest, however, has had little effect on the real frontiers of theological thinking.

782. Fundamentalism, Viewed as a Failure in Contest With Modernism SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Theological Education," *Bulletin of Fuller Theological Seminary*, 4 (Oct., Nov., Dec., 1954), 4. Used by permission of the author.

For decades fundamentalism has proved itself impotent to change the theological and ecclesiastical scene. Its lack of influence has relegated it to the peripheral and subsidiary movements of Protestantism. Wherever fundamentalism and modernism came into test in theological struggle, fundamentalism lost every major battle in the historical field. It has demonstrated little power to crack the social situation challenging the church today. The motivating loyalty to fundamentalism on the part of many Christians lies in its orthodoxy, its faithfulness to the Word of God. However, the judgment of history on fundamentalism is that it has failed.

783. Fundamentalists, Believe in Second Advent

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 59, 60. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 59] Those who "love His appearing" should close ranks and stand together on the great fundamentals of the Word of God. A monument to American Fundamentalism is the series of twelve small volumes, published in 1909–11, financed by two laymen and sent to every Protestant minister in America. The purpose of *The Fundamentals* was to unite those who stood squarely on the fundamentals of the faith and to make a powerful

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

statement in face of the inroads of liberalism. Included in the circle of defenders of the faith were not only dispensationalists like R. A. Torrey, A. T. Pierson, J. M. Gray, C. I. Scofield and A. C. Gaebelein, but non-dispensationalists like W. G. Moorehead, W. J. Erdman, H. W., Frost and C. R. Eerdman, and even postmillennialists James Orr, B. B. Warfield, and E. Y. Mullins. Why can such unity not be demonstrated today?

Ten years later, the Fundamentalist movement within the Northern Baptist Convention was organized. Describing the first Fundamentalist convention held in Buffalo in 1920, Curtis Lee Laws wrote, "The movement ... was in no sense of premillennialist movement, but in every sense a [p. 60] conservative movement. Premillennialists were much in evidence because premillennialists are always sound on the fundamentals, but eschatological questions did not enter into any of the Buffalo controversies. Standing solidly together in the battle for the re-enthronement of the fundamentals of our holy faith were premillenialists, postmillennialists, premillennialists and nomillenialists. Fortunately the conservative group contains no one who repudiates the blessed doctrine of the second coming of our Lord, but the group does contain those who differ radically with one another concerning the whole millennial question."

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

784. Galileo, The Decree Concerning Teaching of

SOURCE: George Salmon, *The Infallibility of the Church* (New York: Dutton, 1914), pp. 235, 236. Used by permission of E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York, and John Murray, Ltd., London.

[p. 235] By order of the Holy Office, Cardinal Bellarmine summoned ... [Galileo] before him, and admonished him in the name of the Pope and of the Holy Office, under pain of imprisonment, that he must give up the opinion that the sun is the centre of the world and immoveable, and that the earth moves, and must not hold, teach it, or defend it either by word or writing; otherwise proceedings would be taken against him in the Holy Office. Galileo submitted, and promised to obey.

But it was not enough that Galileo should be personally [p. 236] warned against holding the heliocentric theory of the universe; the whole world must be similarly instructed; and this was done by another tribunal. On March 5th, 1616, the Congregation of the Index, a Committee of Cardinals appointed by the Pope for the prevention of the circulation of dangerous books, published the following decree:—

'Since it has come to the knowledge of this Holy Congregation that the false Pythagorean doctrine, altogether opposed to the Divine Scriptures, of the mobility of the earth, and the immobility of the sun which Nicolas Copernicus, in his work, *De*

revolutionibus orbium caelestium [On the Motions of the Heavenly Bodies], and Didacus a Stunica, in his Commentary on Job, teach, is being promulgated and accepted by many, as may be seen from a printed letter of a certain Carmelite Father (Foscarini), entitled, et cetera, wherein the said Father has attempted to show that the said doctrine is consonant to truth, and not opposed to Holy Scripture; therefore, lest this opinion insinuate itself further to the damage of Catholic truth, this Congregation has decreed that

the said books, Copernicus' *De revolutionibus*, and Stunica on Job, be suspended till they are corrected, but that the book of Foscarini the Carmelite be altogether prohibited and condemned, and all other books that teach the same thing.'

785. Gnosticism, Definition of

SOURCE: Edwyn Bevan, *Later Greek Religion* (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1950), p. 183. Used by permission of J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., London.

The name "Gnosticism" is given to all those different theories of the universe which professed to be Christian, but amalgamated elements of Christian belief with Hellenistic ideas regarding an intermediate world of superhuman beings between the Supreme One and men, and regarding the human soul as a part of the Divine which had fallen into the dark and evil world of Matter. Each Gnostic sect claimed to have a special "knowledge"

(*gnōsis*) to communicate, by which the Soul could get deliverance from matter and win its way back to the Upper World. Most of the Gnostics were strongly anti-Jewish, and represented the God of the Old Testament as an inferior Being, often a Being hostile to the Supreme God, ruling in the lower world, from which "knowledge" enabled the Soul to escape. Valentinus, probably an Egyptian Greek, set up a school in Rome about 140: amongst the various forms of Gnosticism, his system is one of those which incorporated most of the Greek philosophical tradition.

786. Greece, Alexander as Representative of

SOURCE: J. B. Bury, A History of Greece (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1902), Vol. 2, p. 330.

The Congress of the Confederacy met at Corinth to elect Alexander general in his father's place.

Alexander was chosen supreme general of the Greeks for the invasion of Asia; and it was as head of Hellas, descendant and successor of Achilles, rather than as Macedonian king, that he desired to go forth against Persia... The welcome ... and the vote, however perfunctory, which elected him leader of the Greeks, were the fitting prelude to the expansion of Hellas and the diffusion of Hellenic civilisation, which destiny had chosen him to accomplish. He was thus formally recognized as what he in fullest verity was, the representative of Greece.

787. Greece, Empire of, Under Alexander

SOURCE: Appian *Roman History*, Preface, sec. 10; translated by Horace White, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), p. 15. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

The empire of Alexander was splendid in its magnitude, in its armies, in the success and rapidity of his conquests, and it wanted little of being boundless and unexampled, yet in its shortness of duration it was like a brilliant flash of lightning. Although broken into several satrapies even the parts were splendid.

[EDITORS' NOTE: It should be noted that the "Greece" (KJV "Grecia") of Daniel 8, the world power that conquered and replaced Persia, was not the classic Greece of the golden age of Athens, nor even a kingdom ruled by Greece. The glory of this kingdom had passed, and the independent Greek states had fallen under the rule of the neighboring Macedonian king Philip, prior to Alexander the Great's conquest of Persia and establishment of a Greco-Macedonian-Oriental empire. However, this empire was Greek in character because the Greek-educated Alexander of Macedonia brought to the East, along with his Greek and Macedonian settlers the Greek language and culture. To the Jews, therefore, the Greco-Macedonian ruling class and the Hellenized natives were "Greeks," and the whole Hellenistic world was a Greek empire.]

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

788. Habiru, and the Hebrews

SOURCE: Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1954), pp. 17, 18. Copyright 1954 by Cornell University. Used by permission.

[p. 17] It would seem that at about 2000 B.C. there arose a term Habiru [or Hapiru, SA.GAZ, Apiru] as a name for various unsettled groups of people, Semitic and non-Semitic, chiefly the former. They wandered about as seminomads from one area to another, sometimes with their own flocks and sometimes as skilled craftsmen, as smiths, musicians, and the like. At other times they made sudden raids on caravans and on weak, outlying communities, or else hired themselves out for specific functions and periods of time, for example, as mercenaries and as private or government slaves... [p. 18] Some of the Habiru settled down in conquered towns and regions and ceased to wander.

There appears to be good reason for associating the Biblical Hebrews with some of these far-flung Habiru. The Biblical account places the career of the Hebrews within the general orbit of the activities of some of the Habiru groups in the different lands of the Near East and in the different epochs of the second millennium B.C.; this can scarcely be merely a series of many remarkable coincidences. [See *SDADic*, "Hebrew."]

789. Halloween, Origin of

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 315, 316. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 315] DRUIDIC ELEMENT. Unlike the familiar observance of All Souls, Halloween traditions have never been connected with Christian religious celebrations of any kind. Although the name is taken from a great Christian feast (Allhallows' Eve), it has nothing in common with the Feast of All Saints, and is, instead, a tradition of pre-Christian times that has retained its original character in form and meaning.

Halloween customs are traced back to the ancient Druids... Halloween fires are kindled in many places even now, especially in Wales and Scotland.

Another, and more important, tradition is the Druidic belief that during the night of November 1 demons, witches, and evil spirits roamed the earth in wild and furious gambols of joy to greet the arrival of "their season"—the long nights and early dark of the winter months. They had their fun with the poor mortals that night, frightening, harming them, and playing all kinds of mean tricks. The only way, it seemed, for scared humans to escape the persecution of the demons was to offer them things they liked, especially dainty food and sweets. Or, in order to escape the fury of these horrible creatures, a human could disguise himself as one of them and join in their roaming. In this way they would take him for one of their own and he would not be bothered. That is what people did in ancient times, and it is in this very form the custom has come down to us, practically unaltered, as our familiar Halloween celebration: ...

[p. 316] ROMAN ELEMENT. In those countries that once belonged to the Roman Empire there is the custom of eating or giving away fruit, especially apples, on Halloween. It spread to neighboring countries: to Ireland and Scotland from Britain, and to the Slavic countries from Austria. It is probably based upon a celebration of the Roman goddess Pomona, to whom gardens and orchards were dedicated. Since the annual Feast of Pomona was held on November 1, the relics of that observance became part of our Halloween celebration, for instance the familiar tradition of "ducking" for apples.

790. Healing, Faith—Gift Believed to Reside in Certain Individuals

SOURCE: Will Oursler, "Faith Healing—Miracle or Myth?" *Christian Herald*, 84 (January, 1961), 49. Copyright 1960 by Christian Herald Association, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The gift of healing does appear to reside in certain individuals. But it does not appear to be the decisive factor in healing therapies of the religious type. For religious healings also occur at shrines, in hospitals, in regular church services, in special healing services, in private sessions between a minister and one of the congregation.

791. Healing, Faith, Medical Profession on

SOURCE: Editorial, "The Faith Healer," *JAMA*, 160 (Jan. 28, 1956), 292. Copyright 1956 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

The medical profession recognizes the power of faith on the individual mind as a factor that may affect the condition of sick people. It also recognizes the fact that "faith healing," as such, has no accepted merit whereby it can be regarded as having remedial or curative effect in persons who are actually victims of organic disease...

There have been reported in the medical literature evaluations of "faith healing," and the medical attitude is that such healing is perhaps a part of religious tradition, particularly in the United States, where there has been a wide variety of religious cults whose leaders claimed special healing abilities. These reports refer particularly to those individuals, frequently itinerants, who exhort, pray, and practice "laying on of hands." They have also been designated as "divine healers." These persons are able to interest others, and may, in cases where no organic disease exists, influence the thinking of many lay individuals to such an extent that they believe they have had curative ministrations.

From a public health standpoint, it is known that such faith healers often display a woeful ignorance of public health measures. Diseased persons mingle in crowds in tents and other public meeting places and may very easily upset careful scientific efforts to suppress the spread of contagion or infection by accepted public health measures. The further danger exists that persons whose physical condition demands prompt and adequate scientific medical attention may, by delay or abandonment of such care, contribute to their needless early death.

792. Healing, Faith, a Possible Explanation for Certain Alleged Cases SOURCE: Berton Roueché, "Annals of Medicine: Placebo," *The New Yorker*, 36 (Oct. 15, 1960), 91, 92, 103. Used by permission.

[p. 91] That the placebo effect exists is clear beyond dispute. It owes nothing to the imagination but its origin. Its reality has been abundantly demonstrated by the many double-blind control experiments whose results are now on record. So, almost as abundantly, has its range. The palliative powers with which suggestion can invest the placebo are extraordinarily broad. Their reach surpasses that of the powers inherent in the great majority of genuinely robust drugs. It extends (at least potentially) throughout the spectrum of psychophysiological distress...

[p. 92] Physical pain, as well as mental anguish, is amenable to placebo therapy. Its susceptibility has been established by numerous double-blind investigations.

[p. 103] A third, and crucial, factor involved in the placebo effect is the nature of the patient. "There are personality characteristics and habits of mind which predispose a person to respond to a placebo," Louis Lasagna, professor of clinical pharmacology and medicine at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, has noted. "The psychological predisposition to respond is probably present in varying degrees in all of us. But some persons are very likely to respond positively in a wide variety of situations. Others will almost never respond, whatever the situation." In Lasagna's opinion, which is

shared by most investigators in the field, the traits that distinguish the former group have a strong neurotic cast. The people most receptive to the magnetic pull of faith tend to be "emotionally expressive and to speak freely, most frequently of themselves and their problems." They exhibit "somatic symptoms (nervous stomach, diarrhea, headache) during periods of stress," and are habitual consumers of cathartics and aspirin. They are "anxious, self-centered, and emotionally labile." Few of them are college graduates, and most are regular churchgoers. Such factors as sex and age appear to be irrelevant. So does intelligence. The trait that chiefly distinguishes those who seldom respond to the placebo is emotional stability. That and sophistication.

793. Healing, Faith, True and False

SOURCE: "Near Life, Near Death, Near God," *JAMA*, 163 (April 13, 1957), 1361. Copyright 1957 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

"Faith healing" grew up alongside medical practice in its oldest and crudest forms, when it was thought that evil spirits caused disease. Even today, hundreds of medical missionaries in scattered parts of the primitive world are trying to show ever-increasing numbers of natives that faith in God and in modern medicine is better than mumbo-jumbo reliance on pagan healing rites...

While they may recognize that faith is an element in the well-being of all people, ethical ministers and physicians are firmly allied against the "fake healers," whose huge fund-raising exhibitions exploit the superstitious wishful thinking of the ill-informed and misinformed. For six years, a Presbyterian minister from Atlanta, Ga., Rev. Carroll Stegall Jr., has interviewed scores of invalids before and after they lined up at healing campaigns. He says: "I have never seen a vestige of physical change." So far not a single "healer" has submitted one of his "cures" to medical examination. And yet the flamboyant cultists are collecting millions from elaborate radio, television and tent performances.

794. Healing, Religious — held as Being No Respecter of

Denominations

SOURCE: Will Oursler, "Faith Healing—Miracle or Myth?" *Christian Herald*, 84 (January, 1961), 11. Copyright 1960 by Christian Herald Association, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

Religious healing—in its actual results—is no respecter of denominations or dogmatic differences. It cuts across theological lines and doctrines to reach the individual, whatever his need, who appeals to God for help. All the evidence I have been able to piece together in five years of research indicates that this is the fact we must face.

795. Health and Disease—as Concerned With the Whole Man SOURCE: William S. Reed, "Medical Opinion," *Christian Herald*, 84 (January, 1961), 13. Copyright 1960 by Christian Herald Association, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

No physician seeks simply to concentrate upon the disease entity which presents itself, involving one organ or one organ system. In recent years it has been found that all organic diseases have their psychological implications. It is also true that there is no illness without its concomitant spiritual aspect. Just as there are illnesses which are basically psychological with their organic manifestations, there are also spiritual illnesses which have psychologic and organic attributes. Thus if a physician is to be a doctor of the whole man he cannot ignore the soul of the patient if he would practice enlightened medicine.

796. Health and Disease—Both Body and Spirit Needs Are Significant

SOURCE: Thurman B. Rice and Fred. V. Hein, *Living* (rev. ed.), p. 3. Copyright 1954 by Scott, Foresman and Company, Chicago. Used by permission.

Once the needs of the body were looked upon as base and low compared with the needs of the spirit. The early Christians, in attempting to turn away from the Greco-Roman worship of physical beauty and strength, succeeded too well and established the doctrine that the needs and comforts of the body were quite insignificant, whereas the needs of the spirit were all-important. They failed to visualize the body as the temple of the spirit and to realize that both are vital and precious.

797. Health and Disease—Clear Conscience a Barricade Against Neuroticism

SOURCE: William S. Sadler, *Practice of Psychiatry*, pp. 1012, 1013. Copyright 1953 by The C. V. Mosby Company, St. Louis. Used by permission of the publisher and the author.

[p. 1012] Prayer is a powerful and effectual worry-remover. Men and women who have learned to pray with [p. 1013] childlike sincerity, literally talking to, and communing with, the Heavenly Father, are in possession of the great secret whereby they can cast all their care upon God, "knowing that He careth for us." A clear conscience is a great step toward barricading the mind against neuroticism.

798. Health and Disease—Effect of Acceptance of Principles and Teachings of Christ

SOURCE: William S. Sadler, *Practice of Psychiatry*, p. 1008. Copyright 1953 by The C. V. Mosby Company, St. Louis. Used by permission of the publisher and the author.

No one can appreciate so fully as a doctor the amazingly large percentage of human disease and suffering which is directly traceable to worry, fear, conflict, immorality, dissipation, and ignorance—to unwholesome thinking and unclean living. *The sincere acceptance of the principles and teachings of Christ with respect to the life of mental peace and joy, the life of unselfish thought and clean living, would at once wipe out more than one half the difficulties, diseases, and sorrows of the human race.*

799. Health and Disease—Effect of Worry, Anxiety, Tension SOURCE: Thurman B. Rice and Fred. V. Hein, *Living* (rev. ed.), p. 151. Copyright 1954 by Scott, Foresman and Company, Chicago. Used by permission.

When chronic fatigue is coupled with worry, anxiety, and tension, it appears to be a factor in deterioration of the heart, blood vessels, and kidneys.

800. Health and Disease—Exercise—"American Male Is Soft" SOURCE: Paul Dudley White, "Exercise" Interview in *U.S. News & World Report,* 43 (Aug. 23, 1957), 54. Copyright 1957 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington.

... Q Generally, when a person reaches middle age, isn't it time for him to start assessing his exercise as to whether he's getting enough or too much of it?

A Very few middle-aged people in this country today are getting too much exercise. It looks as if we've gotten into lazy ways with all our push-button devices and automobiles and so on, so that generally the middle-aged American male today is soft. That may be a factor in the production of some of his diseases.

Q Do you think that there is growing interest in this subject of exercise, especially for older people?

A I think that people are beginning to realize, in general, that they've gone too far in omitting exercise. It was common for our ancestors—just one or two generations back—to take a lot of exercise routinely in their lives. They thought nothing of walking five or

10 miles, or of cycling 25 or 50 miles, or of working hard on the farm all day, or of going into the woods and working for hours cutting down trees.

That was more or less the routine life, and all of a sudden, in one generation, has come this rather abrupt change...

801. Health and Disease—Exercise and Coronary Heart Disease SOURCE: R. G. Brown and others, "Coronary-Artery Disease," *The Lancet*, [273] (Nov. 30, 1957), 1077. Used by permission.

The prevalence [of coronary disease in an experimental group] seemed to be unrelated to the mental demands of the men's occupation... It was fairly closely related to the physical demands of occupation, being highest for men in sedentary work. The Association between prevalence and physical demands of work was most evident among men in professional and related occupations.

802. Health and Disease—Exercise and Heart Disease

SOURCE: Report of the Study Group on Atherosclerosis and Ischaemic Heart Disease (World Health Organization Technical Report Series, No. 117. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1957), p. 18. Used by permission.

It has been suggested that the apparent rise in some countries in the frequency of ischaemic heart disease among young and middle-aged men may be related to ... reduction in the average level of physical activity.

803. Health and Disease—Exercise, Benefits of

SOURCE: Paul Dudley White, "Exercise" Interview in U.S. News & World Report, 43 (Aug. 23, 1957), 51. Copyright 1957 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington.

... Q Is exercise important for everyone?

A I have thought of it as being as important as many other things that we do, such as eating, sleeping, working.

Q It's a normal part of a man's life, then?

A It's perfectly normal and probably improves one's health, but I'm quite sure that people vary very much in their need of exercise. It's quite possible that some people may go through life with very little exercise and still be healthy, but nature intended the muscles to be used and such use does improve the circulation and the digestion and the mental state, and quite possibly may help to prevent certain ills or reduce the tendency to them. But that's for research to determine...

[EDITORS' NOTE: In a statement by Dr. White and others representing The American Society for the Study of Arteriosclerosis it is pointed out that arteriosclerosis is often mistakenly attributed to hard work, but that the hazards of this ailment seem rather to be decreased by regular moderate physical activity (*A Statement on Arteriosclerosis, Main Cause of "Heart Attacks" and "Strokes";* New York: National Health Education Committee, Inc.). Further it has been suggested that there is significance in the statistics showing that mortality rates from coronary disease are two to three times higher among persons with light physical activity than among those with heavy physical activity. (S. L. Morrison, "Occupational Mortality in Scotland," *British Journal of Industrial Medicine,* 14 [April, 1957], 130).]

804. Health and Disease — Exercise, Mental Worker's Need of SOURCE: Paul Dudley White, "Exercise" Interview in *U.S. News & World Report*, 43 (Aug. 23, 1957), 50. Copyright 1957 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington.

Q Dr. White, do you think there's any increase in interest in the subject of exercise as a result of President Eisenhower's illness and his subsequent return to playing golf?

A There are a lot of groups in the country who have been intent for a long time in getting the American people back on their feet again. Among them are those interested in cycling, as one example. This isn't wholly a revival as a result of the President's illness.

That has, of course, highlighted it somewhat, and the fact that he has been able to resume golf has pleased the golfers. It has pleased everyone who is an advocate of exercise.

I don't know whether some people have ever had the remarkably pleasant experience of relaxing fatigue after hard exercise, which I think is a very important benefit for one's health. And it's time that we recognize the usefulness of that relationship to exercise not just the exercise for exercise's sake, but the beneficial effects that may come especially to a mental worker. I think that probably those who are constantly intent mentally need more physical relaxation of that sort than those who have a certain amount of walking to do in their routine work...

805. Health and Disease — Exercise of Our Ancestors

SOURCE: Paul Dudley White, "Exercise," Interview in U.S. News & World Report, 43 (Aug. 23, 1957), 52, 53. Copyright 1957 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington.

[p. 52] ... Q Generally speaking, Dr. White, what kind of ground rules would you lay down for a person in his middle age or older years when he contemplates his own problems of exercise? How should he approach it?

A In the first place, he should have a good examination and talk with the family doctor. The family doctor knows the family and the person pretty well. If there's anything especially wrong, then a consultant may have to be called in, but the family doctor is still the first line of defense and advice.

That would be the first thing for a person in middle age—or in youth, or in old age, too—to do, namely, to have a family doctor, use the family doctor, and get an occasional examination. The doctor's often too busy—most of us are, you know—always to look up a person and say: "Well, now, your year is up. You must come." We do it with quite a few patients but we don't do it to everybody. The person himself should have that as a prime need in his mind.

And then he should plan his life, partly according to his own desires and his work and to fit the needs of his family, but also for the sake of his own health. And that, generally, would include a plan of exercise, if he hasn't already one particular type of exercise in mind, or in his habits of life. He may need to lose some weight; he may need to have better habits of rest; he may need to smoke less; he may need to do a number of things that he isn't doing. It's quite possible that exercise and these other habits may make it unnecessary later on to get so much medical help.

Here is a favorite quotation of mine from John Dryden which is very apropos. In 1680, Dryden wrote to a kinsman of the same name in the country. These letters of his were written in verse. In the course of this letter, which extols country life, he was also recommending the value of exercise, and this stanza appears there:

"By chase our fathers earned their food."

"Earned their food" physically, you see.

"Toil strung the nerves and purified the blood."

"Strung" means improved, made taut—not tense. Sometimes when you "string" the nerves you think that you're doing harm.

"But we, their sons, a pampered race of men

"Have dwindled down to three-score years and 10."

This was 300 years ago.

"Better to hunt in fields, for health unbought,

"Than fee the doctor for a nauseous draught."

There may be more truth than poetry in that. It may be [p. 53] that if you have regular exercise, relaxation from it, good improvement of the circulation, you may not need to take so many "poisonous" drugs for high blood pressure. And there are poisons in them; they are nauseous.

"The wise, for cure, on exercise de- pend;"

"God never made His work for man to mend."

Well, that's a little exaggerated but, nevertheless, there may be something in it.

So I think that we can take a leaf from some of the habits of our ancestors who knew more about health than about disease. We know a lot about disease but we don't seem to pay much attention to health. This is true of the doctors, too. They have gotten so much new knowledge about all kinds of diseases and such remarkable treatment for these diseases that now prevention of the disease—except for the infections—has been rather neglected...

806. Health and Disease — Harmful Results of Overnutrition SOURCE: "Management of Overweight," *Nutrition Reviews*, 10 (April, 1952), 109. Copyright 1952 by Nutrition Foundation, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The increased incidence of degenerative diseases such as hypertension, coronary disease, and diabetes among the overweight has been firmly established. With a good deal of justification caloric overnutrition has been termed the most prevalent American nutritional disease.

807. Health and Disease—Intelligent Planning for Health Necessary SOURCE: William Henry Roberts, *The Problem of Choice*, p. 236. Copyright 1941 by Ginn and Company, Boston. Used by permission.

Only rarely can the matter of health be left to our impulses. Intelligent planning is imperative. Such planning must take account not only of immediate pleasure or suffering in any case but also of long-range consequences. To ascertain what such consequences may be often requires elaborate scientific investigation. If we wish to be as healthy as it is possible for us to be, we have to work hard at the undertaking, sacrifice many pleasures, and submit to rigorous discipline. In general our unspoiled tastes and impulses make for health. The trouble is that they do not long remain unspoiled. The conditions of civilized life provide stimuli to indolence or to excessive indulgence against which the inherited patterns of liking or disliking provide no safeguards.

808. Health and Disease—Overeating, Effects of

SOURCE: Charles Glen King, "Trends in the Science of Food and Its Relation to Life and Health," *Nutrition Reviews*, 10 (Jan., 1952), 1. Copyright 1951 by Nutrition Foundation, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The fact that infectious and acute diseases such as pneumonia and diphtheria are coming under control rapidly has been cited with great emphasis at recent meetings of the leading medical societies and especially at this past year's meeting of the American Public Health Association. In contrast, much less progress has been made in finding the causes, other than just simply eating too much, that underlie the metabolic diseases such as hardening of the arteries, heart disease, diabetes, arthritis, premature aging and mental disorders. These are in part, at least, associated with faulty nutrition. They represent the greatest challenge in the field of public health in the years ahead.

809. Health and Disease—Overeating Related to Heart Disease

SOURCE: W. Henry Sebrell, Jr., "What to Eat to Live Longer," Interview in U.S. News & World Report, 48 (April 11, 1960), 91. Copyright 1960 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington.

... Q What is the relation between diet and heart disease?

A Well, we're really not sure. Heart disease in this country is an increasing cause of death, and there is certainly a relation between heart disease and overweight.

Overweight, of course, is just due to bad eating habits—eating more food than we need. So in this way diet certainly does contribute to some of the deaths from heart disease...

810. Health and Disease—Overweight a Dangerous Health Problem SOURCE: Clifford F. Gastineau and Edward H. Rynearson, "Obesity," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 27 (December, 1947), 893. Copyright 1947 by The American College of Physicians. Used by permission of the publisher and the authors.

Obesity is one of the most pressing and dangerous health problems we face today.

811. Health and Disease—Overweight a Hazard SOURCE: Donald B. Armstrong and others, "Obesity and Its Relation to Health and Disease," *JAMA*, 147 (Nov. 10, 1951), 1007. Copyright 1951 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

One of the subtler and more serious health hazards of our times is obesity.

812. Health and Disease—Overweight an Important Factor

SOURCE: W. Henry Sebrell, Jr., "What to Eat to Live Longer," Interview in U.S. News & World Report, 48 (April 11, 1960), 91, 94. Copyright 1960 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington.

 $[p. 91] \dots Q$ Is there a certain age at which a person should become concerned about weight, and what he eats? Is it especially important in the 40s and 50s?

A Obesity—overweight from too much fat—we now recognize as an important health matter at any age. Overweight, even in children and adolescents, from too much fat is a bad thing. As we get older it becomes of greater and greater importance because our habits become firmly fixed, and we tend to get fatter and fatter because we take less exercise.

Q Is there a relation between exercise and food needs?

A Very definitely. Everyone should take a moderate amount of exercise, and the less exercise you take, the less food you need.

If you continue to eat as you get to be 30, 40 or 50 years old the same way you ate in your 20s, when you were more vigorous and participating more in athletics, you become overweight. This is why there is more and more attention given to weight in the older age groups...

[p. 94] *Q* Coming back to the question of weight—does everyone have an ideal weight?

A If we assume that you are a normal individual, your ideal weight is probably about what you weighed around age 26. After age 26, any weight that you gain is likely to be fat and to be deleterious.

So weight-to-height tables that show an increasing body weight as you get older above age 26—may represent the average but they don't represent the ideal...

813. Health and Disease—Overweight and Death Rate

SOURCE: William P. Shepard and Herbert H. Marks, "Life Insurance Looks at the Arteriosclerosis Problem," *Minnesota Medicine*, 38 (November, 1955), 739. Copyright 1955 by Minnesota State Medical Association. Used by permission of *Minnesota Medicine* and Herbert H. Marks.

All of them [life insurance studies] have shown consistently that overweights have a mortality significantly higher than persons of lesser weight, and that this excess mortality is primarily due to cardiovascular diseases.

814. Health and Disease—Overweight and Diseases

SOURCE: W. Henry Sebrell, Jr., "What to Eat to Live Longer," Interview in U.S. News & World Report, 48 (April 11, 1960), 94. Copyright 1960 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington.

... Q Does overeating have other dangers besides increasing the chances of dying of heart disease?

A Oh, yes. The statistics show that obesity results in a greater disability and a greater mortality from many other conditions, not only cardiovascular disease.

Q What are some of these other effects?

A One of them is gall-bladder disease. Another is bone and joint conditions. Another is diabetes. And increased mortality from all sorts of surgical operations—the fat man doesn't react as well to the stresses of surgery...

815. Health and Disease—Overweight and Heart Disease SOURCE: Arthur M. Master and others, "Relationship of Obesity to Coronary Disease and Hypertension," *JAMA*, 153 (Dec. 26, 1953), 1501. Copyright 1953 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

The harmful influence of obesity on the normal and on the diseased heart is well established. Persons with heart disease or hypertension who are obese have a much higher mortality rate than those who are of average weight or below...

The reports in the literature and our own observations, however, clearly indicate the importance of avoiding obesity in cardio-vascular disease.

816. Health and Disease—Overweight and Malnutrition

SOURCE: W. Henry Sebrell, Jr., "What to Eat to Live Longer," Interview in U.S. News & World Report, 48 (April 11, 1960), 93. Copyright 1960 by U.S. News Publishing Corp., Washington.

... Q Would you say that getting too fat is the major diet trouble in this country?

A Getting too fat is basically our biggest malnutrition problem.

Q And is fat medically dangerous?

A Yes, and this gets us back to the question of the relation of diet to heart disease or, specifically, coronary-artery disease and atherosclerosis. The evidence today indicates that a high blood-cholesterol level is associated with heart disease, and high blood cholesterol can be reduced by certain dietary procedures...

817. Health and Disease—Physical Activity Lessens Heart Disease SOURCE: J. N. Morris and others, "Coronary Heart-disease and Physical Activity of Work," *The Lancet*, 265 (Nov. 28, 1953), 1111. Used by permission.

Men in physically active jobs have a lower incidence of coronary heart-disease in middle age than have men in physically inactive jobs. More important, the disease is not so severe in physically active workers.

818. Health and Disease—Prayer a Master Mind Cure

SOURCE: William S. Sadler, *Practice of Psychiatry*, p. 1008. Copyright 1953 by The C. V. Mosby Company, St. Louis. Used by permission of the publisher and the author.

I regard prayer as a master mind cure and personal religious experience as the highest and truest form of psychotherapy. There can be no question that the religion of Jesus, when properly understood and truly experienced, possesses power both to prevent and cure numerous mental maladies, moral difficulties, and personality disorders. It must be evident that fear and doubt are disease producing, while faith and hope are health giving; and in my opinion the highest possibilities of faith and the greatest power of hope are expressed in the sublime beliefs of religious experience. The teachings of Christ are the greatest known destroyers of doubt and despair.

819. Health and Disease—Viruses and Cancer

SOURCE: Ludwik Gross, "Viral Etiology of Cancer and Leukemia?" guest editorial in *JAMA*, 162 (Dec. 1, 1956), 1318, 1319. Copyright 1956 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

[p. 1318] During the past decade the concept of viral etiology of cancer and allied diseases has gained considerable momentum. Experimental data began to accumulate pointing more and more to the possibility that many, if not all, malignant tumors may be caused by viruses...

[p. 1319] Recent developments in experimental cancer research add significantly to the older experiments in which various tumors in chickens, rabbits, frogs, and mice have been transmitted by filtered extracts. In humans thus far only warts and papillomas have been found to be transmissible by filtered extracts. By analogy, however, it is quite apparent that many other human tumors may be caused by viruses. It is entirely possible that most, if not all, malignant tumors, not only in animals but also in humans, are caused by filterable viruses. Many of these viruses may be transmitted from generation to generation, remaining in a latent form harmless for their carrier hosts. Now and then, however, prompted by some obscure activating factors (some of them physiological, such as metabolic or hormonal, others extrinsic, such as chemical poisons or ionizing radiation), these hitherto dormant viruses may change into tumor-producing pathogens.

820. Heaven—Goal of True Christians SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 48–51. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 48] Although New Testament Christians doubtless prayed, as we do, "Thy kingdom come, Thy Will be done on Earth, as it is in Heaven," and although they therefore [p. 49] doubtless worked and prayed for the improvement of the world in which they lived, their hope rested upon God, not merely upon what He could do in this world, but upon His high, mysterious Purpose. Of comparatively recent years the center of our faith has become, at any rate in some quarters, more and more earthbound. We are concerned with the Christian attitude to housing, to social problems, to juvenile delinquency, to international relationships, and indeed to every department of human life. This is fine as far as it goes, but sometimes one gets the impression that Christians are "falling over backwards" to disavow their otherworldliness. Yet to have the soul firmly anchored in Heaven rather than grounded in this little sphere is far more like New Testament Christianity.

In the here-and-now there are many flagrant injustices which remain unjudged, many problems which remain unsolved, and many loose ends which are never tied up. There are also, in the transitory life of this planet, serious limitations which God has imposed upon His own working through the risky gift of what we call "free will." Such factors as sheer ignorance, lack of faith, disobedience, or downright refusal to obey the truth quite plainly inhibit the operation of the Spirit of God. We can read how such things inhibited the power of Jesus Christ Himself and similarly limited the power of the vigorous Young Church. If Christian hope were a kind of optimistic humanism restricted merely to what happens in this passing world it would be a poor lookout indeed. As Paul pointedly remarked, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

Yet, as we look at today's Christians, is it not true that many of them are earthbound? They have been affected far more than they know by the Communist gibe about [p. 50] "pie in the sky" and similar thrusts suggesting that Christianity deals with the shadowy "spiritual" values, and refers all insoluble "real" difficulties to an imaginary Heaven. The suggestion is that the politician, the psychiatrist, the social worker, the doctor, the nurse, and a host of others are left to cope with the tensions and muddles of the here-and-now. Christians have sometimes allowed themselves to be swayed more than they should be by jeers at their "spiritual" and "otherworldly" point of view. In defense they make a determined effort to prove that the Christian Faith is extremely relevant in every department of human existence. Consequently it is not uncommon, at any rate in this country, to have a positive riot of advertising the Faith under such titles as "Christianity and the Home," "Christianity and the Family," "Christianity and World Peace," "Christianity and Daily Work," "Christianity and Local Government," "Christianity and Education," "Christianity and Sex," and so on. Now all this is fine as far as it goes, for it is undeniably true that when people owe a heart loyalty to Jesus Christ it will affect the way they behave in all their human relationships. But Christianity is not a kind of salve which can be applied to a given human situation. It is and has always been a matter of winning individuals to give their heart loyalty to Christ and to the fellowship of Christians. From such a fellowship Christians can indeed permeate the society in which they live and work. But to say, for example, "If only all school-teachers were practicing Christians how wonderful the world would be" is a waste of time. You cannot apply Christianity "in the mass" like that. Even in the most vigorous and flourishing days of the Young Church the followers of the Way were a tiny minority. It can do no harm to point out from time to time how revolutionized our various institutions would be if their members were [p. 51] all practicing Christians. But if this is the limit of our hope, we are laving up for ourselves bitter disappointment.

821. Hell, Appalling Description of

SOURCE: J. Furniss, *Tracts for Spiritual Reading* (New York: P. J. Kenedy, Excelsior Catholic Publishing House, 1882), pp. 12–15, 18–20.

[p. 12] XVI. The Soul before Satan.

The devils carry away the soul which has just come into hell. They bear it through the flames. Now they have set it down in front of the great chained monster, to be judged by him, who has no mercy. Oh, that horrible face of the devil Oh, the fright, the shivering, the freezing, the deadly horror of that soul at the first sight of the great devil. Now the devil opens his mouth. He gives out the tremendous sentence on the soul. All hear the sentence, and hell rings with shouts of spiteful joy and mockeries at the unfortunate soul.

XVII. The Everlasting Dwelling-place of the Soul.

As soon as the sentence is given, the soul is snatched away and hurried to that place which is to be its home for ever and ever Crowds of hideous devils have met together. With cries of spiteful joy they receive the soul. Is. xxxiv. *Demons and monsters shall meet. The hairy ones shall cry out to one another.* See how these devils receive the soul in this time of destruction. Eccus. xxxix. *In the time of destruction, they shall pour out their force. The teeth of serpents and beasts, and scorpions, the sword taking vengeance on ungodly unto destruction.*

Immediately the soul is thrust by the devils into that prison which is to be its dwelling-place for ever more. The prison of each soul is different, according to its sins... *[p. 13] XVIII. The Striking Devil.*

Prov. xix. Striking hammers are prepared for the bodies of sinners. ...

The devil gave Job one stroke, only one stroke. That one stroke was so terrible that it covered all his body with sores and ulcers. That one stroke made Job look so frightful, that his friends did not know him again. That one stroke was so terrible, that for seven

days and seven nights his friends did not speak a word, but sat crying, and wondering, and thinking what a terrible stroke the devil can give.

Little child, if you go to hell there will be a devil at your side to strike you. He will go on striking you every minute for ever and ever, without ever stopping. The first stroke will make your body as bad as the body of Job, covered from head to foot with sores and ulcers. The second stroke will make your body twice as bad as the body of Job. The third stroke will make your body three times as bad as the body of Job. The fourth stroke will make your body four times as bad as the body of Job. How then will your body be after the devil has been striking it every moment for a hundred million of years without stopping?

[p. 14] But there was one good thing for Job. When the devil had struck Job, his friends came to visit and comfort him, and when they saw him they cried. But when the devil is striking you in hell, there will be no one to come and visit and comfort you, and cry with you. Neither father, nor mother, nor brother, nor sister, nor friend will ever come to cry with you. Lam. i. "Weeping she hath wept in the night, and the tears are on her cheeks, because there is none to comfort her amongst all them that were dear to her." Little child, it is a bad bargain to make with the devil, to commit a mortal sin, and then to be beaten for ever for it.

XIX. The Mocking Devil.

Hab. ii. Shall they not take up a parable against him, a dark speech concerning him?

St. Frances saw that on the other side of the soul there was another devil to mock at and reproach it. Hear what mockeries he said to it. "Remember," he said, "remember where you are and where you will be for ever; how short the sin was, how long the punishment. It is your own fault; when you committed that mortal sin you knew how you would be punished. What a good bargain you made to take the pains of eternity in exchange for the sin of a day, an hour, a moment. You cry now for your sin, but your crying comes too late. You liked bad company, you will find bad company enough here. Your father was a drunkard, and showed you the way to the public-house; he is still a drunkard, look at him over there drinking red hot fire. You were too idle to go to Mass on Sundays, be as idle as you like now, for there is no Mass to go to. You disobeyed your father, but you dare not disobey him who is your father in hell; look at him, that great chained monster; disobey him if you dare."

St. Frances saw that these mockeries put the soul into such dreadful despair that it burst out into the most frightful howlings and blasphemies.

But it is time for us now to see where the sinner has been put—his everlasting dwelling-place.

XX. A Bed of Fire.

The sinner lies chained down on a bed of red-hot blazing [p. 15] fire When a man, sick of fever, is lying on even a soft bed, it is pleasant sometimes to turn around. If the sick man lies on the same side for a long time, the skin comes off, the flesh gets raw. How will it be when the body has been lying on the same side on the scorching, broiling fire for a hundred millions of years Now look at that body lying on the bed of fire. All the body is salted with fire. The fire burns through every bone and every muscle. Every nerve is trembling and quivering with the sharp fire. The fire rages inside the skull, it shoots out through the eyes, it drops out through the ears, it roars in the throat as it roars up a

chimney. So will mortal sin be punished. Yet there are people in their senses who commit mortal sin ...

[p. 18] XXV. The Second Dungeon.

THE DEEP PIT.

Luke xvi. *It came to pass that the rich man also died, and he was buried in the fire of hell.* Think of a coffin, not made of wood, but of fire, solid fire And now come into this other room. You see a pit, a deep, almost bottomless, pit. Look down it and you will see something red hot and burning. It is a coffin, a red hot coffin of fire. A certain man is lying, fastened in the inside of that coffin of fire. You might burst open a coffin made of iron; but that coffin made of solid fire never can be burst open. There that man lies and will lie for ever in the fiery coffin. It burns him from beneath. The sides of it scorch him. The heavy burning lid on the top presses down close upon him. The horrible heat in the inside chokes him; he pants for breath; he cannot breathe; he cannot bear it; he gets furious. He gathers up his knees and pushes out his hands against the top of the coffin to burst it open. His knees and hands are fearfully burnt by the red hot lid. No matter, to be choked is worse. He tries with all his strength to burst open the coffin. He cannot do it. He has no strength remaining. He gives it up and sinks down again. Again the horrible choking. Again he tries; again he sinks down; so he will go on for ever and ever This man was very rich. Instead of worshipping God, he worshipped his money...

[p. 19] XXVI. The Dungeon.

THE RED HOT FLOOR.

Look into this room. What a dreadful place it is The roof is red hot; the walls are red hot; the floor is like a thick sheet of red hot iron. See, on the middle of that red hot floor stands a girl. She looks about sixteen years old. Her feet are bare, she has neither shoes nor stockings on her feet; her bare feet stand on the red hot burning floor. The door of this room has never been opened before since she first set her foot on the red hot floor. Now she sees that the door is opening. She rushes forward. She has gone down on her knees on the red hot floor. Listen, she speaks She says; "I have been standing with my bare feet on this red hot floor for years. Day and night my only standing place has been this red hot floor. Sleep never came on me for a moment, that I might forget this horrible burning floor. Look," she says, "at my burnt and bleeding feet. Let me go off this burning floor for one moment, only for one single, short moment. Oh, that in the endless eternity of years, I might forget the pain only for one single moment." The devil answers her question: "Do you ask," he says, "for a moment, for one moment to forget your pain. No, not for one single moment during the never-ending eternity of years shall you ever leave this red hot floor" "Is it so?" the girl says with a sigh, that seems to break her heart; "then, at least, let somebody go to my little brothers and sisters, who are alive, and tell them not to do the bad things which I did, so they will never have to come and stand on the red hot floor." The devil answers her again: "Your little brothers and sisters have the priests to tell them these things. If they will not listen to the priests, neither would they listen even if somebody should go to them from the dead."

Oh, that you could hear the horrible, the fearful scream of that girl when she saw the door shutting, never to be opened any more. The history of this girl is short. Her feet first led her into sin, so it is her feet which, most of all, are tormented. While yet a very little child, she began to go into bad company. The more she grew up, the more she went into bad company against the bidding of her parents. She used to walk about the streets at

night, [p. 20] and do very wicked things. She died early. Her death was brought on by the bad life she led.

XXVII. The Fourth Dungeon. THE BOILING KETTLE.

Amos iv. *The days shall come when they shall lift you up on pikes, and what remains of you in boiling pots.* Look into this little prison. In the middle of it there is a boy, a young man. He is silent; despair is on him. He stands straight up. His eyes are burning like two burning coals. Two long flames come out of his ears. His breathing is difficult. Sometimes he opens his mouth and breath of blazing fire rolls out of it. But listen there is a sound just like that of a kettle boiling. Is it really a kettle which is boiling? No; then what is it? Hear what it is. The blood is boiling in the scalded veins of that boy. The brain is boiling and bubbling in his head. The marrow is boiling in his bones Ask him, put the question to him, why is he thus tormented? His answer is, that when he was alive, his blood boiled to do very wicked things, and he did them, and it was for that he went to dancing-houses, public-houses, and theaters. Ask him, does he think the punishment greater than he deserves? "No," he says.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The following approbation appears in connection with the publication:

"I have carefully read over this Little Volume for Children and have found nothing whatever in it contrary to the doctrine of Holy Faith; but, on the contrary, a great deal to charm, instruct and edify our youthful classes, for whose benefit it has been written."

"William Meagher, Vicar General. Dublin December 14, 1855."]

822. Heresy, Defined

SOURCE: P. Hinschius, "Heresy," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 5, pp. 234, 235. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 234] A view or opinion not in accord with the prevalent standards. The Greek

word *hairesis*, meaning originally a choice, then a self-chosen belief, is applied by the Fathers as early as the third century to a deviation from the fundamental Christian faith, which was punished by exclusion from the Church. From the end of the fourth century the emperors accepted the view that they were bound to use their temporal power against heretics for the maintenance of purity of doctrine; Theodosius the Great attempted to exterminate heretics by a system of penalties, which was extended by his successors and maintained by Justinian. Any deviation from the orthodox belief might be punished by infamy, incapacity to hold office or give testimony, banishment, and confiscation of property; the death penalty was only prescribed for certain sects, such as the Manichean. The severer punishments were imposed on the leaders of heretical sects, or for the conferring and receiving of orders within them and for public gatherings. This legislation was not accepted in the Merovingian kingdom, which left it to the Church to combat heresy with spiritual weapons; the Visigothic law, on the other hand, took the same standpoint as the Roman. The Carolingian period provided penalties for the practice of paganism; but in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the rise and spread of heretical sects, especially the Cathari, led to active ecclesiastical legislation against heresy. As early as the eleventh century, the secular authorities in France and Germany had punished individual heretics with death, and the councils of the twelfth declared them bound to use their power in this way. While Frederick I. and II., and Louis VIII., IX., and X. of France were enacting laws of this kind, the ecclesiastical view that heresy came by right before the Church's tribunal led to the erection of special church courts with a procedure of their own... In the present Roman Catholic practice, heresy is the willful holding by a baptized person of doctrines which contradict any article of faith defined by the catholic Church, or which have been condemned by a pope or a general council as heretical, provided that the holder knows the right faith and makes open profession of his departure from it... [p. 235] Theoretically, the Roman Catholic Church still holds to the old severe legislation, and as late as 1878 Leo XIII. confirmed a ruling of the cardinal vicar based on these principles in relation to those who attended Protestant services in Rome. But the altered position of the Church in modern times permits only the imposition of ecclesiastical penalties [see Nos. 389, 840].

823. Heresy, in Rulers, Deposing Power Used Against

SOURCE: Thomas Francis Knox, "Historical Introduction," in *The Letters and Memorials of William Cardinal Allen*, ed. by fathers of the Congregation of the London Oratory (London: David Nutt, 1882), pp. xxvi, xxvii.

[p. xxvi] The relation which ought to exist between the church [of Rome] and a Christian sovereign ... [is that which obtained] in the middle ages, when the catholic church had remoulded ... the whole fabric of political, social and domestic life...

[p. xxvii] It was chiefly in the case of heresy that the Pope had recourse to his deposing power. Other sins might be tolerated for a time in a sovereign, and their evil effects abated by lesser remedies. But not so heresy, which under the protection of an heretical sovereign will soon pervert a nation. Hence the greatness of the evil calls for prompt and unsparing measures. No monarch so manifestly uses his authority for the destruction, not the good, of the commonwealth as the heretical prince. No one therefore so justly deserves to lose his throne as he. It was in fact an axiom in those days that the heretic, whatever his degree, was an enemy and alien to the Christian commonwealth, and that so long as he continued in heresy he had no part or lot with Christian men... Hence no one saw ground for complaint when the church punished heretics or delivered them over to the civil power for punishment, and men greeted as an act of supreme justice the solemn deposition of an heretical king.

824. Heresy, Punishment Decreed for, A.D. 380 or 381

SOURCE: Edict of Gratain, Valentinian, and Theodosius I, in the Code of Justinian, Book I, title 1, 1; Scott's English version, *The Civil Law*, Vol. 12, p. 9. Copyright 1932 by The Central Trust Company. Used by permission of Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, as one of copyright owners, and John M. Rankin, as trustee, and the beneficiaries of the trust created under the Last Will & Testament of Elizabeth W. Scott, deceased.

1. The Emperors Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius to the people of the City of Constantinople.

We desire that all peoples subject to Our benign Empire shall live under the same religion that the Divine Peter, the Apostle, gave to the Romans, and which the said religion declares was introduced by himself, and which it is well known that the Pontiff Damascus, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic sanctity, embraced; that is to say, in accordance with the rules of apostolic discipline and the evangelical doctrine, we should believe that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit constitute a single Deity, endowed with equal majesty, and united in the Holy Trinity.

(1) We order all those who follow this law to assume the name of Catholic Christians, and considering others as demented and insane, We order that they shall bear the infamy of heresy; and when the Divine vengeance which they merit has been

appeased, they shall afterwards be punished in accordance with Our resentment, which we have acquired from the judgment of Heaven.

Dated at Thessalonica, on the third of the *Kalends* of March, during the Consulate of Gratian, Consul for the fifth time, and Theodosius.

825. Heretics, Breach of Faith With, Despite Guarantee of Safety SOURCE: Council of Constance, Session XIX, trans. in James Lenfant, *The History of the Council of Constance*, Vol. 1 (London: Thomas Cox, 1728), pp. 514, 515.

[p. 514] The present Synod [the Council of Constance] declares, that every Safe-Conduct granted by the Emperor, Kings, and other temporal Princes, to Hereticks, or Persons accused of Heresy, in hopes of reclaiming them, ought not to be of any Prejudice to the Catholick Faith, or to the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, nor to hinder, but such Persons may, and ought to be examined, judged and punished, according as Justice shall require, if those Hereticks refuse to revoke their Errors, even tho' they should be arrived at the Place where they are to be judg'd only upon the Faith of the Safe-Conduct, without which they would not have come thither. And the Person who shall have promised them Security, shall not, in this Case, be obliged to keep his Promise, by whatsoever Tye he may be engaged, because he has done all that is in his Power to do...

WHEREAS there are certain Persons, either ill-disposed, or over-wise beyond what they ought to be, who in secret and in publick, traduce not only the Emperor, but the sacred Council; saying, or insinuating, that the Safe-Conduct granted to *John Hus*, an Arch Heretick, of damnable Memory, was basely violated, contrary to all the Rules of Honour and Justice; though the said *John Hus*, by obstinately attacking the Catholick Faith, in the Manner he did, render'd himself unworthy of any manner of Safe-Conduct and Privilege; and *though according to the Natural, Divine and Human Laws, no Promise ought to have been kept with him, to the Prejudice of the Catholick Faith:* The sacred Synod declares, by these Presents, that the said Emperor did, with regard to *John Hus*, what he might and ought to have done, notwithstanding his Safe-Conduct; and forbids all the Faithful in General, and every one of them in Particular, of what Dignity, Degree, Preheminence, Condition, State or Sex they may be, to speak Evil in any Manner, either of the Council, or of the King, as to what passed with regard to *John Hus*, on pain of being punished, without Re- [p. 515] mission, as Favourers of Heresy, and Persons guilty of High Treason.

826. Heretics, Breach of Faith With, Temporarily Abjured by Council of Trent

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XV (Jan. 25, 1552), "Safe-Conduct Given to the Protestants," trans. in H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, pp. 116, 118. Copyright 1941 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

[p. 116] The holy, ecumenical and general Council of Trent ... adhering to the safeconduct given in the session before the last [see Schroeder, p. 87] and amplifying it in the manner following, certifies to all men that by the tenor of these presents, it grants and fully concedes the public faith and the fullest and truest security, which they call a safeconduct, to each and all ... of whatever state, condition or character they may be, of the German province and nation, ... who shall come or be sent with them to this general Council of Trent, and to those who are going to come or have already come, by whatever name they are or may be designated, to come freely to this city of Trent, to remain, abide and sojourn here and to propose, speak and consider, examine and discuss any matters whatever with the council... [p. 118] Moreover, it promises in sincere and good faith, to the exclusion of fraud and deceit, that the council will neither openly nor secretly seek any occasion, nor make use of, nor permit anyone else to make use of, nor permit anyone else to make use of, any authority, power, right or statute, privilege of laws or canons, or of any councils in whatever form of words expressed, especially those of Constance and Siena, in any way prejudicial to this public faith and the fullest security, and of the public and free hearing granted by this council to the above-named; these it abrogates in this respect and for this occasion.

827. Heretics, Coercion of, in Augustine's Day

SOURCE: Augustine, Letter 93 (to Vincentius), chap. 5, sec. 17, trans. in NPNF, 1st series, Vol. 1, p. 388.

Originally my opinion was, that no one should be coerced into the unity of Christ, that we must act only by words, fight only by arguments, and prevail by force of reason, lest we should have those whom we knew as avowed heretics feigning themselves to be Catholics. But this opinion of mine was overcome not by the words of those who controverted it, but by the conclusive instances to which they could point. For, in the first place, there was set over against my opinion my own town [Hippo], which, although it was once wholly on the side of Donatus, was brought over to the Catholic unity by fear of the imperial edicts.

828. Heretics, Persecution of — "Almost Infinite Numbers" Burned SOURCE: Robert Bellarmine, *Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei* ("Disputations Concerning Controversies of the Christian Faith"), Tom. II, Controversia II, Lib. III, De Laicis, Cap. XXII (Colonia Agrippina [Cologne]: Hierati Fratres, 1628), vol. 1, p. 388. Latin.

"The church," says Luther, ... "has *never burned a heretic."* ... I reply that this argument proves not the opinion, but the ignorance or impudence of Luther. Since almost infinite numbers were either burned or otherwise killed Luther either did not know it, and was therefore ignorant, or if he was not ignorant, he is convicted of impudence and falsehood; for that heretics were often burned by the church may be proved if we adduce a few from many examples.

829. Heretics, Persecution of—Basis in Theory

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *The Death-Penalty for Heresy* (Medieval Studies, No. 18. London: Simpkin. Marshall. Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1924), p. 42. Used by permission of the author's literary executor.

The orthodox doctrine, as formulated by St. Thomas Aquinas and confirmed and elaborated by later Dominicans and by Jesuits like the Blessed Robert Bellarmine and Suarez, runs as follows:—

- 1. All baptized Christians are, *ipso facto*, subjects of the Roman Catholic Church.
- 2. That Church is "a Perfect Society" in the medieval philosophical sense.
- 3. Therefore she has full rights of coercion and punishment over all her subjects.
- 4. Not only of spiritual punishment, such as excommunication, but also corporal punishment.
- 5. Not excluding the extreme penalty of death.
- 6. Heresy—formal as apart from mere material heresy—is a crime.
- 7. And therefore punishable in proportion to its sinfulness and to the damage it causes.
- 8. *Formal* heretics are all who, not being invincibly ignorant (or practically in other words, intellectual deficients) refuse pertinaciously to accept the Roman Catholic faith when put before them.

9. It is not for the individual to judge the point at which this refusal becomes pertinacious, nor for the state, nor for society in general: the sole judge here is the Roman Catholic Church.

830. Heretics, Persecution of, in Spite of "Horror of Blood" (Catholic Professor on)

SOURCE: Alfred Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism,* trans. by Mrs. Philip Gibbs (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., 1908), pp. 182, 183. Used by permission of Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

[p. 182] The Catholic Church is a respecter of conscience and of liberty... She has, and she loudly proclaims that she has, a "horror of blood." Nevertheless when confronted by heresy she does not content herself with persuasion; arguments of an intellectual and moral order appear to her insufficient and she has recourse to force, to corporal punishment, to torture. She creates [p. 183] tribunals like those of the Inquisition, she calls the laws of the State to her aid, if necessary she encourages a crusade, or a religious war and all her "horror of blood" practically culminates into urging the secular power to shed it, which proceeding is almost more odious—for it is less frank—than shedding it herself. Especially did she act thus in the sixteenth century with regard to Protestants. Not content to reform morally, to preach by example, to convert people by eloquent and holy missionaries, she lit in Italy, in the Low Countries, and above all in Spain the funeral piles of the Inquisition. In France under Francis I. and Henry II., in England under Mary Tudor, she tortured the heretics, whilst both in France and Germany during the second half of the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth century if she did not actually begin, at anyrate she encouraged and actively aided the religious wars.

831. Heretics, Persecution of—Infliction of Death Penalty as Late as 1762

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *The Death-Penalty for Heresy* (Medieval Studies, No. 18. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1924), pp. 56, 62. Used by permission of the author's literary executor.

[Appendix IV, p. 56] 4. From p. de la Gorce, "Histoire religieuse de la révolution française," 13me édition, Paris, 1917, vol. I, p. 51. The author is a member of the French Academy, and a loyal and enthusiastic champion of the Roman Church.

The author points out how the French Church, up to 1789, "claimed not only primacy for herself but also the exclusion of every other religious denomination. The King, in his traditional coronation-oath, swears not only to protect her, but to exterminate

[*exterminer*] her enemies. That formula, however superannuated it may be, is not altogether vain; the secular arm is numbed but not paralysed; and, in 1762, (under the edict of May 17th, 1724) a Reformed pastor was condemned to death by the high court of Toulouse." ...

[Appendix VIII, p. 62] There are many unquestionable cases of Protestants punished as heretics in nearly all the lands where Roman Catholics have had power, right down to the French Revolution.¹ [Note 1: And even of the death-penalty: a Protestant pastor was condemned to death at Toulouse in 1762.]

832. Heretics, Persecution of, Justified by Thomas Aquinas

SOURCE: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* (Vol. 20 of Great Books of the Western World), Part II of second part, ques. 11, art. 3, Vol. 2, p. 440. Copyright 1952 by Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago. Used by permission of Benziger Brothers, New York, and Burns & Oates Ltd., London.

I answer that, With regard to heretics two points must be observed: one, on their own side, the other, on the side of the Church. On their own side there is the sin, by which they deserve not only to be separated from the Church by excommunication, but also to be severed from the world by death. For it is a much graver matter to corrupt the faith which quickens the soul, than to forge money, which supports temporal life. Therefore if forgers of money and other evil-doers are condemned to death at once by the secular authority, much more reason is there for heretics, as soon as they are convicted of heresy, to be not only excommunicated but even put to death.

On the part of the Church, however, there is mercy which looks to the conversion of the wanderer, and therefore she condemns not at once, but *after the first and second admonition*, as the Apostle directs. After that, if he is yet stubborn, the Church no longer hoping for his conversion, looks to the salvation of others, by excommunicating him and separating him from the Church, and furthermore delivers him to the secular tribunal to be exterminate from the world by death.

833. Heretics, Persecution of, Justified by Theologians, Not Necessarily by Laity Today

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *The Death-Penalty for Heresy* (Medieval Studies, No. 18. London: Simpkin. Marshall, Humilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1924), pp. 24, 25. Used by permission of the author's literary executor.

[p. 24] Innocent and Aquinas were, by nature, men as kindly as St. Augustine, who was willing to grant a respite to the heretic so long as he did not "defend his opinion, however false and perverse, with any pertinacious fervour." But that case, so grievous for Augustine to contemplate, was the normal case with the thirteenth century Greek, as it would be with a modern Protestant... Very few ... could cling to this one hope which Augustine and Aquinas hold out to us, that we should finally yield to argument and escape punishment.

For this, it must be repeated, is the only final escape allowed by Innocent, by Aquinas, or by any other orthodox writer that I know of, down to the memory of living man... If modern Jesuits hold out hopes which Aquinas denied, this is not because Popes or Councils have had the courage to contradict their predecessors, but because the edu-[p. 25] cated public, everywhere in the world, would now repudiate them—the mass of orthodox themselves, in their hearts if not with their lips, would repudiate Innocent's ideas as immoral and impolitic... Morally, they [earlier Catholics] believed themselves to be saving thousands of souls by the burning of a single heretic. Politically, they believed it possible, by sufficiently persistent and ruthless persecution, to extinguish heresy altogether.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Coulton goes on to add that although professional apologists still use the soul-saving argument (see De Luca on the kindness of killing a heretic, in No. 835), "the ordinary friendly Roman Catholic whom we meet in society would refuse to accept the theologian's doctrine in its naked brutality, while the theologians, for their part, are struggling to reconcile themselves with modern civilization." For modern Catholic writers who attempt to set forth more liberal ideas, see Nos. 1303, 1304.]

834. Heretics, Persecution of — Modern (19th-Century) Approval of Death Penalty

a. Heresy Compared to Murder

SOURCE: A Review of "Maitland on the Reformation: the Lawfulness of Persecution," *The Rambler*, 4 (June, 1849), 119, 126.

[p. 119] The Catholic has some reason on his side when he calls for the temporal punishment of heretics, for he claims the true title of Christian for himself exclusively, and professes to be taught by the never-failing presence of the Spirit of God... [p. 126] We are prepared to maintain, that it is no more morally *wrong* to put a man to death for heresy than for murder; that in many cases persecution for religious opinions is not only permissible, but highly advisable and necessary; and further, that no nation on earth, Catholic or Protestant, ever did, or ever does, or ever will, consistently act upon the idea that such persecution is forbidden by the laws of God in the Gospel.

1

b. If Catholics Ruled England

SOURCE: "Civil and Religious Liberty," The Rambler, 8 (September, 1851), 174, 178.

[p. 174] You ask, if he [the Roman Catholic] were lord in the land, and you were in a minority, if not in numbers yet in power, what would he do to you? That, we say, would entirely depend upon circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, he would tolerate you: if expedient, he would imprison you, banish you, fine you; possibly, he might even hand you. But be assured of one thing: he would never tolerate you for the sake of "the glorious principles of civil and religious liberty." ...

[p. 178] Shall I lend my countenance to this unhappy persuasion of my brother, that he is not flying in the face of Almighty God every day that he remains a Protestant? Shall I hold out hopes to him that I will not meddle with his creed, if he will not meddle with mine? Shall I lead him to think that religion is a matter for private opinion, and tempt him to forget that he has no more right to his religious views than he has to my purse, or my house, or my life-blood? No! Catholicism is the most intolerant of creeds. It is intolerance itself, for it is truth itself. We might as rationally maintain that a sane man has a right to believe that two and two do not make four, as this theory of religious liberty. Its impiety is only equalled by its absurdity ...

A Catholic temporal government would be guided in its treatment of Protestants and other recusants solely by the rules of expediency, adopting precisely that line of conduct which would tend best to their conversion, and to prevent the dissemination of their errors.

835. Heretics, Persecution of—Modern (20th Century) Approval of Death Penalty

SOURCE: Mariano de Luca, *Institutiones Iuris Ecclesiastical Publici* ("Institutions of Ecclesiastical Public Law") (Rome: Pustet, 1901), Vol. 1, pp. 143, 259–261. Latin.

[p. 143] In actual fact, the Church at first dealt more leniently with heretics, by excommunication, confiscation of property, ... till she was compelled to inflict the

extreme penalty. [He quotes ... Bellarmine (*De Laicis*, bk. 3, chap. 21).] ... The public social order of the Church, against the disturbance of which there are many ecclesiastical charges, must necessarily be preserved for the sanctification of souls by the true faith and good works...

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

[p. 259] *Second Confirmation:* If heretics were not subject to the jurisdiction of the Church, they could not even be punished by the same on account of heresy. But they can be punished...

[p. 260] As for the 2d Confirmation, cf. Bellarmine on the power of the Church to punish [he quotes Bellarmine citing authorities for punishment (including the death penalty) for heretics]...

[p. 261] *Reasons:* (1) because they [heretics] may be excommunicated; but this is a greater punishment; (2) because this is sometimes the only remedy. (3) Because forgers deserve death, even as do (4) adulterers; but heretics are forgers of the Word of God, and as adulterers do not keep faith with God, which is worse than for a wife not to keep faith; but especially (5) lest the evil harm the good and the innocent be oppressed by the guilty; (6) in order that, by the punishment of a few, many may be corrected; (7) because sometimes it is better for the delinquents themselves, who, if they lived longer, would (since they are altogether obstinate) become worse, and will suffer more bitter pains in eternal fire...

As to the death penalty [he quotes] from Tanner ...: "The civil magistrate, by *the command and commission of the Church,* ought to punish the heretic with the penalty of death...

To this penalty not only those are subject who as adults have fallen away from the faith, but also those who, having been baptized, and growing up [in heresy], defend pertinaciously the heresy sucked in with their mothers' milk...

[EDITORS' NOTE: De Luca's book contains a letter from Pope Leo XIII warmly commending the lectures that formed the basis of his book. De Luca asserts in 1901 the right of the church to condemn heretics to death. As late as 1910 Alexis M. Lépicier, professor of sacred theology in the Pontifical Urban

College of the Propaganda in Rome, reiterates this claim in his De Stabilitate et Progressu

Dogmatis ("On the Stability and Progress of Dogma"), 2d ed., pp. 194–210, though he concedes (p. 210) that those who were born in heresy or infidelity, unlike those who have once professed the faith, are not to be compelled to the faith but may be required, if the church has the power, to cease from blasphemies, "evil persuasions," or persecution. He disagrees (p. 202n.) with the statement in Wetzer and Welte's

kirchenlexikon that "the Church has contended herself with delivering the culprit to the secular arm with the request that his life might be spared"; rather, he says, the church has sometimes forced the judge's sentence by threat of excommunication. Lépicier's book also earned a commendation from the pope (pp. vii, viii). In his second edition he disclaims any wish to kill heretics in modern times, but he cites (p. xi) "theologians and canonists of note" in defense of his unaltered view that Mother Church has the right to punish her enemies, though she may desist out of kindness or consideration of circumstances. That same claim of the church's right, despite her desisting from using it, is asserted (without including the death penalty) several decades later than Lépicier (see No. 836n.).]

836. Heretics, Persecution of—Modern (20th Century) Assertion of Church's Right (Even Though Not Exercised) to Punish

SOURCE: Mariano de Luca, *Institutiones Iuris Ecclesiastici Publici* ("Institutions of Ecclesiastical Public Law") (Rome: Pustet, 1901), Vol. I, pp. 258, 259–264. Latin.

[p. 258] The Church's Power With Respect to Heretics.

No. 63.

We understand by the term heretics those who, when they have been duly baptized, adhere with pertinacity to any error concerning the faith; whence, by such defection, they have become alien from the Church. When this notion has been established, the power of the Church over them is easily determined. [p. 259]

[p. 259] No. 64.

*Proposition 1. Heretics are bound per se by ecclesiastical laws.*¹ [Note 1: From Tarquini.]

Second Confirmation: If heretics were not subject to the jurisdiction of the Church, they could not even be punished by the same on account of heresy. But they can be punished...

[p. 262] No. 65.

Proposition 2. Circumstances may sometimes be such that ... the Church does not wish heretics to be bound by her laws or by any certain law. ... As theologians commonly teach, [the Church] in fact does not in general bind heretics by many laws, although, per se [because baptized], they would be bound by them. On this Aichner ... writes: ... "Formerly, as is known to all, heresy was punished as a crime by both [the ecclesiastical and the civil] state. But today, when heretical sects are accepted in full civil right and when, further, men are accustomed to be brought up in them from their infancy, the Church does not pursue heretics with her penalties, except that they are excommunicated, nor does she exercise any jurisdiction over them." ...

[p. 263] Heretics [p. 264] do not cease to be subject to ecclesiastical laws; that is, so far as subjection to ecclesiastical laws is concerned, they are members of the Church... For from the fact that anyone is validly baptized, immediately he becomes a subject of Christ. But whomever Christ receives as subjects, He delivers all of them to the Church. Therefore, from the point of view of strict law, since heretics remain subject to the Church, they remain subject to its laws...

The question, therefore, at issue, is not concerning the law viewed as such, but concerning the Church's will: *Whether, that is, the Church wills that heretics also be subject* to the law. [All italics in the original.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: The italic statement following each section number is not De Luca's. He always begins each section with a proposition taken verbally from his predecessor Cardinal Tarquini.

In section 65 De Luca notes that the church now chooses not to exercise her right to punish beyond excommunication, because of the present conditions in civil states. This policy became official in the new papal Code of Canon Law, promulgated in 1917, which states that all penalties not mentioned therein are to be considered as abrogated. Nevertheless, a decade after the Code came out a noted English prelate, Ronald A. Knox, went on record as insisting on the permanent right of the church to employ the secular arm, under certain conditions, to inflict penalties at least to the extent of deportation or imprisonment. This statement was reprinted in the 1940 edition of his book (The Belief of Catholics, p. 241). Knox repudiates the idea that the church should not use any sort of coercion beyond exclusion from its own privileges. He says that in the past Catholic nations have had an alliance between church and state (as also have Protestant nations). and that the church will not be bound over to repudiate for the future such an alliance in which the civil power would be invoked in her behalf. When the church demands liberty in the modern state, she is appealing to the principles of the state, not to hers (p. 242). Such pronouncements as these, and similar ones even later (quoted in No. 495), are significant in relation to the views on religious liberty expressed by certain modern Catholic liberals-views which have raised ecumenical hopes in some Protestant quarters, but which have not, like those of De Luca and Lépicier, received papal commendation (see No. 835n.). This Source Book reproduces, for the sake of balance, statements from both sides.]

837. Heretics, Protestants as, by Catholic Definition

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *The Death-Penalty for Heresy* (Medieval Studies, No. 18. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1924), p. 26. Used by permission of the author's literary executor.

Aquinas, again, with all his meticulous pains to define and to syllogize, excepts the heretic-born only in so far as he does not remain obstinate... Jews and Pagans, in St. Thomas's vocabulary, have always been *infideles*; the heretic is one who has once been

fidelis, but has become *infidelis*. The heretic-born, therefore, of whom the modern Protestant is the typical specimen, is in a category quite distinct from Jews or Pagans; he has been *fidelis*, but is now *infidelis*. It is strange that we should have to enlighten Roman Catholic scholars on this point; but I am convinced that nobody with a reputation to lose would venture to deny publicly, under cross-examination, the following assertions:—

- (1) A heretic can confer valid baptism; therefore, any Protestant who has been sprinkled with water and intentionally baptized in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost is truly baptized.
- (2) Such baptism confers a character no less indelible than if the ceremony had been performed by an orthodox Roman Catholic priest.
- (3) The infant thus baptized becomes at once, in virtue of this sacrament, *fidelis*, since the faith which at that tender age he personally lacks is supplied by the faith of the Catholic Church, of which baptism makes him a member.
- (4) Whatever he may say or do afterwards, he can never lose this character. For a certain time, however short, he has been a *fidelis*.
- (5) Therefore he became at baptism subject to the Church, and, whether in obedience or in revolt, remains legally subject to her until his death.³ [Note 3: These may be found, for instance, explicitly or implicitly, in St. Thomas's own *Summa Theologiae*, pars. III, qq. 66–69.]

838. Heretics, Protestants as, Pope Benedict XIV on

SOURCE: Pope Benedict XIV, "De Matrimonia" (a statement concerning the validity of marriage between a Jewish man and a heretic woman), Feb. 9, 1749, secs. 12–14, in his *Bullarium*, Vol. 3 (Rome: Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, 1753), pp. 11, 12. Latin.

[p. 11, col. 1] § 12. But some one might object that the baptism with which we are concerned was not indeed conferred by a Catholic, but by a minister of the Protestants; and that the woman really, as enslaved to heresy after receiving her baptism, had been outside the bosom of the Catholic Church and therefore not bound by her laws. But we can easily refute this if we consider first (what all agree to) that when a heretic baptizes anyone (if he uses the legitimate form and matter, as we suppose to have been done in the case of the woman under discussion), that person is stamped with the character of the Sacrament. For on this, as a foundation, St. Augustine and the ancient Fathers relied in order to refute the Donatists, who contended that those baptized by heretics should be again initiated by baptism.

§ 13. Secondly, this again is well known, that he who has received baptism in the proper form from a heretic is made, in virtue thereof, a member of the Catholic Church: since indeed the private error of the baptizer cannot deprive him of his felicity if he confers the Sacrament in the Faith of the true church and observes her regulations in those matters which pertain to the validity of baptism. This is excellently proved by Suarez in his *Defense of the Catholic Faith against the Errors of the Anglican Sect* (bk. 1, chap. 24), where he proves that the person baptized becomes a member of the Church, and even adds this, that if the heretic, as often happens, baptizes a child unable to make an act of faith, this is not a hindrance to his receiving the habit of faith with his baptism.

§ 14. Lastly, we have the certainty that those baptized by heretics, if they come to the age at which they can distinguish good from evil and cling to the errors of their baptizers, they are indeed [p. 12, col. 1] driven away from the unity of the Church and

deprived of all the benefits that those who remain in the Church enjoy; yet they are not freed from her authority and her laws.

839. Heretics, Protestants Treated as

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *The Death-Penalty for Heresy* (Medieval Studies, No. 18. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1924), pp. 52–55. Used by permission of the author's literary executor.

[p. 52] 1. W. de Gray Birch, "Catalogue of original MSS. of the Inquisition in the Canary Islands," Vol. I, 1903, *introd.*, p. xx.

"Another *auto de la fe* was held on the 22nd of July, 1587, at which George Gaspar, a tailor, twenty-four years old, a native of London, was burnt in person, for refusing to abjure the Lutheran religion in which he had been born and bred. He stabbed himself in prison the night before, but was still alive when his sentence was executed." ...

[p. 53] 2. "English Merchants and the Spanish Inquisition in the Canaries." Royal Hist. Soc., 1912, pp. 41ff. (Extracts from the interrogatory of Hugh Wingfield, an English soldier, son of Robert Wingfield, labourer, of Rotherham).

"Replied, that he is a baptized Christian, being baptized in the said town of Rotherham ... And that in his land he has never heard Mass, as it is not said, but only the service used by the Protestants of England ... And that he has never been to confession; because confession is not used in his land, as here; and that he has communicated once a year according to the form of communication in use over there ... Replied that he has believed and held to be good all the said things of the new religion, and for such he believes and holds them to be, because in this creed he was brought up and has known and knows no other...

[p. 54] "The accused, being under obligation ... to sever himself from his false belief, he not only refused to do so, but *defended and pertinaciously upheld* the principles of the said sect of the protestants with all his powers. And, great efforts being made to convince him of the truth, he was brought to say that he was converted to our holy catholic faith, and abandoned his new religion, *which he did out of complaisance and to escape the penalty which he feared*, remaining a heretic as he was before." ...

3. How entirely this practice was in accordance with orthodox theory, and how impossible it would have been to make the allowances which modern apologists now suggest, may be seen by the following arguments by which the great Jesuit Suarez met the pleas of our James I ("Adv. Angl. Sectae Errores," lib. I, c. 24, ed. 1613, p. 123).

"The King, in his first argument, brings forward two excuses: first, that his father and grandfather were of the same sect which he now professes; and secondly, that he himself was never in the Catholic Church... However, whatever may have been his grandfather's or father's faith, their fall [from orthodoxy] will not excuse his own heresy, if, after sufficient warning and instruction, he does not correct it. Let him, I pray, read again that sentence of St. Augustine which I cited a little above (from *Ep.* 162) where the saint speaks specially of those who believe a false and perverse doctrine which they have not brought forth by their own boldness, but have received from parents seduced and fallen into error. Only in one case does Augustine not count these among heretics: *viz.* when they do not defend such a doctrine pertinaciously—*pertinaci animo*, but are anxious for truth and are ready to correct their error. Moreover, on the other side, in other places St. Augustine condemns the man who is pertinacious in his error, without any distinction,

whether he have himself invented the error or whether he have learned it from his parent...

[p. 55] "Moreover, ... through the mere baptism, duly administered and not unworthily received, he [King James] would have become a member of the Church... For, even though the ministers or parents be individually in error, yet he is baptized in the faith of the true Church; and, through that same faith which he received by infusion in baptism, he is made a member of that Church, even though he be detained under the power of aliens and enemies to the Church. Therefore the King of England was in the Catholic Church so long as he did not lose his baptismal righteousness and faith; for by

that Church he was regenerated, as Augustine teacheth (*De Baptismo*, book I, ch. 10); and from her he received that mark and that faith which conjoined him unto her. For in that age [of infancy] which is incapable of an act of faith, the habit is sufficient to create such a union; therefore he cannot be excused under that head; nay, in that he hath since lost his faith by his own act of heresy, he hath fallen away from the Catholic Church."

840. Heretics, Severer Penalties for (Beyond Excommunication), Abrogated in 1917

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *The Death-Penalty for Heresy* (Medieval Studies, No. 18. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd., 1924), pp. 37, 40, 41. Used by permission of the author's literary executor.

[p. 37] The new *Codex* of Roman Church law, which was published in 1917 to supersede the old *Corpus Juris Canonici*, contains a sentence to the following effect: "With respect to penalties of which this Codex makes no mention, whether they be spiritual or temporal, medicinal or what are called vindictive, and whether incurred by general law or by judgement of a court, let them be held as abrogated." (Canon No. 6, § 5). [See No. 389.] Here, then, for the first time in history, we have an official abandonment of temporal penalties against heretics; but *not on principle;* only as a matter of present-day practice. It is true that, since 1917, any Roman Catholic who inflicted upon a Protestant, for religion's sake, anything beyond excommunication or similar spiritual penalties would be acting in violation of Papal law. Thus, by one stroke of the pen, Benedict XV here silently abolished half the penal legislation of Lucius III, Innocent III, and Gregory IX; but we must face the fact that the present Pope, or any of his successors, could at any moment revive the old penal laws by another stroke of the pen. He would have the modern conscience definitely against him, but he would have equally definite support from centuries of Catholic principle...

[p. 40] During at least seven centuries, Rome has consistently asserted, *on principle*, a disciplinary and punitive power over all baptized Christians. She only ceased to assert this *in practice* when she found herself deprived of the necessary physical force. In so far as the claim was legally abandoned in 1917, this was only by a sort of Declaration of Indulgence which might be revoked tomorrow... [p. 41] The official Roman Church, except for this Declaration of Indulgence revocable at any moment, has shown no sign of repenting that which Gregory IX proclaimed in 1231, which was formally unregistered in the *Corpus Juris Cononici*, which was steadily and vigorously defended against Protestant objectors by the Blessed Robert Bellarmine, and which was publicly repeated and printed (twice with commendatory papal letters) by professors at the Gregorian University of Rome in 1875, 1901, and 1910 [Tarquini, De Luca, and, Lepicier; see Nos.

835, 836]. If these irreligious and immoral doctrines have been really and finally abandoned at headquarters, then let them be formally and finally renounced, in language which can leave no room for suspicion.

841. Herod the Great, as Hellenist and Jew

SOURCE: Edwyn Bevan, *Jerusalem Under the High-Priests* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1940), pp. 150, 151. Used by permission.

[p. 150] Are we to regard this king of the Jews [Herod the Great] as being a Jewish king? His family, no doubt, was Edomite, but it had been Jewish in practice and in status for at least two generations before him. Herod himself in such externals as circumcision conformed to the Law. His sons, as we saw, inherited the blood of the Hasmonaeans. Probably if Herod had followed the Jewish traditions with any zeal, the nation would have overlooked the discredit of his extraction; but if he was regarded as an alien, it was only too true that his interests and ambitions lay far outside the sphere of Judaism. He wished to be a great king among the kings of the world, and that in those days meant to be a Hellenistic king... [p. 151] To the world Herod advertised the sterling quality of his Hellenism in the usual form of munificence to Greek cities. He built for them temples and

stoas and baths. His name was remembered as a benefactor in Athens and Sparta and Rhodes... In his own kingdom, the new cities he built were of Hellenistic type and he was deterred by no scruple from rearing temples in them to the deity of Caesar. Even in the confines of Jerusalem he built a theatre and an amphitheater. One could hardly expect the Jews to regard such a king as a son of Israel.

At the same time Herod did not abjure his other rôle—however inconsistent—of a Jewish national king. In the negative way, he abstained from putting the image of any living thing upon his coinage, or from introducing any graven image into Jerusalem—at any rate till quite the last years of his reign.

842. Holydays, Catholic—All Saints and All Souls (Nov. 1, 2) SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 307–309, 312, 313. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 307] The Church of Antioch kept a commemoration of all holy martyrs on the first Sunday after Pentecost... In the course of the succeeding centuries the feast spread through the whole Eastern Church...

[p. 308] Meanwhile, the practice had spread of including in this memorial not only all martyrs, but the other saints as well...

Finally, Pope Sixtus IV (1484) established it [All Saints, November 1] as a holyday of obligation for the entire Latin Church, giving it a liturgical vigil and octave. The octave was discontinued in 1955...

The need and duty of prayer for the departed souls has been acknowledged by the [Catholic] Church at all times. It ... found expression not only in public and private prayers, [p. 309] but especially in the offering of the Holy Sacrifice for the repose of souls... Finally, in the fourteenth century, Rome placed the day of the commemoration of all the faithful departed [All Souls] in the official books of the Western Church for November 2 (or November 3 if the second falls on a Sunday).

November 2 was chosen in order that the memory of all the "holy spirits" both of the saints in Heaven and of the souls in purgatory should be celebrated on two successive days, and in this way to express the Christian belief in the "Communion of Saints." ...

[p. 312] PRE-CHRISTIAN ELEMENTS. Our pagan forefathers kept several "cult of the dead" rites as various times of the year. One of these periods was the great celebration at the end of the fall and the beginning of winter (around November 1). Together with the practices of nature and demon lore (fires, masquerades, fertility cults) they also observed the ritual of the dead with many traditional rites. Since All Saints and All Souls happened to be [p. 313] placed within the period of such an ancient festival, some of the pre-Christian traditions became part of our Christian feast and associated with Christian ideas.

There is, for instance, the pre-Christian practice of putting food at the graves or in the homes at such times of the year when the spirits of the dead were believed to roam their familiar earthly places. The beginning of November was one of these times. By offering a meal or some token food to the spirits, people hoped to please them and to avert any possible harm they could do. Hence came the custom of baking special breads in honor of the holy souls and bestowing them on the children and the poor. This custom is

widespread in Europe. "All Souls' bread" (*Seelenbrot*) is made and distributed in Germany, Belgium, France, Austria, Spain, Italy, Hungary, and in the Slavic countries.

In some sections of central Europe boys receive on All Souls' Day a cake shaped in the form of a hare, and girls are given one in the shape of a hen (an interesting combination of "spirit bread" and fertility symbols). These figure cakes are baked of the same dough as the festive cakes that the people eat on All Saints' Day and which are a favorite dish all over central Europe. They are made of braided strands of sweet dough

and called "All Saints' cakes" (Heiligenstriezel in German, Strucel Swiateczne in Polish,

Mindszenti Kalácska in Hungarian).

843. Holydays, Church Adopts, From Paganism

SOURCE: John Henry Newman, An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1906), p. 373. [See FRS No. 73.]

It is not necessary to go into a subject which the diligence of Protestant writers has made familiar to most of us. The use of temples, and these dedicated to particular saints ...; holy water; asylums; holydays and seasons, use of calendars, processions, ... are all of pagan origin, and sanctified by their adoption into the Church.

844. Hypnotism, and Posthypnotic Psychosis

SOURCE: Bernard Teitel, "Post Hypnotic Psychosis and the Law," No. 102 in *Summaries of the Scientific Papers of the One Hundred and Seventeenth Annual Meeting* of American Psychiatric Association, May 8–May 12, 1961, pp. 108–110. Used by permission of the American Journal of Psychiatry (Toronto) and the author.

[p. 108] Knowledge of the phenomena connected with hypnosis is relatively old. Traces of it can be found as early as the Renaissance, in the work of such cabbalists in the field of Medical studies as Cornelius Agrippa and Nettesheim (1535) and Paracelsus (1541) who considered hypnotism magic. Paracelsus distinguished between "white magic" where it is used in the service of medicine and "black magic" where its object is to do harm to others.

The primary attention of the law in relationship to hypnosis has been drawn to the possibility of hypnotism being misused for criminal ends. Liegeois, who was professor of law at Nancy, worked in close personal collaboration with Bernheim and Liebault in the 1870's and 1880's. It was this group of scientific investigators who first advanced the theory that hypnotism can be misused for criminal ends. While this theory has been

challenged, particularly by enthusiasts of the use of hypnosis in the U.S.A., Liegeois' theories have been generally accepted and proven as far as the European courts and medical community are concerned.

However, since 1815 the period of Mesmer when the study of hypnotism came to be carried out on scientific lines, little study has been devoted to hypnosis and its role in the precipitation of psychotic episodes. As in the controversy regarding the use of hypnosis to further criminal activity creating two opposing theories so has the association of hypnosis to the precipitation of a psychosis had its opposing groups. With the increasing use of hypnosis within the community, and particularly its use in paramedical circles such as dentistry, psychology, and its further use as "entertainment" procedure, [p. 109] post-hypnotic psychosis is a condition of increasing incidence, and thus of great importance to the physician and attorney. From the standpoint of the attorney, the most important problem in this area is the correlation of legal liability, hypnosis and psychosis.

In this paper, a case history is reviewed to point out what the relationship between hypnosis and psychosis might be, and how a post-hypnotic psychosis is recognized. The case history involves a 45 year old caucasian female who suffered an injury to her back while working as a restaurant helper. After a period of receiving supportive care with medications and bindings, she was referred to a neurologist. He recommended a course in hypnosis to relieve her symptoms, and consequently she was treated with a course of six hypnosis treatments by a Ph.D. psychologist.

For six months following these treatments there was no medical contact with the patient. When next seen it was noted that there was "some paranoid ideation," and nine months after her last hypnosis treatment she was diagnosed as suffering from a paranoid psychosis and was hospitalized for treatment.

During the nine month period when there were no medical reports on her condition the patient had been moving from one rooming house to the next in rapid succession. She was suffering from the fear that people "were controlling her mind, hypnotizing her, and attempting to harm her."

The relationship between the hypnosis treatment and the psychosis is evident from the sequential chain of events. Early in the course of her treatment following her injury, it was noted that there was a marked emotional component present which was manifested by multiple somatic hysterical-like symptoms. Through the use of hypnosis, these symptoms which the patient had been using as an ego defense mechanism were forcibly taken away from her through the use of hypnosis. This left her without any appreciable ego defense and she had to resort to delusional pre-occupations with one or several themes.

The delusion of fearing that she was in danger of being overtaken by a pursuing evil force is the type of delusion I have noted in three other cases in which post-hypnotic psychosis was considered. While this type of delusion is common in paranoid psychoses when hypnosis has preceded the overt psychosis there has always been an active moving about from place to place to avoid being "found."

In this case, as in others that have been noted, there was unmistakable evidence of a schizoid personality development as manifested by avoidance of close relationships with others, and inability to express directly hostility or any aggressive feelings. There was marked emotional detachment, fearfulness, and avoidance of competition. It is my impression that the likelihood of post-hypnotic psychosis in individuals with a schizoid

personality development is above average, and that the use of such techniques with such patients should be avoided.

In the legal setting of this case before the Industrial Accident Commission [p. 110] of the State of California, the hypnotic treatments were noted as "one of a series of major contributing factors in precipitating the patient's paranoid schizophrenic reaction." To my knowledge this is the first case in the medical-legal annals of the U.S.A., that the aspect of post-hypnotic effects have been accepted as contributory, although not solely responsible, for the development of an undesirable medical result.

845. Hypnotism, Perils of

SOURCE: Fred J. Cook, "Hypnosis: Perilous Passkey to the Mind," Coronet, 48 (July, 1960), 38. Reprinted

from Coronet. © 1960 by Esquire, Inc. Used by permission.

It is now well recognized that hypnosis can lessen the terminal pains of cancer, make childbirth and tooth extraction painless, help the psychiatrist probe the subconscious mind. Less wellknown are its perils. Hypnosis, improperly or viciously used, can lead to mental and nervous breakdowns; it can even be misused to further crime—to forge checks and wills, to instigate suicide, to promote murder.

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

846. IHS, Meaning of

SOURCE: Thomas Albert Stafford, *Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1942), p. 58. Copyright 1942 by Whitmore & Stone. Used by permission.

A Gothic form of *IHC* ... came into use in the Middle Ages when Greek was not understood by priests and monks. Because of this, it was variously interpreted, and it is believed that a Franciscan monk, Saint Bernardine of Siena (A.D. 1380–1444), was

responsible for the unauthentic interpretation, "Jesus Hominum Salvator" (Jesus the Savior of Mankind).⁴ [Note 4: Other interpretations may be heard, among them the following: English: I have suffered; German: Jesus, Heiland, Seligmacher; Latin: In hoc signo (vinces); Greek: Iesous, Hiereus, Soter.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: The monogram *IHS* has often been erroneously interpreted. It is an abbreviation of the Greek name of Jesus and derived from $IH\Sigma$, which is composed of the Greek letters *iota*, *eta*, and

sigma. These letters occur in Jesus' Greek name thus: $IH\Sigma o\gamma \Sigma$, transliterated IESOUS. Eta (H) is not an h but a long vowel transliterated \bar{e} and pronounced like a in ale. There is no letter h in the Greek alphabet. A word beginning with the h sound has its first letter a vowel, over which a rough breathing sign () has been placed to indicate the aspirate. This fact renders invalid another fanciful interpretation of the monogram as a supposed Christian substitute for the initials of the Egyptian deities Isis, Horus, Seb, or Isis, Horus, Serapis. Worshipers of these gods would not see such a substitute in this monogram, for the initial letter of the Greek form of Horus is not eta (H) but omega (Ω) thus: $\Omega Po\Sigma$; it has no eta.]

847. Images—a Medieval Catholic Layman's Protest

SOURCE: Eustache Deschamps, *Balade* (Vol. 8, p. 201), trans. in G. G. Coulton, ed. and trans., *Life in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928), Vol. 1, p. 188. Used by permission.

[Translator's Note:] Eustache Deschamps, Chaucer's French contemporary and panegyrist, is a voluminous poet who, without much inspiration, gives many vivid pictures of contemporary life. This *balade* is all the more significant because Deschamps represents ordinary orthodox lay opinion, and his murmured complaint was repeated a generation later by the great Gerson. The edition quoted is that of the *Société des Anciens*

Textes Français.

That we should set up no graven images in the churches, save only the Crucifix and the Virgin, for fear of idolatry.

Take no gods of silver or gold, of stocks or stones or brass, which make men fall into idolatry; for it is man's handiwork wherein the heathen vainly believed, adoring false idols from whose mouths the devils gave them doubtful answers by parables; warned by their false beliefs, we will have no such images.

For the work is pleasing to the eye; their paintings (of which I complain), and the beauty of glittering gold, make many wavering folk believe that these are gods for certain; and fond thoughts are stirred by such images which stand around like dancers in the minsters, where we set up too many of them; which indeed is very ill done, for ... we will have no such images.

The Cross, the representation of Jesus Christ, with that of the Virgin alone, sufficient fully in church for the sanest folk, without this leaven of wickedness, without believing in so many puppets and grinning figures and niches, where with we too often commit idolatry against God's commandments; we will have no such images.

848. Images, Veneration of

SOURCE: Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. by Neil Buchanan, Vol. 4 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898), pp. 318, 319.

[p. 318] Pictures of Christ, Mary, and the saints, had been already worshipped from the fifth [p. 319] (fourth) century with greetings, kisses, prostration, a renewal of ancient pagan practices. In the naive and confident conviction that Christians no longer ran any risk of idolatry, the Church not only tolerated, but promoted, the entrance of paganism. It was certainly the intention to worship the divine in the material; for the incarnation of deity had deified nature ($\phi \upsilon \varsigma \iota \varsigma$). A brisk trade was carried on in the seventh and beginning of the eighth century in images, especially by monks; churches, and chapels were crowded with pictures and relics; the practice of heathen times was revived.

849. Images, "Worship" of

SOURCE: Richard Frederick Littledale, *Plain Reasons Against Joining the Church of Rome* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1905), pp. 37–39.

[p. 37] Next, let us take the worship of images and pictures. Here it must first be said (a) that the Roman Church in terms denies that any such act as can be strictly called *worship* is done to pictures and images, even by the most ignorant, since no one believes that these representations can see, hear, or help of themselves; (b) that there is no question as to the lawfulness of making some such images and representations, if not intended to receive homage, as even the Jews had the brazen serpent, and the figures of the cherubim in the Holy of Holies, where, however, only one man ever saw them, and that only once a year; and the early Christians set up pictures of our Lord in the catacombs, still to be seen there. But, on the other hand, there is a very suspicious fact which meets us at the outset of the inquiry as to the actual Roman practice, [p. 38] as distinguished from any finespun theories in books, namely, that many Roman Catechisms omit the Second Commandment, while no Roman catechism teaches that there is either danger or sin in any making or using of images for religious honour, short of actual paganism. The point is ... whether in practice one Roman Catholic in a million ever knows that image-worship can be abused or sinful without virtual apostasy from Christianity. The Shorter Lutheran Catechism cuts down the First and Second Commandments just in the same way as many Roman ones do; but, then, on the one hand, Lutherans have free access to the Bible in [p. 39] their own language, and, on the other, nothing of the nature of image worship has ever been practised amongst them.

Intelligent and shrewd heathens, when arguing in favour of idols, say exactly what Roman Catholic controversialists do in defence of their practice, namely, that they do not believe in any sentient power as residing in the mere stone, wood, or metal, of which their idols are made, but regard them as representing visibly certain attributes of Deity, to bring them home to the minds of worshippers; and that homage addressed to these idols on that ground is acceptable to the unseen spiritual Powers, who will listen to and answer prayers so made indirectly to themselves.

850. Immortality, Conditional, John Milton on

SOURCE: John Milton, "The Christian Doctrine," bk. 1, chap. 7, in his *Prose Works*, trans. by Charles R. Sumner (London: George Bell and Sons, 1887), Vol. 4, pp. 187–195.

[p. 187] THE VISIBLE CREATION comprises the material universe, and all that is contained therein; and more especially the human race.

The creation of the world in general, and of its individual parts, is related Gen. i. It is also described Job xxvi. 7, &c. and xxxviii. and in various passages of the Psalms and Prophets. Psal. xxxiii. 6–9. civ. cxlviii. 5. Prov. viii. 26, &c. Amos iv. 13. 2 Pet. iii. 5.

Previously, however, to the creation of man, as if to intimate the superior importance of the work, the Deity speaks like to a man deliberating: Gen. i. 26. "God said, Let us make man in our own image, after our own likeness." So that it was not the body alone that was then made, but the soul of man also (in which our likeness to God principally consists); which precludes us from attributing pre-existence to the soul which was then formed,—a groundless notion sometimes entertained, but refuted by Gen. ii. 7. "God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; thus man became a living soul." Job xxxii. 8. "there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Nor did God merely breathe that spirit into man, but moulded it in each individual, and infused it throughout, enduing and embellishing it with its proper faculties. Zech. xii. 1. "he formeth the spirit of man within him."

We may understand from other passages of Scripture, that when God infused the breath of life into man, what man thereby received was not a portion of God's essence, or a participation of the divine nature, but that measure of the divine virtue or influence, which was commensurate to the capabilities of the recipient. For it appears from Psal. civ. 29, 30. that [p. 188] he infused the breath of life into other living beings also;—"thou takest away their breath, they die… thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created;" whence we learn that every living thing receives animation from one and the same source of life and breath; inasmuch as when God takes back to himself that spirit or breath of life, they cease to exist. Eccles. iii. 19. "they have all one breath." Nor has the word *spirit* any other meaning in the sacred writings, but that breath of life which we inspire, or the vital, or sensitive, or rational faculty, or some action or affection belonging to those faculties.

Man having been created after this manner, it is said, as a consequence, that man became a living soul; whence it may be inferred (unless we had rather take the heathen writers for our teachers respecting the nature of the soul) that man is a living being, intrinsically and properly one and individual, not compound or separable, not, according to the common opinion, made up and framed of two distinct and different natures, as of soul and body,—but that the whole man is soul, and the soul man, that is to say, a body. or substance individual, animated, sensitive, and rational; and that the breath of life was neither a part of the divine essence, nor the soul itself, but as it were an inspiration of some divine virtue fitted for the exercise of life and reason, and infused into the organic body; for man himself, the whole man, when finally created, is called in express terms a *living soul.* Hence the word used in Genesis to signify *soul*, is interpreted by the apostle, 1 Cor. xv. 45. "animal." Again, all the attributes of the body are [p. 189] assigned in common to the soul: the touch, Lev. v. 2, &c. "if a soul touch any unclean thing,"-the act of eating, vii. 18. "the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity;" v. 20. "the soul that eateth of the flesh," and in other places:—hunger, Prov. xiii. 25. xxvii. 7.—thirst, xxv. 25. "as cold waters to a thirsty soul." Isai. xxix. 8.—capture, 1 Sam. xxiv. 11. "thou huntest my soul to take it." Psal. vii. 5. "let the enemy persecute my soul, and take it."

Where, however, we speak of the body as of a mere senseless stock, there the soul must be understood as signifying either the spirit, or its secondary faculties, the vital or sensitive faculty for instance.—Thus it is as often distinguished from the spirit, as from the body itself. Luke i. 46, 47. 1 Thess. v. 23. "your whole spirit and soul and body." Heb. iv. 12. "to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." But that the spirit of man should be separate from the body, so as to have a perfect and intelligent existence independently

of it, is nowhere said in Scripture, and the doctrine is evidently at variance both with nature and reason, as will be shewn more fully hereafter. For the word *soul* is also applied to every kind of living being; Gen. i. 30. "to every beast of the earth," &c. "wherein there is life" (*anima vivens*, Tremell.) vii. 22. "all in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died;" yet it is never inferred from these expressions that the soul exists separate from the body in any of the brute creation.

On the seventh day, God ceased from his work, and ended the whole business of creation: Gen. ii. 2, 3.

It would seem, therefore, that the human soul is not created daily by the immediate act of God, but propagated from father to son in a natural order; which was considered as the more [p. 190] probable opinion by Tertullian and Apollinarius, as well as by Augustine, and the whole western church in the time of Jerome, as he himself testifies, Tom. II. Epist. 82. and Gregory of Nyssa in his treatise on the soul. God would in fact have left his creation imperfect, and a vast, not to say a servile task would yet remain to be performed, without even allowing time for rest on each successive Sabbath, if he still continued to create as many souls daily as there are bodies multiplied throughout the whole world, at the bidding of what is not seldom the flagitious wantonness of man. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the influence of the divine blessing is less efficacious in imparting to man the power of producing after his kind, than to the other parts of animated nature; [p. 191] Gen. i. 22, 28. Thus it was from one of the ribs of the man that God made the mother of all mankind, without the necessity of infusing the breath of life a second time, Gen. ii. 22. and Adam himself begat a son in his own likeness after his image, v. 3. Thus 1 Cor. xv. 49. "as we have borne the image of the earthy;" and this not only in the body, but in the soul, as it was chiefly with respect to the soul that Adam was made in the divine image. So Gen. xlvi. 26. "all the souls which came with Jacob out of Egypt, which came out of his lions." Heb. vii. 10. "Levi was in the lions of Abraham:" whence in Scripture an offspring is called seed, and Christ is denominated the seed of the woman. Gen. xvii. 7. "I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." 1 Cor. xv. 44. "it is sown a natural body." v. 46. "that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural."

But besides the testimony of revelation, some arguments from reason may be alleged in confirmation of this doctrine. Whoever is born, or shapen and conceived in sin, (as we all are, not David only, Psal. li. 5.) if he receive his soul immediately from God, cannot but receive it from him shapen in sin; for to be generated and conceived, means nothing else than to receive a soul in conjunction with the body. If we [p. 192] receive the soul immediately from God, it must be pure, for who in such case will venture to call it impure? But if it be pure, how are we conceived in sin in consequence of receiving a pure soul, which would rather have the effect of cleansing the impurities of the body; or with what justice is the pure soul charged with the sin of the body? But, it is contended, God does not create souls impure, but only impaired in their nature, and destitute of original send them into contaminated and corrupt bodies,---to deliver them up in their innocence and helplessness to the prison house of the body, as to an enemy, with understanding blinded and with will enslaved,-in other words, wholly deprived of sufficient strength for resisting the vicious propensities of the body-to create souls thus circumstanced, would argue as much injustice, as to have created them impure would have argued

impurity; it would have argued as much injustice, as to have created the first man Adam himself impaired in his nature, and destitute of original righteousness.

Again, if sin be communicated by generation, and transmitted from father to son, it follows that what is the $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \circ \nu \delta \epsilon \chi \tau \chi \hat{\delta} \nu$ or original subject of sin, namely, the rational soul, must be propagated in the same manner; for that it is from the soul that all sin in the first instance proceeds, will not be denied. Lastly, on what principle of justice can sin be imputed through Adam to that soul, which was never either in Adam, or derived from Adam? In confirmation of which Aristotle's argument may be added, the truth of which in my opinion is indisputable. If the soul be equally diffused [p. 193] throughout any given whole, and throughout every part of that whole, how can the human seed, the noblest and most intimate part of all the body, be imagined destitute and devoid of the soul of the parents, or at least of the father, when communicated to the son by the laws of generation? It is acknowledged by the common consent of almost all philosophers, that every *form*, to which class the human soul must be considered as belonging, is produced by the power of matter.

It was probably by some such considerations as these that Augustine was led to confess that he could neither discover by study, nor prayer, nor any process of reasoning, how the doctrine of original sin could be defended on the supposition of the creation of souls. The texts which are usually ad- [p. 194] vanced, Eccles. xii. 7. Isai. lvii. 16. Zech. xii. 1. certainly indicate that nobler origin of the soul implied in its being breathed from the mouth of God; but they no more prove that each soul is severally and immediately created by the Deity, than certain other texts, which might be quoted, prove that each individual body is formed in the womb by the immediate hand of God. Job x. 8–10. "thine hands have made me... hast thou not poured me out as milk?" Psal. xxxiii. 15. "he fashioneth their hearts alike." Job xxxi. 15. "did not he that made me in the womb make him?" Isai. xliv. 24. "thus saith Jehovah... he that formed thee from the womb." Acts xvii. 26. "he hath made of one blood all nations of men." We are not to infer from these passages, that natural causes do not contribute their ordinary efficacy for the propagation of the body; nor on the other hand that the soul is not received by traduction from the father, because at the time of death it again betakes itself to different elements than the body, in conformity with its own origin.

With regard to the passage, Heb. xii. 9. where *the fathers of the flesh* are opposed to *the Father of spirits*, I answer, that it is to be understood in a theological, not in a physical sense, as if the father of the body were opposed to the father of the soul; for *flesh* is taken neither in this passage, nor probably any where else, for the body without the soul; nor *the father of spirits* for the father of the soul, in respect of the work of generation; but *the father of the flesh* here means nothing else than the earthly or natural father, whose offspring are begotten in sin; *the father of spirits* is either the heavenly father, who in the beginning created all spirits, angels as well as the human race, or the spiritual father, who bestows a second birth on the faithful; according to John iii. 6. "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which [p. 195] is born of the Spirit is spirit." The argument, too, will proceed better, if the whole be understood as referring to edification and correction, not to generation; for the point in question is not, from what source each individual originated, or what part of him thence originated, but who had proved most successful in employing chastisement and instruction. By parity of reasoning, the apostle might exhort the converts to bear with his rebuke, on the ground

that he was their spiritual father. God indeed is as truly the father of the flesh as of *the spirits of flesh*, Numb. xvi. 22. but this is not the sense intended here, and all arguments are weak which are deduced from passages of Scripture originally relating to a different subject.

851. Immortality, Conditional, Not Inherent

SOURCE: Edward White, Life in Christ (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), p. 248.

The introduction of the anti-Christian figment of man's Immortality has given a wrench to the whole of Christianity,—and rendered it difficult for logical minds to hold some of the plainest gospel doctrines. The recovery of the truth respecting Christ, as the only source of immortal life to mankind, will bring out into fresh beauty the whole facade of the evangelical theology.

For this truth places in a new light all that the New Testament teaches on the Church's Union with Christ. As descendants of Adam, we possess no inherent principle of eternal life. We must be 'born again,' i.e., united by regeneration to Christ, the Incarnate life of God, the second head of the human race. And this union by the Holy Spirit personally dwelling in us is no legal fiction, no dream, or mere imagination, or figure of speech. It is the deepest reality in human existence.

852. Immortality, of the Soul, a Greek Idea

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), pp. 221, 222. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 221] *Why not "immortality of the soul"?* One other inadequate answer must be examined before we look at the Biblical view. And be forewarned, this one is hard to understand, particularly because many people confuse it with the Christian answer.

This is called "immortality of the soul." It comes from the Greeks, and when Greek thought and Hebrew-Christian thought came into contact in the Early Church, the Greek view often seemed to predominate. This view says, in effect, that there is a portion of me, my soul, that will continue to exist. During my lifetime here on earth this immortal soul is lodged in my mortal body. What happens at death is that my body dies and turns to dust, while my immortal soul is released and made free so that it can continue its immortal existence without being hamstrung by confinement in a body.

Sounds pretty good, doesn't it? But wait a minute. This means that my body is a nuisance to my soul, something that confines it, limits it, hampers it, subjects it to temptation. As the Greeks themselves put it, "the body is the prison house of the soul." This means that life on earth in the body is a waste [p. 222] of time, an unpleasant interlude in the life of the soul, something to be over and done with as quickly as possible. The whole aim of life is to escape from life, get rid of the pesky body, in order to resume a free and unfettered existence in eternity. Human life on earth has no final significance.

853. Immortality, of the Soul Incompatible With General Tenor of Scripture

SOURCE: George S. Hendry, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 65, 66. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 65] The idea that the soul is immortal presents some difficulty; it cannot be securely founded on the passages of Scripture which are adduced in support of it; and if the term be taken in its strictly literal sense of "not liable to death," the idea would seem to be incompatible with the general tenor of Scripture, as it is expressed in the emphatic declaration that God alone has immortality. (I Tim. 6:16). It is an unbiblical way of trying

to express the great Biblical truth that God's purpose with man [p. 66] is not completed with his death; God has created man for an eternal destiny.

854. Immortality, of the Soul—Luther Classes Concept With "Monstrous Fictions"

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Assertio Omnium Articulorum M. Lutheri per Bullam Leonis X. Novissamam Damnatorum* ("Assertion of all the Articles of M. Luther Condemned by the Newest Bull of Leo X"), Art. 27, in his *Works*, Vol. 7 (Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1897), pp. 131, 132. Latin.

[p. 131] However I permit the Pope to establish articles of faith for himself and for his own faithful—such are: that the bread and wine are transubstantiated in the sacrament, that the Essence of God [p. 132] neither generates nor is generated, that the soul is the substantial form of the human body; that he [the pope] is emperor of the world and king of heaven, and earthly god; that the soul is immortal, and all these endless monstrous fictions [*portenta*] in the Roman rubbish heap of decretals—in order that such as his faith is, such may be his gospel, such also his faithful, and such his church, and that the lips may have similar lettuce and the lid may be worthy of the dish.

855. Immortality, of the Soul, Silence of Scripture on SOURCE: Edward White, *Life in Christ* (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), pp. 85–87.

[p. 85] That the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul is never once explicitly delivered throughout the whole range of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures is a fact of which every reader may satisfy himself by examination; and it is a fact which long ago has drawn the attention of thoughtful and exact inquirers...

[p. 86] In every other instance we obtain from the Prophets and Apostles clear and frequent expressions of the doctrines which they were commissioned to deliver; even of those which unaided reason was able to discover, as the existence of God and the difference between good and evil. But in this instance nearly a hundred writers have by some astonishing fatality omitted, with one consent, all reference to the Immortality of the Soul; no sentence of the Bible containing that brief declaration 'from God,' or even a passing reference, which would have set the controversy for ever at rest. In our own times scarcely a religious work issues from the press addressed to sinful men, scarcely is a public exhortation directed to them, without a distinct exhibition of the doctrine of Immortality, of deathless being in the nature of man, as the basis of the whole theological superstructure. Now, how shall we explain the remarkable fact that neither Apostles nor Prophets have ever once employed this argument in dealing with the wicked:--'You have immortal souls, and must live for ever in joy or woe, therefore repent!'---an argument of almost irresistible force, if it be true? How, otherwise than by concluding that this was not their philosophy, that this doctrine [p. 87] formed no part of the 'wisdom of God,' and that they were withheld from proposing it to the world by Him who has declared that the eternal life of the righteous is the gift of His grace, and that 'all the wicked He will destroy'?

856. Immortality—Opposition to Teaching of Nonimmortality of the Soul Not Based on Exegetical Arguments

SOURCE: Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead*? (New York: Macmillan, 1958), pp. 5–7. © 1958 by Oscar Cullmann. Used with the permission of The Macmillan Company and The Epworth Press, London.

[p. 5] My critics belong to the most varied camps. The [p. 6] contrast, which out of concern for the truth I have found it necessary to draw between the courageous and joyful primitive Christian hope of the resurrection of the dead and the serene philosophic expectation of the survival of the immortal soul, has displeased not only many sincere Christians in all Communions and of all theological outlooks, but also those whose convictions, while not outwardly alienated from Christianity, are more strongly moulded by philosophical considerations. So far, no critic of either kind has attempted to refute me by exegesis, that being the basis of our study.

This remarkable agreement seems to me to show how widespread is the mistake of attributing to primitive Christianity the Greek belief in the immortality of the soul. Further, people with such different attitudes as those I have mentioned are united in a common inability to *listen* with complete objectivity to what the texts teach us about the faith and hope of primitive Christianity, without mixing their own opinions and the views that are so dear to them with their interpretation of the texts. This inability to listen is equally surprising on the part of intelligent people committed to the principles of sound, scientific exegesis and on the part of believers who profess to rely on the revelation in Holy Scripture.

The attacks provoked by my work would impress me more if they were based on exegetical arguments. Instead, I am attacked with very general considerations of a philosophical, psychological, and above all sentimental kind. It has been said against me, 'I can accept [p. 7] the immortality of the soul, but not the resurrection of the body', or 'I cannot believe that our loved ones merely sleep for an indeterminate period, and that I myself, when I die, shall merely sleep while awaiting the resurrection'.

Is it really necessary today to remind intelligent people, whether Christians or not, that there is a difference between recognizing that such a view was held by Socrates and accepting it, between recognizing a hope as primitive Christian and sharing it oneself?

857. Independent Churches

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 733, 734.

[p. 733] *History*. Under this head are presented those single churches which are not identified with any ecclesiastical body and have not even such affiliation as would entitle them to inclusion under a special name. Although any general classification is impracticable, through the several censuses certain distinct types have persisted.

The first class embraces those churches variously called union, community, nondenominational, and interdenominational. These represent the growing movement toward nonsectarian unity and the consolidation of church work to eliminate weak churches and the waste of duplicated effort in over-churched localities, and they also show a trend toward churches which serve the religious and social needs of the entire community, regardless of its specific creedal beliefs, and emphasize social righteousness rather than individual salvation. In the current census all churches of this class which have any ecclesiastical affiliation [p. 734] are shown with their respective denominations, while the federated churches, formerly included with the independent churches, are presented as a separate group. Community churches and non-denominational churches together comprise nearly one-half of the number of so-called independent churches, while about one-fifth of the whole report themselves as union or interdenominational churches. Of these latter, "Union" may be simply a part of the name and have no other significance, or the term may be historic and suggest a former denominational connection.

Interdenominational churches, as included in this group, are those having organic unity in which the several denominations represented have fully merged their individuality.

The second class includes churches which use a denominational name, but for one reason or another are not included in denominational lists and are not reported by the denominational officers. In the past a number of Lutheran churches were so listed because not included in the synodical returns, but the Lutheran bodies, as a part of the larger movement toward union, now report both synodical and nonsynodical churches. Among other bodies it occasionally happens that a Baptist, Presbyterian, Congregational, Methodist, Reformed, or other church, for some reason—doctrinal, ecclesiastical, or geographical—is not included in the lists of any association, presbytery, classis, or other body. In some cases these have simply grown up dissociated from the ecclesiastical bodies, and have preserved their independent status from habit rather than from difference of opinion. Not being included in the denominational returns, however, they are classed as independent.

The third class includes churches which were organized by individuals independent of any denominational status, some that originally had denominational connection, and some which are the result of holiness or evangelistic movements.

With regard to all these classes it is to be noted that they represent a constantly shifting number. In each class, occasionally, a church which is one year reported as independent will in another year be reported as identified with some ecclesiastical body. Others, lacking the support of some general body, drop out of existence entirely or become consolidated with other churches. Classified with the Independent Churches are several Christian Churches which did not join the Congregational and Christian merger and now have no denominational affiliation.

Doctrine and Organization. The withdrawal from the list of Independent Churches of the denominational federated churches has left a group for which no special features either of doctrine or polity can be definitely stated. Each of the organizations included in this report draws up its own creed, adopts its own form of organization, chooses its own officers, makes its own conditions of membership, and conducts its own worship as it chooses, and no general statement is practicable, except that the union and interdenominational churches accord more or less closely to the customs of the denominations represented in their organizations.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1936), 40,276 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 255). That *Yearbook* also lists on the same page two other independent groups, the Independent Fundamental Churches of America (organized 1930) with a fundamentalist statement of faith and a membership (1959) of 90,000; and Independent Negro Churches, membership (1936), 12,337.]

858. Indulgences, the Catholic doctrine of

SOURCE: *This We Believe* (rev. ed. of the *Baltimore Catechism No. 3*), pp. 332–340. Copyright 1957 by Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington. Used by permission.[p. 332] 435. *What is an indulgence?*

An indulgence is the remission granted by the Church of the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven.

(a) An indulgence does not take away sin. Neither does it take away the eternal punishment due to mortal sins. An indulgence can produce its effects in the soul only after sins are forgiven and, in the case of mortal sins, only after their eternal punishment is taken away. Many who are not Catholic wrongly understand an indulgence to be a permission to commit sin, or a pardon for future sin, or a guarantee against temptation.

By an indulgence the Church merely wipes out or lessens the temporal punishment due to sins already forgiven...

(b) The Church from the beginning has granted indulgences. Up to the sixth century indulgences generally took the form of a lessening of the public pen- [p. 333] ances imposed for sins. In the early centuries it was customary for those who were to be martyred to ask that indulgences be granted to certain individuals. *Scripture*

"And I will give the the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matthew 16:19–20). Also, read II Kings 24:1–20.

436. How many kinds of indulgences are there?

There two kinds of indulgences, plenary and partial.

- 437. What is a plenary indulgence?A plenary indulgence is the remission of all the temporal punishment due to our sins.a) A plenary indulgence is understood to be so granted that if a person should be unable
- (a) A plenary indulgence is understood to be so granted that if a person should be unable to gain it fully, he will nevertheless gain it partially, in keeping with the disposition that he has.
- (b) A plenary indulgence, unless it be otherwise expressly stated, can be gained only once a day, even though the prescribed work be performed several times.
- (c) The conditions ordinarily prescribed for gaining the plenary indulgence and designated by the familiar phrase, "under [p. 334] the usual conditions," are the following: confession, Communion, a visit to a church or public oratory, or even a semi-public oratory in certain cases, and prayer for the intentions of the Supreme Pontiff.
- (d) The confession which may be required for gaining any particular indulgences can be made within the eight days which immediately precede the day to which the indulgences are appointed; and the Communion may take place on the previous day; or both conditions may be satisfied on the day itself or within the following octave.
- (e) The following are several examples of plenary indulgences that can be gained by all the faithful:

Those who piously recite a third part of the Rosary (five decades) in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament, publicly exposed or even reserved in the tabernacle, may gain a plenary indulgence, on condition of confession and Communion (*The Raccolta*, No. 395, c.)

The faithful who with at least a contrite heart, whether singly or in company, perform the pious exercises of the Way of the Cross, when the latter has been legitimately erected according to the prescrip- [p. 335] tions of the Holy See, may gain a plenary indulgence as often as they perform the same, and another plenary indulgence if they receive Holy Communion on the same day, or even within a month after having made the Stations ten times (*The Raccolta*, No. 194).

The faithful who recite devoutly the prayer, "Behold, O good and sweetest Jesus," before an image of Jesus Christ Crucified, may gain a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions (*The Raccolta*, No. 201).

438. What is a partial indulgence?

A partial indulgence is the remission of part of the temporal punishment due to our sins.

(*a*) A partial indulgence, unless the contrary be expressly stated, can be gained frequently throughout the day, whenever the prescribed work is repeated.

- (b) To say that an indulgence of so many days or years is granted means that the amount of temporal punishment is remitted which, in the sight of God, would have been remitted by so many days or years of penance in the early Church.
- (c) God alone knows exactly how much of the temporal punishment is actually taken away by an indulgence.
- [p. 336] (*d*) The following are some ejaculations and invocations to which partial indulgences are attached:

An indulgence of 500 days for saying the ejaculation: "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts: the heavens and the earth are full of Thy glory!" (*The Raccolta*, No. 2).

An indulgence of 300 days for saying the ejaculation: "My God and my All!" (*The Raccolta*, No. 5).

An indulgence of 500 days for saying the ejaculation: "O God, be merciful to me, the sinner" (*The Raccolta*, No. 14).

An indulgence of 300 days; a plenary indulgence under the usual conditions, if this invocation is devoutly recited every day for a month: "My Jesus, mercy!" (*The Raccolta,* No. 70).

An indulgence of 300 days; a plenary indulgence once a month under the usual conditions, for the daily repetition of: "O Sacrament most holy, O Sacrament divine! All praise and all thanksgiving be every moment Thine!" (*The Raccolta*, No. 136).

An indulgence 300 days; a plenary once a month on the usual conditions, if this invocation is devoutly re- [p. 337] peated daily: "O Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee!" (*The Raccolta*, No. 357).

439. How does the Church by means of indulgences remit the temporal punishment due to sin?

The Church by means of indulgences remits the temporal punishment due to sin by applying to us from her spiritual treasury part of the infinite satisfaction of Jesus Christ and of the superabundant satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the saints.

- (*a*) In granting indulgences the Church exercises the power of the keys given to her by Christ.
- (b) When the Church, by means of an indulgence, remits the temporal punishment due to sin, this action is ratified in heaven.

Scripture

"But not like the offense is the gift. For if by the offense of the one the many died, much more has the grace of God, and the gift in the grace of the one man Jesus Christ, abounded unto the many. Nor is the gift as it was in the case of one man's sin, for the judgment was from one man unto condemnation, but grace is from many offenses unto justification. For if by reason of the one man's offense death reigned through the one man, much more will they who receive the abundance of the grace and of the gift of justice reign in life through the one Jesus Christ. Therefore as from the offense of the one man the result was unto condemnation to all men, so from the justice of the [p. 338] one the result is unto justification of life to all men. For just as by the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners, so also by the obedience of the one the many will be constituted just. Now the Law intervened that the offense might abound. But where the offense has abounded, grace has abounded yet more; so that as sin has reigned unto death, so also grace may reign by justice unto life everlasting through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Romans 5:15–21).

"For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, bearing witness in his own time" (I Timothy 2:5–6).

"But if anyone sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just; and he is a propitiation for our sins, not for ours only but also for those of the whole world" (I John 2:1–2).

See Scripture, question 435, Matthew 16:19–20.

440. What is the superabundant satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the saints?

The superabundant satisfaction of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the saints is that which they gained during their lifetime but did not need, and which the Church applies to their fellow members of the communion of saints.

441. What must we do to gain an indulgence for ourselves?

To gain an indulgence for ourselves we must be in the state of grace, have at least a general intention of gaining the indulgence, and perform the works required by the Church.

[p. 339] (a) Only baptized persons are capable of gaining indulgences.

- (b) The state of grace is required for gaining an indulgence at least at the moment when the prescribed work is finished. Even a person in mortal sin, therefore, can begin to gain an indulgence, unless the prescribed work demands the state of grace, for example, Holy Communion.
- (c) Since a general intention is sufficient to gain indulgences, it is well to express from time to time, especially in our morning prayer, the desire to gain all the indulgences attached to the prayers we shall say and to the good works we shall perform.
- (*d*) To gain an indulgence the work required by the Church must be performed fully and according to the prescribed time, place, and manner.

442. Can we gain indulgences for others?

We cannot gain indulgences for other living persons, but we can gain them for the souls in purgatory, since the Church makes most indulgences applicable to them. *Scripture*

"Then they all blessed the just judgment of the Lord, who had discovered the things that were hidden. And so betaking themselves to prayers they besought him that the sin which had been [p. 340] committed might be forgotten. But the most valiant Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forasmuch as they saw before their eyes what had happened because of the sins of those that were slain.

"And making a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection.

"(For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead.)

"And because he considered that they who had fallen asleep with godliness had great grace laid up for them.

"It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins" (II Maccabees 12:41–45).

859. Indulgences, for the Dead—Uncertainty as to Degree of Benefit SOURCE: T. Lincoln Bouscaren and Adam C. Ellis, *Canon Law: A Text and Commentary*, pp. 325, 326. Copyright 1946 by The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. Used by permission.

[p. 325] *Indulgences Defined*. An indulgence is the remission before God of the temporal punishment due for sins whose guilt has already been forgiven, granted by ecclesiastical authority from the treasury of the Church, by way of absolution for the living and by was of suffrage for the departed (cf. c. 911)...

[p. 326] 5. *By way of suffrage for the departed*. These have passed out of the Church's jurisdiction, but if they died in the state of grace they are still her suffering members through the Communion of Saints. Hence, though she cannot juridically determine the application of it, she implores God to accept a designated share of her treasury and apply it to the departed soul. Is the effect in this case infallible? Many hold

that, since the Church represents Christ, *some* effect is infallible, that is, that God will certainly accept the satisfaction so offered and apply it to some soul, not necessarily to the soul designated nor in the measure specified. Others hold that all rests in the inscrutable dominion and mercy of God. If not infallible, how does such an application of indulgences by the Church differ from the ordinary prayers of the faithful? To ask this question is to answer it. In one case it is the Church herself imploring God and offering the merits of Christ; in the other it is mere man offering a supernatural prayer more or less imperfect. Their manner of operation is similar (both are suffrages or intercession); but their power is unequal, that of the Church is far more effective.

860. Indulgences, Sale of (1512), by Tetzel

SOURCE: Oswald Myconius, trans. in Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 338–340. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[p. 338] Abuses in the Sale of Indulgences, 1512.

Fr. Myconius, Geschichte der Reformation.

[Translator's introduction:] Cardinal Raymond, papal legate in 1503, complained that the agents who sold indulgences were actuated only by the basest motives of gain and were thoroughly dishonest. Myconius (his German name was Mecum) was a Franciscan monk who became a Protestant...

[p. 339] Anno 1512. Tetzel gained by his preaching in Germany an immense sum of money which he sent to Rome. A very large sum was collected at the new mining works at St. Annaberg, where I heard him for two years. It is incredible what this ignorant and impudent monk used to say... He declared that if they contributed readily and bought grace and indulgence, all the hills of St. Annaberg would become pure massive silver. Also, that, as soon as the coin clinked in the chest, the soul for whom the money was paid would go straight to heaven... The indulgence was so highly prized that when the agent came to a city the bull was carried on a satin or gold cloth, and all the priests and monks, the town council, school-master, scholars, men, women, girls, and children went out in procession to meet it with banners, candles, and songs. All the bells were rung and organs played. He was conducted into the church, a red cross was erected in the centre of the church, and the pope's banner displayed...

Anno 1517. It is incredible what this ignorant monk said and preached. He gave sealed letters stating that even the sins which a man was intending to commit would be forgiven. [p. 340] He said the pope had more power than all the apostles, all the angels and saints, even than the Virgin Mary herself. For these were all subject to Christ, but the pope was equal to Christ. After his ascension into heaven Christ had nothing more to do with the management of the church until the judgment day, but had committed all that to the pope as his vicar and vicegerent.

861. Indulgences, Sale of (1517)—Instructions From Tetzel's

Archbishop

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 2, No. 6 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 4–9.

[Translator's introduction; p. 4] The Archbishop of Mainz arranged with the Pope in 1515 to conduct the sale of indulgences in his own vast archiepiscopal provinces, Mainz and Magdeburg, for one-half the proceeds. The plan was not carried out until 1517 when, we may infer, the undated Instructions to Subcommissioners were drawn up, a portion of which is given below. These instructions, Cardinal Hergenröther observes, "corresponding with the teaching of the church, cannot be a source of reproach to the Elector" (*Conciliengeschichte*, IX, II)...

Archbishop Albert's instructions to the sub-commissioners.

Gerdes: Introductio in Historiam Evangelii Seculo XVI Renovati, Supplement to Vol. I, pp. 90, *sqq*.

*** Here follow the four principal graces and privileges, which are granted by the apostolic bull, of which each may be obtained without the other. In the matter of these four privileges preachers shall take pains to commend each to believers with the greatest care, and, in-so-far as in their power lies, to explain the same.

The first grace is the complete remission of all sins; and nothing greater than this can be named, since man who lives in sin and forfeits the favor of God, obtains complete remission by these means and once more enjoys God's favor: moreover, through this remission of sins the punishment which one is obliged to undergo in Purgatory on account of the affront to the divine Majesty, is all remitted, and the pains of Purgatory completely blotted out. And although nothing is precious enough to be given in exchange for such a grace,—since it is the free gift of god and a grace beyond price,—yet in order that Christian believers may be the more easily induced to procure the same, we establish the following rules, to wit:

In the first place every one who is contrite in heart, and has made oral confession, or at all events has the intention of confessing at a suitable time, shall visit at least the seven churches indicated for this purpose, that is to say, those in which the papal arms are displayed, and in each church shall say devoutly five Paternosters and five Ave Marias in honor of the five wounds of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby our salvation is won, or one

Miserere, which Psalm is particularly well adapted for obtaining forgiveness of sins...

[p. 5] *Respecting, now, the contribution to the chest,* for the building of the said church of the chief of the apostles [the present St. Peter's church in Rome], the penitentiaries and confessors, after they have explained to those making confession the full remission and privileges, shall ask of them, for how much money or other temporal goods they would conscientiously go without the said most complete remission and privileges; and this shall be done in order that hereafter they may be brought the more easily to contribute. And because the conditions and occupations of men are so manifold and diverse that we cannot consider them individually, and impose specific rates accordingly, we have therefore concluded that the rates should be determined according to the recognized classes of persons. [The rates here follow.] ...

[p. 6] And those that have no money, they shall supply their contribution with prayer and fasting; for the Kingdom of Heaven should be open to the poor not less than to the rich...

The second signal grace is a confessional letter containing the most extraordinarily comforting and hitherto unheard of privileges... [p. 7] There will be granted in the confessional letter, to those who buy: first, the power to choose a qualified confessor, even a monk from the mendicant orders, who shall absolve them first and foremost, with the consent of the persons involved, from all censures by whomsoever imposed; in the second place, from each and every crime, even the greatest, and as well from those reserved to the apostolic see, once in a lifetime and in the hour of death; third, in those cases which are not reserved, as often as necessary; fourth, the chosen confessor may grant him complete forgiveness of all sins once in life, and at the hour of death, as often as it may seem at hand, although death ensue not; and, fifth, transform all kinds of vows, excepting alone those solemnly taken, into other works of piety (as when one has vowed to perform the journey to the Holy Land, or to visit the holy Apostles at Rome, to make a

pilgrimage to St. James at Compostella, to become a monk, or to take a vow of chastity); sixth, the confessor may administer to him the sacrament of the altar at all seasons, except on Easter day, and in the hour of death.

We furthermore ordain that one of these confessional letters shall be given and imparted for the quarter of a Rhenish gold guilder, in order that the poor shall not thereby be shut out from the manifold graces therein contained; it may however happen that nobles and other wealthy persons may, out of devotion and liberality, be disposed to give more...

[p. 8] The third most important grace is ... that contributors toward the said building, together with their deceased relations, who have departed this world in a state of grace, shall from now and for eternity, be partakers in all petitions, intercessions, alms, fastings, prayers, in each and every pilgrimage, even those to the Holy Land; furthermore, in the stations at Rome, in the masses, canonical hours, flagellations, and all other spiritual goods which have been brought forth or which shall be brought forth by the universal, most holy church militant or by any of its members. Believers will become participants in all these things who purchase confessional letters. Preachers and confessors must insist with great perseverance upon these advantages, and persuade believers that they should not neglect to acquire these along with their confessional letter.

We also declare that in order to acquire these two most important graces, it is not necessary to make confession, or to visit the churches and altars, but merely to purchase the confessional letter...

The fourth distinctive grace is for those souls which are in purgatory, and is the complete remission of all sins, which remission the pope brings to pass through his intercession to the advantage of said souls, in this wise; that the same contribution shall be placed in the chest by a living person as one would make for himself. It is our wish, however, that our subcommissioners should modify the regulations regarding contributions of this kind which are given for the dead, and that they should use their judgment in all other cases, where in their opinion modifications are desirable. It is furthermore not necessary that the persons who place their contributions in the chest for the dead should be contrite in heart and have orally confessed, since this grace is based simply on the state of grace in which the dead departed, and on the contribution of the living, as is evident [p. 9] from the text of the bull. Moreover, preachers shall exert themselves to give this grace the widest publicity, since through the same, help will surely come to departed souls, and the construction of the Church of St. Peter will be abundantly promoted at the same time.

862. Indulgences, Trent Decree Concerning

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXV (Dec. 3 and 4, 1563), Decree Concerning Indulgences, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 173, 174. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 173] The sacred, holy synod teaches and enjoins that the use of indulgences for the Christian people, most salutary and approved of by the authority of sacred councils, is to be retained in the Church; and it condemns with anathema those who either assert that they are useless, or who deny that there is in the Church the power of granting them... It ordains generally by this decree that all evil gains for the obtaining thereof—[p. 174] whence a most prolific cause of abuses among the Christian people has been derived—be wholly abolished.

863. Infallibity, Papal, and Ex Cathedra Utterances

SOURCE: Geddes MacGregor, *The Vatican Revolution* (Boston: Beacon, 1957), pp. 134–136, 139–141. Copyright 1957 by Geddes MacGregor. Used by permission of The Macmillan & Co., Ltd., London, and the author.

[p. 134] We are left, according to the testimony of modern Roman Catholic theologians, [in doubt] on the subject of whether papal utterances in the past were *ex*

cathedra and therefore in fallible, or private observations and therefore as fallible as those of anyone else. Hefele, the most learned [p. 135] authority on the subject, took the view⁴ [Note 4: *History of the Councils,* English edition, Vol. V, p. 61.] that the seventh-century Pope Honorius, who was anathematized by both an ecumenical council and a subsequent pope (Leo II), was giving a doctrinal instruction to the whole Eastern Church and, implicitly, to all Christendom...

Hefele wrote a special pamphlet on the subject of Honorius and his account of the affair would seem to be fatal to the personal infallibility of popes. Other modern Roman Catholic theologians, therefore, try to escape from the difficulty by contending that Honorius could not have been speaking *ex cathedra* at the time he made the utterance that was subsequently condemned and is now universally held to have been heretical. This is a difficult course for them to have to take; yet not impossible. The point is that it is almost always possible to question whether a pronouncement is *ex cathedra*.

We do not, indeed, have to go as far back as the seventh century to be confronted with doubt whether a papal utterance was given out as *ex cathedra* or not: there is an eminently important example among others that could be cited in our own time. Dom E. C. Butler correctly says⁶ [Note 6: *History of the Vatican Council*, Vol. II, p. 228.] that theologians in the 1860's and 1870's very commonly defended the *Syllabus [of Errors*] as an *ex cathedra* and therefore infallible document, though this was questioned by Fessler, the papal secretary at the Vatican Council, but that this view of it is to be dismissed as "being now almost given up." Pius himself maintained, however, that in applying the Vatican Decree there [p. 136] could be no such difficulty for any man of good will, since the Vatican definition was as clear as daylight. But there were certainly many very sincere persons within the Roman fold who, three-quarters of a century ago, believed the *Syllabus* to be an infallible utterance. There can be no doubt that Pius was aware of this fact, and yet only a generation later very few regarded the notorious *Syllabus* as having this all-important quality...

[p. 139] One looks in vain in the Codex of Canon Law for any commentary on the meaning of the words *ex cathedra*...

Dom E. C. Butler considers the question whether there had indeed been any [p. 140] infallible pronouncements from the time of the Vatican Decree till the date of his writing, some sixty years later. According to two of the experts he cites on this question, Père Choupin and Père Dublanchy, there probably were none. Nevertheless, some have supposed that the declaration, by Leo XIII, of the nullity of Anglican Orders, was an infallible pronouncement. Dom Cuthbert Butler doubts, however, whether that pronouncement was really invested with this character. Neither the word "define" nor the expression *ex cathedra* was used, so that there is ample room for doubt. Ought Leo to have left such room? Much less conspicuous officials of both Church and State are

accustomed to feel it their duty to take considerable precaution in making clear whether they are speaking *ex officiis* or "off the record."

We now turn for enlightenment, not unnaturally, to the bishop who was papal secretary at the Vatican Council itself. But Fessler only tells us blandly that we are not to expect easily to discern an *ex cathedra* utterance. No mere circumstances suffice in themselves, he says, to enable us to recognize whether that which a pope proclaims is or is not an *ex cathedra* definition. It is only, he affirms, when it is *acknowledged* that the circumstances and the words and the pronouncement itself *all* support the view that it has been the papal intention to make an *ex cathedra* definition that the pronouncement may

be presumed to be ex cathedra...

[p. 141] Who is to speak with greater authority concerning the interpretation of the intention of the Pope but the Pope himself, who evidently is not to be expected to do so? The interpretation, therefore, must always be left to others whose authority to make it is limited, and so, while having an infallible Pope, we can never know infallibly whether his definition is infallible or not.

864. Infallibility, Papal, Cardinal Manning on

SOURCE: Henry Edward [Manning], *Petri Privilegium* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1871), third pastoral letter, pp. 112, 113.

- [p. 112] 1. The privilege of infallibility is *personal*, inasmuch as it attaches to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of [p. 113] Peter, as a *public person*, distinct from, but inseparably united to, the Church; but it is not personal, in that it is attached, not to the private person, but to the primacy, which he alone possesses.
- 2. It is also *independent*, inasmuch as it does not depend upon either the *Ecclesia docens*

or the *Ecclesia discens*; but it is not independent, in that it depends in all things upon the Divine Head of the Church, upon the institution of the primacy by him, and upon the assistance of the Holy Ghost.

- 3. It is *absolute*, inasmuch as it can be circumscribed by no human or ecclesiastical law; it is not absolute, in that it is circumscribed by the office of guarding, expounding, and defending the deposit of revelation.
- 4. It is *separate* in no sense, nor can be, nor can so be called, without manifold heresy, unless the word be taken to mean *distinct*. In this sense, the Roman Pontiff is distinct subject of infallibility; and in the exercise of his supreme doctrinal authority, or magisterium, he does not depend for the infallibility of his definitions upon the consent or consultation of the Episcopate, but only on the Divine assistance of the Holy Ghost.

865. Infallibility, Papal, Decreed by Vatican Council, 1870 SOURCE: Vatican Council, Session IV (July 18, 1870), First Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ (*Pastor Aeternus*), chap. IV, Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff, in Philip Schaff,

The Creeds of Christendom (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 266–271.

[p. 266] Moreover, that the supreme power of teaching is also included in the Apostolic primacy, which the Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, Prince of the Apostles, possesses over the whole Church, this Holy See has always held, the perpetual practice of the Church confirms, and oecumenical Councils also have declared, especially those in which the East with the West met in the union of faith and charity. For the

Fathers of the Fourth Council of Constantinople, following in the footsteps of their predecessors, gave forth this solemn profession: The first condition of salvation is to keep the rule of the true faith. And because the sentence of our Lord Jesus Christ can not be passed by, who said: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,' these things which have been said are approved by events, because in the Apostolic See the Catholic religion and her holy and well-known doctrine has always been kept undefiled. De- [p. 267] siring, therefore, not to be in the least degree separated from the faith and doctrine of that See, we hope that we may deserve to be in the one communion, which the Apostolic See preaches, in which is the entire and true solidity of the Christian religion... Finally, the Council of Florence defined: That the Roman Pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, and the head of the whole Church, and the father and the teacher of all Christians...

[p. 268] The Roman Pontiffs, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, sometimes assembling oecumenical Councils, or asking for the mind of the Church scattered throughout the world, sometimes by particular Synods, sometimes using other helps which Divine Providence supplied, de- [p. 269] fined as to be held those things which with the help of God they had recognized as conformable with the sacred Scriptures and Apostolic traditions. For the Holy Spirit was not promised to the successors of Peter, that by his revelation they might make known new doctrine; but that by his assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the Apostles. And, indeed, all the venerable Fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have venerated and followed, their Apostolic doctrine; knowing most fully that this See of holy Peter remains ever free from all blemish of error according to the divine promise of the Lord our Saviour made to the Prince of his disciples: 'I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and, when thou art converted, confirm thy brethren.'

This gift, then, of truth and never-failing faith was conferred by heaven upon Peter and his successors in this chair, that they might perform their high office for the salvation of all; that the whole flock of Christ, kept away by them from the poisonous food of error, might be nourished with the pas- [p. 270] ture of heavenly doctrine; that the occasion of schism being removed, the whole Church might be kept one, and, resting on its foundation, might stand firm against the gates of hell.

But since in this very age, in which the salutary efficacy of the Apostolic office is most of all required, not a few are found who take away from its authority, we judge it altogether necessary solemnly to assert the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God vouch-safed to join with the supreme pastoral office.

Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith, for the glory of God our Saviour, the exaltation of the Catholic religion, and the salvation of Christian people, the sacred Council approving, we teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed: that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when in discharge of the office of pastor and doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Re- [p. 271] deemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals; and that

therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church.

But if any one—which may God avert—presume to contradict this our definition: let him be anathema.

Given at Rome in public Session solemnly held in the Vatican Basilica in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy, on the eighteenth day of July, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate.

866. Infallibility, Papal—Errors of Popes, Luther on SOURCE: Luthers Werke (Erlangen, 1828–1870), trans. and ed. by H. Wace and C. A. Buckheim in *First*

Principles of the Reformation (Philadelphia, 1885), pp. 159–239, *passim*. Reprinted in Louis L. Snyder, ed., *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 69, 70. Copyright © 1958 by Rutgers, The State University. Used by permission.

[p. 69] They assume authority, and juggle before us with impudent words, saying that the Pope cannot err in matters of faith, whether he be evil or good, albeit they cannot prove it by a single letter... We will quote the Scriptures. St. Paul says, "If any thing be revealed to another that sitteth by, let the first hold his peace" (1 Cor. 14:30). What would be the use of this commandment, if we were to believe him alone that teaches or has the highest seat? Christ Himself says, "And they shall be all taught of God" (John 6:45). Thus it may come to pass that the Pope and his followers are wicked and not true Christians, and not being taught by God, have no true understanding, whereas a common man may have true understanding. Why should we then not follow him? Has not the Pope often erred? ...

Therefore it is a wickedly devised fable—and they cannot quote a single letter to confirm it—that it is for the Pope alone to interpret [p. 70] the Scriptures or to confirm the interpretation of them. They have assumed the authority of their own selves. And though they say that this authority was given to St. Peter when the keys were given to him, it is plain enough that the keys were not given to St. Peter alone, but to the whole community.

867. Infallibility, Papal, Historical Problem of

SOURCE: J. J. Ign. von Dollinger, *Fables Respecting the Popes of Middle Ages*, trans. by Alfred Plummer (London: Rivingtons, 1871), pp. 219, 220.

[p. 219] ALVARO PELAYO, who, next to AUGUSTINE OF ANCONA [Augustinus Triumphus], furthered the aggrandisement of the papal power, with the greatest zeal, beyond all previous bounds, and almost beyond all limits whatever, in his great work on the condition of the Church, makes mention of the judgment which came upon Anastasius, in order to prove his dictum, that an heretical pope must receive a far heavier sentence than any other. OCCAM, also, makes use of the "heretical" Anastasius as an instance to prove, what was his main point, that the Church erred by his recognition. The council of Basle in like manner, with a view to establishing the necessary supremacy of an oecumenical council [p. 220] over the pope, did not fail to appeal to the fact, that popes who did not obey the Church were treated by her as heathens and publicans, as one reads of Liberius and Anastasius.

"The pope," says DOMENICUS DEI DOMENICI, bishop of Torcello, somewhat later, in a letter addressed to pope Calixtus III. (1455–58), "the pope by himself alone is not an infallible rule of faith, for some popes have erred in faith, as, for example, Liberius and Anastasius II., and the latter was in consequence punished by God." After him the Belgian JOHN LE MAIRE, also, says (about 1515), Liberius and Anastasius are the two

popes of ancient times, who, subsequent to the Donation of Constantine, obtained an infamous reputation in the Church as heretics.

868. Infallibility, Papal, Newman's Celebrated Letter on SOURCE: Extract from a letter from John Henry Newman to Bishop Ullathorne, quoted in *Letters From Rome on the Council*, by Quirinus [J. J. I. von Dollinger] (London: Rivingtons, 1870), pp. 356–358.

[p. 356] As to myself personally, please God, I do not expect any trial at all; but I cannot help suffering with the many souls who are suffering, and I look with anxiety at the prospect of having to defend decisions which may not be difficult to my own private judgment, but may be most difficult to maintain logically in the face of historical facts...

[p. 357] With these thoughts ever before me, I am continually asking myself whether I ought not to make my feelings public; but all I do is to pray those early doctors of the Church, whose intercession would decide [p. 358] the matter (Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Basil) to avert this great calamity.

If it is God's will that the Pope's infallibility be defined, then it is God's will to throw back "the times and moments" of that triumph which He has destined for His kingdom, and I shall feel I have but to bow my head to His adorable, inscrutable Providence.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Among the most noted converts from the Church of England to the Roman Catholic Church was John Henry Newman, who was made cardinal by Pope Leo XIII in 1879. This letter was written by him during the Vatican Council, when it appeared likely that the Council would adopt the decree of infallibility.]

869. Infallibility, Papal, Not Catholic Dogma Before 1870 SOURCE: Stephen Keenan, *A Doctrinal Catechism* (New York: Edward Dunigan & Brother, 1848), pp. 305, 306.

[p. 305] **Q.** *Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?*

A. This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige, under pain of heresy, unless it be [p. 306] received and enforced by the teaching body,—that is, by the Bishops of the Church. [See No. 870.]

870. Infallibility, Papal, Not Universally Taught in Past

SOURCE: J. J. Ign. von Döllinger, *Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1891), p. 84.

In several pastoral letters and manifestoes of recent date from the bishops, the opinion is maintained, or an historical proof is attempted, that the new doctrine of papal omnipotence over every individual Christian, and of papal infallibility in decisions of faith as proclaimed at Rome, has always been believed and taught universally, or, at all events, almost universally in the Church from the earliest times and throughout all the centuries. This assertion rests, as I am ready to prove, on a complete misunderstanding of ecclesiastical tradition in the first thousand years of the Church, and on a distortion of her history.

[EDITORS'S NOTE: Among the most illustrious and learned Catholic prelates and scholars who strenuously opposed the doctrine of the dogma of infallibility were Archbishop Darboy of Paris, Bishop Dupanloup of Orl, ans, Bishop Hefele of Hefele of Rottenburg (Charles Joseph Hefele, the author of the celebrated *History of the Councils of the Church*), Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis, and J. J. Ign. von D"llinger, the well-known historian and theologian. Peter Richard Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis, prepared a speech to be delivered in the Vatican Council, but as he was prevented from delivering this speech by the sudden and unexpected closing of the debate, it was printed and circulated among the bishops at the council. The original of this famous speech is found in *Documenta ad Illustrandum Concilium Vaticanum*, part 1, pages 189–226. A translation of it is found in *An Inside View of the Vatican Council*, issued by the American Tract Society, New York, pages 95–166. See No. 1224.]

871. Infallibility, Papal—Scope and Limitations

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, pp. 165–167.

[p. 165] It [papal infallibility] does not mean that the Pope is infallible in his *private* opinions on theology and religion. As a man, he may be a heretic (as Liberius, Honorius, and John XXII.), or even an unbeliever (as John XXIII. [see editors' note], [p. 166] and, perhaps, Leo X.), and yet, at the same time, infallible as Pope, after the fashion of Balaam and Kaiphas.

Nor does it mean that infallibility extends beyond the proper sphere of religion and the Church. The Pope may be ignorant of science and literature, and make grave mistakes in his political administration, or be misinformed on matters of fact (unless necessarily involved in doctrinal decisions), and yet be infallible in defining articles of faith.

Infallibility does not imply impeccability. And yet freedom from error and freedom from sin are so nearly connected in men's minds that it seems utterly impossible that such moral monsters as Alexander VI. and those infamous Popes who disgraced humanity during the Roman pornocracy in the tenth and eleventh centuries, should have been vicars of Jesus Christ and infallible organs of the Holy Ghost. If the inherent infallibility of the visible Church logically necessitates the infallibility of the visible head, it is difficult to see why the same logic should not with equal conclusiveness derive the personal holiness of the head from the holiness of the body.

On the other hand, the dogma does mean that all official utterances of the Roman Pontiff addressed to the Catholic Church on matters of Christian faith and duty are infallibly true, and must be accepted with the same faith as the word of the living God... This infallibility extends over eighteen centuries, and is a special privilege conferred by Christ upon Peter, and through him upon all his legitimate successors. It belongs to every Pope... It is per- [p. 167] sonal, i. e., inherent in Peter and the Popes; it is independent, and needs no confirmation from the Church or an occumenical Council, either preceding or succeeding; its decrees are binding, and can not be rejected without running the risk of eternal damnation.

Even within the narrow limits of the Vatican decision there is room for controversy on the precise meaning of the figurative term *ex cathedra loqui*, and the extent of faith and *morals*, viz., whether Infallibility includes only the supernatural order of revealed truth and duty, or also natural and political duties, and questions of mere history, such as Peter's residence in Rome, the number of occumenical Councils, the teaching of Jansen and Quesnel, and other disputed facts closely connected with dogmas. But the main point is clear enough.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The John XXIII here mentioned was a pope who was later repudiated to the extent that his number, XXIII, was not counted. That is how it is possible for the modern Pope John XXIII to carry the same number.]

872. Infallibility, Papal—Significance of Dogma

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, pp. 164, 165.

[p. 164] The dogma of Papal Infallibility ... involves a question of absolute power... [p. 165] It is the direct antipode of the Protestant principle of the absolute supremacy and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures. It establishes a perpetual divine oracle in the Vatican. Every Catholic may hereafter say, I believe—not because Christ, or the Bible, or the Church, but—because the infallible Pope has so declared and commanded... If the dogma is false, it involves a blasphemous assumption, and makes the nearest approach to the fulfillment of St. Paul's prophecy of the man of sin, who 'as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself off that he is God' (2 Thess. ii. 4).

873. Inquisition, Medieval, Not Justifiable

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 117, 118. First published in 1938 but William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

[p. 117] We must not be hypercritical; but, on the other hand, we must not attempt to justify the unjustifiable... We must cast the main blame not on individuals, but on the spirit of the age, newly emerged from barbarism and lacking that respect for toleration which, after all, has come more from the practical experience of the last four centuries than from any speculation or argument. To us, the [p. 118] historical effect of past religious wars has brought conclusive proof that neither orthodox nor unorthodox can in fact exterminate each other, and therefore that agreement to differ is happiest for both parties. The Middle Ages had not that experience, nor sufficient knowledge of history to make up for their disadvantage. They erred, we may say, in invincible ignorance, and the most selfrighteous among us may well confess that he himself might have erred with them. But that is no excuse for setting ourselves, with history and experience before us, to justify their error. If indeed, as Lord Acton wrote: "the principle of the Inquisition is murderous," then no man in cold blood can justify what our forefathers did, without becoming an accomplice after the fact.

874. Inquisition, Papal, Beginning of

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 110, 112–114. First published in 1938 by William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

[p. 110] What has been called the Episcopal Inquisition [that carried on by each local bishop] had proved evidently insufficient. By this institution, first from 1184 onwards, and then with redoubled emphasis at the Lateran in 1215, it was made the Bishop's duty to enquire after heretics throughout his diocese, and for the faithful in each parish to report any suspect, even though it were his own parent or child. This, again, broke down through the remissness or incapacity or immorality of many prelates, with rivalries or jealousies between Church and State authorities. Evidently persecution must be further systematised and the edge of the law sharpened: there must no longer be this more or less ambiguous talk of "extermination," but the plainest insistence upon the sword or the stake. Innocent himself would probably have undertaken this if he had long outlived the Lateran Council; fourteen years later it was undertaken by Gregory IX, the friend and patron of St. Francis, who had been as distinguished a canon lawyer as Innocent himself... [p. 112] Gregory IX then circularised all the bishops, to press upon them the need of systematic and ubiquitous enquiry, inquisitio, into the beliefs of their flocks. In some of the Italian cities, again, the magistrates were burning heretics. From 1227 to 1233 he gave full support and encouragement to the fanatic Conrad of Marburg...

[p. 113] In 1233 he formally entrusted the work to the recently formed and specially enthusiastic Dominican Order. From among these he named certain Inquisitors, whom he sent to different lands with powers to work with, and in many ways to supersede, the diocesan bishops. It is from this year that we must date, in so far as an exact date may be fixed, the full-blown Inquisition: the *Monastic*, as some call it, in view of the fact that it was mainly worked by Dominicans and Franciscans: or the *Papal*, as it may be more exactly called in virtue of the absolute papal responsibility for its creation...

Vacandard writes truly: "In short, Gregory IX only pressed upon Christendom the application of already existing laws, and introduced, when no such existed, the most rigorous legislation against heresy. But what belongs [p. 114] specially to him is the procedure to which he had recourse for the prosecution of heretics: that is, his

Inquisitorial system. The Inquisition proper, the Monastic, is in fact his work."

875. Inquisition, Papal, Defined

SOURCE: K. Benrath, "Inquisition," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 6, p. 1. Copyright 1910 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

The Inquisition (Inquisitio haereticae pravitatis) or the "Holy Office" (Sanctum

officium) is the name of the spiritual court of the Roman Catholic Church for the detection and punishment of those whose opinions differ from the doctrines of the Church. It was a comparatively late outgrowth of ancient ecclesiastical discipline. "In the primitive Church there was no arrangement that could have borne even a remote resemblance to the Inquisition... The whole instinct and the prevailing cast of thought of Christendom in the first four centuries was opposed to compulsion in religious affairs."

(J. J. I. von Dollinger, *Kleinere Schriften*, p. 295, Stuttgart, 1890.) The institution of "elder for repentance" ..., which occurs in the third century, bears quite a different character, as the very name denotes. Of course deviations in the sphere of Christian doctrine were combated, but hardly with other than spiritual weapons; and this practise continued until Theodosius (d. 395), before a Christian emperor found it advisable to impose an ultimate death penalty on (Manichean) heresy. Chrysostom repudiated such action: "It is not right to put a heretic to death, since an implacable war would be brought into the world" (*Hom.* x1vi. on Matt. xiii. 24–30); and still in the neighborhood of 450 the church historian Socrates characterized persecution for heresy as foreign to the orthodox Church. Nevertheless, in the meantime Augustine, in his conflict with the Donatists, had set up the contrary doctrine in the West and had recommended compulsion as well as penalties against heretics (*Epist.* xciii., c1xxxv.), though he did not approve the death penalty. Six centuries more passed before the theory of religious compulsion and of the violent extirpation of heresy came to have universal validity, although Pope Leo I. (*Epist.*

xv., *ad Turribium*) had approved it in the fifth century. This long season of comparative tolerance is the more impressive in view of the circumstance that in Italy under East Gothic and Lombard rule, Catholics and Arians lived whole centuries in close proximity, or even together (as in Ravenna).

876. Inquisition, Papal—Development

SOURCE: Alfred Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism,* trans. by Mrs. Philip Gibbs (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1908), pp. 156, 157. Used by permission of Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

[p. 156] Historically, the Inquisition may be traced back as far as the thirteenth century, but it was not until 1542 that Pope Paul III., by the bull *Licit ab initio* gave it the form and extent which made it a supreme tribunal for the whole Church; it can reach cardinals and bishops as well as plain laymen. Paul III. placed at its head Cardinal Caraffa, who proved pitiless. He began by renting a house in which he installed surgeons and provided chains and instruments of torture. He then proclaimed these four fundamental principles: there must be no delay in matters of faith; no consideration for

princes or prelates; no clemency for anyone who seeks protection from the secular power; indefatigable activity in seeking out traces of Calvinism everywhere. When he became Pope Paul III. [i.e. IV], Caraffa pursued his course with extreme severity and did not spare such cardinals as Morone and Pole, who had spent their lives in defence of the Church. Pius IV., Pius V., Sixtus V. were to complete the work begun by Paul III. and to make the congregation of the Inquisition, [p. 157] or the Holy Office, the highest authority of the Roman Curia.

877. Inquisition, Papal, Procedures of

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 119–121, 123–125, 128–130. First published in 1938 by William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

[p. 119] Procedure was by way of *inquisitio*, enquiry. If the man was branded as suspect by public report, ... the authorities might bring him into court. In this case his position was reversed; his guilt was assumed unless he could prove his innocence...

(2) Again, the judges were purely ecclesiastical: that is, interested parties. The civil powers vainly attempted to assert the right of even consulting the documents...

(3) The procedure was secret, and the Inquisitors jealously guarded their records from all outsiders.

(4) The names of the hostile witnesses were generally concealed, on the plea that this was necessary for their [p. 120] protection. Even when the Inquisitors took assessors to assist their judgment, no names were generally put before them, whether of the accused or of the witnesses...

[p. 121] (5) Whereas, in all other courts, the evidence of infamous persons or heretics was ruled out, in this court they were welcomed, so long as their testimony was hostile...

[p. 123] (6) In accordance with this same spirit, ordinary justice was no less grossly violated in the matter of advocacy. Innocent III, in a decree afterwards inserted in Canon Law, forbade advocates or scriveners to aid heretics...

(7) A very small nonconformity might be magnified into a crime punishable by death. We shall see later on that it finally became a burning matter to possess a Bible in the mother-tongue, or to wear garments disapproved by the authorities...

[p. 124] (8) Beyond this, the theory of "constructive heresy" was pushed to its farthest limits. Any apparent want of respect for the Church might form a *prima facie* ground for suspicion.

(9) Whereas the persecutor Trajan had forbidden Pliny to seek out the concealed Christian, yet the Inquisition compelled every man to spy upon his neighbour's secrets. Neglect of talebearing was, in itself, constructive heresy. A heretic who abjured, and thus exchanged the stake for prison, was obliged first to promise that he "would prosecute the heretics, and inform against them, and reveal them wherever he knew them to be." ...

[p. 125] (10) With all these dice loaded against the suspect, it is not surprising that acquittals pure and simple are almost unknown; the most that an accused could hope for was a verdict of "not proven." ...

[p. 128] It is sometimes pleaded that, after all, there is no feature of Inquisitorial procedure of which examples cannot be found in one or other of contemporary law-courts. This would be at best a poor apology, to plead that this court, which was, above all others, the most characteristic creation of the Church, should adopt every fault of a

comparatively cruel and lawless age. But it is not even strictly true... A few extracts from the lengthy analysis with which Bernard Gui [a medieval inquisitor] prefaces the fourth book of [p. 129] his *Practica* will give a sufficient, though still incomplete, idea... "The Inquisitors' excommunication is stronger than another man's in four respects. (a) They can compel *podestas* or governors of cities to banish whomsoever they excommunicate; (b) they can likewise compel them to confiscate the goods of the excommunicate; (c) they can condemn as heretics all men who persist a whole year under their excommunication: (d) they can excommunicate all who participate or communicate with any whom they have excommunicated." Again: "The Inquisitors' power of punishment is mighty and excellent. (a) They can punish in person. (b) They can punish substantially in goods or possessions. (c) They can punish in reputation. (d) They can punish in honour. (e) The rigour of the power of the Office of the Inquisition, in those matters which are committed to the Inquisitors, must be executed according to their discretion and will." ... "The execution of the Inquisitor's office is free and untrammelled, for all impediments are swept away. (a) The Inquisitors have no impediment from their superiors. (b) They have none from the inferiors against whom they proceed. (c) They have none from the officials or ministers through whose ministry they act. (d) They have none from the witnesses whom they hear. (e) They have none from contingent defects."

History affords few plainer examples of the demoralising [p. 130] effects of absolute power upon fairly ordinary men... "Released from all the restraint of publicity, and unrestricted by the formalities of law, the procedure of the Inquisition, as [the Inquisitor] Zanghino tells us, was purely arbitrary."

878. Inquisition, Papal, Sorcerers Condemned by

SOURCE: E. Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, trans. from the 2d ed. by Bertrand L. Conway (New York: Longmans, 1908), p. 201. Copyright 1907 by Bertrand L. Conway. Used by permission.

It is impossible to estimate the number of sorcerers condemned. Louis of Paramo triumphantly declared that in a century and a half the Holy Office sent to the stake over thirty thousand. Of course we must take such round numbers with a grain of salt, as they always are greatly exaggerated. But the fact remains that the condemnations for sorcery were so numerous as to stagger belief.

879. Inquisition, Papal, Today

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), pp. 313, 314. First published in 1938 by William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

[p. 313] It [the papal Inquisition] still exists under the title of Holy Office; and though the 1917 *Code of Canon Law* has at last abolished corporal penalties for [p. 314] questions of faith, yet the principle has never been abandoned. In the present century two separate professors of distinction in Rome, with Papal encouragement, have taught that the Pope possesses the *right* (as apart from *expediency* or *present power*) of punishing all baptized Christians (Protestants included) for pertinacious nonconformity, either in goods or in body. And, since the *Code of Canon Law* is the Pope's own creation and may be altered by any succeeding Pope with a single stroke of the pen, therefore Roman authority reposes still upon this principle which we have traced all down the Middle Ages. Thus, if any State ever became again a hundred per cent Catholic, it is difficult to see how it could avoid not merely the possibility, but even the moral compulsion, of reintroducing the principles, if not the whole methods, of the medieval Inquisition.

880. Inquisition, Spanish, Differentiated From Papal, or Roman, Inquisition

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (reprint; Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), p. 283. First published in 1938 by William Heinemann, Ltd., London. Used by permission of both publishers.

By common agreement the Spanish Inquisition stands in a category by itself, both as to its constitution and in its effects.

As England was least Inquisition-ridden among all the great countries of Europe, Spain at the end of the Middle Ages was worst: so much so, that modern apologists commonly attempt to draw a clean line of demarcation here. Elsewhere, they admit, the Ecclesia Romana was definitely responsible for this institution; but in the Peninsula it was a State machine; whatever ill was done must be reckoned not to the Church, but to Ferdinand and Isabella, the enlightened despots who created modern Spain.

This is a deceptive half-truth. The instrument which, confessedly, Spanish sovereigns abused had been constructed by the papacy. It was specially adapted to the purposes for which Ferdinand and Isabella used it; and popes themselves had often tried to employ it with equal severity; in so far as they failed, it was for lack not of will but of power. Finally, the Spanish abuses claimed papal protection, and nearly always got it, tacitly if not explicitly: the rare papal protests were never clinched with deeds. Civil authorities were threatened, and sometimes punished with the gravest penalties, for neglecting to back up the Inquisition, but never for excessive and misguided severity. Thus the Inquisition became one of the principal features of national life. The modern Spaniard owes as much to this institution, whether by attraction or by repulsion, as Britain does to her parliamentary constitution.

881. Inquisition, Spanish, Dutch Condemned by SOURCE: John Lothrop Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* (New York: A. L. Burt, [n.d.]), Vol. 1, p. 626.

The Roman tyrant [Nero] wished that his enemies' heads were all upon a single neck, that he might strike them off at a blow; the inquisition assisted Philip [II of Spain] to place the heads of all his Netherland subjects upon a single neck for the same fell purpose. Upon February 16, 1568, a sentence of the Holy Office condemned *all the inhabitants* of the Netherlands *to death* as heretics. From this universal doom *only a few persons, especially named,* were excepted. A proclamation of the king, dated ten days later, confirmed this decree of the inquisition, and ordered it to be carried into instant execution, without regard to age, sex, or condition. This is probably the most concise death warrant that was ever framed. Three millions of people, men, women, and children, were sentenced to the scaffold in three lines.

882. Inquisition, Spanish—Number of Victims

SOURCE: D. Juan Antonio Llorente, *The History of the Inquisition of Spain* (London: Geo. B. Whittaker, 1827), pp. 575, 582, 583. [FRS No. 92.]

[p. 575] It is impossible to determine the exact number of persons who perished in the first years after the establishment of the holy office. Persons were burnt in the year 1481, and the Supreme Council was not created until 1483. The registers in its archives, and

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

those of the inferior tribunals, are of a still later date; and as the inquisitor-general accompanied the court, which had no fixed residence until the reign of Philip II., many of the trials must have been lost during these journeys. These circumstances oblige me to found my calculations on the combination of certain data, which I found in the registers and writings of the holy office.

Mariana, in his History of Spain, informs us that, in 1481, the Inquisitors of Seville condemned two thousand persons to *relaxation*, that is, to be burnt, and that there were as many effigies; the number of persons reconciled was one thousand, seven hundred. The latter were always subjected to severe penances.

The autos-da-fé of this period, which I examined at Saragossa and Toledo, lead me

to suppose that each tribunal of the Inquisition celebrated at least four *autos-da-fé* every year. The provincial tribunals were successively organised. I do not speak of those of Mexico, Lima, Carthagena in America, Sicily or Sardinia, although they were subject to the Inquisitors-general and the Supreme Council, because I am only enabled to establish my calculation for those of the Peninsula and the neighbouring isles...

[p. 582] *Thirty-seventh inquisitor-general*. Don Manuel Isidro Manrique de Lara, Archbishop of Santiago, four years [apparently 1742–1746]. Burnt, 336. Effigies, 68. Penances, 816. Total, 1020.

Thirty-eighth inquisitor-general. Don Francisco Perez de Prado y Cuesta, Bishop of Teruel. He was confirmed by the Pope in 1746; I do not know the exact term of his administration, but I have fixed it in 1757, before the death of Ferdinand VI., who appointed his successor. Burnt, 10. Effigies, 5. Penances, 107. Total, 122.

Thirty-ninth inquisitor-general. ... Seventeen years. Burnt, 2. Penances, 10 in public, a greater number in private.

Fortieth inquisitor-general. Don Philip Bertran, Bishop of Salamanca, nine years. Two were burnt every year of this administration, six condemned to public, and a great number to private penances *. [Footnote *: The last person burnt by the Inquisition was a Beata, for having made a compact with the devil. She suffered on the 7th of November, 1781.]...

Forty-fourth inquisitor-general. Don Ramon Joseph de Arce, Archbishop of Saragossa, eleven years. Twenty individuals were condemned to public, and a very consider- [p. 583] able number to private penances. The Curate of Esco was condemned to the flames, but the grand-inquisitor and the Supreme Council would not permit the sentence to be executed.

[Totals for the whole period of the Spanish Inquisition, approximately 300 years:]

Number of persons who were

condemned and perished in	
the flames	31,912
Effigies burnt	17,659
Condemned to severe penances	291,450

341 021

883. Intolerance, Catholic—Effect on Catholic Unity

SOURCE: Albert Hartmann, *Toleranz und Christlicher Glaube* (Tolerance and Christian Faith) (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht Carolusdruckerei, 1955), p. 223, trans. in A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 53. Used by permission of both publishers.

The application of force to maintain unity of faith has not succeeded in preventing the secularisation of the modern spirit [in the very countries where there is the so-called Catholic unity]. On the contrary, this secularisation is largely the outcome of such compulsion.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Bracketed section not in the original, but appears without brackets in the translation.] **884. Isidorian Decretals,** a Stupendous Forgery

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 326, 335, 337–339. Used by permission.

[p. 326] The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals were a curious collection of documents, both genuine and forged, which appeared in western Europe about the middle of the ninth century under the name of Isidore Mercator, to give the Church a definite, written constitution. They were a stupendous forgery—the most audacious and pious fraud ever perpetrated in the history of the Church—worked out with admirable skill and consummate ingeniousness. Forgery was a common thing in those days, and it was generally believed that all things which upheld the doctrines and prerogatives of the Church of God were allowable...

[p. 335] Pope Nicholas I. (853–867) gave them papal sanction and used them to extend his power. He led the Church to believe that they were among the most venerable and carefully preserved documents of the papal archives. Backed up by them, he asserted his jurisdiction over both East and West; in fact, the whole world...

[p. 337] These forged decretals gave the Papacy a definite constitution; the Petrine theory was now proved by indisputable historical evidence—the ideal Papacy was made a fact from the very first... The Popes from St. Peter on were made the parents and guardians of the faith of the world, and the legislators for it, and also the supreme judges in all cases of justice. In short this constitution logically completed the Petrine theory...

[p. 338] Imperial control of the Church, exercised for eight centuries, was declared to be a usurpation which entailed disputes and wars. The state was represented as unholy, the Church as holy... In short these decretals carried the papal theocracy [p. 339] far beyond any claims made up to that time by the Popes themselves. It was left to Gregory VII. and Innocent III. to make the claim a living reality...

Both the civil and ecclesiastical polity of Europe was affected for centuries to follow. Over and over again they were quoted to prove papal omnipotence against temporal authority...

In this period of ignorance and lawlessness, while the Empire established by Charles the Great was disintegrating, the Papacy rapidly forged to the front as the champion of united Christendom; and to this end the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals contributed powerfully.

885. Islam, History, Practices, and Teachings of

SOURCE: Salma Bishlawy, "Islam," in Vergilius Ferm, ed., *Religion in the Twentieth Century*, pp. 155–159, 161, 162, 167–170. Copyright 1948 by The Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 155] Islam ... claims for its adherents about one-eighth of the world's population, over 250,000,000 [in 1961 estimated at about 350,000,000], and extends from Morocco to Zanzibar, from Sierra Leone to China, from the Balkans to the Philippines. Besides the nations of the Near East where the population is predominantly Mohammedan, the ninety

millions in India and the millions in China and Russia, there are communities of Muslims in Lithuania, the Cape Colony, West India Islands, British [and] Dutch Guiana, England, Australia, Japan, ... United States...

[p. 156] Muhammad was born to the clan of Banu Hashim, of the leading Meccan tribe of Quraish around 570 A.D.... He was a caravan conductor until his marriage to his employer, Khadījah, a wealthy widow fifteen years his senior and a woman of great character. This union which came when he was about twenty-five years of age, brought him freedom from economic care and enabled him to pursue his spiritual inclinations.

According to Muslim tradition, Muhammad, who had periodi- [p. 157] cally sought solitude for his meditation, received his divine call (610 A.D.) in a cave outside Mecca... Fired by his vision he began to preach the Unity of God, the Creator, His omnipotence, the rewards of the believers in paradise and the punishment of the wicked in Hell. His ideas were largely the result of the impression religious and moral concepts of both Judaism and Christianity had made upon him. In the main, there were three chief features of his teaching upon which he laid particular emphasis: the Unity of God, the moral responsibility of man toward God, and the judgment awaiting mankind on the day of resurrection.

At first the powerful group that were the custodians of the pagan shrine [at Mecca], and for whom such doctrines were detrimental to their vested interests, met the new Prophet with ridicule and derision. In time, as more converts to the new faith were won, the persecution took a more severe turn... About 620 A.D. he was invited to make Yathrib (later called Medīna) his home and to mediate in the suicidal feud between the Aws and Khazraj tribes, which was fast depleting their ranks. They [the people of Medina] promised him and his Meccan followers protection. The Prophet accepted, and two years later, after he had arranged for his Meccan followers to precede, he followed them and arrived in Medina on September 24, 622, the official day of the beginning of the Muslim era...

[p. 158] As legislator, Muhammad enacted the social and political ordinance of the new Muslim theocracy... At first he seems to have tried to establish an alliance with the Jews in Medina. He included several features of their worship such as the instituting of the 10th Muharran as a fast day resembling the fast of the Day of Atonement on the 10th of Tishri, the introduction of the midday prayer and the purification ritual before the prayer-just to cite a few instances. However, it soon became quite apparent that compromise with the Jews was becoming increasingly impossible as they heaped ridicule upon him for his reproduction of Old Testament stories. This brought about a difficult situation. All along Muhammad had simply claimed that his revelation confirmed the Jewish and Christian scriptures. Instinctively he took over elements from the older religions and perpetuated them in his teaching, even though his sources were in the main apocryphal and heretical. The doctrine of the Logos can be easily traced in the Qur'an, III: 4 and IV: 169. In his Christology Muhammad accepted the doctrine of the virginbirth, the miracles of healing the sick, raising of the dead and the ascension. He rejected the suffering of Christ on the cross and vigorously denied the idea of Jesus being the son of God or that he ever made such a claim for himself.

Muhammad now accused both Jews and Christians of falsifying their scripture, and proceeded to Arabicize Islam. Friday was substituted for the Sabbath, the direction of prayer was changed from Jerusalem to Mecca, the pilgrimage to the Ka'ba was included

in Islam and the kissing of the Black Stone was permitted. Muhammad during this period led several battles against the Meccans and their mercenaries, but it was not until 630 A.D. that the complete conquest of Mecca was accomplished. The pagan idols were utterly demolished, but the inhabitants were treated very generously. Now one tribe after another, from all corners of Arabia, flocked to his banner. A year later he headed the farewell pilgrimage to Mecca and there gave his last sermon where he substituted the most vital [p. 159] bond of Arab relationship, that of tribal kinship, with the brotherhood of Islam. His life ended suddenly after a short illness on June 8, 632 A.D.

Arabia after its long strife and disunity had finally brought forth a man who aroused the religious feeling of his countrymen and laid down for them a socio-economic and moral code which not only satisfied them but served as a foundation for an intense and highly productive intellectual activity for other people who already could pride themselves on an old and venerable civilization. Muhammad had never claimed divine origin nor did he want to be regarded as different from other men. He did not claim that he could perform miracles and frequently admitted that he was not free from sin. However, his conviction was unshakable that God had selected and privileged him to preach his will to the Arabs. It was this firm belief in the divinity of his message that conquered the religiously indifferent Arab and made him a fanatical follower of his call.

[p. 161] The Tenets of Islam and Its Prescribed Duties Belief in God, in His Angels, His divine Books, His Messengers, in Muhammad as the last of His Prophets, and in the Judgment Day—these are the tenets which constitute the articles of faith of Islam.

The only unpardonable sin is "shirk" or the joining of other Gods to the One Allah. Islam maintains an uncompromising monotheism. The practical religious duties incumbent on each believer are:

- p. 162] 1. The profession of faith (*shahādah*) which is summed up in the formula "there is no God but Allah; Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah." Upon conversion to Islam, the new believer is required to pronounce the formula once and hence becomes automatically a member of the Faith. There is no other ceremony involved.
- 2. Ritual prayer (*salat*) five times a day with the believer facing the direction of Mecca. The worshipper must be in a state of ceremonial purity and must use the Arabic language as his medium. The prayer consists always of the Fātihah (the Muslim equivalent of the *paternoster*) and additional phrases of the Glorification of God, combined with genuflexions and prostrations. The Friday noon prayer is the only public prayer obligatory for all adult males. An address is usually delivered during this service by the leader of the Prayer, the *Imām*.
- 3. The alms-tax (*zakāt*) was originally a voluntary act but it soon evolved into an obligatory tax on property. The money thus collected was used for the support of the poor, the building of mosques and for expenses incurred in the administration of the Muslim empire. With the disruption of the purely Muslim state, the *zakāt* became once more a voluntary gift left to the believer's conscience.
- 4. Fasting during the month of Ramadan. During this month, in which the *Qur'ān* was first revealed, food and drink are abstained from, from dawn till sunset. The occurrence

of Ramadan at times during the summer months in hot countries makes this duty a particularly rigorous one.

5. The pilgrimage (*hajj*). This duty is incumbent on every Muslim at least once in his lifetime, provided he is physically and economically able to perform it...

[p. 167] *The Qur'ān*

It is the Orthodox Muslim view that the $Qur'\bar{a}n$ is the word of God transmitted to Muhammad through the Angel Gabriel from an arch[e]type preserved in heaven. Hence it is eternal and uncreated. It is also considered the most perfect model of the Arabic

language... The Old Testament characters who figure prominently in the $Qur'\bar{a}n$ are Adam, Noah, Abraham, Ishmael, Lot, Joseph, Moses, Saul, David, Solomon, Jonah and Job; while of the New Testament only Zachariah, John the Baptist, Jesus and Mary are

emphasized. There are also other Qur'ānic figures of purely Arabic origin.

The substance of the material indicates parallelism with accounts in the apocryphal Gospels, the Mishna, the Aggada, the Midrash and other non-canonical Jewish works. Several passages dealing with the theological reflections, moral exhortations and a great system of ceremonial and civil laws are laid down forming the core of Muslim canon law.

The arrangement of the *Qur'ānic* material was arbitrary and mechanical. The longest *sūras* were placed first...

[p. 168] The *Qur'ān* has been translated into forty languages... Besides being the religious and ethical manual by which millions of Muslims are guided, it is the only reason why the Arabic dialects have not become distinct languages and why, although the Syrian may find it difficult to understand the Moroccan's spoken idiom, he has no trouble

reading the written Arabic since the latter is modelled upon the Qur'ān.

Muslim Sects

The two main sects in Islam are the Sunnī and the Shī'ites. The former is by far the

larger majority; the latter does not exceed nine per cent of all Muslims. The Shī'ites and their various subsects are found mainly concentrated in Iran and to some extent in India...

[p. 169] The Sunnī have shown relative unity in their main beliefs even though mystical elements, a few centuries after Muhammad, gained entrance into the rationalistic theology of Islam. Subsequently, we find development of pious fraternal organizations and worship of saint-like figures which heretofore were rejected as idolatrous. On the other hand, [there have been] puritanical and orthodox movements such as the Wahhabi movement in Saudi Arabia...

According to our historical knowledge, Muhammad has modified his concept of the monotheistic convictions according to the specific emotional needs of the Arabic people. Nevertheless, he was carried by the firm conviction that his revelation of God was the true God of Abraham undistorted and undiluted by faulty tradition...

It has been pointed out by scholars of many faiths that Islam has found its success by its great realism as to human nature. Its ethical teachings are not transformed into rigid demands interfering with the biological needs of human existence. The divine laws are not zealously surrounded by narrow barriers of continuous ritual. God's character is not presented by mystical and secretive allusions. No original sin and self-sacrificial purifications interfere with the positivism of the Muslim's attitude towards God. God is merciful and compassionate. He needs no interpretation by priest appointed by Him or devoted exclusively to the performance of religious rituals. No theological hierarchy interferes with the immediacy of the individual's worship and his communication with his creator.

Islam can boast of being thoroughly practical. It makes no [p. 170] demands upon its adherents which require explaining away because of their impossibility, none that cannot be fulfilled...

The simplicity of the creed together with unelaborate but still all-pervading ceremonial of worship which keeps a constant unifying bond within the believers has proved to be of equal appeal to the primitive nomad as well as the sophisticated scholar.

886. Islam, Rise and Spread of

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 100, 101. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 100] The Moslems ... had appeared as a new rival on the scene before Christianity had completed the conquest of Europe. A century before Charlemagne's time the followers of Mohammed had burst upon the stage of history as a terrifying surprise. The Arab prophet had fled from Mecca and taken over the rule of Medina in 622. That is the vear one in the Moslem calendar. It may be helpful to note that at this crucial date the monk Augustine was still archbishop of Canterbury. Mohammed died ten years later [632]. While the Saxons were settling England and had not yet been Christianized, the Moslems were spreading through the Middle East and sweeping across North Africa. With a unique success in giving religious sanction to military conquest and in turning conquered peoples into ardent propagandists of the faith of their conquerors, within a century after the prophet's death Islam had conquered and converted Arabia, Egypt, Syria, Persia, North Africa, and Spain, and had advanced its armies almost to the middle of France. Charles Martel, Charlemagne's grandfather, had [p. 101] stopped them at Tours in 732. This was just three years after the pope had commissioned Boniface to convert the Germans. Thus new and unsettled was the state of Europe when the great Moslem menace came.

Rather quickly the Moorish Moslems were forced back across the Pyrenees, and more slowly into the southern half of Spain. They held Cordova, and made it the seat of a high Islamic culture, until it was taken by a Christian king of Castile in 1236. Granada, the last stronghold of the Moors in Spain, held out until 1492. Through a great part of that period the Moslem powers constituted a menace and a challenge to Christian Europe on three sides. For more than two centuries the Crusades furnished an outlet for the energies of the Christian peoples, a field for knightly exploits, an opportunity for giving a pious coloration to deeds of violence and pillage, and a method of combining meritorious pilgrimages to sacred places with profitable adventure. The Crusades were, in the aggregate, only an episode in this long Moslem threat. From the seventh century to the seventeenth (there was a Turkish siege of Vienna in 1683), European Christianity knew that it had an enemy, sometimes only potential, sometimes actual, in the powerful religio-political system of Islam.

It has been customary for Christians to regard with a sense of moral superiority the slogan "the Koran or the sword," which is supposed to represent the ruthless technique of

the Moslem advance. This attitude requires correction for two reasons: first, historical research has shown that the expansion of Islam, though paralleled and accelerated by military action, did not rest wholly or even chiefly on that basis; second, a frank recognition of the known facts about the expansion of Christianity itself during and after the fourth century requires the admission that it rested quite as much on compulsion as on conversion.

887. Islam. See as Reaction Against Corrupt Christianity

SOURCE: Denis Baly, *Multitudes in the Valley*, pp. 266, 267. Copyright 1957 by The Seabury Press, Inc., Greenwich, Conn. Used by permission.

[p. 266] Islam [is] the most resistant system in the world to Christian missionary endeavor. Its strength lies in its simplicity, and the truth which it proclaims above all others is the authority and unity of God. Originally God's rebuke to the corrupt teaching and disunity [see No. 64] of the Church of Muhammed's day it has endured because in their modern forms these things still persist. As long as Christians permit themselves the luxury of their divisions, as long as the West rejects the absolute demands of the Creator, as long as a major section of Christendom toys with the idea of a "co-redemptrix,"* [Note * : This goes back to the original protest of Muhammed, who was so impressed by the excessive devotion paid to the Virgin Mary that he understood that she formed a member of the Christian Trinity.] so long will Islam endure to throw back [p. 267] the falsehood in their teeth.

888. Israel, Ancient Religion of, Despite Environment, Unique SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 80–82. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 80] Writers sometimes speak of the two religions of Israel, because it is clear from the Old Testament itself that there was a popular religion, with which the religion of Yahweh was often mingled and fused, but which was fundamentally different from it, and against which the prophets with increasing clearness protested. These texts enable us to understand more clearly against what the prophets declaimed. From the start there was the consciousness that Yahweh was the God of Israel and that the indigenous fertility cult was not Israel's true faith. While there were periods when this consciousness receded into the background, in all times of national revival it awoke anew and came to the fore...

Archaeology has helped to make some Old Testament narra- [p. 81] tives live afresh, and has placed Israel in her contemporary world; it has shown us the stock from whence she came, the cultural inheritance she began with, and the world into which she came; it has shown the nature of the constant struggle Israel had with the ideas and practices that prevailed around her, and helped us to realize that by her very geographical position she was exposed to influences that were hard to resist. It has not diminished our regard for the Bible, nor our respect for Israel. For in the light of her origin and her environment we are the better able to appreciate the heights she attained. We see the finger of God more clearly in her story, and wonder at the way He led her from such a beginning, and through such an environment, to such heights. And our regard for the succession of men we call the prophets, who served as the mouth-piece of God to Israel, is deepened. The uniqueness of the religious quality of the Old Testament, its profound insight and spiritual penetration, are more manifest than ever in the light of all that Israel had to discard, both within and around her...

[p. 82] Her debt to her Semitic inheritance, and to her environment may be readily acknowledged. But deeper than both, because infusing her literature and her life with that spirit which has made it endure, and which makes it still of living worth to men, was her debt to her own experience. The most enduring things that Israel attained were not the

things she had in common with others, but the *differentiae*, that were progressively born out of her growing experience of God. For the appreciation of the religious significance of the Old Testament, then, the study of Biblical archaeology is not without value. It brings into crystal clarity the recognition that nothing it can unfold can really explain the Old Testament in its deepest meaning, and beyond gratitude for the measure of light it brings, it induces a profound sense that the only satisfying clue to all it leaves unillumined must be found in the perception of the hand of God in Israel's life and in her Scriptures.

889. Israel, Ancient Religion of, Not Derived From Babylonian Polytheism

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1908), pp. 227, 228.

[p. 227] The religion of Israel is not developed out of Babylonian polytheism. Babylonian polytheism existed as polytheism in the earliest periods of which we have even the semblance of knowledge, and it endured as polytheism unto the end...

[p. 228] The origin of Israel's religion, the motive power of its mighty and resistless progress, is to be sought in a personal revelation of God in history, and that this personal revelation looks forward to the kingdom that was to be, when Judaism had passed over her carefully guarded body of truth to the Christianity which was to be born within her portals. The explanation of the religion of Israel is not to be sought in the religion of Babylonia which lies behind, outworn and useless, but in the living Christianity which stands before it.

890. Israel, Ancient Religion of, Unique in Ethical and Prophetic Character

SOURCE: E[rnst] Sellin, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, trans. by W. Montgomery (London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1923), pp. 205, 206. Used by permission.

[p. 205] The literatures of Ancient Egypt and of Babylon show us that in respect of religious lyric, as of prophecy, the People of the Revelation reached a height absolutely unique among the nations of the Ancient East. In spite of all the formal affinities of style, imagery, etc., it is here alone that [p. 206] the ethical is set free from the bondage of the natural ...; it is here alone that a consciousness of salvation is attained which in places already bears an almost New-Testament character ...; it is here alone that the keynote is the hope of a Kingdom of God which is to embrace all nations, along with the heavens and the earth.

891. Israel, Kingdom Rejected by

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, Scriptural Studies in the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 107. Copyright 1959 by The Paternoster Press. Used by permission of the author and of The Paternoster Press, London.

It cannot be denied that Jesus offered the Kingdom to Israel. When he sent his disciples upon their preaching mission, he told them not to go among the Gentiles but to "go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 10:6). Jesus rebuffed a Canaanitish woman with the words, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of

Israel" (Matt. 15:24). Furthermore, our Lord spoke of the Jews as the "sons of the Kingdom" (Matt. 8:12), even though they were rejecting the Messiah and the Kingdom of God. They were the sons of the Kingdom because it was Israel whom God had chosen and to whom He had promised the blessings of the Kingdom. The Kingdom was theirs by right of election, history, and heritage. So it was that our Lord directed His ministry to them and offered to them that which had been promised them. When Israel rejected the Kingdom, the blessings which should have been theirs were given to those who would accept them.

892. Israel, Remnant of, in New Testament Church

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible* (1957 ed.), pp. 108, 109. Published 1955 by The Westminster Press. Used by permission of The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, and Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., London.

[p. 108] The Church consisted of a Remnant of Israel, together with Gentiles who were won to the faith by them. The first Christians were all Jews, undeniably a Remnant of Israel, whether they be thought to be the Remnant of Promise or not. Soon they had communicated the faith to non-Jews who entered whole-heartedly into it and took its obligations seriously. Either this was the fulfillment of the hope and promise of the Old Testament or it was not. If it was not, then where shall we look for the fulfilment? And if it was not, how comes it to pass that here we find so remarkable a correspondence with the promise that had been set forth? If this was not the Remnant of Promise, then how comes it to pass that the obligations of the Covenant, including the obligation to make the Only God of all men known throughout the world, and to carry His Law to the nations, were so enthusiastically taken up by this Remnant, while the Remnant of Promise is still to seek? The faith of the Church that it was the Remnant of Promise is surely supported by the testimony of history, in which its inner hope has found such signal vindication in demonstrable fact.

Here, then, are a few of the ways in which the New Testament may be said not alone to spring out of the Old, but to respond to the faith and promise of the Old. We have not merely a development that did in fact follow from the Old. Expectations and promises are set before men in the Old Testament, and in the New Testament and in the Church we have the only response to them so far seen, which can be taken seriously. It is not that we have in the New Testament and in the Church a response which the Church believes to be superior to the response that can be found in Judaism. With all its nobility and grandeur, which may be recognized with the utmost sincerity, Judaism does not even claim to be the response to these hopes. It has no Messiah to [p. 109] offer, no Suffering Servant that can gather to Himself the things predicated of the Servant in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, no new revelation of God to authorize the dispensing with sacrifice, no vital sense of a mission to win the world for its God, no overmastering passion to communicate the Law of God to all men. All of these things, and more that could be added to them, are offered in the New Testament and in the Church, where the response to the promises is impressive indeed.

893. Israel, Restoration of—Conditionality of Promises (Millerite View) SOURCE: [S.] B[liss?] "The Return of the Jews," *The Signs of the Times*, 3 (August 31, 1842), 170.

The covenant which God made with that nation [Israel] was a conditional covenant. If they should serve the Lord their God with all their heart, to do all his commandments, and should diligently hearken unto him, they were to be blessed above every nation, and were to be forever the chosen people of God; but if they would not hearken unto the voice of the Lord their God, to observe and to do all his commandments, and his statutes, they were to be cursed above every nation, until they should be finally destroyed. In the other predictions of their various dispersions, they were promised that IF they would return unto the Lord their God, that the Lord would have compassion upon them, and would turn their captivity, and gather them from all nations whither he should scatter them. And we accordingly find that he was faithful who promised; for as often as they repented in their various captivities, he restored them to their own land. But in the chapter referred to. Moses evidently looked forward to the time when their waywardness and folly should be fully proved, when all the mercies and judgments of God should be found to be of no avail in restraining them from utterly rejecting the Lord their God, and walking after the evil imaginations of their own perverse hearts; and when it would seem that there was nothing more which God could do for his vineyard, which he had not done for it, so that he should cast them off forever and leave them to their own hardness of heart and blindness of minds, until they should perish. That the dispersion here predicted was their dispersion by the Romans, is evident from the nation that was to be brought against them, and from the complete fulfillment of that prediction, in the destruction of Jerusalem by that nation...

From this dispersion there is no promise of a return [see No. 1073n] ... [signed] B.

894. Israel, Restoration of—Millerite and British Literalist Differ SOURCE: Signs of the Times (a Millerite periodical), 1 (Sept. 15, 1840), 90; (Oct. 15, 1840), 109. *a. Letter, dated June 27, 1840, from Henry Jones, a Millerite*

[p. 90] So many of our dear brethren [i.e. premillennialists] both in Europe and America, including the celebrated Frey, Wolff, converts of Judaism, with whom I am agreed in the expected near coming of Christ and his kingdom, ... are doing a great and good work, in vindicating the coming of the Lord at hand; so that I would not, for my life, oppose them in it; but would rather consecrate all that I have and am, to help forward the same great work. And yet, in the most successful preaching of the kingdom of God at hand, I feel impelled to take the ground that the literal return to Palestine of the people called the Jews, is a doctrine not sustained by the Holy Scriptures.

b. Letter, dated Sept. 16, 1840, from James Begg of Scotland, a Literalist [p. 109] I regret to perceive, on the part of some of those who are in America testifying of the speedy advent of the Redeemer, much misconception of what appears to me so interwoven with it as to require corresponding consideration, especially the restoration of Israel to the land of their fathers, and their faithful fulfillment of Jehovah's purpose there... He [Miller] speaks of all the prophecies in which this is predicted, having been fulfilled in the restoration of the Jews from Babylon.

c. Letter from J. V. Himes, the editor, to James A. Begg, dated Oct. 8, 1840 [p. 109] I cannot express to you my gratitude on the reception of intelligence from England, Scotland, and Ireland, of the progress of the cause of the Second Advent *near* [i.e. premillennialism]. "As cool water to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country." When I commenced the paper called the "Signs of the Times," I did not know of another devoted to the doctrine of the Second Advent near... But I rejoice that the "day has dawned;" and that the time has now come, for the friends of the advent near, to become one in both countries. We wish now to open a correspondence with our brethren in Great Britain, and to get all the intelligence we can on the subjects connected with the return of the Lord Messiah to our earth; while in return, I shall unite with the friends in this country to give you a full account of the cause among us...

We think you in great *error* in relation to the "literal return of the Jews." Though we are not all united on this subject, yet the sentiment, that they will return, is fast passing away, among those who believe the advent near. Indeed, there are but few among our opposers who now publicly advocate the literal return of Israel. Our difference of opinion, on the Jews' return, however, will be no bar to our fellowship and co-operation.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For this difference of opinion about the return of the Jews as a prophetic doctrine, see No. 1073n.]

895. Israel, Restoration of—Millerite Statement on No Future Return of the Jews Promised

SOURCE: G. F. Cox, Letters on the Second Coming of Christ (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), pp. 37-43.

[p. 37] No return of the Jews, as a nation, to the land of Palestine is promised in the Scriptures, other than what has already taken place.

1. ... When Zerubbabel returned, there are mentioned as going with him other tribes than those of Benjamin and Judah. Also, under the Maccabees, and in the time of our Saviour, Palestine was peo- [p. 38] pled by the *Israelites* of all the tribes indifferently.

2. It should be recollected that *all* the prophets who have been supposed to predict the return of the Jews, lived and uttered their prophecies *prior* to the return of the Jews from Babylon; so that all the predictions referred to *may have* been fulfilled already, as far as they can be in an earthly sense... The Jews, universally, had liberty to return, if they [p. 39] wished, wherever they may have been scattered. And they did actually return—vast numbers of them at least—built their temple again, and enjoyed more or less prosperity till Christ came, who was its glory and end.

3. Does not the return of the Jews to Palestine, to build up again their temple, conflict with express declarations of the gospel, and otherwise appear absolutely *absurd*? Think of it. Prophets raised up, and prophecies uttered over two thousand years beforehand, that the nation of the Jews shall return to Palestine, and build up Jerusalem so that it shall equal in magnificence Boston, or New York, or even London!—with a wonderful temple, in its structure, gold and other appendages—for what? Why, to worship God in—to worship the true God—the meek and lowly Jesus... [p. 40] He came to make both Jews and Gentiles ONE—to break down the middle wall of partition, and to make of the twain *one new man*. What conflicts with the plain testimony of the gospel cannot be true.

4. The fourth argument I offer is, that the Jews have no more title to Palestine than have the Gentiles; because the original promise to Abraham was a *general one*. ... It was given before circumcision, that he might be father of the Gentiles; and circumcision was added that he might be father of the Jews also. But the promise was given to both Jew and Gentile, through FAITH; and they only which be of FAITH are blessed with faithful Abraham...

2. The promise was given to Abraham *in person*, and to *his seed*, which was *Christ*. ... Christ had not where to lay his head; and "to Abraham he gave none inheritance in it." ... [p. 41] These things show plainly that what was promised to Abraham and to Christ, was a "heavenly kingdom," shadowed out by Canaan. For Abraham and Christ both became heirs of the world... And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's *seed*, and *heirs* ACCORDING TO THE PROMISE. ...

[p. 42] I conclude, then, if the land of Palestine was promised to Abraham and to Christ, neither of whom ever possessed it, they must either come back again to inherit it as it now is, or they are to possess it in its new and purified form under the new heavens and earth; either of which implies a resurrection...

Let me conclude, then, by asking the reader if he does not join me in saying, if ... the prophets who have predicted their return, prophesied before their return from Babylon; and if at the time they were restored from all the tribes, indifferently, and built their temple, and flourished in Jerusalem; if Christ came to break down the middle wall of partition—to break up the division between the Jews and Gentiles as [p. 43] distinct nations; and if the original promise was never given to any but to Abraham and Christ, and to those who *believe* with Abraham; is it not probable that no restoration is intended in the Scriptures [see No. 1073n], other than what has already taken place, or may be claimed equally by the Jew and Gentile? Thus I judge, and thus I think the prophets testify.

896. Israel, Restoration of—Millerites Versus Literalists SOURCE: [Josiah Litch], "The Rise and Progress of Adventism," *The Advent Shield and Review*, 1 (May, 1844), 92.

In 1840, an attempt was made to open an interchange between the Literalists of England and the Adventists in the United States. But it was soon discovered that they had as little fellowship for our Anti-Judaizing notions, as we had for their Judaism; and the interchange was broken off.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Litch refers to an irreconcilable difference in the views of the two groups of premillennialists, the American Millerites and the British Literalists. The "Judaism" that he attributes to the Literalists was the belief (found also among some postmillennialists) that the prophecies required the restoration of the Jews as God's chosen people and their theocratic world leadership in the expected millennial kingdom (see Nos. 1052, 1073). By the Millerites' "Anti-Judaizing" (not anti-Jewish; see No. 1073n) notions he meant their contrasting view that the promises to Israel were conditional and either had been fulfilled to Biblical Israel or were inherited by spiritual Israel—all Christians, whether Jew or Gentile—and would be realized in the kingdom on the earth made new (see Nos. 893, 895, 1085).]

897. Israel, Restoration of—Nonrestorationist Position Summarized SOURCE: Everett F. Harrison, "Restoration of Israel," in *Baker's Dictionary of Theology*, p. 447. Copyright 1960 by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The nonrestorationist position seeks to establish its case principally on the following considerations. (1) OT prophecies often appealed to in support of national restoration, such as Isa. 11:11 and Ezek. 37, were fulfilled in the return from Babylonian captivity. (2) What was not thus fulfilled must be regarded as realized in the church of the NT, the new Israel. (3) Jesus frankly told the Jews that the kingdom of God would be taken from them and given to a nation bringing forth its fruits (Matt. 21:43). This emphasizes that the restoration promises regarding Israel in the OT must have a conditional rather than an absolute character. Israel failed to meet the conditions. (4) In the unfolding of the divine purpose the NT church includes both Jews and Gentiles, the middle wall of partition between them being broken down by Christ. A return to special consideration for one nation would seem to be an anachronism once the church is a reality. (5) The return of the Jews to Palestine in considerable numbers in modern times, however interesting as a phenomenon of history, does not in itself guarantee for this nation a spiritual future in terms of national conversion [see No. 1073n].

898. Israel, Salvation of, in Christian Church

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, Scriptural Studies in the Kingdom of God (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1959), pp. 117, 118. Copyright 1959 by The Paternoster Press. Used by permission of the author and of The Paternoster Press, London.

[p. 117] While we must therefore speak of Israel and the Church, we must speak of only one people of God. This is vividly clear in [p. 118] Paul's illustration of the olive tree in Romans 11. There is one olive tree; it is the people of God. In the Old Testament era, the branches of the tree were Israel. However, because of unbelief, some of the natural branches were broken off and no longer belong to the tree (v. 16). We know from verse 5 that not all of the branches were broken off, for "there is a remnant, chosen by grace." Some Jews accepted the Messiah and His message of the Gospel of the Kingdom. We must remember that the earliest Church consisted of Jewish believers; but they came into the Church not because they were Jews but because they were believers.

When these natural branches were broken off, other branches were taken from a wild olive and contrary to nature grafted into the olive tree (vv. 17, 24). This refers to the Gentiles who received the Gospel of the Kingdom, the "other nation" (Matt. 21:43) of which our Lord spoke. The natural branches which were broken off were cast from the tree because of unbelief; and the wild branches were grafted on because of their faith (v. 20). This entire procedure is "contrary to nature"; *i.e.*, it is not what one would expect from reading the Old Testament. From the Old Testament point of view, one would never know that the people of God was to consist largely of Gentiles and that the majority of the Jewish nation were to be broken off. This mixed character of the Church is indeed another mystery—a furtherdisclosure of God's redemptive purpose which had not been revealed to the Old Testament prophets (Eph. 3:3).

In the Old Testament era, the olive tree—the people of God—consisted of the children of Israel. Gentiles entered into the blessings of God's people only as they shared the terms of the covenant with Israel. In the New Testament dispensation, the natural branches, Israel, have been largely broken off the tree because of unbelief and wild branches from the Gentiles have been grafted in, through faith. But there is but one tree, one people of God, which consisted first of Israelites and then of believing Gentiles and Jews. It is impossible to think of two peoples of God through whom God is carrying out two different redemptive purposes without doing violence to Romans 11.

899. Israel — History — Abraham to Exodus, Josephus' Reckoning of the Period

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* ii, 15, 2; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 3 (Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 269. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

They [the Hebrews] left Egypt in the month of Xanthicus [Nisan], on the fifteenth by lunar reckoning, 430 years after the coming of our forefather Abraham to Canaan, Jacob's migration to Egypt having taken place 215 years later.

900. Israel — History — Canaan, Conquest of SOURCE: Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (Ithaca N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1954), pp. 49–51. Copyright 1954 by Cornell University. Used by permission.

[p. 49] According to the traditional understanding of the Biblical account, the taking of Canaan was accomplished in a single spectacularly successful invasion, with Joshua smiting one-and-thirty kings. In this picture, the Hebrew tribes, led by Joshua, crossed the Jordan near the Dead Sea and took the key point of Jericho, "whose walls came tumbling down." The next objective was Ai, up in the Hill Country...

Joshua took and razed a series of fortified towns, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, and Debir. This done, he conquered all the highland of southern Canaan, a section of the coastal strip as far as Gaza, and then in the north by the Waters of Merom, a hundred miles more or less from his base at Gilgal, he routed a Canaanite army.

Reuben, Gad, and half of the tribe of Manasseh took oc- [p. 50] cupation of Transjordan; the other half of Manasseh settled on the Plain of Sharon just south of Esdraelon. The tribe of Levi, consisting entirely of religious functionaries, received no single fixed territory. The rest of the tribes shared in the partition of Canaan according to their population.

The author of Chapters 10–11 in the Book of Joshua provides the basis of this traditional view. Joshua, he recounts,

defeated all the land, the hill country, and the Negeb, and the Shefelah, and the slopes, and all their kings; he left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed ... So Joshua took the whole land according to all that the Lord said to Moses; and Joshua gave it for an inheritance to Israel according to their divisions by their tribes. And the land had rest from war.

Chapters 15–19 in Joshua and Chapter 1 in Judges, however, give a different picture both of the conquest and of the role of Joshua therein. This version describes the conquest as a slow piecemeal affair, accomplished largely after Joshua and his generation were gone, by individual tribes and clans seldom acting even in partial unison. Thus Judges 1:1 would indicate that the land was not at rest from war, in fact was never pacified: "After the death of Joshua, the Israelites asked of the Lord, 'Who shall go up for us first against the Canaanites to fight against them?""

The latter picture of the conquest was generally taken by scholars to be correct and the former thrown into discard, together with Joshua's traditional career, as myth. The truth of the matter, however, appears to comprehend both versions. Excavations at Lachish, Tell Beit Mirsim (=Kiriat[h]-sepher?), Hebron, Eglon, Beth-shemesh, Gibeah, Bethel, Shiloh, Megiddo, and Beth-shan indicate that these places were destroyed or occupied, then were sometimes retaken [p. 51] and rebuilt by the Canaanites, only to change hands again, during the thirteenth, twelfth, and eleventh centuries B.C. ... "There was a campaign by Joshua which achieved an amazing success in attacking certain key Canaanite royal cities but ... there was also a long period of struggle for possession which continued after Joshua's death." ¹ [Note 1: Quoted from G. E. Wright, in *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, V (1946), 105–114.]

Biblical authors tended to telescope accounts of long campaigns—a device by no means abandoned even today... Thus Joshua acquires once again an association with the conquest of Canaan no less deserving and prominent in its way than that of Moses with the Exodus and the Wilderness.

901. Israel—History—Chronology of the Judges

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, Archeology and the Old Testament, pp. 180, 181. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 180] The date allocated to the period of the Judges is, of course, dependent upon the date assigned to the Exodus from Egypt and the Conquest of Palestine. Following the early date 1441 B.C. for the Exodus and 1401 B.C. for the fall of Jericho, and allowing thirty years for Joshua and ten years for the elders who outlived him, the period would extend from about 1361 to about 1020 B.C., the time of Saul. Following the later theories the period would be placed from about 1200–1020 B.C. This latter dating, although considered inescapable in the light of certain alleged archeological findings,³ [Note 3: *Cf.*]

W. F. Albright, *Archeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore, 1942), pp. 110–113; *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 212.] is nevertheless fraught with grave problems and much confusion, and is not in focus with the Biblical data. It not only clashes with the time scheme of the earlier period from Abraham to Moses, but also necessitates telescoping the era of the Judges, if one follows the Biblical chronological notices contained in the book even in a general way.

1. Detailed Chronological Notices in the Biblical Account. Although the numerous indications of time which are found in the Book of Judges do not permit this period of Israelite history to be dated by this medium, a careful collocation of the various chronological elements found in the book and a comparison with other pertinent chronological elements in other books of the Old Testament show that the time scheme underlying the Biblical narrative is quite consistent with the early or 1441 B.C. date [equally with 1445; see No. 723] for the Exodus and in keeping with 1 Kings 6:1, according to which the fourth year of Solomon, in which he began building the temple, was 480 years after the children of Israel came up out of Egypt. However, this underlying time plan of the Book of Judges is quite irreconcilable with the late-date theories of the Exodus and must be almost completely rejected or largely explained away by advocates of these late-date theories.

Chronological notices dealing with the length of the various oppression, judgeships and periods of peace as given in the Book of Judges... [p. 181] total ... 410 years... But this is obviously far too great an interval, for the much more extended period from the Exodus ... till Solomon's fourth year ... is only 480 years (1 Kings 6:1). The answer to this problem is quite evident from the narrative. Individual judges, like Shamgar, who has no chronological notation connected with his name (3:31), Tola (10:2), Jair (10:3), Ibzan (12:9), Elon (12:11), Abdon (12:14), who are listed in the barest possible manner without any detail and perhaps others whose careers are described more fully were merely local chieftains whose activity was strictly confined to some limited district and who doubtless ruled simultaneously with other judges, at least for part of their regime. For instance, the period of Ammonite oppression (18 years) was almost completely confined to Transjordan and doubtless overlapped the era of Philistine aggression during Samson's long judgeship of two decades (15:20; 16:31).

902. Israel—History—David and Solomon

SOURCE: Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1954), pp. 67, 69, 72, 73, 80, 81. Copyright 1954 by Cornell University. Used by permission.

[p. 67] Ancient Israel's Golden Era came during the tenth century B.C., when David and Solomon ruled Israel and Israel dominated western Asia...

Recent discoveries have greatly enhanced the historical value of the Biblical account, and even enriched its three-thousand-year-old story with considerable new material. The Queen of Sheba, after she met Solomon, is reported to have exclaimed, "It was a true report that I heard in my country concerning your achievements and your wisdom... [p. 69] But I did not believe the reports until I came, and my own eyes saw. Indeed, the half of it was not told me. You have wisdom and prosperity exceeding the report that I heard" (I Kings 10:6–7). The same words might well express the mood of modern scholars rereading the Biblical history of the reigns of David and Solomon in the light of the recent revelations...

[p. 72] The rise of the Israelite empire can be understood properly only in the context of the entire Near East. At the turn of the second millennium not a single state in

Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt—the aggressive forces normally active within the historic constellation of which Israel was a part—was powerful enough to interfere with David's plans for expansion. Babylonia had been in decline since the downfall of the Hammurabi dynasty in the sixteenth century B.C. The Hurrian state, in northeast Iraq, had been destroyed by Assyria in the thirteenth century. The latter, in turn (except briefly about 1100 under Tiglath-pileser I), was too weak to seek empire and adventure outside its territory until after 900 B.C. The Hitties, who had taken over northern Syria and the Hurrian state early in the fourteenth century, and whose power in the entire Near East at the time was equaled only by that of Egypt, collapsed before the onslaughts of the Aegean peoples at about 1200 B.C.

Egypt's power, too, had waned. The disintegration which had begun during the Twentieth Dynasty, especially after 1150, was not alleviated when the Amon priesthood and their wealthy associates assumed control of the land, shortly after 1100. Except for a brief period under Sheshonk I, the Biblical Shishak (about 925), Egypt was in no position to challenge anyone outside its borders until over four centuries later, when her power revived under Necho of the Twenty-sixth Dynasty. As for the Arameans (Syrians), their ascendancy in upper Transjordan, where they eventually founded a number of city-states, had only just begun.

In the context of this political void which was western [p. 73] Asia about 1000 B.C., the Biblical account of the rise of David's empire bears eloquent testimony to the skillful manner in which the Israelites moved to fill the vacuum...

[p. 80] It is a frequent archaeological experience to uncover the material remains of the Solomonic (Early Iron) level of Israelite towns—for example, at Megiddo, Gezer, Tell Qasileh, Eziongeber, Hazor, and Lachish. Like the Temple, these structures were generally Phoenician in concept and in such details as the pattern of masonry, the use of capitals (which the Greeks also borrowed from the Phoenicians a couple of centuries later), and the style of gateways. The government buildings at Megiddo ... form a particularly noteworthy example...

Of particular interest is the famous copper refinery and seaport at Eziongeber, on the Gulf of Aqabah, rediscovered in the early 1930's, about a third of a mile north of the present coastline. Although the site of the port had long been sought by scholars and travelers, no one was prepared [p. 81] for the discovery of the extraordinary structure built specifically to smelt the copper ore which was dug from the mines of near-by Sinai and Edom. Its excavator called Ezion-geber "the Pittsburgh of Palestine, in addition to being its most important port," and described Solomon "as a great copper king." Eziongeber, like the corresponding levels from the period of Solomon at Meggido and Tell Qasileh, "was planned in advance, and built with considerable architectural and engineering skill at one time as an integral whole." ⁶ [Note 6: From N. Glueck, *The Other Side of the Jordan* (New Haven, 1940), chs. iii, iv.]

903. Israel—History—Fall of—Kingdom of Israel

SOURCE: Jack Finegan, *Light From the Ancient Past* (2d ed.), p. 210 & n. 29. Copyright 1959 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

If these statements comprise the authentic record of the fall of Samaria, then that city must have been captured at the earliest in the accession year of Sargon II, that is sometime after late December, 722 B.C., hence probably in 721 B.C. This is, however, in conflict with the data which indicate that Samaria was taken by Shalmaneser V. If Samaria fell in the summer or fall of 722 B.C. it was only a few months until the death of

Shalmaneser V in December of that year, and this may have made it easy for Sargon II, in inscriptions written late in his reign, to claim for his own glory the conquest which was actually accomplished by his predecessor. Furthermore, in the few months before his death Shalmaneser V may have but barely begun the deportation of the people of Samaria and the actual carrying out of this deportation may have actually been the work of Sargon II, as the latter says.²⁹

[Note 29: Tadmor in JCS 12 (1958), pp. 37f. It has also been thought that Sargon II might have participated in the taking of Samaria along with his brother, Shalmaneser V, but prior to his own accession to the kingship, and in this connection it is pointed out that II Kings 18:9f. says that Shalmaneser besieged Samaria but that "they" (ASV) took it. The use of the word "they" could allow for the association of Sargon with Shalmaneser at the end of the siege; on the other hand it may be simply a reference to the Assyrian army in the plural.]

904. Israel—History—Hezekiah Attacked by Sennacherib

SOURCE: Sennacherib, Annals, trans. in James B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (2d ed.), pp. 287, 288. Copyright 1955 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 287] In my third campaign I marched against Hatti. Luli, king of Sidon, whom the terror-inspiring glamor of my lordship had overwhelmed, fled far overseas and perished. The awe-inspiring splendor of the "Weapon" of Ashur, my lord, overwhelmed his strong cities (such as) Great Sidon, Little Sidon, Bit-Zitti, Zaribtu, Mahalliba, Ushu (i.e. the mainland settlement of Tyre), Akzib (and) Akko, (all) his fortress cities, walled (and well) provided with feed and water for his garrisons, and they bowed in submission to my feet. I installed Ethba'al (*Tuba'lu*) upon the throne to be their king and imposed upon him tribute (due) to me (as his) overlord (to be paid) annually without interruption.

As to all the kings of Amurru—Menahem (Mi-in-hi-im-mu) from Samsimuruna,

Tuba'lu from Sidon, Abdili'ti from Arvad, Urumilki from Byblos, Mitinti from Ashdod, Buduili from Beth-Ammon, Kammusunadbi from Moab (and) Aiarammu from Edom, they brought sumptuous gifts (*igisû*) and—fourfold—their heavy *tâmartu* -presents to me and kissed my feet...

[p. 288] As to Hezekiah, the Jew, he did not submit to my yoke, I laid siege to 46 of his strong cities, walled forts and to the countless small villages in their vicinity, and conquered (them) by means of well-stamped (earth-) ramps, and battering-rams brought (thus) near (to the walls) (combined with) the attack by foot soldiers, (using) mines, breeches as well as sapper work. I drove out (of them) 200,150 people, young and old, male and female, horses, mules, donkeys, camels, big and small cattle beyond counting, and considered (them) booty. Himself I made a prisoner in Jerusalem, his royal residence, like a bird in a cage. I surrounded him with earthwork in order to molest those who were leaving his city's gate. His towns which I had plundered, I took away from his country and gave them (over) to Mitinti, king of Ashdod, Padi, king of Ekron, and Sillibel, king

of Gaza. Thus I reduced his country, but I still increased the tribute and the $katr\hat{u}$ - presents (due) to me (as his) overlord which I imposed (later) upon him beyond the former tribute, to be delivered annually. Hezekiah himself, whom the terror-inspiring splendor of my lordship had overwhelmed and whose irregular and elite troops which he had brought into Jerusalem, his royal residence, in order to strengthen (it), had deserted him, did send me, later, to Nineveh, my lordly city, together with 30 talents of gold, 800 talents of silver, precious stones, antimony, large cuts of red stone, couches (inlaid) with

ivory, *nîmedu* -chairs (inlaid) with ivory, elephant-hides, ebony-wood, boxwood (and) all kinds of valuable treasures, his (own) daughters, concubines, male and female musicians. In order to deliver the tribute and to do obeisance as a slave he sent his (personal) messenger.

905. Israel—History—Hezekiah Attacked Twice, by Sennacherib SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period* (reprint; Pittsburgh: Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania), pp. 43, 44. Copyright 1949 by Louis Finkelstein. Used by permission of Harper and Brothers, New York.

[p. 43] The Chaldean chieftain, Merodach-baladan, had re-established himself as king of Babylon and was defying Assyrian efforts to dislodge him. Under the circumstances, it was to be expected that Judah would try to throw off the onerous Assyrian yoke. In preparation for the day of decision, Hezekiah accepted the overtures made by Babylon and Egypt, intervened in Philistine affairs in order to strengthen the hands of the local rebels, and fortified Jerusalem, where the excavated the Siloam tunnel through the solid rock in order to provide the city with water in time of siege.

In 701. B.C.E. the Assyrian army invaded Palestine and crushed the rebellion, after defeating a large Egyptian and Ethiopian host which had advanced northward to relieve the beleaguered town of Ekron. The strong frontier fortress of Lachish was stormed, as vividly pictured in the Assyrian reliefs, and the fortified towns—forty-six in number, according to the Assyrians-fell in rapid succession. Hezekiah thereupon capitulated, paying an extremely heavy tribute, listed in detail by the Assyrian records, which agree substantially with the much briefer summary in Kings. According to the Assyrian annals, Sennacherib also turned over a strip of Jewish territory in the Shephelah to the three neighboring Philistine principalities. What happened subsequently we do not know, though it appears that the Jewish towns were recovered not long afterwards. Deuteronomic tradition connects a disastrous pestilence with an Assyrian invasion which took place after the accession of the Ethiopian prince Tahardo (Tirhakah) to the Egyptian throne in 689. Since Hezekiah died in 686, the invasion would have occurred between 689 and 686. Our Assyrian records close in 689 and we have no record of military doings in Sennacherib's reign thereafter. In 691, however, the Assyrians were defeated at Khalule by the Babylonians and Elamites, so it is entirely reasonable to suppose that Hezekiah then began planning a new revolt with Ethiopian aid, and that he revolted after Tirhakah's accession. This time the aged Isaiah supported the king, who [p. 44] was saved by the pestilence and apparently died before the Assyrians were able to put a new army into the field.

906. Israel — History — Jehoiachin of Judah Captured (Babylonian Record)

SOURCE: Babylonian Chronicle, tablet BM 21946, reverse, lines 11–13, trans. in D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Caldaean Kings* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1956), p. 73, with explanation from translator's Introduction, pp. 33, 44. Used by permission.

[p. 73] 11. In the seventh year, the month of Kislev, the king of Akkad [Nebuchadnezzar] mustered his troops, marched to the Hatti-land,

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

12. and encamped against (i.e. besieged) the city of Judah and on the second day of the month of Adar he seized the city and captured the king.

13. He appointed there a king of his own choice (lit. heart), received its heavy tribute and sent (them) to Babylon.

[From translator's Introduction: p. 33] The Babylonian Chronicle gives but a brief reference to operations in this year [the seventh of Nebuchadnezzar's reign] ... Judah was the primary objective for this year's expedition, which was led by Nebuchadrezzar in person. The date of this conquest of Jerusalem is now known precisely for the first time, namely, the second of Adar (15/16th March 597 B.C.)...

Although no details of the siege are given, the Chronicle clearly expresses the result. The king of Jerusalem was captured, a substitute chosen by Nebuchadrezzar was placed on the throne and considerable tribute collected and sent back to Babylon. Jehoiachin's place was taken by a Babylonian nominee, the young uncle of Jehoiachin named Mattaniah whose official name was designated or changed to Zedekiah... [p. 34] Having personally settled the future administration Nebuchadrezzar collected 'a heavy tribute' from Jerusalem which was otherwise spared. This booty included such parts of the treasures of Solomon's temple and the royal palace as were easily transportable. Jehoiachin, his mother, wives, family and the leading state and military officials were taken as hostages to the court at Babylon... The Babylonians do not seem to have collected this large group quickly and the Jewish captives only moved off to their exile home some weeks after the city itself had fallen. Thus their exile began at 'the turn of the year' in the month following the capture of the city, which month also marked the commencement of Nebuchadrezzar's eighth year.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This brief record of Nebuchadnezzar's 7th year harmonizes perfectly with the Bible account (2 Kings 24:1, 6, 8–17; 2 Chron. 36:5–10). The difference between the "7th year" in the Chronicle and the "8th year" in 2 Kings 24:12 may be due, as Wiseman explains, to a delay in the transportation of the captives. However, it has also been explained as representing merely the difference between the Babylonian and Jewish calendars, with the Bible writer using the Jewish civil year (beginning with the 7th month, in the autumn), which ran 6 months earlier than Nebuchadnezzar's spring-beginning Babylonian year. For the two calendars see "Year" in *SDADic*. The two unnamed kings are Jehoiachin and Zedekiah. The latter, who reigned 11 years, was taken into exile in Nebuchadnezzar's 19th year, 586 B.C. The B.C. dating of Nebuchadnezzar's regnal years is astronomically fixed (see No. 452).]

907. Israel—History—Jerusalem destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar SOURCE: W. F. Albrigth, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Coloquium, 1955), pp. 101, 102. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 101] Until very recently it was impossible to disprove the views of Torrey and other eminent scholars who declared that the destructive effects of the Chaldaean conquest had been greatly exaggerated in the Hebrew records and that the Babylonian [p. 102] Diaspora did not become important until much later; the Book of Ezekiel was regarded by this group as being more or less unhistorical...

Excavations in Judah (see Chapter XVI) have proved that many of the towns of the land were completely destroyed about 600 B.C. or a little later, and never reoccupied; others were destroyed and their occupation interrupted for a considerable length of time.

Moreover, the discoveries at Tell Beit Mirsim, Bethshemesh, and Lachish have shown that the final catastrophe took place between 589 and 587, when Jerusalem was captured and destroyed, according to the chronological researches of most recent scholars.

908. Israel—History—Jews and Others Repatriated by Cyrus

SOURCE: Ira Maurice Price and others, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, p. 319. Copyright 1958 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

When Cyrus issued his proclamation in Babylon about 538 or 537 B.C., it undoubtedly met with a hearty response from thousands of captive peoples who had been forcibly brought into that land. This proclamation reversed the transportation policy of the Assyrian kings of the eighth century B.C. Cyrus permitted the homesick captives to return to their homelands. He aided them to rebuild their ruined cities and to organize autonomous governments under the suzerainty of Persia. Perhaps the Jews were more highly favored than others in that special aid was given them by the authorities...

The captive and migrating Jews were not all from the Mesopotamian valley or Babylonia. Many had been sold as slaves by the Philistines (Amos 1:6) and the Edomites (Amos 1:9), probably to the Phoenicians who distributed them about the Mediterranean countries. Some also had found their way into Egypt, either as captives, as mercenaries, or as immigrants.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Relatively few Jews actually returned, but Cyrus' decree extended the privilege to all worshipers of the God of Israel. These included those of all the tribes, in all parts of Cyrus' empire— Media, Persia, Babylonia, old Assyria, Syria, and the neighboring lands of Phoenicia, Edom, Moab, Ammon, etc. The decree could not yet apply to Jews in Egypt, which was not part of the Persian Empire until the reign of Cyrus' successor, Cambyses.]

909. Israel—History—Jews' Ecclesiastical State

SOURCE: Cyrus H. Gordon, *The World of the Old Testament* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1958), pp. 277–280. Copyright 1953 by Ventnor Publishers, Inc., copyright © 1958 by Cyrus H. Gordon. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc.

[p. 277] Nehemiah resisted the attempt of Judean fanatics to revive Messianic pretensions for which there could be no place in the Persian Empire... National aspirations, which had proved unrealistic, were deferred to the far-off golden age of the Messiah. For the time being, Judah would content itself with its church as a church state,

which Josephus (*Contra Apionem* 2:165) later termed a theocracy. No more pretenders to the Davidic throne appeared on the scene. Tribute was paid to the empire which attended to external politics, military affairs and the security of life and property. But autonomy in religion (and in other internal affairs such as justice) had been secured for Judah by the religious party, whose most influential leaders were Babylonian Jews.

In the ecclesiastical state of Judah, where the Temple was the *raison d'être*, the priests soon became the wealthy elite who assumed the leadership over the council of elders for administration and justice. The High Priest, who alone was acknowl- [p. 278] edged to have direct contact with Yahwe, mediated between God and the people. The function of the laity was to support the Temple so that its service should be kept up. Laymen had to be content with the role of spectators and worshipers blindly obedient to the divine Law...

It was in that period that the rupture between Samaritans and Jews became irreparable and that the Samaritan heresy became firmly established. The fact that Samaritans and Jews were close neighbors with the same faith, Law and ritual made them deadly enemies. The only difference between them was the identification of God's Holy Mountain. Though the Samaritans were numerically significant for centuries (as is, for example, witnessed by the New Testament), they could have no future, because their religion and hope were those of the Jews, and withal they were not Jews. History was to show that the continuity of the Jewish people depended on the Diaspora (i.e., the dispersal of the Jews beyond the limits of Palestine) and not on the Palestinian community...

[p. 279] The expansion of the Jews meant that the High Priest, presiding in Jerusalem over the assembly of ecclesiastical and civil leaders, was growing in importance with the spread of his followers.

As the end of the Book of Nehemiah shows, Judah was set up strictly as an ecclesiastical entity. The community there was not the main body of Jewry. The Diaspora was ever widening. From Babylonia, Jews spread to Susa, Media and westward to all the provinces of the World Empire (Esther 3:8; 8:17; 9:2–3, 16). Those Jews, no matter how separated they were, retained their Jewish identity so that they were different from the rest of the population (Esther 3:8). As is sometimes the case with minorities, the Jews were enterprising and successful in government service as well as private business. Since the Jews were not bound by close ties to their gentile neighbors, they [p. 280] were free to serve the king without conflicting loyalties. Thus men like Nehemiah or Mordecai were in a position to serve their king well, to attain to serve their king well, to attain positions of influence and to secure royal protection for their coreligionists when necessary.

910. Israel—History—Jews in Egypt, 5th Century B.C. SOURCE: A. Cowley, Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra (New York: Macmillan, 1919), pp. x-xvii, xxiii, xxiv.

[p. x] The present texts [the Jewish papyri from Elephantine], which ... cover practically the whole of the fifth century B.C. (494 to circ. 400), during which time Egypt was under Persian rule, ... are the earliest Jewish documents in existence (except one or two inscriptions) outside the Bible, and are a valuable contemporary illustration of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

The language in which they are written is Aramaic, a language distinct from, though closely allied to, Hebrew... It was, in fact, like modern French, the diplomatic or international language of that time in the East, and was used by the Persian Government in the administration of the provinces...

[p. xi] As to the origin of the colony [Yeb, on the Nile island of Elephantine] whose existence is here revealed to us, we have no evidence in the texts themselves. That it was Jewish, and conscious of being so, seems to be certain. Individual members of it are described as Yehudi, "Jew," the community is called "the Jewish force," and the names

of the people are good Jewish names of the post-exilic type, mostly ending in -iah. They were, however, not the only inhabitants of Elephantine, for we find names of various other nationalities, Babylonian, Persian, Egyptian, Arab, etc. The Jews lived apparently on equal terms with the people of other races, doing business with them, and even intermarrying without compunction.

Probably the connexion between Judaea and Egypt was always close, and Jewish settlers in Egypt must have become more numerous as trade increased; cf. e. g. Deut. 17^{16} , Jer. 44. But this colony seems to have had a more definite origin. It was essentially military, since it is called the "Jewish force." ... [p. xii] Now, the writer of the letter of Aristeas incidentally mentions (§ 13) that Psammetichus, King of Egypt, used Jewish mercenaries in his campaign against Ethiopia. This must be Psammetichus II (see Herodotus ii, 159), who reigned from 595 to 590 B.C....

These colonists ... were already settled in the south of Egypt at the time when their brethren were returning to Jerusalem, and they were developing inde- [p. xiii] pendently as a religious community during all the constructive, or re-constructive, activity of Ezra and Nehemiah...

The religious and internal affairs of the community were directed by priests, as we see from No. 30 and frequently, but these priests (*kahanin*) are never called sons of Aaron. They acknowledged the God of the Jews, who is called Yahu, the older (not an abbreviated) form of the name which we used to pronounce Jehovah, now generally written Yahweh. They had no scruple, as the later Jews had, about writing or uttering the name. But we also find mention of Ishumbethel and 'Anathbethel (No. $22^{124-125}$), apparently as gods associated with Yahu, though their relation to him is obscure. Elsewhere Herembethel and 'Anathyahu seem to be gods, and we find personal names

compounded with Bethel and Herem, just as others are formed with -yah(u). Whatever may be the origin of the other names, it is probable that Bethel is the old Canaanite god (cf. Gen. 31¹³ in the Hebrew), whom the colonists had brought with them. Not only so, but in No. 14⁵ a Jewess of good position (therefore presumably not from ignorance), in a transaction with an Egyptian, [p. xiv] takes an oath by the Egyptian goddess Sati. Yet it is evident throughout that they regarded Yahu as the supreme God, and themselves as specially devoted to the worship of Yahu.

This worship was conducted in a temple—not merely a synagogue or meeting-house, but (from the description in No. 30) a building of considerable dignity, containing an altar on which burnt-sacrifice was offered to Yahu. Now, according to Deuteronomy 12^{5-6} , etc. this ought to have been impossible. The law is very definite: sacrifice was only to be offered in the place which the Lord should choose, to put His name there. It is a clear restriction of the earlier practice recognized in Exodus and frequently illustrated in the Books of Samuel. Was the colony, then, ignorant of Deuteronomy or did it understand the command to apply only to Judaea, or was it frankly heretical? Not the last, apparently, for when their temple was destroyed they appealed to Jerusalem for help to rebuild it. Clearly they saw no reason why they should not offer sacrifices in their local temple, just as Samuel sacrificed at Gilgal (1 Sam. 11¹⁵) and others elsewhere. Both this practice and the worship of other (subsidiary) gods look like a continuation of earlier, pre-exilic customs, which became impossible in Judaea after the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah... [p. xv] They were as sheep without a shepherd in the spiritual desert of Egypt. Their national existence was ended, and it is not surprising or discreditable that they should have organised themselves as an independent religious community, and, since the temple at Jerusalem was destroyed, should have erected a temple of their own at Elephantine. According to the statement in 30^{13} , it was built before the Persian conquest of Egypt, and when Cambyses came into the country (in 525) it was already there, and was not injured by him.

Much more difficult to understand is the complete silence of these texts as to some of the fundamental facts of Jewish history and religion... [p. xvi] The fact that there is none suggests a doubt whether these isolated colonists in the fifth century B.C. really knew anything of their early history and institutions—and this doubt again suggests a question whether they had forgotten it all, or, supposing their mental attitude to be that of their

ancestors in 600 B.C., whether the ordinary Jew of that date, in Judaea, was equally uninstructed.

Even the mention of the Passover does not make the case better, for a special order seems to have been necessary for its celebration, and the regulations for the feast of Unleavened Bread, which is connected with it, have to be explained to the people...

[p. xvii] It would seem that the colony knew about the Passover, although they had not kept it regularly, but that the feast of Unleavened Bread was either unknown to them or had been entirely neglected.

The important point, about which there can be no question, is that the order was sent by the Persian king. It was a curt command, and the details were added by the messenger, who was a Jew. If, then, Darius could be induced, for whatever reasons, to issue a special edict concerning a single religious observance in an obscure colony of Jews, we need not question the authenticity of the letter of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7¹², dealing with the much more important matter of Ezra's mission. In neither case need we suppose that the details are due to the king himself. In the papyrus they certainly are not, and in Ezra 7¹² one can imagine the king, when once his consent had been obtained, saying, "Very well, then, give the man an order for what he wants." The order would then be drawn up by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, probably advised by Ezra himself, and sealed by the king's seal-bearer. Granted the initial good-will of the king, there is nothing improbable about the rest...

[p. xxiii] The religion of Judaea in the time of church was not the same as that of the book of Judges. A thousand years had fashioned it in a thousand ways, and anything which throws light on the process is as instructive as it is interesting. Much has been done by careful analysis of the Old Testament text, but hitherto the external evidence has been very slight. For this reason the present texts are of first-rate importance. At the present time the daily life of the practicing Jew is one continuous religious exercise: there is a

dîn, a religious rule, for every act. In the business documents of this collection, on the contrary, we see a people whose daily life appears to be wholly uninfluenced by religious considerations, and who seem to be quite unconscious of any religious past. In the Ahikar story we have a sample of the literature they read. It may have been, and almost certainly was, of entirely foreign origin. There is nothing Jewish about it, and the proverbs are as different as can be from the high standard of collections like the Pirke Aboth. Yet such documents as No. 30 show that they held to one essential fact—the worship of Yahu—regarding the interruption of it as a national calamity. They may have been less spiritually minded than the main body of their contemporaries in Judaea, but it seems likely that they had remained at much the same [p. xxiv] level as their forefathers of the sixth century B.C. There could have been no natural religious development among a people such as these colonists appear to be. Nothing short of an earthquake could make the dry bones live. It was in the shock of Ezra's reforms that modern Judaism was born, and the system of morality in which Christianity was afterwards planted. As the rabbis said, "the Law was forgotten, and Ezra restored it."

One other point. The existence of this colony, unsuspected fifteen years ago, shows that the Diaspora, or Dispersion of the Jews (1 Peter 1¹), had already begun several centuries before the Christian era. Besides the colony at Elephantine, there was a settlement at Abydos, and no doubt others elsewhere. The use of Aramaic, which was common all over the East, came easily to the Jews abroad, and eventually became their

natural language. (Though there are Hebraisms in these documents, there is not a single text composed in Hebrew.) Probably intercourse between the colonists and the mothercountry helped to establish Aramaic in Judaea, as we find it in the time of Christ. But the important thing is that these outlying settlements, with their common language and common belief in a revived Judaism, were there as a field prepared for the scattered seed of Christianity. The records of this colony show us an earlier type of the communities so often mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles $(2^{5,9-11})$. They are therefore not merely of antiquarian interest. They reveal the rock whence we are hewn, and appeal to our human sympathy with the difficulties of a people seeking God in their darkness, if haply they might feel after Him and find Him, though He is not far from each one of us.

911. Israel—History—Jews in Egypt, Temple of

SOURCE: A. Cowley, ed. and trans., Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923), No. 30, pp. 108, 113, 114. Used by permission.

[Translator's note; p. 108] It [papyrus No. 30] is a (draft or copy of a) letter from Yedoniah, who thus appears to be the chief priest (see below) and head of the community at Yeb, to Bigvai the Persian viceroy of Judaea. It describes a plot (to which allusion has already been made in no. 27) between the Egyptians and the Persian governor Waidrang for the destruction of the temple, which took place three years before the date of writing. Incidentally the temple is described, and some historical facts are mentioned. Finally Bigvai is asked to give orders for its re-building...

[p. 113: Text of papyrus No. 39] ¹To our lord Bigvai, governor of Judaea, your servants Yedoniah and his colleagues, the priests who are in Yeb the fortress [Elephantine, Egypt]. The health ² of your lordship may the God of Heaven seek after exceedingly at all times, and give you favor before Darius the king ³ and the princes of the palace more than now a thousand times, and may he grant you long life, and may you be happy and prosperous at all times. ⁴Now your servant Yedoniah and his colleagues depose as follows: In the month of Tammuz in the 14th year of Darius the king, when Arsames ⁵ departed and went to the king, the priests of the god Khnub, who is in the fortress of Yeb, (were) in league with Waidrang who was governor here, ⁶saying: The temple of Ya'u the God, which is in the fortress of Yeb let them remove from there. Then that Waidrang, ⁷the reprobate, a letter to his son Nephayan who was commander of the garrison in the fortress of Syene saying: The temple which is in Yeb⁸the fortress let them destroy. Then Nephayan led out the Egyptians with the other forces. They came to the fortress of Yeb with their weapons, ⁹they entered that temple, they destroyed it to the ground, and the pillars of stone which were there they broke. Also it happened, 5 gateways ¹⁰ of stone, built with hewn blocks of stone, which were in that temple they destroyed, and their doors they lifted off (?), and the hinges ¹¹ of those doors were bronze, and the roof of cedar wood, all of it with the rest of the furniture and other things which were there, ¹²all of it they burnt with fire, and the basons of gold and silver and everything that was in that temple, all of it, they took ¹³ and made their own. Already in the days of the kings of Egypt our fathers had built that temple in the fortress of Yeb, and when Cambyses came into Egypt ¹⁴he found that temple built, and the temples of the gods of Egypt all *of them* they overthrew, but no one did any harm to that temple. ¹⁵When this was done, we with our wives and our children put on sack-cloth and fasted and

prayed to Ya'u the the Lord of Heaven, ¹⁶who let us see (our desire) upon that Waidrang. The dogs tore off the anklet from his legs, and all the riches he had gained were [p. 114] destroyed, and all the men ¹⁷who had sought to do evil to that temple, all *of them*, were killed and we saw (our desire) upon them. Also before this, at the time when this evil

¹⁸was done to us, we sent a letter *to* your lordship and to Johanan the high priest and his colleagues the priests who are in Jerusalem, and to Ostanes the brother ¹⁹of 'Anani, and the nobles of the Jews. They have not sent any letter to us. Also since the month of Tammuz in the 14th year of Darius the king ²⁰till this day we wear sack-cloth and fast. Our wives are made widow-like, we do not anoint ourselves with oil ²¹and we drink no wine. Also from that (time) till (the present) day in the 17th year of Darius the king, neither meal-offering, incense, nor sacrifice ²²do they offer in that temple. Now your servants Yedoniah and his colleagues and the Jews, all *of them* of Yeb, say as follows: ²³If it seem good to your lordship, take thought for that temple to build (it), since they do not allow us to build it. Look upon your ²⁴well-wishers and friends who are here in Egypt, (and) let a letter be sent from you to them concerning the temple of the God Ya'u

offering and incense and sacrifice ²⁶on the altar of the God Ya'u on your behalf, and we will pray for you at all times, we, our wives, our children, and the Jews, ²⁷all who are here, if they do so that temple be re-built, and it shall be a merit to you before Ya'u the God of ²⁸Heaven more than a man who offers to him sacrifice and burnt-offerings worth as much as the sum of a thousand talents. As to gold, about this ²⁹we have sent (and) given instructions. Also the whole matter we have set forth in a letter in our name to Delaiah and Shelemiah the sons of Sanballat governor of Samaria. ³⁰Also of all this which was done to us Arsames knew nothing. On the 20th of Marheshwan the 17th year of Darius the king [407 B.C.].

912. Israel—History—Jews in Period of Alexander's Divided Empire SOURCE: Edwyn Bevan, *Jerusalem Under the High-Priests* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1940), pp. 20– 23, 27–29. Used by permission.

[p. 20] When Alexander died without out leaving a capable heir, there followed, as we might expect, a period of terrible confusion and fighting. I think it is a popular fallacy, due perhaps to the first book of Maccabees, that Alexander on his death-bed divided his kingdom among four of his generals. Of course, nothing could be more untrue. There was some pretence at first of keeping the kingdom together, with Alexander's son, born after his death, and Alexander's feeble-minded half brother [Philip], for joint [p. 21] kings. But really there was a general scramble among all the strong Macedonian chiefs. The poor kings were soon made away with in that wild time... [Some sixty] years after Alexander's death, ... it has come to the formation of three kingdoms [earlier, four kingdoms; see No. 53], which are to be ruled by the descendants of the most fortunate three out of those five. One of these kingdoms, whose territory corresponds roughly with the old Macedonian kingdom which Alexander inherited, need not concern us at all; it lies far off from the region which interests us now. Of the other two we shall have a great deal to say... One of Alexander's principal friends, a Macedonian chief called Ptolemy, had the shrewdness to get himself made governor of Egypt before the actual fighting began...

[p. 22] The other kingdom with which we shall have to do offers a striking contrast to the Ptolemaic. It fell to the heirs of the last survivor of Alexander's generals, Seleucus, who finally outlived all his competitors... [p. 23] The line of kings descended from Seleucus are what we call the Seleucid dynasty. They did not have one royal name for all the kings, as the Ptolemies had, but the earlier kings were all called either Seleucus or

Antiochus. Later on other names came in as well. The territory which at the outset this dynasty aspired to hold was all the Asiatic part of Alexander's empire from the Mediterranean to the frontiers of India...[p. 27] After Ptolemy had definitely occupied Palestine in 301, a period of comparative peace may be supposed to have ensued; for although the wars between the houses of Seleucus and Ptolemy began [p. 28] in the next generation we do not hear of the Seleucid armies getting farther south, in the interior, than Damascus. But if it was peace, it was subjection to the Ptolemaïc government.

The phases in the hundred-years' struggle between Ptolemy and Seleucid make up whatever external history the Jewish state has during that epoch. They are traced in the eleventh chapter of the book of *Daniel*. We have there the break-up of Alexander's empire, its division "towards the four winds of heaven"; the rise of Seleucus to great dominion; the truce in the struggle about 250, when Antiochus II. married the daughter of Ptolemy II.; the tragedy in which that truce too soon ended, and then the victorious march of the third Ptolemy into the heart of the Seleucid realm; the renewal of the conflict by Seleucus II. and his sons.

In all these vicissitudes the Jews were apparently passive spectators. They would often, looking down from their uplands upon the Philistian plain, have seen the long lines of King Ptolemy's army moving past against the king of the north, covering the country with its tents. The rumours of far-off battles, of the shifting policy of kings, would be matter of talk in the bazaars of Jerusalem. That is all that we can safely say.

In 223, a hundred years after the death of Alexander, there came to the Seleucid throne the man under whom the controversy was to be finally settled in favour of the northern kingdom—the third Antiochus, commonly known as Antiochus the Great. Antiochus waged two series of campaigns for the possession of Palestine... [p. 29] The decisive battle was fought in 198 at the place where the road through the defiles of the Lebanon approaches the sources of the river Jordan—the battle of the Panium. There was a sanctuary of the god Pan close by, and the place is still called Banias. The Seleucid army was commanded by Antiochus himself and his eldest son; the Ptolemaic army was commanded by a Greek called Scopes. Antiochus was victorious, and Palestine immediately passed finally to the house of Seleucus. The hundred-years' tenure of Palestine by the Ptolemies comes now to an end; the Seleucid kings are henceforth the kings with whom the Jews have to deal.

913. Israel—History—Jews of Palestine Between Ptolemies and Seleucids

SOURCE: C. W. Boase, "The Macedonian Empire," *The Encyclopedia Britanica*, Vol. 15 (9th ed. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1883), p. 144.

The Ptolemies [of Egypt] gained Cyrene and Cyprus, and struggled hard with the Syrian kings [the Seleucids] for the possession of Phoenicia; Palestine was as of old the battlefield for the king of the north and the king of the south. The Ptolemies even held Seleucia at the mouth of the Orontes for some time. The history of these times is lost in its detail.

914. Israel—History—Jews Persecuted by Antiochus IV Epiphanes SOURCE: Edwyn Bevan, *Jerusalem Under the High-Priests* (London: Edward Arnold & Co., 1940), pp. 76– 83. Used by permission.

[p. 76] The Jewish state found itself in 175 B.C. [under the rule of Antiochus IV Epiphanes]. Syria soon felt that a man with a progressive program was at the head of affairs. Antiochus saw in his kingdom a field in which to operate as the crowned apostle

of Hellenism; or perhaps we should say he saw in Hellenism the medium which could best unify his heterogeneous kingdom. The cities were encouraged to conform more perfectly to the Hellenic pattern, and possibly a larger measure of autonomy was conceded to those which were willing to do so, in accordance with that ground-principle of Hellenism which prescribed that every city-state should be a free and sovereign community. This conversion ... was [p. 77] not something ... Antiochus forced upon unwilling societies, but something conceded as a favour, a grant of liberties, of dignity... Antiochus, if he expected to receive divine honours, was not expecting anything unusual according to the notions of the time. Alexander the Great had received divine honours, and so even had some of the prominent men of Greece in the generations before Alexander; all the Ptolemies and all the Seleucids were officially worshipped in their kingdoms; the Roman emperors later on were worshipped, as a regular thing, with temples and priesthoods and sacrifice... [p. 78] Now for the first time in the Seleucid realm the coins display, beside the name of the king, highsounding surnames, *Epiphanes*,

that is, as it sometimes appears in full, *Theos Epiphanes*, the "god made manifest";

Nikephoros, "the holder of victory," a surname connected by Greek usage with the supreme god, Zeus.

The accession of such a king made a great difference at Jerusalem. The prospects of the Hellenishing party opened to an unexpected extent; they would now find ready enough hearing at Antioch. Oniah the high-priest was an obstacle, but the Hellenists had a champion in his brother Jeshua, or, by his Greek name, Jason... Jason, by the usual sort of money-transaction at court, got himself recognized as high-priest by the king's government in the place of his brother, and he obtained [p. 79] leave to remodel Jerusalem, as a new Antioch, on Hellenic lines... The indispensable gymnasium rose in the heart of the city; the younger members of the Jewish aristocracy eagerly formed a body of *epheboi*, and flaunted about the streets in the ephebic garb, which corresponded, as we saw, to the Greek country dress—chlamys and broad-brimmed hat. By the act of its own people, Jerusalem had renounced its age-long isolation and come into line with the great Hellenic world.

You can imagine the grief and horror, the consuming indignation, with which members of the Hasîdîm watched those young men stroll by. I think we must allow that, if we had sought for real piety and high earnestness, we should have found it in the meetings of the Hasîdîm rather than in the gymnasium... The HasŒdŒm ... were men of their day with its limitations and narrow thoughts; but it was they who [p. 80] kept, in whatever shell of old-world prejudice, that spiritual treasure, so unspeakably precious to the whole human race, committed to Israel...

[p. 81] While Antiochus was campaigning in Egypt [in 170 or 169 B.C.] a report spread through Palestine that he was dead... But Antiochus was not dead, and this outbreak at Jerusalem, this rebellion during the process of a foreign war, seemed to call for signal chastisement. On his way back from Egypt he turned aside to beat down Jerusalem beneath the feet of the highpriest, and let loose his soldiers to massacre. But that was not all. It was an unwise practice of Antiochus to relieve his financial necessities by appropriating the treasures of the Syrian temples. The Temple at Jerusalem was said to contain great riches, and Jerusalem had made itself liable to punishment. Antiochus determined to enter the Temple and carry off whatever pleased his fancy. It is difficult for us to realise the horror which such a profanation would send through the Jewish people, the appalling insistence with which the question would rack them, Why, why the Lord did not defend His own sanctuary? "Wherefore do the heathen say, Where is now thy God?" ...

[p. 82] He [Antiochus] came to the conclusion that it was possible, that it was expedient, to extinguish the eccentric Jewish religion once for all. As far as Jerusalem itself went, the execution of his plans was fairly simple. Already a part of the population. and especially, as we saw, of the ruling class, had adopted Hellenism; the political organisation of the state after the pattern of a Greek republic was carried through by a royal commissioner; and Jehovah having been identified with the Olympian Zeus, the Temple service was recast in Greek forms, with an image of the god, which probably displayed the features of Antiochus himself. A garrison of the king's troops occupied the citadel; and under their eye Jerusalem held its new political assemblies, and sacrificed animals forbidden by Moses to its transfigured divinity. No doubt, a large number of those who took part in these things, did so with a heavy heart; the triumph of Hellenism was not as complete as outward appearances proclaimed. But there were many whom no stress could bring [p. 83] to conform, and these forsook the city and thronged into the country towns and villages. Here they were followed up by the agents of the government, which was resolved to stamp out Jewish practices throughout the land. If only these practices could be once interrupted, if circumcision were once stopped and the rules of food broken through, the thing would be done. And surely practices so irrational and uncouth, as they seemed to the Greeks, would soon give way, if torture and death were applied firmly to break them down.

How familiar it all sounds to us, who look back along such a dreadful vista of religious persecutions! But it was a new thing then. Israel had never gone through such a crisis before. And when we reckon up our debt to Israel, we must remember that it is this crisis which opens the roll of *martyrs*. There were many in that day of agony who endured everything, the several forms of torture and death, rather than disobey the Law of their God. You may read the typical cases, as they were remembered in subsequent generations, in the 6th and 7th chapters of *2 Maccabees*, the story of the old scribe Eleazar, of the Seven Brethren.

915. Israel—History—Jews, Rome's Treaty With (161 B.C.) SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* xii. 10. 6; translated by Ralph Marcus, Vol. 7 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 217, 219. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 217] Thereupon, having heard of the power of the Romans and that they had subdued Galatia and Iberia and Carthage in Libya, and in addition had conquered Greece and the kings Perseus, Philip and Antiochus the Great, he [Judas Maccabaeus] decided to make a treaty of friendship with them. Accordingly, he sent to Rome his friends Eupolemus, the son of Joannes, and Jason, the son of Eleazar, and through them requested the Romans to become his allies and friends, and to write to Demetrius that he should not make war on the Jews. When the envoys sent by Judas came to Rome, the Senate received them, and after they had spoken about their mission, agreed to the alliance. It also made a decree concerning this, and sent a copy to Judaea, while the original was engraved on bronze tablets and deposited in the Capitol. It read as [p. 219] follows. "A decree of the Senate concerning a treaty of alliance and goodwill with the Jewish nation. No one of those who are subject to the Romans shall make war on the Jewish nation, or furnish to those who make war on them any grain, ships or money. And if any attack the Jews, the Romans shall assist them so far as they are able, and on the other hand, if any attack the Romans, the Jews shall help them as allies. And if the Jewish nation wishes either to add anything to, or remove anything from, this treaty of alliance, this shall be done with the concurrence of the Roman people, and whatever may be added shall be valid."

916. Israel—History — Jews Under Successive Empires

SOURCE: F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1956), pp. 11–13. Copyright 1956 by the Paternoster Press, London. Used by permission of the author and of the Paternoster Press.

[p. 11] When the Persian king Cyrus brought the Babylonian Empire to an end in 539 B.C., he authorized a body of Jewish displaced persons to return to their home in Judaea, from which they had been deported by Nebuchadrezzar two generations previously, and to rebuild their national shrine in Jerusalem. After some years the temple was rebuilt, and its services were carried out anew by the members of the old priestly families, at whose head stood Jeshua, a scion of the house of Zadok, which had occupied the chief priesthood in the former temple since its dedication in by King Solomon about 960 B.C. down to its destruction by the Babylonians in 587 [rather 586]. But, while the ancient chief-priestly family was restored to its sacred office, the royal house of David, which also returned from exile, was not restored to the kingship.

The new Jewish community was organized as a temple-state, consisting of Jerusalem and a few miles around. At the head of the state was the high priest, who controlled internal Jewish affairs; the wider interests of the Persian Empire were the responsibility of the civil governor of Judaea, who was appointed by the crown. When, after two hundred years, the Persian Empire was in its turn brought to an end by Alexander the Great, no material change took place in the Jewish constitution. They had a Macedonian governor over them instead of one appointed by the Persian king; they had to pay taxes to a Macedonian court instead of to the Persian court; they were exposed to the powerful influence of Hellenistic culture. But the high priests of the house of Zadok remained as before at the head of the Jewish temple-state. So matters continued under the domination of the Ptolemies, who inherited Alexander's empire in Egypt, and retained Palestine under their control until 198 B.C. When in that year they lost Palestine to the rival dynasty of the Seleucids, who had succeeded to Alexander's heritage in the greater part of Asia, the transition was smooth so far as Judaea was concerned. To be sure, the [p. 12] increasing tendency to follow western ways caused grave concern to the more conservatively-minded Jews, but they had no complaint against the Gentile government, which guaranteed the temple constitution and granted the utmost liberty in the practice of the Jewish religion.

For a variety of reasons a change came about with the accession of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) to the Seleucid throne in 175 B.C. Early in his reign he interfered with the Zadokite succession to the high priesthood; later he tried to prohibit the Jewish religion altogether. This led to a national and religious rising, as a result of which Judaea ultimately secured complete political independence. The leaders of this rising, the priestly family of the Hasmoneans, became the ruling dynasty in the independent state, and assumed the high priesthood in addition to the chief civil and military power. From 142 to 63 B.C. the Jews preserved their hardly won independence under the Hasmoneans, but in the latter year they lost it to the Romans, who reorganized all the territory west of the

Euphrates as part of their empire. But the Romans left a Hasmonean high priest in charge of the internal affairs of Judaea for over twenty years. In 40 B.C., however, the political situation in western Asia caused them to nominate one Herod as king of the Jews, and Herod ruled Palestine from 37 to 4 B.C. in the interests of Rome. His son Archelaus, who succeeded him in Judaea, was deposed by the Roman Emperor in A.D. 6, and for the next sixty years Judaea was governed by procurators appointed by the Emperor, except for three years (A.D. 41–44) when a grandson of Herod, Agrippa I, reigned over Judaea as king. From the beginning of Herod's reign the high priests, who were henceforth appointed by Herod and his descendants, or else by Roman governors, counted for less and less, although by virtue of their office they continued to preside over the Sanhedrin, the supreme court of the Jewish nation.

Misrule by Roman procurators, combined with an increasing intolerance of Gentile control on the part of Jewish nationalists, led to the Jewish revolt of A.D. 66 and the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem by the Roman forces in A.D. 70. With the fall of the temple, the last vestiges of the temple constitution, together with the highpriestly office, came to an end. Judaea was placed under firmer military control than before. But in A.D. 132 a new revolt broke out, and the independence of Judaea was pro-[p. 13] claimed under a messianic claimant who is commonly known as Bar-Kokhba. After three years of guerrilla fighting this rising was crushed. Jerusalem was rebuilt by the Romans as a completely Gentile city, and a new chapter opened in the history of the Holy Land.

917. Israel, State of (Modern), Jewish View of

SOURCE: Denis Baly, *Multitudes in the Valley*, pp. 4, 5. Copyright 1957 by The Seabury Press, Inc., Greenwich, Conn. Used by permission.

[p. 4] A great many Israelis could perhaps best be described as "post-religious" in the sense in which much of Western Europe today has been called "post-Christian," but, of course, the religion through which they have passed is Judaism and not Christianity. Even though they do not practice it, it commands respect because it is undoubtedly the religion of the Jewish people and of none other. In just the same way as among the "post-Christians" of Western Europe, their thinking is determined by the religion. Naturally, the factors which determine their thinking are different, and it might perhaps be suggested that some of the chief controls are: the Promises of God, the Messianic Hope, the Sense of the Community, the Rabbinic Method, and the Absence of Theology...

The promises of God, of course, are those which concern the land of Palestine. Jewish thinking is more [p. 5] strongly conscious of the covenant relationship than Christian thinking tends to be. It is perfectly true that part of the Christian claim is that in Jesus there has been a new agreement, and that this is the meaning of the prophecy in the thirty-first chapter of Jeremiah, but this idea of an agreement having been made with God is not normally very much to the forefront of the minds of the Christian laity. It is otherwise with the Jew... It is, in fact, drummed into him by his teachers that what makes Judaism different from other religions is just that it is based upon a contract... Even the most secular observance of Passover seldom entirely obscures this fact. The feasts of Pentecost and Tabernacles likewise emphasize that God kept His word and that He will continue to keep it... This has burned down into their thinking, and it colors much of their emotional reaction to the State of Israel. Even the least religious of them conceive of Palestine as in

some way theirs by more than historic justice—[they believe that] it is theirs by divine right.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Bracketed insertion is the author's.]

918. Jehovah's Witnesses

SOURCE: *Yearbook of American Churches*, 1961, ed. by Benson Y. Landis, p. 57. Copyright 1960 by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission.

Jehovah's witnesses adhere to the oldest religion on earth, the worship of Almighty God revealed in his Bible as Jehovah. From man's beginning there have been at all times some of Jehovah's witnesses on earth, adhering to the Bible principle of separateness from all parts of the world organization of men. In modern times Jehovah's witnesses are primitive Christians, recognizing and teaching the Bible as God's word of truth, believing it and following its commandments, which accounts for their consistent neutrality toward any nationalistic interests. They use the Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania, Watchtower Bible and Tract Society of New York, Inc., International Bible Students Association, and other corporations in their earthwide preaching activity, and preach to all regardless of denomination. To be one of Jehovah's witnesses one must make an unconditional individual dedication to do the will of Almighty God and then must proceed faithfully to obey the commandments of God and Christ as expressed in the Bible, which course of action is the worship of God and is true religion.

Therefore, all of Jehovah's witnesses are ministers of the gospel and have no human leader. Their *Yearbook* shows them active during 1959 in 175 countries of the earth, where there are approximately 871,737 such ministers preaching, teaching the people of all nations that God's word is true and that their only hope is in the Kingdom of Jehovah under Christ Jesus which has been established to rule over earth and which will replace all governments of man. There are now 4,020 congregations in continental United States with 239,418 members (ministers), and worldwide 19,982 congregations. (From a statement by the President of Jehovah's witnesses to the Editor of the *Yearbook of American Churches*.)

919. Jericho, Earliest City Known

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955), p. 46. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

Work at Jericho has been disappointing to biblical scholars, who had naturally hoped for elucidation of the vexed problem of the date of the Israelite Conquest. The attempts made by previous excavators to date this event have all proved wrong; during the long period of abandonment (nearly four centuries at the lowest estimate) several metres were eroded from the top of the mound by driving rain and wind, since nearly all buildings were of mud brick. Practically all remains of the last Canaanite occupations were thus washed or blown away. This disappointment was compensated by the discovery of the earliest stratified levels ever found in any occupied site in the world.

920. Jericho, Excavation of

SOURCE: Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Digging Up Jericho* (New York: Praeger, 1957), pp. 228, 229, 261–263. Used by permission.

[p. 228] This rather lengthy survey of the defences of Jericho in the later part of the Middle Bronze Age will have served to bring out something of the character of the Palestine which Abraham knew. It was a country of strongly defended towns, with a population of which the characteristic culture is derived from a spread southwards of the coastal Canaanite, or Phoenician, civilisation, about 1900 B.C., which was superimposed on a population of which the civilisation had been disrupted by the Amorite invasions of the preceding centuries... Abraham and his descendants were wanderers. They must have known at least the outside of those massive defences, and probably entered the [p. 229]

gates to trade the products of their herds for the products, pottery, tools, textiles and so on, of the townsfolk.

Jericho has also provided good evidence of what the interior of the towns in the time of the Patriarchs would have looked like. There are some ten successive layers of buildings belonging to Middle Bronze II surviving on the east side of the mound. Of these, the best preserved is the final stage. The preceding stages seem to have succeeded each other peacefully, with the resultant removal of household goods and probably some of the building materials, for reuse in the later buildings. But the final buildings were violently destroyed, and left in ruins with all their contents. This destruction can be identified with very little doubt as the work of the Egyptians. About 1580 B.C. the native Eighteenth Dynasty established itself, and drove out the hated Hyksos. The Egyptian records tell how they were pursued back into Palestine, and archaeology shows that soon after that date a number of towns were destroyed, and to this period belongs the end of Middle Bronze Age Jericho...

[p. 261] Over most of the area we have excavated on the west side of the mound, the thick layer of burning above the Middle Bronze Age buildings is the highest surviving level. But in the photograph (Pl. 62 A [in source]), it will be seen that there is a row of stones just under the modern surface (the upper mound is an excavation dump). These stones are the foundations, and all that remains, of the wall of a room... To the south of this wall, a small irregular area of contemporary floor survives. In the photograph it can be seen clearly how to the south and east the modern surface is below the level of this floor. On the floor is a small mud oven, just like those still used by peasant women in Palestine today... Beside the oven, a single dipper juglet was lying on the floor. This juglet ... is the only Late Bronze Age vessel we have found *in situ* on the *tell*. Its date is fourteenth century, and fits in well with the more precisely datable finds in the tombs made by Professor Garstang.

The houses of Late Bronze Age Jericho have therefore almost entirely disappeared. We have already seen that over most of the summit of the *tell* even the houses of the certainly populous Middle Bronze Age town have vanished, and only levels of the Early Bronze Age remain. We have also seen how the process of erosion was washing away the Middle Bronze Age houses on the east slope, during an interval of perhaps 180 years. This process was arrested when the town of 1400 B.C. was built on top of the wash, but this in turn was abandoned, and erosion has almost removed it.

It is a sad fact that of the town walls of the Late Bronze [p. 262] Age, within which period the attack by the Israelites must fall by any dating, not a trace remains. The erosion which has destroyed much of the defences has already been described. It will be remembered that the summit of the Middle Bronze Age rampart only survives in one place. The Late Bronze Age town must either have re-used this, or a new wall may have been built above it, so nothing remains of it. Professor Garstang believed that he had identified the defences of the period. But additional evidence about the stratification makes it quite clear that these are to be dated to the Early Bronze Age.

The excavation of Jericho, therefore, has thrown no light on the walls of Jericho of which the destruction is so vividly described in the Book of Joshua. One can visualise the Children of Israel marching round the eight acres of the town and striking terror into the heart of the inhabitants, until all will to fight deserted them when on the seventh day the blast of the trumpets smote their ears. But as to what caused the walls to fall down flat, we have no factual evidence...

[p. 263] The evidence seems to me to be that the small fragment of a building which we have found is part of the kitchen of a Canaanite woman, who may have dropped the juglet beside the oven and fled at the sound of the trumpets of Joshua's men.

921. Jerusalem, Fall of (A.D. 70), Omens Preceding

SOURCE: Tacitus *Histories* v. 13; translated by Clifford H. Moore, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956). pp. 197, 199. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 197] Prodigies had indeed occurred, but to avert them either by victims or by vows is held unlawful by a people which, though prone to superstition, is opposed to all propitiatory rites. Contending hosts were seen meeting in the skies, arms flashed, and suddenly the temple was illumined with fire from the clouds. Of a sudden the doors of the shrine opened and a superhuman voice cried: "The gods are departing": at the same moment the [p. 199] mighty stir of their going was heard. Few interpreted these omens as fearful; the majority firmly believed that their ancient priestly writings contained the prophecy that this was the very time when the East should grow strong and that men starting from Judea should possess the world. This mysterious prophecy had in reality pointed to Vespasian and Titus, but the common people, as is the way of human ambition, interpreted these great destinies in their own favour, and could not be turned to the truth even by adversity.

922. Jerusalem—Roman War (A.D. 66–70), Josephus on SOURCE: Josephus *War* (subdivisions as indicated); translated by H. St. J. Thackeray (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956, 1957). Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

a. False Christs in Decades Preceding the War (ii. 13. 4, 5)

[Vol. 2, p. 423] Besides these there arose another body of villains, with purer hands but more impious intentions, [p. 425] who no less than the assassins ruined the peace of the city. Deceivers and impostors, under the pretence of divine inspiration fostering revolutionary changes, they persuaded the multitude to act like madmen, and led them out into the desert under the belief that God would there give them tokens of deliverance. Against them Felix, regarding this as but the preliminary to insurrection, sent a body of cavalry and heavy-armed infantry, and put a large number to the sword.

A still worse blow was dealt at the Jews by the Egyptian false prophet. A charlatan, who had gained for himself the reputation of a prophet, this man appeared in the country, collected a following of about thirty thousand dupes, and led them by a circuitous route from the desert to the mount called the mount of Olives. From there he proposed to force an entrance into Jerusalem and, after overpowering the Roman garrison, to set himself up as tyrant of the people, employing those who poured in with him as his bodyguard.

b. Forewarnings of Impending Doom, 62 (vi. 5. 3)

[Vol. 3, p. 463] Moreover, at the feast which is called Pentecost, the priests on entering the inner court of the temple by night, as their custom was in the discharge of their ministrations, reported that they were conscious, first of a commotion and a din, and after that of a voice as of a host, "We are departing hence"

But a further portent was even more alarming. Four years before the war, when the city was enjoying profound peace and prosperity, there came to the feast at which it is the custom of all Jews to erect tabernacles to God, one Jesus, son of Ananias, a rude peasant,

who, standing in the temple, suddenly began to cry out, "A voice from the east, a voice [p. 465] from the west, a voice from the four winds; a voice against Jerusalem and the sanctuary, a voice against the bridegroom and the bride, a voice against all the people." Day and night he went about all the alleys with this cry on his lips. Some of the leading citizens, incensed at these ill-omened words, arrested the fellow and severely chastised him. But he, without a word on his own behalf or for the private ear of those who smote him, only continued his cries as before. Thereupon, the magistrates, supposing, as was indeed the case, that the man was under some supernatural impulse, brought him before the Roman governor; there, although flaved to the bone with scourges, he neither sued for mercy nor shed a tear, but, merely introducing the most mournful of variations into his ejaculation, responded to each stroke with "Woe to Jerusalem!" When Albinus, the governor, asked him who and whence he was and why he uttered these cries, he answered him never a word, but unceasingly reiterated his dirge over the city, until Albinus pronounced him a maniac and let him go. During the whole period up to the outbreak of war he neither approached nor was seen talking to any of the citizens, but daily, like a prayer that he had coined, repeated his lament, "Woe to Jerusalem!" He neither cursed any of those who beat him from day to day, nor blessed those who offered him food: to all men that melancholy presage was his one reply. His cries were loudest at the festivals. So for seven years and five months he continued his wail, his voice never flagging nor his strength exhausted, until in the siege, having seen [p. 467] his presage verified, he found his rest. For, while going his round and shouting in piercing tones from the wall, "Woe once more to the city and to the people and to the temple," as he added a last word, "and woe to me also," a stone hurled from the *ballista* struck and killed him on the spot. So

with those ominous words still upon his lips he passed away.

c. Sudden Withdrawal of Romans, Giving Opportunity for Flight, Late 66 (ii. 19. 5–7) [Vol. 2, p. 531] The soldiers [of Cestius] with immunity undermined the wall and prepared to set fire to the gate of the Temple.

A terrible panic now seized the insurgents, many of whom were already slinking out of the city in the belief that it was on the verge of capture. The people thereupon took heart again, and the more the miscreants gave ground, the nearer did these advance to the gates, to open them and welcome Cestius as a benefactor. Had he but persisted for a while with the siege, he would have forthwith taken the city; but God, I suppose, because of those miscreants, had already turned away even from His sanctuary and ordained that that day should not see the end of the war.

At any rate, Cestius, realizing neither the despair of the besieged nor the true temper of the people, suddenly recalled his troops, renounced his hopes, without having suffered any reverse, and, contrary to all calculation, retired from the city. On this unexpected retreat, the brigands, plucking up courage, sallied out upon his rear and killed a considerable number of calvary and infantry.

[p. 537] After this catastrophe of Cestius many distinguished Jews abandoned the city as swimmers desert a sinking ship. [See No. 923.]

d. Horrors of the Famine During Siege, Spring, 70 (v. 10. 3)

[Vol. 3, p. 355] Pitiful was the fare and lamentable the spectacle, the stronger taking more than their share, the weak whimpering. Famine, indeed, overpowers all the emotions, but of nothing is it so destructive as of shame: what at other times would claim respect is then treated with contempt. Thus, wives would snatch the food from husbands,

children from fathers, and-most pitiable sight of all-mothers from the very mouths of their infants, and while their dearest ones were pinning in their arms they scrupled not to rob them of the life-giving drops. Nor, though thus feeding, did they escape detection: everywhere the rebels hovered even over these wretches' prey. For, whenever they saw a house shut up, this was a signal that the inmates were taking food, and forthwith bursting open the doors they leapt in and forcing the morsels almost out of their very jaws brought them up again. Old men were beaten, clutching their victuals, and women were dragged by the hair, concealing what was in their hands. There was no compassion for hoary hairs or infancy: children were actually lifted up with the fragments to [p. 337] which they clung and dashed to the ground. To those who had anticipated their raid and already swallowed their expected spoil they were vet more brutal, as defrauded of their due. Horrible were the methods of torture which they devised in their search for food, blocking with pulse the passages in their poor victims' frames and driving sharp stakes up their bodies; and one would shudder at the mere recital of the pangs to which they were subjected to make them confess to the possession of a single loaf or to reveal the hidingplace of a handful of barley-meal.

e. Cannibalism During Famine, Summer, 70 (vi. 3. 4)

[Vol. 3, p. 435] Among the residents of the region beyond Jordan was a woman named Mary, daughter of Eleazar, of the village of Bethezuba (the name means "House of Hyssop"), eminent by reason of her family and fortune, who had fled with the rest of the people to Jerusalem and there become involved in the siege. The bulk of her property, which she had packed up and brought with her from Peraea to the city, had been plundered by the tyrants; while the relics of her treasures, with whatever food she had contrived to procure, were being carried off by their satellites in their daily raids. With deep indignation in her heart, the poor woman constantly abused and cursed these extortioners and so incensed them against her. But when no one either out of exasperation or pity put her to death, weary of finding for others food, which indeed it was now impossible from any quarter to procure, while famine coursed through her intestines and marrow and the fire of rage was more consuming even than the famine, impelled by the promptings alike of fury and necessity, she proceeded to an act of outrage upon [p. 437] nature. Seizing her child, an infant at the breast, "Poor babe," she cried, "amidst war, famine, and sedition, to what end should I preserve thee? With the Romans slavery awaits us, should we live till they come: but famine is forestalling slavery, and more cruel than both are the rebels. Come, be thou food for me, to the rebels an avenging fury, and to the world a tale such as alone is wanting to the calamities of the Jews." With these words she slew her son, and then, having roasted the body and devoured half of it, she covered up and stored the remainder. At once the rebels were upon her and, scenting the unholy odour, threatened her with instant death unless she produced what she had prepared. Replying that she had reserved a goodly portion for them also, she disclosed the remnants of her child. Seized with instant horror and stupefaction, they stood paralysed by the sight. She, however, said, "This is my own child, and this my handiwork. Eat, for I too have eaten. Show not yourselves weaker than a woman, or more compassionate than a mother. But if you have pious scruples and shrink from my sacrifice, then let what I have eaten be your and portion and the remainder also be left for me." At that they departed trembling, in this one instance cowards, though scarcely yielding even this food to the mother. The whole city instantly rang with the abomination, and each, picturing the

horror of it, shuddered as though it had been perpetrated by himself. The starving folk longed for death, and felicitated those who had gone to their rest ere they had heard or beheld such evils.

f. Torture of Captives During Siege, 70 (v. 11. 1)

[Vol. 3, p. 341] They [those caught while trying to escape from the city] were accordingly scourged and subjected to torture of every description, before being killed, and then crucified opposite the walls. Titus indeed commiserated their fate, five hundred or sometimes more being captured daily; on the other hand, he recognized the risk of dismissing prisoners of war, and that the custody of such numbers would amount to the imprisonment of their custodians; but his main reason for not stopping the crucifixions was the hope that the spectacle might perhaps induce the Jews to surrender, for fear that continued resistance would involve them in a similar fate. The soldiers out of rage and hatred amused themselves by nailing their prisoners in different postures; and so great was their number, that space could not be found for the crosses nor crosses for the bodies.

g. Efforts of Titus to Save the Temple, August, 70 (vi. 2. 4)

[Vol. 3, p. 413] "Why then, you miscreants, do you now actually trample corpses underfoot within it? Why do you defile your temple with the blood of foreigner and native? I call the gods of my fathers to witness and any deity that once watched over this place—for now I believe that there is none—I call my army, the Jews within my lines, and you yourselves to witness that it is not I who force you to pollute these precincts. Exchange the arena of conflict for another and not a Roman shall approach or insult your holy places; nay, I will preserve the temple for you, even against your will."

h. The Multitude of Victims, 66–70 (vi. 9. 3)

[Vol. 3, p. 497] The total number of prisoners taken throughout the entire war amounted to ninety-seven thousand, and of those who perished during the siege, from first to last, to one million one hundred thousand. Of these the greater number were of Jewish blood, but not natives of the place; for, having assembled from every part of the country for the feast of unleavened bread, they found themselves suddenly enveloped in the war, with the result that this over-crowding produced first pestilence, and later the added and more rapid scourge of famine.

i. Survivors Carried Away Captive, Autumn, 70 (vi. 9. 2)

[Vol. 3, p. 497] Fronto put to death all the seditious and brigands, information being given by them against each other; he selected the tallest and most handsome of the youth and reserved them for the triumph; of the rest, those over seventeen years of age he sent in chains to the works in Egypt, while multitudes were presented by Titus to the various provinces, to be destroyed in the theatres by the sword or by wild beasts; those under seventeen were sold.

j. Wall and Temple Destroyed, Autumn, 70 (vii. 1. 1)

[Vol. 3, p. 505] The army now having no victims either for slaughter or plunder, through lack of all objects on which to vent their rage—for they would assuredly never have desisted through a desire to spare anything so long as there was work to be done— Caesar ordered the whole city and the temple to be razed to the ground, leaving only the loftiest of the towers, Phasael Hippicus, and Mariamme, and the portion of the wall enclosing the city on the west: the latter as an encampment for the garrison that was to remain, and the towers to indicate to posterity the nature of the city and of the strong defences which had yet yielded to Roman prowess. All the rest of the wall encompassing the city was so completely levelled to the ground as to leave future visitors to the spot no ground for believing that it had ever been inhabited. Such was the end to which the frenzy of revolutionaries brought Jerusalem, that splendid city of world-wide renown. *k. Jerusalem's Destruction Blamed on Jews (i. preface, 4)*

[Vol. 2, p. 7] That it owed its ruin to civil strife, and that it was the Jewish tyrants who drew down upon the holy temple the unwilling hands of the Romans and the conflagration, is attested by Titus Caesar himself, who sacked the city; throughout the war he commiserated the populace who were at the mercy of the revolutionaries, and often of his own accord deferred the capture of the city and by protracting the siege gave the culprits time for repentance.

l. Jerusalem's Fall Considered by the Romans as a Judgment (vi. 9. 1) [Vol. 3, p. 495] Titus, on entering the town, was amazed at its strength, but chiefly at the towers, which the tyrants, in their infatuation, had abandoned. Indeed, when he beheld their solid lofty mass, the magnitude of each block and the accuracy of the joinings, and marked how great was their breadth, how vast their height, "God indeed," he exclaimed, "has been with us in the war. God it was who brought down the Jews from these strongholds; for what power have human hands or engines against these towers?"

923.Jerusalem—Roman War, A.D. 66–70—Successful Flight of Christians

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* iii. 5; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 199, 201. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 199] On the other hand, the [p. 201] people of the church in Jerusalem were commanded by an oracle given by revelation before the war to those in the city who were worthy of it to depart and dwell in one of the cities of Perea which they called Pella. To it those who believed on Christ migrated from Jerusalem, that when holy men had altogether deserted the royal capital of the Jews and the whole land of Judaea, the judgement of God might at last overtake them for all their crimes against the Christ and his Apostles, and all that generation of the wicked be utterly blotted out from among men.

[EDITORS' NOTE: An opportunity for flight was provided by Cestius' withdrawal of the Roman troops in A.D. 66 (see No. 922c.)]

924. Jesuits—Obedience a Mark of the Order

SOURCE: Frederick A. Norwood, *The Development of Modern Christianity Since 1500* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1956), p. 81. Copyright 1956 by Pierce & Washabaugh. Reprinted by permission of Abingdon Press. Quotation from Bettenson used by permission of Oxford University Press.

With the formal establishment of the new order in 1540, a constitution provided the framework for one of the most totalitarian institutions ever conceived. Members were directed to serve the Lord alone and the pope, his vicar. Absolute obedience became a mark of the Order. As the constitution put it:

Let us with the utmost pains strain every nerve of our strength to exhibit this virtue of obedience, firstly to the Highest Pontiff, then to the Superiors of the Society; so that in all things, to which obedience can be extended with charity, we may be most ready to obey his voice, just as if it issued from Christ our Lord...; by directing to this goal all our strength and intention in the Lord, that holy obedience may be made perfect in us in every respect, in performance, in will, in intellect; by submitting to whatever may be enjoined on us with great readiness, with spiritual joy and perseverance; by persuading ourselves that all things [commanded] are just; by rejecting with a kind of blind obedience all opposing opinion or judgment of our own; and that in all things which are ordained by the Superior where it cannot be clearly held that any kind of sin intervenes. And let each one persuade himself that they that live under obedience ought to

allow themselves to be borne and ruled by divine providence working through their Superiors exactly as if they were a corpse which suffers itself to be borne and handled in any way whatsoever; or just as an old man's stick which serves him who holds it in his hand wherever and for whatever purpose he wish to use it.¹⁵ [Note 15: Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*, p. 366... Taken from C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des Römischen Katholizismus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1934), p. 276.]

In the course of a long and, in some respects, glorious history the Jesuits became famous for recovery of Protestant lands for Rome. They were the epitome of counterreformation. They began to make a name for themselves in the fields of education and scholarship. And above all they carried the Christian message in the work of foreign missions.

925. Jesuits, Rules of Founder

SOURCE: Ignatius Loyola, *Spiritual Exercises,* trans. in Henry Bettenson, ed., *Documents of the Christian Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 363–366. Used by permission.

[Introductory note; p. 363] The Society of Jesus, founded by Ignatius Loyola (1491–1556), was skillfully organized into a great force for the conservation and propagation of the Roman Church. The Society started with six friends, in 1534, but it was not until 1540 that Pope Paul III could be induced to give his approval. The following extracts are given to show the spirit of obedience which served to make the Society such a mighty influence of propaganda.

a. Rules for Thinking with the Church

- 1. ALWAYS to be ready to obey with mind and heart, setting aside all judgment of one's own, the true spouse of Jesus Christ, our holy mother, our infallible and orthodox mistress, the Catholic Church, whose authority is exercised over us by the hierarchy.
- 2. To commend the confession of sins to a priest as it is practiced in the Church; the reception of the Holy Eucharist once a year, or better still every week, or at least every month, with the necessary preparation.
- 3. To commend to the faithful frequent and devout assistance at the holy sacrifice of the Mass, the ecclesiastical hymns, the divine office, and in general the prayers and devotions practiced at stated times, whether in public in the churches or in private.
- 4. To have a great esteem for the religious orders, and to give the preference to celibacy or virginity over the married state.
- 5. To approve of the religious vows of chastity, poverty, perpetual obedience, as well as the other works of perfection and supererogation. Let us remark in passing, that we must never engage by vow to take a state (such e.g. as marriage) that would be an impediment to one more perfect...
- [p. 364] 6. To praise relics, the veneration and invocation of Saints: also the stations, and pious pilgrimages, indulgences, jubilees, the custom of lighting candles in the Churches, and other such aids to piety and devotion.
- 7. To praise the use of abstinence and fasts as those of Lent, of Ember Days, of Vigils, of Friday, of Saturday, and of others undertaken out of pure devotion: also voluntary mortifications, which we call penances, nor merely interior, but exterior also.
- 8. To commend moreover the construction of Churches, and ornaments; also images, to be venerated with the fullest right, for the sake of what they represent.
- 9. To uphold especially all the precepts of the Church, and not censure them in any manner; but, on the contrary, to defend them promptly, with reasons drawn from all sources, against those who criticize them.

- 10. To be eager to commend the decrees, mandates, traditions, rites and customs of the Fathers in the Faith or our superiors. As to their conduct; although there may not always be the uprightness of conduct that there ought to be, yet to attack or revile them in private or in public tends to scandal and disorder. Such attacks set the people against their princes and pastors; we must avoid such reproaches and never attack superiors before inferiors. The best course is to make private approach to those who have power to remedy the evil.
- 11. To value most highly the sacred teaching, both the Positive¹ [Note 1: i.e. dogmatic, defined in formularies and decrees, as opposed to the philosophical speculations of scholasticism.] and the Scholastic, as they are commonly called...
- 12. It is a thing to be blamed and avoided to compare men who are still living on the earth (however worthy of praise) with the Saints and Blessed, saying: This man is more learned than St. Augustine, etc...
- 13. That we may be altogether of the same mind and in conformity with the Church herself, if she shall have defined [p. 365] anything to be black which to our eyes appears to be white, we ought in like manner to pronounce it to be black. For we must undoubtingly believe, that the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of the Orthodox Church His Spouse, by which Spirit we are governed and directed to Salvation, is the same; ...
- 14. It must also be borne in mind, that although it be most true, that no one is saved but he that is predestinated, yet we must speak with circumspection concerning this matter, lest perchance, stressing too much the grace or predestination of God, we should seem to wish to shut out the force of free will and the merits of good works; or on the other hand, attributing to these latter more than belongs to them, we derogate meanwhile from the power of grace.
- 15. For the like reason we should not speak on the subject of predestination frequently; if by chance we do so speak, we ought so to temper what we say as to give the people who hear no occasion of erring and saying, 'If my salvation or damnation is already decreed, my good or evil actions are predetermined'; whence many are wont to neglect good works and the means of salvation.
- 16. It also happens not unfrequently, that from immoderate preaching and praise of faith, without distinction or explanation added, the people seize a pretext for being lazy with regard to any good works, which precede faith, or follow it when it has been formed by the bond of charity.
- 17. Nor any more must we push to such a point the preaching and inculcating of the grace of God, as that there may creep thence into the minds of the hearers the deadly error of denying our faculty of free will. We must speak of it as the glory of God requires ... that we may not raise doubts as to liberty and the efficacy of good works.
- 18. Although it is very praiseworthy and useful to serve God through the motive of pure charity, yet we must also recommend the fear of God; and not only filial fear, but servile fear, which is very useful and often even necessary to raise man from sin... Once risen from the state, and [p. 366] free from the affection of mortal sin, we may then speak of that filial fear which is truly worthy of God, and which gives and preserves the union of pure love. (Ignatius Loyola, *Spiritual Exercises*, part ii.)

926. Jews, Ancient Religion of—Worship Described by a Roman

SOURCE: Dio Cassius *Roman History* xxxvii. 17. 2, 3; translated by Earnest Cary, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 127, 129. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 127] They [the Jews] are distinguished from the rest of mankind in practically every detail of life, and especially by the fact that they do not honour any of the usual gods, but show extreme reverence for one particular divinity. They never had any statue of him even in Jerusalem itself, but believing him to be unnamable and invisible, they worship him in the most extravagant fashion on earth. They built to him a temple [p. 129] that was extremely large and beautiful, except in so far as it was open and roofless, and likewise dedicated to him the day called the day of Saturn, on which, among many other most peculiar observances, they undertake no serious occupation.

927. Jews—Diaspora, in Hellenistic and Roman Times SOURCE: Albert A. Trever, *History of Ancient Civilization*, Vol. 1, pp. 522–524. Copyright 1936 by Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 522] No discussion of Hellenistic religion and culture and the intermingling of Greece and the Orient would be complete without some mention of the [p. 523] Jewish Diaspora, the dispersion of the Jews over the entire Mediterranean world due to the vicissitudes in their history from the deportations by Assyria and Nebuchadrezzar to the end of the Roman period. It is one of the most significant facts in the history of ancient civilization. Some of the main factors in the dispersion in Greco-Roman times were: the general tolerance of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids (except Antiochus IV), which caused the advance of Hellenism in Palestine and the unhindered migration of Jews to Egypt and Syria; the repeated enslavement of thousands of Jews as captives of war, their sale and transportation into many lands, and their gaining of freedom later; the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman Titus in 70 A.D.; the complete suppression of the last attempt of the Jews to gain independence in Judaea by the Roman emperor Hadrian in the second century A.D., which deprived them of a national home; extensive forced and voluntary migrations and colonizations; and the pressure of population in Palestine due to the lack of natural resources and the prolific character of the Jewish race.

The literary and archaeological data for the widespread dispersion of the Jews in Hellenistic and Roman times are abundant. There were Jewish settlements in Arabia, Syria, Phoenicia, Mesopotamia, Parthia, Media, Armenia, Cyprus, Asia Minor, southern Russia, Thrace, Macedonia, Pannonia, Spain, Gaul, Germany, Egypt, Cyrene, and Roman North Africa. The Alexandrian Jew Philo, in the first century A.D., estimated the Jewish population in Egypt at 1,000,000. The Jews numbered 8,000 in Rome in the Augustan age, and probably 180,000 in Asia Minor about 62 B.C.

The independent Greek cities were usually unfriendly to them, and frequent massacres resulted, but the Hellenistic rulers and, to a large extent, the Roman government actively encouraged them. The former especially were very important in making the Diaspora possible. Under Rome, the Jews throughout the Empire were granted important privileges, such as the assurance of not being expelled from their assigned district, the right to their synagogues and cemeteries, free worship, exemption from military service, the right to levy taxes on their members, and a good deal of administrative and judicial autonomy. However, they had their distinct disabilities. As aliens, they were subject to special taxes, though they sometimes won tax equality in Greek cities, and often full citizenship in the Roman Empire. Their uncompromising religious attitude, however, made them a peculiar and despised race to upper-class Romans and Greeks.

As a result of the Diaspora, the Jews ceased to be predominantly farmers, as they were in Palestine, and became city-dwellers, active in trade, industry, and almost every kind of business and profession. While they had little regular social contact with Greek and Roman citizens and mixed marriages were forbidden by their own law, much amalgamation with other races was inevitable, especially for the Hellenized Jews of Cyprus, Egypt, and Cyrene, where the Jewish population was so large.

Culturally and religiously, the Jewish Diaspora is especially significant. Through its influence multitudes of the Jews took over the Greek language, and were quite thoroughly Hellenized. Their culture and their religion of Judaism were much colored by Greek thought. We have seen how in Alex- [p. 524] andria, for example, they early found it necessary to translate their Old Testament and much of their other literature into Greek. Philo of Alexandria was thoroughly Platonized, and the Hellenized St. Paul reinterpreted the gospel of Jesus in the light of Greek thought, and carried it throughout the Roman Empire. This mingling of Judaism and Hellenism was later to have significant results for the development of Christian thought and biblical interpretation.

Again, the Jews were zealous propagandists for their religion, and their dispersion and partial Hellenization made this practice possible on an extensive scale. They were very clever in the use of their oracles and writings, and by establishing grades of proselytes were tactful in not exacting rigid fulfillment of the Jewish law. The number of conversions to Judaism in the second century B.C. became so large that the Roman Emperors legislated strictly against conversion. By these means the Jewish Diaspora was an important factor in producing in the later Greco-Roman world the peculiar religious complex in which Christianity developed.

928. Jews—Diaspora, in Roman Empire—Respect of Pagans for Judaism SOURCE: Josephus *Against Apion* ii. 39; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 405, 407. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 405] The masses have long since shown a keen desire to adopt our religious observances; and there is not [p. 407] one city, Greek or barbarian, nor a single nation, to which our custom of abstaining from work on the seventh day has not spread, and where the fasts and the lighting of lamps and many of our prohibitions in the matter of food are not observed. Moreover, they attempt to imitate our unanimity, our liberal charities, our devoted labour in the crafts, our endurance under persecution on behalf of our laws.

929. Jews—Diaspora, in Roman Empire—Scorn of Pagans for Sabbath Idleness

SOURCE: Augustine, The City of God, bk. 6, chap. 11, trans. in NPNF, 1st series, Vol. 2, p. 120.

Seneca [4 B.C.?–A.D. 65], among the other superstitions of civil theology, also found fault with the sacred things of the Jews, and especially the sabbaths, affirming that they act uselessly in keeping those seventh days, whereby they lose through idleness about the seventh part of their life, and also many things which demand immediate attention are damaged....

930. Jews — Diaspora, Modern, in Yemen—Messianic Expectations in 1836

SOURCE: Joseph Wolff, Narrative of a Mission to Bokhara (New York: Harper, 1845), pp. 51, 52.

[p. 51] The Arabs of this place [Hodeyda, Yemen] have a book called *Seera*, which treats of the second coming of Christ, and his reign in glory...

[p. 52] I spent six days with the children of Rechab (Beni Arhab). They drink no wine, plant no vineyards, sow no seed, live in tents, and remember the word of Jonadab the son of Rechab. With them were children of Israel of the tribe of Dan, who reside near Terim in Hatramawt [*sic*], who expected, in common with the children of Rechab, the speedy arrival of the Messiah in the clouds of heaven.

931. Jews—Proselytes From Many Peoples

SOURCE: H. G. *The Outline of History*, pp. 493, 494. Copyright 1920 and 1921 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and by H. G. Wells. Used by permission of Prof. G. P. Wells.

[p. 493] The Jewish idea was and is a curious combination of theological breadth and an intense racial patriotism. The Jews looked for a special saviour, a Messiah, who was to redeem mankind by the agreeable process of restoring the fabulous glories of David and Solomon, and bringing the whole world at last under the benevolent but firm Jewish heel. As the political power of the Semitic peoples declined, as Carthage followed Tyre into the darkness and Spain became a Roman province, this dream grew and spread. There can be little doubt that the scattered Phoenicians in Spain and Africa and throughout the [p. 494] Mediterranean, speaking as they did a language closely akin to Hebrew and being deprived of their authentic political rights, became proselytes to Judaism. For phases of vigorous proselytism alternated with phases of exclusive jealousy in Jewish history. On one occasion the Idumeans, being conquered, were all forcibly made Jews. There were Arab tribes who were Jews in the time of Muhammad, and a Turkish people who were mainly Jews in South Russia in the ninth century.

932. Jews, World Rule by, Expected in First Century

SOURCE: Suetonius *The Lives of the Caesars* viii. 4. 5; translated by J. C. Rolfe, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), p. 289. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

There had spread over all the Orient an old and established belief, that it was fated at that time for men coming from Judaea to rule the world. This prediction, referring to the emperor of Rome, as afterwards appeared from the event [see No. 933], the people of Judaea took to themselves; accordingly they revolted and after killing their governor, they routed the consular ruler of Syria as well, when he came to the rescue, and took one of his eagles.

933. Jews, World Rule of, Expected in First Century

SOURCE: Tacitus *Histories* v. 13; translated by Clifford H. Moore, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 199. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

The majority [of the Jews] firmly believed that their ancient priestly writings contained the prophecy that this was the very time [A.D. 66] when the East should grow strong and that men starting from Judea should possess the world.

934. Judaism—Jewish Congregations SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 763–766.

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

[p. 763] *History*. There were Jews in the original colonies before 1650. In New York, then New Amsterdam, there were Jews in 1654, and in the fall of that year a company of Jewish refugees arrived from Brazil, who settled in the colony. Although the Dutch authorities of New Amsterdam favored the Calvinist church and did not permit persons of other faiths to hold public assemblies, the Jews established their worship upon their arrival in the town, the population of which then numbered only about 800 persons. Like other residents of dissident faiths, the Jews gathered among themselves according to their opportunities, in their own homes or in a hired room, beginning to do so as soon as there were enough persons to hold public worship. In July 1655 they applied to the authorities for a plot for a cemetery. With the granting of this application, in 1656, the Congregation Sheerith Israel (Remnant of Israel), the first Jewish congregation in North America, entered upon its career as an institution. Its first minister was one named Saul Brown (originally Moreno, Spanish for Brown), who came to the congregation from Newport, R. I., and he officiated in the synagogue regularly. He died in the year 1682, at which time the congregation was occupying a rented building on Mill Street, now South William Street

Other Jewish communities were formed in Newport, R. I. (1658); in Savannah, Ga., Jews having been in the company which came with Oglethorpe; in Charleston, S. C.; in Philadelphia, Pa.; and in Richmond, Va.; all in colonial times. In 1850 there were 77 Jewish congregations, located in 21 of the then 31 States of the Union. In 1877 there were at least 277 congregations in the country and 230,000 Jews; in 1890, 533 congregations and probably 475,000 Jews; in 1906, 1,700 congregations and about 1,775,000 Jews; in 1916, 1,900 congregations and about 3,300,000 Jews; in 1926, 3,118 permanent congregations and 4,081,000 Jews; and in 1936, 3,728 congregations and 4,641,184 Jews residing in the cities, towns, and villages in which the congregations were located.

Doctrine. The Jewish religion is a way of life and has no formulated creed, or articles of faith, the acceptance of which brings redemption or salvation to the believer, or divergence from which involves separation from the Jewish congregation. On the other hand, it has certain teachings, sometimes called doctrines or dogmas, which have been at all times considered obligatory on the adherents of the Jewish religion.

The unity of God.—The fundamental doctrine of the Jewish religion is that God is One. At all times the religion of the Jew vigorously protested against any infringement of this dogma of pure monotheism, whether by the dualism of the East or by the Trinitarianism of the West. It never permitted the attributes of justice and of love to divide the Godhead into different powers or personalities. God is a Spirit without limitations of form, eternal, noncorporeal, unique, omniscient, omnipotent, and one. "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is One" is the declaration of faith which the Jew pronounces daily and breathes it even in his hour of death. God is the Creator of the world. He is also the preserver of the world, its ruler, and the arbiter of its destiny. He was God from the very beginning, and the worship of other gods is a rebellion against the universal God beside whom there is no other. "Look unto Me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God and there is none else" (Isaiah, xlv, 22). He is the God of righteousness, mercy, love, and holiness; the ideal of moral perfection. God is "our Father, our Redeemer for everlasting" (Isaiah, lxiii, 16); He is not remote from mortal man in his need, but He is rather, as Jewish sages have put it, "near, nearer than any other help or sympathy can be," who "appears to each according to his capacity or temporary

need." A Jew cannot compromise with idolatry or polytheism; indeed he is enjoined to give his life rather than to renounce the purity of his religion.

The world and man.—The world is a cosmic unit and it is good. The Holy One created and sustains the earth and heaven, light and darkness, life and death; and the world is ruled by everlasting wisdom and kindness. There is no cosmic force for evil, no principle of evil in creation. There is no inherent impurity in the flesh or in matter, and man is not subject to Satan. There is [p. 764] no original sin: sin is the erring from the right path. The crown and the acme of God's creation is man. He is capable of perfection without the aid of an extraneous being, and, being born free, is able to choose between good and evil, and is endowed with intelligence; "God created man in His own image" and made him "but little lower than the angels." From one man did all the races of the earth descend, and thus they constitute one family. This doctrine of the unity of the human family is a corollary of the doctrine of the unity of God. The One God is in direct relation with man, all men, there being no mediator between God and man, and all men may attain to immortality through following the good life; for immortality, the Jewish religion teaches, is the reward of human righteousness. There is in this respect no distinction between its own adherents and those of other faiths. As one ancient teacher exclaims: "I call heaven and earth to witness that whether it be Jew or gentile, man or woman, manservant or maidservant, according to their acts does the divine spirit rest upon them."

The future of mankind and Israel.—The perfection of humanity through the unfolding of the divine powers in man is the aim of history. There is to be a divine kingdom of truth and righteousness on this earth. Daily the Jew concludes his prayers by declaring his hope to behold speedily the time when God, in the glory of His might, will be manifested, and the abominations will be removed from the earth and idolatry utterly cut off, and He will perfect the world as the kingdom of the Almighty, and all flesh will call upon His name. This kingdom is the hope of mankind and the goal toward which it is striving. Whether or not this universal kingdom of God will be preceded by the day of God or by a universal judgment when "all that work wickedness shall be stubble," Jewish religion teaches the coming on this earth of a social order of human perfection and bliss, of peace without end, when none shall hurt or destroy, and when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord (Isaiah chapters ix, xi); this is the Messianic era.

Israel is a unique people that shall never cease (Jeremiah xxxi, 36). It is not claimed that this people is better than others or that it possesses a special share of the divine love; but it is affirmed, and the Jew daily declares this faith in his prayers, that God has brought them near to His great name, to give thanks unto Him, and to proclaim His unity. In this sense Israel is called a "kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (Exodus xix, 6), selected or assigned by God for His special purpose. Because of this duty they are taken to task more severely than others: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth, therefore I will visit upon you all youriniquities" (Amos iii, 2). It is a widespread Jewish interpretation that the Servant of the Lord described in Isaiah refers not to an individual but to the Jewish people as a group. Israel is God's witness (Isaiah xli–xliii), testifying to His existence and His unity. The duty of Israel, its imperishability and restoration (Deuteronomy xxx, 1–4) and the blessed future that awaits mankind, are doctrines of the Jewish religion.

The Law.—The belief in the unity of God, in the future hope of the world, and in the other doctrines is of no value unless one lives in accordance with the requirements of the beliefs. The emphasis is not on belief, but on righteous conduct. What is required is service of the Lord, a just system of human conduct in accordance with statutes and ordinances, "which if a man do, he shall live by them." The duty of man, created in the image of God, is to order his life entirely in accordance with the will of God, and only by so doing can he attain perfection and fulfill his destiny. And what does God desire of man? That was definitely conveyed to him. Already the first man, Adam, had received divine revelation for his conduct and for that of his descendants; other followed, until Moses received the full revelation, all the commandments and the statutes and the ordinances, which should govern the life of man and lead him to moral and religious perfection. This revelation, as contained in the Five Books of Moses, constitutes the Law of Moses, the Law, the Torah, the Written Law, and it must be understood in the light of Jewish tradition, the Oral Law. This Torah of divine origin, which will not be changed, is the foundation of the Jewish faith; and that the Jew must order his life in accordance with the Torah has always been a basic principle of the Jewish religion. To fear God and to keep His commandments is the whole duty of man.

The Torah, written and oral, preeminently emphasizes the principle of justice; other principles stressed are purity and truth, optimism and hope, and joy and thanksgiving, holiness and the love of God. Righteousness and compassionate love are demanded for the fatherless, the widow, the oppressed, the stranger, and even the criminal; charity is *zedakah*, justice to the needy; and compassion is required even for the dumb animal.

Further, a man's life must be permeated by purity of heart and built on truth. For, "the seal of the Holy One is truth" and "upon truth rests the world." Hope and optimism are other requirements, and hope is but [p. 765] rarely deferred to the world to come, but a man must rather wait for the moral and spiritual advancement of mankind in this world. At times this world is declared to be "like a vestibule in which one prepares for the palace," nevertheless, "one hour devoted to repentance and good deeds in this world is more valuable than the entire life of the world to come." A man should "rejoice before the Lord" and gratefully enjoy his gifts and fill other hearts with joy and thanksgiving; ascetism is discouraged. The whole life of man is holy, for the "Lord our God is holy," and man's life should be motivated by the love of God. Twice daily a Jew recites the

Shema', a declaration which contains the words "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy might." It implies the purest motives for action, specifically serving the Lord, not from fear but rather out of love and for the sake of God and the glorification of His name; the doing of good, not in view of any reward, but for its own sake; and the love of man and the most unselfish devotion and the willing surrender of one's life itself whenever the cause of God demands.

Other fundamental teachings of the law, written and oral, are freedom of will and human responsibility, divine providence, retribution, resurrection of the dead, the power of repentance and of prayer. Man is free, the choice between good and evil having been left to him as a participant of God's spirit; man is responsible for his own actions. In close relation with the doctrine of divine providence stands that of retribution—that God rewards the righteous and punishes transgressors. The doctrine of the soul's immortality and of a future life in which retribution shall take place is plainly set forth in the Talmud, and the belief in the resurrection of the dead is closely connected with the doctrines of immortality and of retribution in the hereafter. Emphasis is laid on the power of repentance to avert from man the evil which threatens and to procure for him God's grace, and on the efficacy of the prayer "of all that call upon Him in truth." There is no need for any mediator when one prays to God, "for the Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon Him." He hears great and small alike.

The Torah emphasizes the need of study and education. It imposes a duty a upon every father to instruct his children and upon the community to provide for the general instruction of old and young. The law sanctifies labor and makes the teaching of a trade whereby one may earn his living a duty upon the father and upon the communal authorities. Each man is enjoined to build a home and to contribute to the welfare of human society; celibacy, except under rare circumstances, is unlawful. Systematic care of the poor is a duty of a community. Love of one's country and loyalty to his government is enjoined upon every Jew, and he is solemnly adjured to seek the peace of his country and to pray for the welfare of its government.

Side by side with these universal principles of conduct the Torah surrounds the Jewish people with numerous laws and rites. Some laws, also called testimonies, have been given to make Israel testify to God's miraculous guidance, such as the festive seasons of the year; others, called signs, are tokens of the covenant between God and Israel, such as circumcision and the Sabbath; and still others, also called statutes, are divine marks of distinction—special means to preserve Israel and its group life. The covenant at Sinai made Israel a society "of priests and a holy nation" and laws were given to them designed to preserve the priestly character of the nation. Some of these appeal to the human reason while others do not, but even those which human intelligence is unable to grasp, are, through belief in their divine origin, vouchsafed the same high religious importance. Judaism is bound up with the Jewish people. "Ye shall be holy unto Me; for I the Lord am holy, and have set you apart from the peoples, that ye should be Mine" (Leviticus xx, 26). These particularistic religious obligations of the Torah, written and oral, enabled the small Jewish people to resist the disintegrating forces of the idolatry and error which surrounded them, and encouraged the Jews to live by the principle, ascribed by the early rabbis to Abraham, "let all the world stand on the one side, I side with God and shall win in the end." The laws gave the Jews the strength to withstand the persecutions of the nations and the vicissitudes of time, and to fight for the truth amidst a hostile world. The Jewish religion knows of no sacraments, in the sense of rites by which a person is brought in bodily relationship to God...

The Jewish religion in its relation to other faiths.—The Jewish religion enjoins upon its adherents the application of one law for Jew and members of other faiths, [p. 766] home-born or stranger; "Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger as for the home-born" (Numbers xxiv, 22). The harsh expressions found sometimes in ancient Jewish lore, concerning the heathen and the laws against him, are directed against the moral depravity ascribed to the heathen because of his unchastity and violence; he is always under grave suspicion of immoral conduct. The Jewish religion recognizes two classes of proselytes—"a proselyte of the gate" is one who abandons idolatry and accepts instead the seven Noachian laws of humanity, while "a proselyte of righteousness" is one who submits to the Abrahamic rite and becomes a full member of the House of Israel. No distinction whatever is drawn between a born Jew and a proselyte of righteousness. In former centuries, the Jews carried on an extensive proselytizing propaganda; later the

world conditions prevented it. But whether as a result of that interference or not, proselytizing activities have since been neglected. In the fullness of time, however, the prophetic promises of the universal recognition of God will be fulfilled, and as the Jew expresses it in his prayers on New Year's Day, "God will reign in His glory over the whole universe and all the living shall say, the Lord, God of Israel, is King, and His kingdom ruleth over all."

Organization. The polity of the Jewish congregations is characterized by the independence which the individual congregations enjoy. There is no synod, conference, assembly, hierarchy, or other organization which directly controls the ritual and synagogal customs of the congregation or its organization; nor do the Jewish congregations feel the need of any; all congregations teach the doctrines of the faith, accept the inspiration of the Law, and hold to the unity of Israel.

Due to the fact that the Jews in the United States came from many countries, some congregations differ slightly from others in the version of their prayer book and synagogal customs—(*nussah*=version, or *minhag*=custom)—and also in matters of polity. One important group of congregations uses a prayer book designated as of "German version" and follows the synagogal customs that go with it (Congregation So

and So nussah Ashkenaz), and another important group uses a prayer book known as of

"Spanish version" (Congregation So and So *nussah Sefarad*). The great majority of the latter group are known also others, like Spanish-Portuguese congregations (Congregation

So and So Portuguese *minhag*). These are sometimes designated as orthodox congregations, to distinguish them from others known as conservative congregations or as reform (or liberal, or progressive) congregations. The conservative congregations, which as a rule use the "German version," are at other times classed with the orthodox congregations as distinguished from the reform congregations, whose version of the book

of common prayer was once known as "American custom" ("*minhag* America"), but which is now known as the Union Prayer Book... All congregations use Hebrew in their prayers; but numerous congregations make extensive use of English, while still others use little or none at all. As for the sermon, in some congregations the rabbis preach in English only; in other congregations, in English on some occasions and in other vernaculars, specifically Yiddish—a dialect of German with a large admixture of Hebrew words—on other occasions; while in still others, whose congregants are mostly immigrants, the rabbis preach solely in Yiddish or other vernaculars best understood by the congregants. The congregations differ also in the use of music in the services. Some congregations abstain from the use of instrumental music, regarding the latter as unlawful in synagogal services. Such congregations often have choirs of men, but not of women; others admit women to their choirs. To pray in the synagogues with covered heads is regarded as a synagogal custom by the great majority of the congregations, but some congregations pray with uncovered heads.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1954), 5,500,000 (YAC, 1961, p. 255).]

935. Judaism, Modern, in America

SOURCE: Nathan Glazer, *American Judaism*, pp. 131, 132. Copyright 1957 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 131] If the absence of tenets and doctrines were accompanied by the observance of even the major commandments of the Jewish religion, there would be much virtue in

such a position. However, traditional Jewish piety as expressed in the observance of ritual is now to be found among only a small minority of American Jews. Some form of observance, it is true, will be found in almost every Jewish home. One may discover from a study of lay members of Reform synagogues in 1953 that 74 per cent conduct Seders on Passover and 81 per cent light candles on Hanukkah (largely, one may assume, to counter the effects of Christmas: 21 per cent also report they have Christmas trees!). One is surprised to discover that the dietary laws—which are not in any way a requirement of Reform Judaism—are observed by 8 per cent of Reform Jews, and as many as one-quarter will not eat pork. Thus, the remnants of traditional observance are found almost everywhere. Yet it is also true that a Conservative rabbi will take it for granted that he cannot eat in the homes of most of his congregants. A survey of lay leaders of Conservative congregations reports that among these laymen only 37 per cent have kosher homes.

But more significant than the figures of those adhering to one or another rite is the fact that the pattern of life envisaged by traditional Judaism, which in fact was the way of life of almost all Jews down to the nineteenth century, is now the way of life of only a very small minority of American Jews. There is much in the Jewish religion that is not law and observance. Yet its essence, as developed over a period of two thousand years, was a complete pattern of life, in which a daily round of prayers and observances, punctuated by the more intense observances of the Sabbath and the festivals, reminded all Jews that they were a holy people. This pattern of life was Judaism; today it is maintained by a small minority, and, since only a minority observe it, it has changed its character. The ob- [p. 132] servances are no longer the outward form of the Jew but the ideological platform of only one of several trends in Jewish life. Judaism, which was the religion of all the Jewish people, has become Orthodoxy, which is the position of only some of them. This creates a more serious break in the continuity of Jewish history than the murder of six million Jews. Jewish history has known, and Judaism has been prepared for, massacre; Jewish history has not known, nor is Judaism prepared for, the abandonment of the law

936. Justification, and the Antinomian Error

SOURCE: Edward White, Life in Christ (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), p. 233.

This error was seemingly based upon a recognition of the mercy of God as the ground of salvation; but made the fatal mistake of imagining that that mercy was available for other than regenerate men. It held the truth on the gratuitous reckoning of righteousness; but supposed that an intellectual *belief* in this truth had a saving efficacy. The Apostle [James] refuted this error by the admonition,—*The devils also believe, and tremble;* reminding its victims that the true *faith* was an active principle which works by love. S. James does not represent sanctification as the ground of justification, but as its necessary concomitant.

937. Justification, by Faith, Defined

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 35, 36. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 35] One of Paul's most important teachings, though it is only one, is the doctrine of what we call "justification by faith." It frequently appears to the non-Christian mind that this is an immoral or at least unmoral doctrine. Paul appears to be saying that a man is justified before God not by his goodness or badness, not by his good deeds or bad deeds, but by believing in a certain doctrine of the Atonement.

Of course, when we come to examine the matter more closely we can see that there is nothing unmoral in this teaching at all. For if "faith" means using a God-given faculty to apprehend the unseen divine order, and means, moreover, involving oneself in that order by personal commitment, we can at once see how different that is from merely accepting a certain view of Christian redemption. What Paul is concerned to point out again and again is that no man can reconcile himself to the moral perfection of God by his own efforts in this time-and-space setup. It is a foregone conclusion that he must fail. The truth is—and of course it is a truth which can only be seen and accepted [p. 36] by the faith faculty—that God has taken the initiative, that, staggering as it may seem, one of the main objects of the Personal Visit was to reconcile man to Himself. That which man in every religion, every century, every country, was powerless to effect, God has achieved by the devastating humility of His action and suffering in Jesus Christ. Now, accepting

such an action as a *fait accompli* is only possible by this perceptive faculty of "faith." It requires not merely intellectual assent but a shifting of personal trust from the achievements of the self to the completely undeserved action of God. To accept this

teaching by mind and heart does indeed require a *metanoia*, a revolution in the outlook of both mind and heart. Although the natural human personality sometimes regards this generous fact of reconciliation as an affront to its pride, to countless people since Paul's day it has been, as it was meant to be, Good News.

The phrase "justification by faith," then, simply means acceptance of a forgiveness and a reconciliation made by God Himself, and the total abandonment of efforts at selfjustification. God's action, His "grace," as Paul calls it, becomes effectual when the truth of the matter becomes real by "faith." That is why Paul repeats again and again in different words his great theme, "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God."

938. Justification, Council of Trent on

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VI (Jan. 13, 1547), Decree Concerning Justification, chaps. 4, 5, 7–9, trans. in H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, pp. 31–35. Copyright 1941 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

[p. 31] In which words is given a brief description of the justification of the sinner, as being a translation from that state in which man is born a child of the first Adam, to the state of grace and of the adoption of the sons of God through the second Adam, Jesus Christ, our Saviour. This translation however cannot, since the promulgation of the Gospel, be effected except through the laver of regeneration or its desire, as it is written: *Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* ...

It is furthermore declared that in adults the beginning of that justification must proceed from the predisposing grace of God through Jesus Christ, that is, from His vocation, whereby, without any merits on their part, they are called; that they who by sin had been cut off from God, may be disposed through His quickening and helping grace to convert themselves to their own justification by freely assenting to [p. 32] and cooperating with that grace; so that, while God touches the heart of man through the illumination of the Holy Ghost, man himself neither does absolutely nothing while receiving that inspiration, since he can also reject it, nor yet is he able by his own free will and without the grace of God to move himself to justice in His sight. Hence, when it is said in the sacred writings: *Turn ye to me, and I will turn to you*, we are reminded of our liberty; and when we reply: *Convert us, O Lord, to thee, and we shall be converted,* we confess that we need the grace of God...

[p. 33] This disposition or preparation is followed by justification itself, which is not only a remission of sins but also the sanctification and renewal of the inward man through the voluntary reception of the grace and gifts whereby an unjust man becomes just and from being an enemy becomes a friend, that he may be an heir according to hope of life everlasting. The causes of this justification are: the final cause is the glory of God and of Christ and life everlasting; the efficient cause is the merciful God who washes and sanctifies gratuitously, signing and anointing with the holy Spirit of promise, who is the pledge of our inheritance; the meritorious cause is His most beloved only begotten. our Lord Jesus Christ, who, when we were enemies, for the exceeding charity wherewith he loved us, merited for us justification by His most holy passion on the wood of the cross and made satisfaction for us to God the Father; the instrumental cause is the sacrament of baptism, which is the sacrament of faith, without which no man was ever justified; finally, the single formal cause is the justice of God, not that by which He Himself is just, but that by which He makes us just, that, namely, with which we being endowed by Him. are *renewed in the spirit of our mind*; and not only are we reputed, but we are truly called and are just, receiving justice within us, each one according to his own measure, which the Holy Ghost distributes to everyone as He wills, and according to each one's disposition and cooperation. For [p. 34] though no one can be just except he to whom the merits of the passion of our Lord Jesus Christ are communicated, yet this takes place in that justification of the sinner, when by the merit of the most holy passion, the charity of God is poured forth by the Holy Ghost in the hearts of those who are justified and inheres in them; whence man through Jesus Christ, in whom he is ingrafted, receives in that justification, together with the remission of sins, all these infused at the same time, namely, faith, hope and charity. For faith, unless hope and charity be added to it, neither unites man perfectly with Christ nor makes him a living member of His body. For which reason it is most truly said that faith without works is dead and of no profit, and in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith that worketh by charity. This faith, conformably to Apostolic tradition, catechumens ask of the Church before the sacrament of baptism, when they ask for the faith that gives eternal life, which without hope and charity faith cannot give. Whence also they hear immediately the word of Christ: If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. Wherefore, when receiving true and Christian justice, they are commanded, immediately on being born again, to preserve it pure and spotless, as the first robe given them through Christ Jesus in place of that which Adam by his disobedience lost for himself and for us, so that they may bear it before the tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ and may have life eternal...

But when the Apostle says that man is justified by faith and freely, these words are to be understood in that sense in which the uninterrupted unanimity of the Catholic Church has held and expressed them, namely, that we are therefore said to be justified by faith, because faith [p. 35] is the beginning of human salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, *without which it is impossible to please God* and to come to the fellowship of His sons; and we are therefore said to be justified gratuitously, because none of those things that precede justification, whether faith or works, merit the grace of justification. For, *if by grace, it is not now by works, otherwise,* as the Apostle says, *grace is no more grace.* ...

But though it is necessary to believe that sins neither are remitted nor ever have been remitted except gratuitously by divine mercy for Christ's sake, yet it must not be said that sins are forgiven or have been forgiven to anyone who boasts of his confidence and certainty of the remission of his sins, resting on that alone, though among heretics and schismatics this vain and ungodly confidence may be and in our troubled times indeed is found and preached with untiring fury against the Catholic Church. Moreover, it must not be maintained, that they who are truly justified must needs, without any doubt whatever, convince themselves that they are justified, and that no one is absolved from sins and justified except he that believes with certainty that he is absolved and justified, and that absolution and justification are effected by this faith alone, as if he who does not believe this, doubts the promises of God and the efficacy of the death and resurrection of Christ. For as no pious person ought to doubt the mercy of God, the merit of Christ and the virtue and efficacy of the sacraments, so each one, when he considers himself and his own weakness and indisposition, may have fear and apprehension concerning his own grace, since no one can know with the certainty of faith, which cannot be subject to error, that he has obtained the grace of God.

939. Justification, Freedom Confirmed Through

SOURCE: Karl von Hase, *Handbook to the Controversy With Rome* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1909), Vol. 2, p. 37. By permission of Lutterworth Press, London, present publishers.

Justification by faith alone is not the denial, it is rather the confirmation, of the highest freedom, for it involves this, that the man in matters relating to his eternal salvation is independent of any sort of priestly mediation, of any sort of human pronouncement, of any sort of legal tradition, that he stands alone before the face of God, and that it is only in his own heart that the decision is made with regard to him how far he belongs to the truly Catholic, the ideal Church.

940. Justinian, as a Persecutor

SOURCE: John Chapman, *Studies on the Early Papacy* (New York: Benziger [1929?]), pp. 221, 222. Used by permission of Benziger Brothers, Inc., New York and Burns and Oates Ltd., London.

[p. 221] He [Justinian] felt himself to be the Vicegerent of the Almighty to rule the [p. 222] world and bring it all to the service of Christ. His wars were holy wars. In later centuries a Byzantine battle began like a church ceremony. Even in the sixth century every enterprise was consecrated by religion.

He was well aware that judicious persecution is a great help towards conversion! ... He strengthened the existing laws against pagans, Jews and heretics... Many were burnt at Constantinople after the Emperor had made vain attempts to convert them. John of Ephesus ... was employed in this apostolate. He boasts that in 546 he gained 70,000 pagans in Asia Minor, including nobles and rhetoricians and physicians, and many at Constantinople. Tortures discovered these men, and scourgings and imprisonment induced them to accept instruction and baptism. A Patricius, named Phocas, hearing that he had been denounced, took poison. The Emperor ordered that he should be buried as an ass is buried. The pious Emperor paid all the expenses of this Christian mission, and gave to each of the 70,000 Asiatics the white garments for their baptism and a piece of money...

Other heretics were given three months' grace. All magistrates and soldiers had to swear that they were Catholics.

941. Justinian, Conciliated Roman Church

SOURCE: Charles Diehl, "Justinian's Government in the East." chap. 2 in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926), p. 44. Used by permission.

Justinian spared nothing in his efforts to conciliate the Roman Church, and we find inserted with evident satisfaction in Justinian's *Code* pontifical letters, which praise his efforts to maintain "the peace of the Church and the unity of religion."

942. Justinian—Design to Clear the Arian Power From Italy SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 41, Vol. 4 (London: Methuen & Co., 1898), p. 327.

When Justinian first meditated the conquest of Italy, he sent ambassadors to the kings of the Franks, and adjured them, by the common ties of alliance and religion, to join in the holy enterprise against the Arians.

943. Justinian, Heretics Persecuted by

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 41, Vol. 4 (London: Methuen & Co., 1898), p. 134.

The reign of Justinian was an uniform yet various scene of persecution; and he appears to have surpassed his indolent predecessors both in the contrivance of his laws and the rigour of their execution. The insufficient term of three months was assigned for the conversion or exile of all heretics; and, if he still connived at their precarious stay, they were deprived, under his iron yoke, not only of the benefits of society, but of the common birth-right of men and Christians.

944. Justinian, Religious Policy Adopted by

SOURCE: G. Krüger, "Justinian I., Emperor of the East," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 6, p. 286. Copyright 1910 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

The recognition of the Roman see as the highest ecclesiastical authority (cf. *Novellae*, cxxxi.) remained the cornerstone of his [Justinian's] policy in relation to the West, although he thus grievously offended those of the East, and though he felt himself entirely free to show a despotic front toward the pope.

945. Justinian, Religious Policy of

SOURCE: G. Krüger, "Justinian I., Emperor of the East," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 6, p. 286. Copyright 1910 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 285] Justinian's religious policy was upheld by the imperial conviction that the unity of the empire unconditionally presupposed unity of faith; and with him it was a matter of course that his faith could be only the orthodox. Those of a different belief had to recognize that the process which had been begun by imperial legislation from Constantius down was now to be vigorously continued. The Codex contained two statutes (*Cod.*, I., xi. 9 and 10) which decreed the total destruction of Hellenism, even in the civil life; nor were the appertaining provisions to stand merely on paper. The sources (Malalas, Theophanes, John of Ephesus) tell of severe persecutions, even of men in high positions. But what proved of universal historic account, was the ruling whereby the emperor, in 529, abrogated philosophical and juridical instruction at the University of Athens, thus putting an end to this training-school for Hellenism. And the Christian propaganda went hand in hand with the suppression of paganism... The emperor interfered too in the internal affairs of the synagogue (*Nov.*, cxlvi., Feb. 8, 553), and forbade, for instance, the use of the Hebrew language in divine worship...

[p. 286] Justinian entered the arena of ecclesiastical statecraft shortly after his uncle's accession in 518, and put an end to the schism that had prevailed between Rome and

Byzantium since 483... In the condemnation of the Three Chapters Justinian tried to satisfy both the East and the West but succeeded in satisfying neither. Although the pope assented to the condemnation, the West believed that the emperor was acting contrary to the decrees of Chalcedon; and though many dele- [p. 287] gates were found in the East subservient to Justinian, yet there were many, especially the Monophysites, left unsatisfied. So the emperor's efforts were wasted on an impossible task; the more bitter for him because during his last years he took greater interest in theological matters.

It cannot be doubted that Justinian also took an actual, personal hand in the theological manifestoes which he put forth as emperor; although, in view of the author's exalted position, it is a difficult matter to ascertain whether the documents current under his name are the direct product of his pen.

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

946. Keys, Power of, Catholic View of

SOURCE: Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 281, 282. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 281] Having said so much on contrition, we now come to confession, which is another part of Penance. The care and exactness which its exposition demands of pastors must be at once obvious, if we only reflect that most holy persons are firmly persuaded that whatever of piety, of holiness, of religion, has been preserved to our times in the Church, through God's goodness, must be ascribed in great measure to confession. It cannot, therefore, be a matter of surprise that the enemy of the human race, in his efforts to destroy utterly the Catholic Church, should, through the agency of the ministers of his wicked designs, have assailed with all his might this bulwark, as it were, of Christian virtue. It should be shown, therefore, in the first place that the institution of confession is most useful and even necessary to us.

[p. 282] ... Contrition, it is true, blots out sin; but who does not know that to effect this it must be so intense, so ardent, so vehement, as to bear a proportion to the magnitude of the crimes which it effaces? This is a degree of contrition which few reach; and hence, in this way, very few indeed could hope to obtain the pardon of their sins. It, therefore, became necessary that the most merciful Lord should provide by some easier means for the common salvation of men; and this He has done in His admirable wisdom, by giving to His Church the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

According to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, a doctrine firmly to be believed and constantly professed by all, if the sinner have a sincere sorrow for his sins and a firm resolution of avoiding them in future, although he bring not with him that contrition which may be sufficient of itself to obtain pardon, all his sins are forgiven and remitted through the power of the keys, when he confesses them properly to the priest. Justly, then, do those most holy men, our Fathers, proclaim that by the keys of the Church the gate of heaven is thrown open, a truth which no one can doubt since the Council of Florence has decreed that the effect of Penance is absolution from sin.

947. Kingdom of God, Diverse Meanings of

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1959), pp. 18, 22, 23. Copyright 1959 by The Paternoster Press. Used by permission of the author and of The Paternoster Press, London.

[p. 18] The parables of the Kingdom make it clear that in some sense, the Kingdom is present and at work in the world. The Kingdom of God *is* like a tiny seed which becomes a great tree; it *is* like leaven which will one day have permeated the entire bowl of dough (Luke 13:18–21). Yet on the other hand, when Pilate examined Jesus about His teaching, Jesus replied, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36).

The very complexity of the Biblical teaching about the Kingdom of God is one of the reasons why such diverse interpretations have arisen in the history of theology. Isolated verses can be quoted for most of the interpretations which can be found in our theological literature. The Kingdom is a present reality (Matt. 12:28), and yet it is a future blessing (1 Cor. 15:50). It is an inner spiritual redemptive blessing (Rom. 14:17) which can be experienced only by way of the new birth (John 3:3), and yet it will have to do with the government of the nations of the world (Rev. 11:15). The Kingdom is a realm into which men enter now (Matt. 21:31), and yet it is a realm into which they will enter tomorrow (Matt. 8:11). It is at the same time a gift of God which will be bestowed by God in the future (Luke 12:32) and yet which must be received in the present (Mark 10:15).

Obviously no simple explanation can do justice to such a rich but diverse variety of teaching...

[p. 22] Our problem, then, is found in this threefold fact: (1) Some passages of Scripture refer to the Kingdom of God as God's reign. (2) Some passages refer to God's Kingdom as the realm into which we may now enter to experience the blessings of His reign. (3) Still other passages refer to a future realm which will come only with the return of our Lord Jesus Christ into which we shall then enter and experience the fulness of His reign. Thus the Kingdom of God means three different things in different verses. One has to study all the references in the light of their context and then try to fit them together in an overall interpretation.

Fundamentally, as we have seen, the Kingdom of God is God's sovereign reign; but God's reign expresses itself in different stages through redemptive history. Therefore, men may enter into the realm of God's reign in its several stages of manifestation and experience the blessings of His reign in differing degrees. God's Kingdom is the realm of the Age to Come, popularly called heaven; then we shall realize the blessings of His Kingdom (reign) in the perfection of their fulness. But the Kingdom is here now. There is a realm of spiritual blessing into which we may enter [p. 23] today and enjoy in part but in reality the blessings of God's Kingdom (reign).

We pray, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." The confidence that this prayer is to be answered when God brings human history to the divinely ordained consummation enables the Christian to retain his balance and sanity of mind in this mad world in which we live. Our hearts go out to those who have no such hope. Thank God, His Kingdom is coming, and it will fill all the earth.

948. Kingdom of God, Present and Future Phases of SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), pp. 211, 212. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 211] In the Bible are three interpretations of the Kingdom.

There is *first* the understanding of the eternal and unending sovereignty of God. He exercises his Kingship over all creation "from everlasting to everlasting." God is Lord of all that is, both now and forevermore. His Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, whether we know about it or not.

[p. 212] In *addition* to this, it is plain that to a certain degree this ultimate rule of God is actually manifested in human history. It is partly realized by the Jews when they obey the Torah or Law. It is partly realized in the coming of Christ. After his coming it is spoken of as being "in your midst." It is "at hand"; it has "come upon you."

Finally, there are a number of passages that make it plain that the Kingdom, in all its fullness, is still off in the future. If it has partially come, it is also still coming. The consummation of the purpose of God has not yet been completely achieved, but is still to come.

These elements can be combined so as to bring out the distinctiveness of the Biblical position by saying that the Kingdom of God has "broken in" to human history in a decisive way in the coming of Jesus Christ, but that the completion and fulfillment of this mighty act of God still lie in the future. Look at the two sides of this statement.

949. Kingdom of God, a Present and Future Reality

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 66–69. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 66] After we have recognized that the Gospels represent the kingdom as both a present and a future reality, we are faced with the problem of the underlying significance of these two aspects of the kingdom...

[p. 67] The Gospel data require us to recognize the future eschatological aspect of the kingdom as the primary temporal orientation and not as merely incidental to the present aspect. In the Sermon on the Mount, the kingdom is repeatedly viewed as something in the future which is yet to come... The situation reflected in these promises of future blessing is that of a future and final world order, displacing the course of the present world, set up by the mighty act of God, consisting essentially in the overthrow of every will resisting God and every power hostile to the good, when God alone and absolutely will rule the world as king.

While the Sermon on the Mount deals with a present righteousness, the possession of that righteousness is viewed as necessary not so much to live in the present world as the necessary prerequisite for entering into the future kingdom. Unless men have such a righteousness which exceeds that of the Scribes and Pharisees, they *will never enter* the kingdom (Matt. 5:20). The kingdom is not something which was [p. 68] come, but something for whose coming men are now to prepare themselves. When it comes, it will involve judgment and a separation between men. "On that day" some will endeavor to enter the kingdom but will be excluded because they have not in this life done the will of God. Jesus himself will then be the one to whom the power of judgment is given (Matt. 7:21–22).

When a gentile centurion manifested faith in Jesus, he received the commendation that his faith would find its fullest recognition in the future kingdom. In that day, many others—gentiles like the centurion—would come from the east and the west to sit at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—Old Testament saints who apparently at that time have been raised from the dead—while the sons of the kingdom, the Jewish people to whom Jesus came and who ought to occupy those seats because of their religious heritage, will be cast into outer darkness where men will weep and gnash their teeth (Matt. 8:11–12). This again anticipates the coming of the kingdom after a day of judgment.

In the same vein, Jesus taught that those who were then his disciples would not experience the full blessing of their discipleship until the future. Because they had abandoned earthly possessions and relationships to follow Jesus, he promised them that "in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. 19:28).

While the parables of the kingdom view it as something present, it is not present in its fullness and perfection. Evil doers will not be gathered out of the kingdom until the consummation of the age, and only then will the righteous shine forth like the sun in the kingdom of their Father (Matt. 13:38–43). The kingdom of heaven will not be perfectly realized until the division between the good and the evil at the consummation of the present age (Matt. 13:47–50).

[p. 69] At the last supper with the disciples as Jesus anticipated his death, he looked forward to the day when he would drink the fruit of the vine new with his disciples in his Father's kingdom (Matt. 26:29).

When Jesus came to Jerusalem for the last time, the people thought that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately. Jesus told them a parable to disabuse them of such expectations. The kingdom was to be long delayed. Jesus, who in the parable is

represented by a nobleman, is to go into a "far country" to obtain his kingly authority and then to return. The coming of the kingdom must await the return of Christ (Luke 19:11–27).

Thus while there is a sense, as we shall see, in which Jesus represented the kingdom as already present, yet he continually looked forward to the coming of the kingdom in the future when the Son of Man would return in glory. The present age must run its course before the kingdom is fully manifested, before the kingdom "comes." By their acceptance or rejection of Jesus, men prepare themselves for that day when the kingdom is to come. The one group will find entrance into it, the others will be shut out. To this extent the consistent eschatology is correct: *the kingdom in its fullness is consistently future*.

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

946. Keys, Power of, Catholic View of

SOURCE: Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 281, 282. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 281] Having said so much on contrition, we now come to confession, which is another part of Penance. The care and exactness which its exposition demands of pastors must be at once obvious, if we only reflect that most holy persons are firmly persuaded that whatever of piety, of holiness, of religion, has been preserved to our times in the Church, through God's goodness, must be ascribed in great measure to confession. It cannot, therefore, be a matter of surprise that the enemy of the human race, in his efforts to destroy utterly the Catholic Church, should, through the agency of the ministers of his wicked designs, have assailed with all his might this bulwark, as it were, of Christian virtue. It should be shown, therefore, in the first place that the institution of confession is most useful and even necessary to us.

[p. 282] ... Contrition, it is true, blots out sin; but who does not know that to effect this it must be so intense, so ardent, so vehement, as to bear a proportion to the magnitude of the crimes which it effaces? This is a degree of contrition which few reach; and hence, in this way, very few indeed could hope to obtain the pardon of their sins. It, therefore, became necessary that the most merciful Lord should provide by some easier means for the common salvation of men; and this He has done in His admirable wisdom, by giving to His Church the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

According to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, a doctrine firmly to be believed and constantly professed by all, if the sinner have a sincere sorrow for his sins and a firm resolution of avoiding them in future, although he bring not with him that contrition which may be sufficient of itself to obtain pardon, all his sins are forgiven and remitted through the power of the keys, when he confesses them properly to the priest. Justly, then, do those most holy men, our Fathers, proclaim that by the keys of the Church the gate of heaven is thrown open, a truth which no one can doubt since the Council of Florence has decreed that the effect of Penance is absolution from sin.

947. Kingdom of God, Diverse Meanings of

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1959), pp. 18, 22, 23. Copyright 1959 by The Paternoster Press. Used by permission of the author and of The Paternoster Press, London.

[p. 18] The parables of the Kingdom make it clear that in some sense, the Kingdom is present and at work in the world. The Kingdom of God *is* like a tiny seed which becomes a great tree; it *is* like leaven which will one day have permeated the entire bowl of dough (Luke 13:18–21). Yet on the other hand, when Pilate examined Jesus about His teaching, Jesus replied, "My kingdom is not of this world" (John 18:36).

The very complexity of the Biblical teaching about the Kingdom of God is one of the reasons why such diverse interpretations have arisen in the history of theology. Isolated verses can be quoted for most of the interpretations which can be found in our theological literature. The Kingdom is a present reality (Matt. 12:28), and yet it is a future blessing (1 Cor. 15:50). It is an inner spiritual redemptive blessing (Rom. 14:17) which can be experienced only by way of the new birth (John 3:3), and yet it will have to do with the government of the nations of the world (Rev. 11:15). The Kingdom is a realm into which men enter now (Matt. 21:31), and yet it is a realm into which they will enter tomorrow (Matt. 8:11). It is at the same time a gift of God which will be bestowed by God in the future (Luke 12:32) and yet which must be received in the present (Mark 10:15).

Obviously no simple explanation can do justice to such a rich but diverse variety of teaching...

[p. 22] Our problem, then, is found in this threefold fact: (1) Some passages of Scripture refer to the Kingdom of God as God's reign. (2) Some passages refer to God's Kingdom as the realm into which we may now enter to experience the blessings of His reign. (3) Still other passages refer to a future realm which will come only with the return of our Lord Jesus Christ into which we shall then enter and experience the fulness of His reign. Thus the Kingdom of God means three different things in different verses. One has to study all the references in the light of their context and then try to fit them together in an overall interpretation.

Fundamentally, as we have seen, the Kingdom of God is God's sovereign reign; but God's reign expresses itself in different stages through redemptive history. Therefore, men may enter into the realm of God's reign in its several stages of manifestation and experience the blessings of His reign in differing degrees. God's Kingdom is the realm of the Age to Come, popularly called heaven; then we shall realize the blessings of His Kingdom (reign) in the perfection of their fulness. But the Kingdom is here now. There is a realm of spiritual blessing into which we may enter [p. 23] today and enjoy in part but in reality the blessings of God's Kingdom (reign).

We pray, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." The confidence that this prayer is to be answered when God brings human history to the divinely ordained consummation enables the Christian to retain his balance and sanity of mind in this mad world in which we live. Our hearts go out to those who have no such hope. Thank God, His Kingdom is coming, and it will fill all the earth.

948. Kingdom of God, Present and Future Phases of SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), pp. 211, 212. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 211] In the Bible are three interpretations of the Kingdom.

There is *first* the understanding of the eternal and unending sovereignty of God. He exercises his Kingship over all creation "from everlasting to everlasting." God is Lord of all that is, both now and forevermore. His Kingdom is an everlasting Kingdom, whether we know about it or not.

[p. 212] In *addition* to this, it is plain that to a certain degree this ultimate rule of God is actually manifested in human history. It is partly realized by the Jews when they obey the Torah or Law. It is partly realized in the coming of Christ. After his coming it is spoken of as being "in your midst." It is "at hand"; it has "come upon you."

Finally, there are a number of passages that make it plain that the Kingdom, in all its fullness, is still off in the future. If it has partially come, it is also still coming. The consummation of the purpose of God has not yet been completely achieved, but is still to come.

These elements can be combined so as to bring out the distinctiveness of the Biblical position by saying that the Kingdom of God has "broken in" to human history in a decisive way in the coming of Jesus Christ, but that the completion and fulfillment of this mighty act of God still lie in the future. Look at the two sides of this statement.

949. Kingdom of God, a Present and Future Reality

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 66–69. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 66] After we have recognized that the Gospels represent the kingdom as both a present and a future reality, we are faced with the problem of the underlying significance of these two aspects of the kingdom...

[p. 67] The Gospel data require us to recognize the future eschatological aspect of the kingdom as the primary temporal orientation and not as merely incidental to the present aspect. In the Sermon on the Mount, the kingdom is repeatedly viewed as something in the future which is yet to come... The situation reflected in these promises of future blessing is that of a future and final world order, displacing the course of the present world, set up by the mighty act of God, consisting essentially in the overthrow of every will resisting God and every power hostile to the good, when God alone and absolutely will rule the world as king.

While the Sermon on the Mount deals with a present righteousness, the possession of that righteousness is viewed as necessary not so much to live in the present world as the necessary prerequisite for entering into the future kingdom. Unless men have such a righteousness which exceeds that of the Scribes and Pharisees, they *will never enter* the kingdom (Matt. 5:20). The kingdom is not something which was [p. 68] come, but something for whose coming men are now to prepare themselves. When it comes, it will involve judgment and a separation between men. "On that day" some will endeavor to enter the kingdom but will be excluded because they have not in this life done the will of God. Jesus himself will then be the one to whom the power of judgment is given (Matt. 7:21–22).

When a gentile centurion manifested faith in Jesus, he received the commendation that his faith would find its fullest recognition in the future kingdom. In that day, many others—gentiles like the centurion—would come from the east and the west to sit at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—Old Testament saints who apparently at that time have been raised from the dead—while the sons of the kingdom, the Jewish people to whom Jesus came and who ought to occupy those seats because of their religious heritage, will be cast into outer darkness where men will weep and gnash their teeth (Matt. 8:11–12). This again anticipates the coming of the kingdom after a day of judgment.

In the same vein, Jesus taught that those who were then his disciples would not experience the full blessing of their discipleship until the future. Because they had abandoned earthly possessions and relationships to follow Jesus, he promised them that "in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. 19:28).

While the parables of the kingdom view it as something present, it is not present in its fullness and perfection. Evil doers will not be gathered out of the kingdom until the consummation of the age, and only then will the righteous shine forth like the sun in the kingdom of their Father (Matt. 13:38–43). The kingdom of heaven will not be perfectly realized until the division between the good and the evil at the consummation of the present age (Matt. 13:47–50).

[p. 69] At the last supper with the disciples as Jesus anticipated his death, he looked forward to the day when he would drink the fruit of the vine new with his disciples in his Father's kingdom (Matt. 26:29).

When Jesus came to Jerusalem for the last time, the people thought that the kingdom of God was to appear immediately. Jesus told them a parable to disabuse them of such expectations. The kingdom was to be long delayed. Jesus, who in the parable is

represented by a nobleman, is to go into a "far country" to obtain his kingly authority and then to return. The coming of the kingdom must await the return of Christ (Luke 19:11–27).

Thus while there is a sense, as we shall see, in which Jesus represented the kingdom as already present, yet he continually looked forward to the coming of the kingdom in the future when the Son of Man would return in glory. The present age must run its course before the kingdom is fully manifested, before the kingdom "comes." By their acceptance or rejection of Jesus, men prepare themselves for that day when the kingdom is to come. The one group will find entrance into it, the others will be shut out. To this extent the consistent eschatology is correct: *the kingdom in its fullness is consistently future*.

974. Law, Moral, Ceremonial, and Jewish National

SOURCE: Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 21 (originally 19), "Of the Law of God," secs. 1–4, in *A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards*, ed. by James Benjamin Green (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 110, 111, col. 1.

- [p. 110] 1. God gave to Adam a law, as a covenant of works, by which he bound him and all his posterity to personal, entire, exact, and perpetual obedience; promised life upon the fulfilling, and threatened death upon the breach of it; and endued him with power and ability to keep it.
- [p. 111] 2. This law, after his fall, continued to be a perfect rule of righteousness; and, as such, was delivered by God upon mount Sinai in ten commandments, and written in two tables; the first four commandments containing our duty toward God, and the other six our duty to man.
- 3. Besides this law, commonly called moral, God was pleased to give to the people of Israel, as a church under age, ceremonial laws, containing several typical ordinances, partly of worship, prefiguring Christ, his graces, actions, sufferings, and benefits; and partly holding forth divers instructions of moral duties. All which ceremonial laws are now abrogated under the New Testament.
- 4. To them also, as a body politic, he gave sundry judicial laws, which expired together with the state of that people, not obliging any other, now, further than the general equity thereof may require.

975. Law, Moral, Ceremonial, and Judicial

SOURCE: Samuel Mather, *The Gospel of the Old Testament* (London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1834), Vol. 1, p. 210.

The laws ... delivered by Moses, were of three kinds—moral, ceremonial, and judicial... The first, or moral law, being the law of universal or unalterable right, is binding upon all men, and is still in force.

976. Law, Moral, Distinguished From Ceremonial and Civil

SOURCE: *Epitome of Rev. Dr. Erick Pontoppidan's Explanation of Martin Luther's Small Catechism*, trans. from the Norwegian by Edmund Belfour (Minneapolis: Book Committee of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, 1935), pp. 6–8.

[p. 6] Part I. Of the Law, or the Ten Commandments.

23. How many kinds of laws did God give in the Old Testament?

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Three kinds: 1. The ceremonial church law; 2. The civil law; 3. The moral law.

24. Which of these laws is still in force?

The moral law, which is contained in the Ten Commandments.

[p. 7] 25. *Cannot this law be abolished?*

No; because it is founded on God's holy and righteous nature.

26. How had God revealed this Law?

In the creation He wrote it in men's hearts, and hence it is called the Law of nature. Rom. 2:15...

27. Has not God revealed this Law in any other Way?

Yes, He gave it on Mount Sinai, written on two tables of stone...

[p. 8] 33. Are believers subject to the compulsion and condemnation of the Law?

No, for Christ has redeemed us therefrom. Rom. 6:14... I Tim. 1:9...

34. Are not believers bound to live according to the law?

Yes, certainly. Rom. 3:31...

35. What is it, then, that drives a believer to live according to the Law, since he does it not from fear of the condemnation of the Law?

The love of Christ constraineth us. II Cor. 5:14, 15.

36. Is the Law satisfied with outward works?

No; it demands the whole man, body and soul. Luke 10:27?

977. Law, Moral, Indispensable to Our Existence in Society

SOURCE: Ralph J. Bunche, "Toward Peace and Freedom," *The Christian Century*, 70 (April 22, 1953), 479. Copyright 1953 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from The *The Christian Century*.

People in society can live together only if their relations are governed by some recognition, however imperfect, of moral law and mutual respect. The nations of the world, which make up the international community, must be similarly governed in their relationships or there will be international chaos on a scale beggaring description and with consequences, in this atomic era, too forbidding to contemplate. In our society, in every society, there are rebels, mavericks and evildoers who refuse to govern their conduct by any accepted code... It is precisely because of them that laws, police and moral pressures are indispensable to our existence in society.

978. Law, Moral—Relationship to Salvation

SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *The Case for Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 25–28. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 25] Now, from this ... [that Moral Law which He has put into our minds] we conclude that the Being behind the universe is intensely interested in right conduct... The Moral Law doesn't give us any grounds for thinking that God is "good" in the sense of being indulgent, or soft, or sympathetic. There's nothing indulgent about the Moral Law. It's as hard as nails. It tells you to do the straight thing and it doesn't seem to care how painful, or dangerous, or difficult it is to do. If God is like the Moral Law then He is not soft. It's no use, at this stage, saying that what you mean by a "good" God is a God who can forgive... [p. 26] And it's no good either saying that if there is a God of that sort—an impersonal absolute goodness—then you don't like Him and aren't going to bother about Him. For the trouble is that part of you is on His side and really agrees with His disapproval of human greed and trickery and exploitation. You may want Him to make an exception in your own case, to let you off this one time; but you know at bottom that unless the power behind the world really and unalterably detests that sort of behaviour,

then He can't be good. On the other hand, we know that if there does exist an absolute goodness it must hate most of what we do. That's the terrible fix we're in. If the universe is not governed by an absolute goodness, then all our efforts are in the long run hopeless. But if it is, then we are making ourselves enemies to that goodness every day, and aren't in the least likely to do any better to-morrow, and so our case is hopeless again. We can't do without it, and we can't do with it. God is the only comfort, He is also the supreme terror: the thing we most need and the thing we most want to keep out of the way of. He is our only possible ally, and we have made ourselves His enemies. Some people talk as if meeting the gaze of absolute goodness would be fun. They want to think again. They're still at the Munich stage of religion. Goodness is either the great safety or the great danger—according to the way you react to it...

[p. 27] Christianity simply doesn't make sense until you've faced the sort of facts I've been describing. Christianity tells people to repent and promises them forgiveness. It therefore has nothing (as far as I know) to say to people who don't know they've done anything to repent of and who don't feel that they need any forgiveness. It's after you've realized that there is a real Moral Law, and a Power behind the law, and that you have broken that law and put yourself wrong with that Power-it's after all that that Christianity begins to talk. When you know you're sick, you'll listen to the doctor. When you have realised that your position is nearly desperate you'll begin to understand what the Christians are talking about. They offer an explanation of how we got into our present state of both hating goodness and loving it. They offer an explanation of how God can be this impersonal mind at the back of the Moral Law and yet also a Person. They tell you how the demands of this law, which you and I can't meet, have been met on our behalf, how God Himself becomes a man to save man from the disapproval of God. It's an old story and if you want to go into it you will no doubt consult people who have more authority to talk about it than I have. All I'm doing is to get people to face the facts—to understand the questions which Christianity claims to answer. And they're very terrifying facts... Of course, I quite agree that the Christian religion is, in the long run, a thing of unspeakable comfort. But it doesn't begin in comfort: it begins in the dismay I've been describing, and it's just no [p. 28] good trying to go on to that comfort without first going through that dismay. In religion, as in the war and in everything else, comfort is the one thing you can't get by looking for it. If you're looking for truth, you may find comfort in the end: if you're looking for comfort you will not get either comfort or truth-only soft soap and wishful thinking to begin with and, in the end, despair. Most of us have got over the pre-war wishful thinking about international politics. It is time we did the same about religion.

979. Law, Mosaic—Not Legalism but Love

SOURCE: B. Davie Napier, "The Law and the Gospel," The New Century Leader, 59 (May, 1958), 15.

Because Christianity emerged only after a severe tussle with those who would make of it a religion of extreme legalism, we who stand in that faith and who are informed of that early struggle are disposed to discount—sometimes unthinkingly—the place of law not only in the life of faith but in the totality of life. And we would do well to reflect that the Law of Moses, the kind of law we find in Deuteronomy, is a far cry from the extreme legalistic mentality against which Christianity in its first years was forced to fight...

We will do well to understand the nature of that law. The entire Book of Deuteronomy is a moving and eloquent testimony to the warmth and vitality of law. The average person assumes that law is and rigid, an unpleasant necessity in the disciplining of society. But look at Deuteronomy. Listen to it.

Observe first the motivation of the law. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (Deut. 6:5). This is Deuteronomy's theme song. Over and over again, in a number of different ways, this body of legal material declares that its justification is love—that it asks what it does because the relationship on which it is built, the relationship between God and man, is one of love. Love is the motivation of the law, not fear, not the promise of reward, although this is certainly present, not even awe.

On what is the love based? Listen again: "When thy son asketh thee in time to come, saying, What mean the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgements, which the Lord our God hath commanded you? Then thou shalt say unto thy son, We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt; and the Lord brought us out of Egypt with a mighty hand ... that he might bring us in, to give us the land" (Deut. 6:20–23). God acted first. He first loved us—this is the sense of it. He first loved us and showed that love in what he had done for us (with what deeper meaning the Christian says these same words). Yes, the appeal, the motivation, is love, love based upon the experienced, the known, the tangible, real grace, mercy, and goodness of God.

980. Law, of God, a Manifestation of God's Nature

SOURCE: The Augsburg Sunday School Teacher, 63 (August, 1937), 483.

Is there such a thing as a perfect law? Everything that comes from God is perfect. The law of which we are thinking came from Him. It becomes sullied in our hands. We take from it and try to add to it, and in that way it becomes less than perfect. In a very real sense the law of the Lord is the manifestation of the nature of the Lord. It could no more be imperfect than He is. That law would work differently if we were to let it have its way in our lives.

981. Law, of God, and Love

SOURCE: Peter H. Eldersveld, *Of Law and Love*, pp. 75–79. Copyright 1954 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 75] When the Son of God summarized His Father's law, the ten commandments, He put it in just one word: *Love*. The law of God is the law of love. And we can easily understand why. God is love. So we should be too, for we were made in His image. He wants us to be like Him. That is why He gave us His law. It tells us in practical terms what it means to love, and how we can test our love.

But Jesus also told us that this love must have two dimensions: love for God, and love for man. The one is vertical, and the other is horizontal. It was as though He took those two tablets of stone from Mount Sinai and wrote "Love God" on the first one and "Love Man" on the second. In other words, He said: If you love God with all your heart and soul and mind, you will not have other gods, nor make images of God, nor take His name in vain, nor break His sabbath; and if you love your neighbor as yourself, you will not dishonor your parents, nor kill, nor commit adultery, nor steal, nor bear false witness, nor covet. So there are two kinds of love which God requires of us in His law: love toward Him, and love toward our fellowmen.

But now, notice the intimate relationship between those two. Jesus said that the second is "like unto" the first, and [p. 76] that the whole law "hangs" on them—not on just one of them, but on both of them together. So these two dimensions of love are quite inseparable, just as those two tablets of stone on Mount Sinai were inseparable. We

cannot love God unless we love man, and we cannot love man unless we love God. There is really only one love, though it moves in two directions.

[p. 77] But men say that's too idealistic; it will never work in a world like this one; love may be a fine thing, but we have to look out for ourselves first. Why do they say that? They don't talk that way about the other laws of God in this universe, do they? For example, they never say the law of gravity is too idealistic. And it works the same way. It is just as inexorable. When a man wants to get down to the street from the top floor of a high building, there are two ways he can do it. He can take an elevator, or jump out of the window. Is he being too idealistic when he says that he will obey the law of gravity and take the elevator? He would not say that the window is more practical, would he? ...

[p. 78] If we are honest, there is only one thing we can do in the face of our failure to obey this law. We must humbly confess. There is nothing wrong with the law. But there is something wrong with us. We know that we should obey it, but we do not obey it. It does not make sense to discard the law just because we break it. And, for that matter, we cannot discard it, no more than we can discard the law of gravity.

Even the most God-fearing men are bound to confess that they fall short in their love for God and man...

But what then? Is there no hope for us? If we confess that we cannot obey this law of love, will God excuse us for disobeying it? No, indeed, He would no longer be God if He did that. And besides, He made us capable of loving Him and our neighbors. It is not His fault that we have lost that capacity through sin. And we cannot expect Him to revoke His law. Even if it were possible it would be disastrous. A moral universe depends upon it. So there seems to be no way out of our predicament. We cannot escape the penalty of our disobedience.

Thank God, that is not true! There is a way out. There is a Cross on Mount Calvary. It has a vertical beam and a horizontal beam—symbols of the two kinds of love you see there. For on that Cross hangs the Son of God and Man, [p. 79] the God-Man. He loved God with all His heart and soul and mind, and His neighbor as Himself—even unto death. He obeyed the law of love perfectly, and He is the only One who ever did!

But He did not do it just to prove that it could be done. He did it precisely because it could not be done—by anyone else. It was not a demonstration. It was a redemption. He did it for us because we could never have done it. And He did it not to *show* us His love, but to *give* it to us; not to *teach* us, but to *save* us; not to set an *example* for us, but to make *atonement* for us.

If we love Him as our Saviour, by faith, we love both God and Man in one Person! And that is the only way for sinners to begin obeying this law of love again. For to love God above all and our neighbors as ourselves we must first have the redeeming love of Christ in our hearts!

982. Law, of God, and the Law of Sin and Death

SOURCE: G. Campbell Morgan, The Ten Commandments (New York: Revell, 1901), p. 12.

He [man] needs to be solemnly reminded that the law of the spirit of life in Christ sets him free from the law of sin and death, but not from the law of God.

983. Law, of God—Catholics Claim Right to Change Certain

Commandments

SOURCE: Richard Challoner, *The Catholic Christian Instructed* (New York: E. Dunigan and Brother, 1853), p. 211 [FRS No. 19.]

Q. But has the Church a power to make any alterations in the commandments of God?

A. The commandments of God, as far as they contain his eternal law, are unalterable and indispensable; but as to whatever was only ceremonial, they cease to oblige, since the Mosaic law was abrogated by Christ's death. Hence, as far as the commandment obliges us to set aside some part of our time for the worship and service of our Creator, it is an unalterable and unchangeable precept of the eternal law, in which the Church cannot dispense: but forasmuch as it prescribes the seventh day in particular for this purpose, it is no more than a ceremonial precept of the old law, which obligeth not Christians. And therefore, instead of the seventh day, and other festivals appointed by the old law, the Church has prescribed the Sundays and holydays to be set apart for God's worship; and these we are now obliged to keep in consequence of God's commandment, instead of the ancient Sabbath.

984. Law, of God, Functions as a Mirror

SOURCE: Peter H. Eldersveld, *Of Law and Love*, pp. 83–85. Copyright 1954 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 83] The law of God is ... like a mirror which God holds up before us and says: Take a good look at yourself; this will tell you what you really are inside; you may have a good reputation, and men may not be able to see the marks of your sin, and you may even think you are getting away with it; but this will tell you the truth about yourself.

It makes us uncomfortable to look at that law. We do not like what we see. And so we run away from it. Or we close our eyes to it. Or we try to get rid of it. We do not want to be reminded of our sins. We would much rather be told about our good points.

Suppose we recall what God says in His Word about such behavior? You will find it in James 1:23, 24: "If any be a hearer of the Word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a glass: for he beholdeth himself, and goeth his way, and straightway forgetteth what manner of man he was."

That is ridiculous, of course! Nonsense! When a man looks into a mirror and sees that his face is dirty, he does not run away and forget what he saw. He faces the facts and proceeds to apply soap and water. He would be slightly abnormal, to say the least, if he tried to run away from all mirrors just because he did not like his reflection.

And besides, there is no way to escape the picture of ourselves which we see in God's law. We may be able to forget it for a while, but in the end it always catches up with us. Even if we succeed in ignoring it as long as we live, we know it will be waiting to confront us at last when we stand in the searching light of divine judgment.

But why does God pursue us with that picture? Why doesn't He just leave us alone? He knows it only makes us miserable. Is He not being merciless when He confronts us with our sin? Why doesn't He just forget about it? After all, He knows we cannot keep His law. And what is the use [p. 84] of talking about our past failures? We cannot do anything about them anymore, can we?

Well, why does the doctor take an X-ray picture when he suspects there is something radically wrong with us, and then show it to us? Because he is merciless? Because he delights in diagnosing terrible diseases? Suppose he would tell us instead that we are the picture of health, and that therefore we have nothing to worry about. Would we prefer that? Perhaps some people would. And they might even be happy to pay the exorbitant fee that usually goes with such a diagnosis. But in the end they would discover that they were in the hands of a quack.

Why does God pursue us with His law? Because He knows that unless we see ourselves as He sees us, we will never realize how very desperate our spiritual condition is—until it is too late to do anything about it. If He did not love us, He would not bother us with His law. If He did not have a cure for us, He would not tell us how sick we are. If He didn't want to save us, He would not confront us with our sin.

In other words, He knows that if He did not make us go to Mount Sinai, we would never go to Calvary. If we do not see our sin, we will not see our Savior. If we will not stand in the searching light of that law, we may not stand in the saving light of that Cross. Mount Calvary is only for those who have been to Mount Sinai.

The reflection we see of ourselves when we look into God's perfect law makes us miserable. And it should, for we are all sinners by nature. But God wants us to see it, to face the facts of our sin, so that He can then show us our Savior on the Cross—the Son of God and Man in one perfect Person, who became like us in every way except sin, who never broke any of these commandments, and who therefore can save those who do.

The law of God condemns us. But the love of God redeems us. We cannot have the one without the other. We [p. 85] may not like what we see on Mount Sinai, but we may love what we see on Mount Calvary. And having seen both, we will want both. For the law of God leads to the love of God, and the love of God fulfills the law of God. So with the apostle we say: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ!" And with the psalmist we say: "O how love I Thy law!"

985. Law, of God, Not Belittled by Justification by Faith SOURCE: C. H. Spurgeon, *Sermons*, 2d series (New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., 1857), sermon 18, p. 280.

The law of God is a divine law, holy, heavenly, perfect. Those who find fault with the law, or in the least degree depreciate it, do not understand its design, and have no right idea of the law itself. Paul says, "The law is holy, but I am carnal; sold under sin." In all we ever say concerning justification by faith, we never intend to lower the opinion which our hearers have of the law, for the law is one of the most sublime of God's works. There is not a commandment too many; there is not one too few; but it is so *incomparable*, that its *perfection* is a proof of its divinity. No human lawgiver could have given forth such a law as that which we find in the decalogue. It is a perfect law; for all human laws that are right are to be found in that brief compendium and epitome of all that is good and excellent toward God; or between man and man.

986. Law. Protestant Creeds on SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pages as indicated below.

a. Lutheran—Formula of Concord, article 6

[p. 131] Although they who truly believe in Christ, and are sincerely converted to God, are through Christ set free from the curse and constraint of the Law, they are not, nevertheless, on that account without Law, inasmuch as the Son of God redeemed them for the very reason that they might meditate on the Law of God day and night, and continually exercise themselves in the keeping thereof.

b. Reformed—Second Helvetic Confession, chapter 12

[p. 854] We teach that the will of God is set down unto us in the law of God; to wit, what he would have us to do, or not to do, what is good and just, or what is evil and unjust. We therefore confess that 'The law is good and holy' (Rom. vii. 12); and that this law is, by the finger of God, either 'written in the hearts of men' (Rom. ii. 15), and so is

called the law of nature, or engraven in the two tables of stone, and [p. 855] more largely expounded in the books of Moses (Exod. xx. 1–17; Deut. v. 22)...

We teach that this law was not given to men, that we should be justified by keeping it; but that, by the knowledge thereof, we might rather acknowledge our infirmity, sin, and condemnation; and so, despairing of our strength, might turn unto Christ by faith. c. Church of England—Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, article 7

[p. 491] The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and [p. 492] Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called Moral.

- d. Protestant Episcopal—Thirty-nine Articles, revised, article 6 [p. 816: Same as article 7 of the Church of England Articles of Religion.]
- Methodist—Articles of Religion, article 6 e.

[p. 808: Same as article 7 of the Church of England Articles of Religion.]

f. Presbyterian—Westminster Confession of Faith chapters 19, 20

[Chap. 19, p. 641] V. The moral law doth forever bind all, as well justified persons as others, to the obedience thereof; and that not only in regard of the matter contained in it, but also in respect of the authority of God the Creator who gave it. Neither doth Christ in the gospel any way dissolve, but much strengthen, this obligation...

[p. 643] VII. Neither are the forementioned uses of the law contrary to the grace of the gospel, but do sweetly comply with it: the Spirit of Christ subduing and enabling the will of man to do that freely and cheerfully which the will of God, revealed in the law, requireth to be done.

[Chap. 20, p. 643] I. The liberty which Christ hath purchased for believers under the gospel consists in their freedom from the guilt of sin, the condemning wrath of God, the curse of the moral law... All which were common also to believers under the law; but under the New Testament the liberty of Christians is further enlarged in [p. 644] their freedom from the yoke of the ceremonial law, to which the Jewish Church was subjected.

- Congregational—Savoy Declaration g. [According to Schaff (p. 718), same as the above quotation from the Westminster Confession.]
- Baptist-Philadelphia Confession h.

[According to Schaff (p. 738), same as the above quotation from the Westminster Confession.1

Baptist-New Hampshire Confession, article 12 i.

[p. 746] We believe that the Law of God is the eternal and unchangeable rule of his moral government; that it is holy, just, and good; and that the inability which the Scriptures ascribe to fallen men to fulfill its precepts arises entirely from their love of sin; to deliver them from which, and to restore them through a Mediator to unfeigned obedience to the holy Law, is one great end of the Gospel, and of the means of grace connected with the establishment of the visible Church [see No. 953].

987. Liberalism, Moderate, Defined

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), pp. 16, 17. Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

[p. 16] Among the theologians who would, in various ways and degrees, modify the traditional interpretations of the Christian faith in adaptation to our science-dominated culture, we observe first the moderate liberals. They regard themselves as unequivocally Christian, maintaining the essential affirmations of Christian doctrine. They think these affirmations to be sound and true. Because they are true they may, without fear or favor, be subjected to all the tests and evidences which reason can muster. The moderate liberals believe that truth will have the best chance to win over error in the open arena of honest, critical examination. They believe also that doctrines ought to be stated as clearly and intelligibly as possible, in forms which make evident their relevance to contemporary life.

These moderate liberals have high respect for scientific method; they do not agree with all the ideas which are recommended in the name of science. For example, though accepting biological evolution, they reject the view that man is "only another animal." Though encouraging and participating in psychological inquiry, they vigorously [p. 17] deny that man's conduct is rigorously determined by causal law, to the exclusion of free and responsible choice. At the same time, they grant the propriety of critically examining also religious ideas, wherever found, in the open-minded search for truth. They make use of philosophical methods in their inquiries, and often move easily between philosophy and theology.

988. Liberalism—a Sketch

SOURCE: Bernhard W. Anderson, *Rediscovering the Bible* (New York: Association Press, 1951), pp. 11–14. Copyright 1951 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 11] Many Protestants have adopted a position which has been labeled "liberalism." Instead of hiding their heads, ostrichlike, in the barren sands of the past, these Christians sincerely and devoutly have attempted to make the Bible speak relevantly to the modern situation. A Christian cannot believe one set of ideas on Sunday and then live by another set of assumptions the rest of the week. Such religious "schizophrenia" is intolerable, for the Christian faith jealously demands the allegiance of the whole man. Therefore, liberals sought to adjust the inherited faith to the bewildering modern world whose outlook had been defined by the achievements of science. It was their intention to remain loyal to the biblical faith, but to make this faith relevant by translating its truth into the language of the modern age...

[p. 12] Specifically, this meant reinterpreting the Bible in terms of the concept of evolution, a scientific hypothesis which originally was applied in the field of biology but which soon was transferred to other fields of investigation until it became the dominant philosophical point of view on the American scene. This outlook found theological expression in the toning down or outright rejection of supernaturalism in favor of the idea of divine immanence, that is, God's indwelling in man and nature. For instance, creation by supernatural fiat was reinterpreted to mean God's continuing creation, his immanence in the long evolutionary upthrust...

Applied to religious knowledge, the evolutionary interpretation found expression in the idea of "progressive revelation." That is to say, God works immanently within the historical process, revealing his timeless truths up to man's ability to understand; on man's side, this progressive illumination yields increasing "discovery" or expanding "insight." The Bible allegedly gives evidence of such progress. The [p. 13] religion of

Moses is said to be comparatively primitive. But under the influence of the prophetic "genius," crude and barbarous elements were gradually removed, until Jesus finally came as the great discoverer of God and the teacher of the loftiest ethical principles. Since all humanity is involved in the evolutionary process, it is no more surprising that religions outside the biblical tradition should arrive at the same insights than it is that both Russia and America, working independently, should unlock the secret of the atom. According to this view, the greatness of Jesus is that he saw what many others had seen, or could have seen, but by his forceful teaching and sacrificial death he helped men to take truth seriously.

This modern view of the Bible enabled Christians to keep their heads erect in a world where only fools or fanatics would dare to challenge the assured results of science. Of course, liberals were also children of their time, and therefore fell into the temptation of revising the Bible in accordance with their own presuppositions. Nevertheless, liberalism at its best was governed by the spirit of evangelical Christianity. This is noticeable, for example, in one of the characteristic elements of the liberal attitude: devotion to truth... According to liberalism, all conclusions must be judged by truth itself. This attitude, when applied to biblical study, has aided in our rediscovery of the Bible by enabling us to read it in the light of the circumstances in which it was written...

[p. 14] Although liberalism was swept along by a powerful current of evangelical Christianity, the theology of liberalism came too much under the influence of the modern world-view. It is one thing to attempt to translate the biblical faith into categories which modern man can understand; it is quite another thing to adopt modern categories as ruling principles of interpretation. In attempting to bring Christianity up to date, liberals virtually capitulated to the prevailing world-view of the day, so much so that the dividing line between liberal Protestantism and secularism became increasingly dim.

989. Lord's Supper, Reinhold Niebuhr on Eschatological Significance of

SOURCE: Reinhold Niebuhr, *Faith and History*, p. 241. Copyright 1949 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and James Nisbet, Ltd., London.

The supreme sacrament of the Christian church, the Lord's Supper, is filled with this eschatological tension. It is instituted with the words: "This do in remembrance of me." St. Paul declares that "as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death *till he come*" (1 Corinthians 11:26). Thus in this Sacrament the Christian community lives by a great memory and a great hope. The present reality is different because of that memory and hope. What lies between the memory and the hope is a life of grace, in which the love of Christ is both an achieved reality in the community and a virtue which can be claimed only vicariously. The Christian community does not have the perfection of Christ as an assured possession. It will show forth that love the more surely the less certain it is of its possession.

990. Lutheran Bodies, General Statement

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 849-853.

[p. 849] *History.*—The position of the Lutheran Church in America rests upon a birthright. It is not an immigrant church that needed to be naturalized after it was transplanted from some European land. It is as old as the American Nation and much older than the American Republic. The Lutheran Church in America is an integral part of

American Christianity. The people in the Lutheran churches of the land are a constituent and typical element of this Nation.

Lutheranism was thoroughly rooted in American soil during colonial times. It has grown up side by side with the Nation and developed by similar stages of progress. The Lutheran Church in America came from Europe, as did all other churches whose members constitute integral elements in American civilization today. Lutherans were among the very earliest European settlers on American shores. A Lutheran Christmas service was held on Hudson Bay in 1619 and a Lutheran congregation was formed on Manhattan Island in 1648. The Lutherans who came to America with the Dutch colonists of New Amsterdam (now New York) during the third decade of the seventeenth century were mostly Germans and Scandinavians. The Swedish Lutherans who settled on the banks of the Delaware during the next decade finally lost touch with the church in Sweden and passed to the control of the Episcopal Church.

The chief source of Lutheran population in the American colonies was immigration from Germany. The German immigrants came mostly in the eighteenth century. Some of them (particularly from north Germany) came to the colony of New York. The exiles from Salzburg settled in Georgia. Lutherans from Wurttemberg landed at Charleston and settled in South Carolina. But the main current of German Lutheran immigration during colonial times flowed into Pennsylvania, so that by the middle of the eighteenth century there were perhaps 60,000 Lutherans in that colony. Throughout colonial times Pennsylvania was the chief home of American Lutheranism.

From the port of Philadelphia Lutheran settlements spread inland across Pennsylvania to New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina. Everywhere these Lutherans shared with other Christians the hardships and triumphs of American life and helped as much as any other group in moulding American civilization. Some of them, for example, the Muhlenbergs, were among the leaders in the Revolutionary War, in the State governments, and in the establishment of the Federal Government.

At first only a very small fraction of these Lutherans were gathered into congregations. The supply of pastors was utterly inadequate to their needs. The first organization was effected by Henry Melchior Muhlenberg, who had been sent out from the University of Halle in response to appeals from America. In 1748 he gathered some of the pastors and congregations into a synod which is known today as the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. Other synods followed, in New York in 1786, in North Carolina in 1803, in Ohio in 1818, in Maryland and Virginia in 1820, and in Tennessee in 1820.

As the territory of the church expanded and the number of synods increased, it was felt that they should be bound into some sort of unity so as to bring about greater cooperation. This led to the organization in 1820 of the General Synod. The General Synod in reality cut the European apron-strings of the Lutheran Church in America, because it established a theological seminary, prepared to train its own native ministry, and planned to carry on the home and foreign missionary work of the church. The outstanding leader among the Lutherans during this period was S. S. Schmucker, president of the Gettysburg Seminary.

[p. 850] The organization of a general body gave the Lutherans of America a nationwide outlook and interest. It gave them a sense of permanent citizenship in the Republic. It paralleled the deepest current in the life of the nation at that time. Just when the American Nation felt sufficiently solid and secure to issue its *noli me tangere* in the

form of the Monroe Doctrine, the Lutheran Church in America achieved a federal organization intended to maintain its independent existence among the other church bodies. As Washington and Jefferson, and particularly Monroe, had broken European bonds and announced to European nations that our national policy was "America for Americans," so the organization of a General Synod proclaimed to the religious world that the Lutheran Church in this country had reached its majority and announced the policy of "The Lutheran Church for Lutherans." Both were the outgrowth of the same spirit, the rising American spirit of independence and enterprise.

Then came a period of great numerical increase and territorial expansion, due in part to fresh tides of immigration from Germany. The westward movement of American civilization scattered these Lutherans over the entire length and breadth of the country. Before the middle of the nineteenth century the General Synod extended far into the Middle West, where it came into touch with younger and more conservative Lutheran bodies such as the Missouri, the Iowa, and the Scandinavian synods.

It was in 1839 that the first Lutherans from Germany settled in Missouri. They came from Saxony and were fleeing from the rationalism that was rampant in the state church of their homeland at that time. They were imbued with a double portion of the spirit of confessionalism. Their fiery zeal for the whole body of Lutheran doctrine was made even more intense by the ardor of their piety. This union of denominational zeal and religious fervor gave them extraordinary power of propagandism, so that the few shiploads of Saxon pilgrims have grown into one of the largest of Lutheran bodies, the Missouri Synod. This body was organized in 1847 with headquarters at St. Louis and under the powerful leadership of C. F. W. Walther.

Beginning about 1840 the stream of Lutheran immigration from Europe grew rapidly in volume. It came from Germany and the Scandinavian lands. The greatest strength of the current was reached in the 10 years preceding the Civil War. In that decade nearly 1,000,000 immigrants came to American shores from Germany alone. After the close of the Civil War they continued to come at the rate of about 130,000 annually. Multitudes of these German immigrants were Roman Catholics. Great numbers also went to swell the churchless and godless population of the land. But the greater portion of them were Lutherans. From Norway and Sweden also they came in generous numbers and, like the Germans, settled chiefly in the Middle West and Northwest. The results are seen both in the size and the spirit of the Lutheran Church in America.

New bodies were organized, the Norwegian Church in 1854, the German Iowa Synod in 1854, and the Augustana Synod (Swedish) in 1860. The numerical strength of the church grew rapidly. During the first 40 years in the life of the Republic the communicant membership of the church had multiplied threefold, just keeping pace with the general population of the country. But from 1830 to 1870, while the population at large was increasing threefold, the membership of the Lutheran Church increased more than ninefold, reaching in 1870 a total of about 400,000 and standing fourth among the Protestant churches.

These new Lutherans came without pomp or circumstance and took their places quietly in the land. Their genuine spirituality, the solidity of their church life, and the vigor and warmth of their piety were patent to all who came to know them. They were untrained in the habits of free churches and humbled both by the circumstances of their emigration from Europe and by their strange surroundings when they arrived in the New World. But their training in the equable, systematic, and methodical ways of state churches, and their constant emphasis on thorough religious instruction and indoctrination insured them against the irregular fervor of that revivalism that periodically burned over their neighbor churches. It helped to guarantee their independence and permanence in their adopted land. They had much to learn in matters of church organization and administration and in the course of time they did learn their lessons along these lines. But from the beginning they also had much to teach to American Christianity in general on methods of the theology and usages of worship, and their teaching has long since yielded visible results.

One effect of this middle period was to infuse a strong confessional element into the body of the Lutheran Church in America. In the older Lutheran bodies, those dating from colonial times, there was a doctrinal reaction due to the study [p. 851] of the confessions and theology of the historic Lutheran Church. Like the other churches in this period, Lutherans cultivated their denominational consciousness. Sectionalism in political history of our country had its parallel in sectarianism among all the churches. Lutherans shared fully in the current trend. This, together with the importation of rigid confessionalists from the Scandinavian lands and from Germany, stamped the Lutheran Church in America as indelibly evangelical and forever doctrinally conservative.

But the middle period of the century was a time of great strife in all phases of American life. In national life it led to the Civil War. This produces a breach in the ranks of the General Synod. The southern synods withdrew and in 1863 organized a new general body afterwards called the United Synod of the South. A second breach came in 1866. The recovery of the General Synod from the doctrinal indifference of the eighteenth century was not rapid enough to suit certain elements in the body, and a number of synods, led by the Ministerium of Pennsylvania, withdrew and organized the General Council. This new organization formed its own institutions, prepared its own literature, and organized its own benevolent operations. As the two general bodies in the North occupied much the same territory and claimed the same mission fields farther west, there was much rivalry and conflict between them. But they both grew rapidly and they both expanded until at the close of the century the district synods of both of them extended to the Pacific.

During the period of phenomenal economic growth in our country, that is, from 1870 to 1910, the Lutheran churches reflected faithfully the spirit of the times. They were full of the spirit of expansion and enterprise. Immigration from the Scandinavian lands grew to magnificent dimensions. More than 1,750,000 came during this period, one-half from Sweden, one-third from Norway, and one-sixth from Denmark. In 1882 more than 100,000 arrived from these sources. Most of these sturdy newcomers, like most of the Lutherans from Germany, did not join any church in America. So they constituted a "Lutheran constituency" and presented a most inviting mission field. The Lutheran churches, old and new, took up the challenge and the result was a high spirit of home missionary enterprise.

The General Synod now centralized not only its home missionary work but also its chief branches of benevolence and put them into the hands of general boards. Other bodies adopted this policy, and in this way they were prepared to go forward rapidly in the practical tasks of the church when the new spirit of enterprise visited American Christianity. New fields were opened, in sprawling cities, in newly settled areas of the Middle West, Northwest, and Far West, and in India, Africa, and Japan. Lutheran colleges and seminaries began to dot the land. Periodicals were established. A Lutheran literature began to appear. A worthy liturgy was devised and commonly accepted. An excellent hymnary was collected and introduced into the congregations. Enthusiasm was carried into every line of the church's proper business, and contributions to benevolences multiplied three times as rapidly as the membership.

So the Lutheran churches flourished and grew. The confirmed membership of all of them increased in these 40 years from less than 500,000 to nearly 2,250,000. This was the largest relative increase made in this period by any of the large denominations. The number of Lutherans passed the number of Presbyterians, and the Lutheran Church advanced from fourth to third place among the Protestant churches in the country. Only the Methodists and Baptists surpassed her numbers. Much of this increase was due to the strong tides of immigration from Europe but much of it also is accounted for by natural increase and by the aggressive missionary spirit that began to pervade all branches of the church.

The twentieth century has been a period of rapprochement among all the Lutherans in America, both along doctrinal lines and in practical work. Here again the Lutheran Church mirrors the tendency in American Christianity as a whole and in American culture in general. The last three decades have been a period of larger units. It has been a time of broad national outlook and even of international mind.

In the Lutheran Church the tendency toward denominational consolidation into larger units appeared somewhat earlier than in the other churches. The first definite expression of the growing solidarity among Lutherans in this period took place among the Norwegians. In 1917, the quadricentennial of the Lutheran Reformation, the three larger bodies of Norwegian Lutherans united to form the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America. The next year four German synods in the Middle West united and formed the Joint Synod of Wisconsin. In 1930 the American Lutheran Church was formed out of the Iowa, Ohio, and Buffalo synods.

[p. 852] But the largest merger of all was that of the three general bodies with headquarters in the East. Gradually, very gradually, the breaches were closed. The wounds made by the Civil War were healed. Many factors worked toward reunion of the factions in the North. Not the least of these factors were the advent of a new generation of leaders and the rise of the general spirit of cooperation to take the place of competition and strife. Finally, in November 1918, simultaneously with the armistice in the World War, the General Synod, nearly 100 years old, and the General Council, just 50 years old, joined hands with each other and with the United Synod in the South, and organized the United Lutheran Church in America. This was the reunion of the oldest elements of Lutheranism in this country, the Lutherans of the Muhlenberg development. It made the largest Lutheran body in America and one of the potent forces to be reckoned with in American Christianity today.

In addition to these organic unions among Lutherans, the last few decades have witnessed significant federations in the Lutheran forces of the land. About one-third of all Lutherans in America are cooperating in the Synodical Conference, a loose organization of which the Missouri Synod constitutes five-sixths and which embraces a small body of Negro Lutherans and Slovak Lutherans and Norwegian Lutherans. Then there is the National Lutheran Council, the outgrowth in 1918 of the National Lutheran Commission for Soldiers' and Sailors' Welfare. This is an agency rather than a federation in the strict sense. It accomplishes a large volume of work cooperatively for the United Lutheran Church, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod, the American Lutheran Church, the United Danish Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Free Church, the Icelandic Synod, and the Danish Lutheran Church. A third federation is called the American Lutheran Conference. This began in 1930. It is a medium of cooperation and the cultivation of fraternal relations among a number of Lutheran Church bodies that have headquarters in the Middle West. It unites for cooperative purposes the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Augustana Synod, the American Lutheran Church, the Lutheran Free Church, and the United Danish Lutheran Church. These bodies have many interests in common both by virtue of their geographical location and their limited history in America, and by virtue of their general outlook and attitude on questions of belief and life. All these facts testify to the high degree of solidarity that has come to expression among the Lutheran forces in America, particularly in this period of larger units that began in all American life about 1910.

Across the boundaries of these several organizations there is a growing spirit of common interest and outlook. All of the major Lutheran bodies have appointed commissions to meet and consider a more complete consolidation of Lutheran forces on this continent. These negotiations proceed slowly, but some results are beginning to appear [see editors' note].

It should be added that in these days of universal conferences and ecumenical movements the Lutherans of America have entered into definite relationships with the Lutherans of other lands. They have helped to form a Lutheran World Convention. The immediate occasion of this new Lutheran world consciousness on the part of American Lutherans was the work of the National Lutheran Council during and after the World War. The Lutherans of America, who had felt little of the ravages of war, were moved to undertake a ministry of mercy among their suffering European brethren in the faith. Commissioners were sent; contacts were made; large funds were gathered and carefully administered. A sense of fellowship developed, and at Eisenach, Germany, in 1923 an organization was effected by delegates from 22 nations. Twice since then the Lutheran World Convention has held meetings, in Copenhagen in 1929 and in Paris in 1935. The fourth meeting is planned for Philadelphia in 1940. In the meantime a vast field for international Lutheran endeavor has opened and much of it has been occupied. So the Lutherans of America are today in process of lifting their eyes above the limitations of language and nation and ecclesiastical organization. They are moving toward a unified intelligence and a consciousness of solidarity.

Doctrine.—The Lutheran churches of America believe that the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments are given by inspiration of God and are the perfect and only rule of faith and life. They believe that the three general creeds—the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian—exhibit the faith of the Christian church, in accordance with the Holy Scriptures.

They believe that the Unaltered Augsburg Confession is in harmony with the Holy Scriptures and is a correct exhibition of its teachings; and that the Apology, the two catechisms of Luther, the Smalcald Articles, and the Formula of Concord, are a faithful development and interpretation of the doctrines of the Word of God and of the Augsburg Confession.

[p. 853] Justification by faith alone in Jesus Christ is held to be the central doctrine of the Word of God according to which all other doctrines are determined and developed. The preaching of the Word of God, rightly divided between law and Gospel, occupies a prominent place in accomplishing repentance and faith. Two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, are regarded as effective means of grace rather than mere signs and memorials. Baptism of infants, which is the rule among Lutherans, is held to have regenerative power through which faith is begotten. In the case of adults it seals and confirms the faith begotten of the Holy Ghost through the Word. Lutherans believe in the real presence of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Lord's Supper, offered and given in, with, and under the bread and wine. Consubstantiation, transubstantiation, and impanation are rejected, yet it is firmly believed that the real body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ are sacramentally and supernaturally received by those who partake of the communion.

The Lutheran faith centers in Christ as the only savior of sinful man. "Th 2

e church is the congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered." Its unity is one of faith rather than of organization. Organic union is not looked upon as essential to the inner unity of faith.

The Lutheran Church is a firm believer in thorough Christian indoctrination and education, hence insists upon catechetical instruction preparatory to confirmation. Conservative in spirit vet progressive in purpose, the Lutheran Church believes its primary function is to preach and teach the Gospel message without compromise or modification.

Organization... In Europe, Lutheran Church polity has followed more or less definitely the forms of political government in the several countries, and that not always freely. Accordingly, organization has hitherto functioned through the exercise of authority from the head downward; that is, through bishops, general superintendents, and the like. With the establishment of more democratic forms of government the process has been in many instances reversed

In the United States and Canada the church has its own free life, independent of the state. Nevertheless, organization has taken place in all Lutheran bodies, whatever the parent country whence they came, along lines having at least general resemblance to the arrangements adopted for the conduct of political government. There are (1) congregations, corresponding to the local or municipal government; (2) synods, corresponding to the State government (in some instances called districts and in still others conferences); and (3) general organizations variously named, corresponding to the National Government.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For later Lutheran mergers, see Nos. 991, 993.]

991. Lutherans—American Lutheran Church (Formed 1961 by Merger of the American Lutheran Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the United Evangelical Lutheran Church)

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 889-891, 872.

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

[a. Evangelical Lutheran Church (Formerly the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America)]

[p. 889] *History*. There were Norwegians in America before 1825. The immigration from Norway to America that developed into historical proportions, however, had its beginning in that year. It developed into a mighty stream.

The Norwegian immigrants came to America to make this country their home, and most of them selected the northern part of the Mississippi Valley as the place of their abode. There are some large Norwegian congregations in a few cities on the Atlantic coast, and many congregations of later date have been established on the Pacific coast and in Canada. The larger settlements, however, were made in Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Michigan, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Texas, and Montana.

In Norway the church is a department of the national Government, and its confession is Lutheran. It was natural that the immigrants should transplant their confession to the American soil; but they could not transplant their native church polity. In Norway, since the administration of church affairs was in the hands of the Government, the people as such gave no thought to the matters of church organization. As a consequence, the immigrants were without experience in this field. Yet when they came to America, they settled in groups and early began to organize congregations; later the congregations were organized into units called "church" or "synod."

Inasmuch as neither state nor church authorities in Norway made any exertion to guide the social and religious activities of the Norwegian immigrants in their new environment, there appeared no single effective force as a unifying factor in church matters. On the other hand, there were forces operating among the people which promoted diverging tendencies. Toward the close of the eighteenth century a great religious awakening spread over Norway, of which the principal instrument was the layman, Hans Nielsen Hauge (born 1771). Among the early immigrants was the "Haugean" lay preacher, Elling Eielsen, who emigrated in 1839 and settled at Middle Point, Ill. He was ordained in 1843 and was the moving spirit in organizing the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America in 1846. This was the first synod organized among the Norwegians in America. In 1843 came C. L. Clausen, another lay preacher, who had been educated as a teacher, and was sent by the "Haugeans" as a religious instructor for the Norwegians in America. He came to Muskego, Wis., where he was ordained to the ministry in October of the same year. J. W. C. Dietrichson, ordained in Norway, came in 1844, as pastor for the congregation at Koshkonong, Wis.

[p. 890] In 1848 came H. A. Stub, and in 1850 A. C. Preus, both graduates from the divinity college at the University of Norway. Under their leadership was organized the Synod for the Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, commonly called the Norwegian Synod at Koshkonong, Wis., in 1853.

In 1860, at Clinton, Wis., Norwegians and Swedes organized the Scandinavian Augustana Synod. Nine years later this synod was amicably divided along national lines. Then appeared a new movement, which sponsored a different form of church polity and which resulted in the formation of the association known as the Norwegian-Danish Conference. In the oldest synod, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America, an effort was made to revise the constitution. Under the new constitution, which was adopted in 1875, the body assumed the name of Hauge Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Synod, commonly called the Hauge Synod. Later, a group, led by Eielsen, withdrew and reorganized under the old constitution. The Norwegian Synod, the second oldest synod, became involved in a theological controversy which brought about a schism in 1887. The pastors and congregations that withdrew associated themselves together under the name of the "Anti-Missourian Brotherhood."

In the year 1890 there were among the Norwegian Lutherans the following synods: The Hauge Synod of 1846, the Norwegian Synod of 1853, the Norwegian Augustana Synod of 1860, the Norwegian-Danish Conference of 1860, the Anti-Missourian Brotherhood of 1887, and the reorganized Evangelical Lutheran Church of America.

From 1860 five synods and from 1887 six synods competed in offering Lutheran church homes to Norwegian immigrants. This competition and possibility of choice to suit individual preference accounts in a great measure for the fact that such large percentages of the emigrants from Norway remained true to the Lutheran confession.

The immigration period had its problems, among which the gathering of the immigrants into the church was possibly the greatest. The transition from a Norwegian-speaking church to an English-speaking church began at the close of the nineteenth century. During this period cooperation was essential, and rivalry among the synods would be suicidal. This helped to bring success to movements for consolidation. Attempts at merging synods date back to 1852.

In 1887 the "Anti-Missourian Brotherhood" invited the various Norwegian Lutheran Synods to merge. The result was that the Norwegian Augustana Synod, the Norwegian-Danish Evangelical Lutheran Conference, and the Norwegian Anti-Missourian Brotherhood all merged in 1890 into the United Norwegian Lutheran Church in America. The Hauge Synod had taken part in the negotiations but withdrew before the merging.

The United Norwegian Lutheran Church constantly worked for merging of the Norwegian Lutheran synods, but it was destined to experience a schism in 1893, when a part withdrew and formed the Norwegian Lutheran Free Church.

In 1905 the Hauge Synod took up the question of union with the other Norwegian Lutherans—the Synod for the Norwegian Church, the United Norwegian Church, and the Lutheran Free Church. The Norwegian Synod and the United Church responded cordially. The Free Church expressed its sympathy, but under its organization, lacking the corporate unity of the other bodies, it could not as a body enter the proposed organization. Definite action approving a suggested plan of union was adopted by each body, and there was a joint meeting of the three bodies at St. Paul, Minn., June 9, 1917, at which the union was formally adopted and took effect immediately. Thus the Norwegian Lutherans in the United States and Canada celebrated the quadricentennial of the Protestant Reformation by bringing together 3 organizations into 1, with a membership of about 2,500 congregations, in which 1,215 pastors ministered to the spiritual needs of 445,000 souls.

Doctrine. The church believers, teaches, and confesses that the Holy Scriptures, the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, are the revealed Word of God and, therefore, the only source and rule of faith, doctrine, and life. It accepts as a true statement of the doctrine of the Word of God the ecumenical symbols, the Apostolic, the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds, the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and Luther's Small Catechism.

[p. 891] In regard to church rites, each congregation may decide for itself; but in order that there may be uniformity, the church recommends that the congregations use the

ritual of the Church of Norway, modified according to the prevailing requirements in the American environment.

Organization. Beginning with 1917, the national, or rather, the international organization, held general conventions once every 3 years... [*B*. AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH]

[p. 872] *History*. The American Lutheran Church is the result of a merger in Toledo, Ohio, in August 1930, of the Joint Synod of Ohio and Other States, organized September 1818, Somerset, Ohio; the Lutheran Synod of Buffalo, organized June 1845, Milwaukee, Wis.; and the Synod of Iowa and Other States, organized 1854, St. Sebald, Iowa...

Doctrine. The American Lutheran Church accepts the canonical books of Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God and the only infallible authority in all matters of faith and life. It also accepts each and all of the symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as the true exposition and presentation of the faith once for all delivered unto the saints. In worship it is liturgical and, although uniformity is not demanded, it is generally observed.

Organization. In polity the American Lutheran Church is both congregational and synodical. It is congregational in that the individual congregation is considered the highest judicatory in the affairs of the church... The polity is synodical in that the decisions of the district synods and of the general body are final in all questions referred to them.

The district synods meet annually and the general body biennially. Delegates to the general convention are chosen at the meetings of the district synods.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The union in 1961 of The American Lutheran Church (1959 membership, 1,002,015), the Evangelical Lutheran Church (1959 membership, 1,125,867), and the smaller United Evangelical Lutheran Church (1959 membership, 66,623), gave the combined American Lutheran Church a membership of 2,194,505 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 60, 63, 66, 255).]

992. Lutherans—Augustana Evangelical Lutheran (Formerly the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America) SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 881, 882.

[p. 881] *History*. The immigration from Sweden to America in the seventeenth century was not large nor did it continue, to any appreciable extent, longer than a brief period of time. It left its impress, however, on both the body politic and the religious life of this land. Several of the churches which these early immigrants from the North built are still in existence, albeit they no longer belong to the Lutheran Church, chief of which are Holy Trinity (Old Swedes) in Wilmington, Del., and Gloria Dei in Philadelphia.

Another and a much stronger immigrant stream began to flow into this country from Sweden in the forties of the last century. Then, as in the seventeenth century, did the immigrants bring with them men who were to care for their spiritual welfare.

The first of the congregations of the Augustana Synod to be organized was that in New Sweden, Henry County, Iowa, in 1848, and the second was in Andover, Henry County, Ill., in 1850.

Men of the Augustana Synod, together with American, German, Norwegian, and Danish Lutherans, organized the Synod of Northern Illinois in the fall of 1851. In this body all of these worked together until 1860, when the Swedes and Norwegians withdrew and organized the Scandinavian Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America. Articles of faith were adopted as follows: "The Scandinavian Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America confesses the Holy Scriptures, as the revealed Word of God, to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice. It holds to and confesses not only the three oldest symbols of the church, the Apostolic, the Nicene, and the Athanasian, but also holds to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a brief but true summary of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Church, understood through their development in the other symbolical writings of the Lutheran Church." In 1870 there occurred the friendly withdrawal of the Norwegian section for the purpose of organizing the [p. 882] Norwegian Lutheran Conference. In 1894 the word "Scandinavian" was dropped from the name, which thenceforth became the Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod of North America, or, in brief, the Augustana Synod. This synod was a part of the General Council, but formally withdrew from the council November 12, 1918, and declined to enter the merger of the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod of the South, by which was formed the United Lutheran Church in America. In 1930 the Augustana Synod joined in the organization of the American Lutheran Conference, a federation of five Lutheran general bodies.

In the early days the Swedish language was used in the public worship, but now the English language is mostly used as the great majority of the membership is Americanborn.

The synod is the center of authority. It convenes as a delegated body every year and is presided over by a president chosen quadrennially.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 596,147 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 225). For the 1962 merger with the United Lutheran Church and others to form the Lutheran Church in America, see No. 993.]

993. Lutherans—Lutheran Church in America (New Merger) SOURCE: News item in *The Christian Century*, 78 (June 7, 1961), 724, 725. Copyright 1961 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

[p. 724] All 13 conferences of the Augustana [Evangelical] Lutheran Church have ratified the agreement to merge their denomination with the United Lutheran, the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran and the American Evangeli- [p. 725] cal Lutheran churches to form the Lutheran Church in America...

[EDITORS' NOTE: This initial ratification ensured the merger of at least the Augustana body (see No. 992) and the United Lutheran Church in America (see No. 996), which had already gone on record with a majority of its synods in favor of the union (*Newsweek*, 57 [June 5, 1961], 56). The 1959 membership of the other two bodies was, respectively, 36,264 and 23,800 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 255). The combined membership of all four constituents will give the merger a total of over 3,000,000. By August the final approval of all the constituents was completed.]

994. Lutherans—Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod (Formerly German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States) SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 924, 925.

[p. 924] *History*. The incipient stages of "Missouri Lutheranism" (Lutheranism as restored, proclaimed, and propagated by the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States) are clearly discernible in certain events which transpired just 100 years ago, chief among which the following deserve special mention: Unionizing of Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Prussia in the early decades of the nineteenth century by the state protested against in words and actions by confessional Lutherans; emigration from their fatherland by the latter; their arrival on the friendly shores of our country in the late thirties; their settlement in St. Louis and Perry County, Mo.; in Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, and New York; organization of congregations with churches and parochial schools; building of a (log cabin) college in Perry County, Mo., in 1839 (later transferred to St. Louis); erection of a Practical Ministerial Seminary (shorter

course) at Fort Wayne, Ind. (at first privately owned by Pastor William Loehe of Neuendettelsau, Germany, transferred to the Missouri Synod at its organization in 1847); issuing of a religious periodical, "Der Lutheraner," in 1844 (synodical organ since 1847); pioneer missionary and organization work of the Saxon pastors, particularly the Rev. C. F. W. Walther in Missouri; the pastors of the Franconian settlements in Michigan, Pastors Fr. Wyneken, Wm. Sihler, and others in Indiana and Ohio. A special centennial celebration of the arrival of the Saxon immigrants was arranged for the years 1938–39.

[p. 925] After preliminary correspondence and special meetings held at St. Louis and Fort Wayne, Ind., the organization of the synod was effected at Chicago in May 1847, 12 voting pastors, 11 advisory pastors, 4 lay delegates, and 7 guests attending the conventions.

The Saxon immigrants of 1839, with a few accessions, numbered not quite 1,000 souls. In 1848, the first statistics after the organization of the synod listed: 37 congregations, 19 pastors, 4,099 souls. Since then the growth in membership (souls) has been as follows: 1857, 20,501; 1867, 73,106; 1877, 122,177; 1887, 459,376; 1897, 685,334; 1907, 838,646; 1917, 1,001,380; 1927, 1, 106,745.

Doctrine. In doctrine the Mousier Synod recognizes one standard, to which there must be absolute accord, and upon which all its pastors are pledged: The Holy Scriptures, accepted as the infallible inspired Word of God; the three ecumenical creeds—the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian; and the six Lutheran Confessions accepted as a correct presentation of the Biblical doctrines—the Augsburg Confession, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, The Smalcald Articles, the Large and Small Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord.

Organization. On polity the Missouri Synod is pronouncedly congregational... The synod and its officials ... [act] merely in an advisory capacity...

Originally organized as a German church body, the Missouri Synod now numbers only 178 all-German stations in North America... Church attendance is 33 percent German and 67 percent English.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This Lutheran body, with a membership (1959) of 2,304,962, is the largest of the four members of the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America, a conference organized in 1872 by synods of the stricter type. The other three are the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (see No. 997), the Evangelical Lutheran Synod (formerly the Norwegian Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church, with a 1959 membership of 14,302), and the Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (formerly Slovak Evangelical Lutheran Church), with a 1958 membership of 19,931, as well as the Negro Missions conducted by these four bodies, with a 1959 membership of 7,999 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 60, 225).]

995. Lutherans—Lutheran Free Church

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2 pp. 898, 899.

[p. 898] *History*. The Lutheran Free Church was organized in Minneapolis, Minn., in June 1897, at a meeting of the Norwegian Lutherans representing churches in some of the Central and Western States. The immediate occasion of the organization was a disagreement between the trustees of Augsburg Seminary at Minneapolis and the United Norwegian Church. On the organization of the latter body, in 1890, it was understood that it would include Augsburg Seminary, the oldest Norwegian divinity school in America, and until that time supported by the Norwegian-Danish Evangelical Lutheran Conference. In the prosecution of its work for educating Lutheran ministers the seminary developed certain characteristics which its friends and supporters considered essential to the work to be done. It had been incorporated under the laws of Minnesota, and its management was in the hands of a board of trustees. When the demand came that,

according to an agreement with the Norwegian—Danish Conference, the seminary should be transferred to the United Norwegian Church in such a manner as to enable that church to control it entirely, it became evident to some that material changes were intended in the plan of the school, and on this account the board of trustees refused to transfer, unconditionally, the property and management of the seminary to the United Church. The result was a sharp disagreement and the withdrawal, and in some cases expulsion, from the United Church of certain churches and ministers, because of their support of the position taken by the trustees of the seminary. These churches and ministers were at first known as the "Friends of Augsburg," and had no other organization than a voluntary annual conference. Nevertheless they carried on the work of an organized synod, and had their divinity school, home and foreign missions, deaconess institute, orphans' homes, and publishing business. In 1897 they adopted the name of the "Lutheran Free Church."

Doctrine. The Lutheran Free Church, with its strong emphasis on the independence and autonomy on the independence and autonomy of the individual congregation, puts the more stress on the Lutheran principle of the unity of the church—that it exists in the confession of the one common faith. The Lutheran Free Church, holding that Holy Writ is the only perfect, divine revelation of salvation, and therefore the absolute rule for the Christian faith, doctrine, and life, adheres with unflinching fidelity to the Lutheran confession because it believes that this agrees with Scripture. Hence it lays the greatest stress on practical Christian experience on the part of all church members and especially all teachers and ministers in the congregation. The Lutheran Free Church holds Lutheranism to be the correct and sound union of the most profound insight into the way of salvation, and of the most intense experience of the power of grace unto a new life in the hearts of men.

The doctrinal basis of the Lutheran Free Church is: The canonical books of the Old and New Testaments; the Apostolic, Athanasian, and Nicene creeds; the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism.

The Lutheran Free Church further believes and teaches that:

(1) According to the Word of God, the congregation (local church) is the right form for the kingdom of God on earth. (2) The congregation consists of believers who, by using the means of grace and the gifts of the Spirit (charismata) as directed by the Word of God, seek salvation and eternal blessedness for themselves and for their fellow men. (3) According to the New Testament, an external organization of the congregation is necessary, with membership roll, election of officers, stated times and places for its gatherings, etc. (4) Members of the organized congregation are not, in every instance, believers, and such hypocrites often derive a false hope from their external connections with the congregation. It is, therefore, the sacred obligation of the congregation to purify itself through the quickening preaching of the Word, by earnest admonition and exhortation, and by expelling the openly sinful and perverse. (5) The congregation governs its own affairs, subject to the authority of the Word of God and of the Spirit, and recognizes no other ecclesiastical authority or government above itself. (6) A free and independent congregation esteems and cherishes all the gifts of the Spirit which the Lord gives it for its own edification and seeks to stimulate and to encourage their use. (7) A free and independent congregation gladly accepts the [p. 899] mutual assistance which

the congregations can give one another in the work for the furtherance of the Kingdom of God.

Guiding principles and rules.—(8) This mutual assistance consists both in the exchange of spiritual gifts between congregations through conferences, exchange of visits, laymen's activities, etc., whereby congregations are mutually edified, and in the voluntary and Spirit-prompted cooperation of congregations for the purpose of accomplishing such tasks as would exceed the ability of the individual congregation. (9) Among such tasks may be mentioned specifically a theological seminary, distribution of Bibles and other books and periodicals, home missions, foreign missions, Jewish missions, deaconess institutes, children's homes, and other institutions of charity. (10) Free and independent congregations have no right to demand that other congregations shall submit to their opinion, will, judgment, or decision; therefore, all domination of a majority of congregations over a minority shall not be tolerated. (11) Cooperating agencies that may be found desirable for the activities of congregations, such as larger and such as smaller conferences, committees, officers, etc., cannot, in a Lutheran free church, impose any obligations or restrictions, exert any compulsion, or lay any burden upon the individual congregation, but have the right only of making recommendations to, and requests of, congregations and individuals. (12) Every free and independent congregation, as well as every individual believer, is prompted by the Spirit of God and has the right of love to do good and to work for the salvation of souls and for the quickening of spiritual life as far as its abilities and power permit. In such free spiritual activity it is limited neither by parish nor synodical bounds.

Organization. The Lutheran Free Church is not a synod, as that term is commonly understood. It is an association of free and independent Lutheran congregations...

A very important feature of the organization of the Lutheran Free Church is its annual conference...

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 82,595 (YAC, 1961, p. 255).]

996. Lutherans.—United Lutheran Church in America SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 953–955.

[p. 953] *History*. The United Lutheran Church in America is direct successor and heir to three Lutheran bodies—the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States of America, the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, and the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South—which were merged into the United Lutheran Church in America in 1918.

For the General Synod the figures for 1916 were as follows: 1,846 organizations, 370,715 members, 1,232 ministers from whom schedules were received, and 1,514 ministers reported on the rolls of the body. For the General Council in 1916 there were 2,389 organizations, 540,642 members, 1,327 ministers from whom schedules were received, and 1,664 ministers reported on the rolls of the [p. 954] body. For the United Synod in the South there were 492 organizations, 56,656 members, 189 ministers from whom schedules were received, and 259 ministers reported on the rolls of the body. Immediately prior to the merger in 1918 the Augustana Synod, with 1,167 organizations, 204,417 members, and 720 ministers reported on the rolls, withdrew from the General Council. Thus, the totals for the United Lutheran Church at its first convention were as follows: 3,560 organizations, 763,596 members, and 2,717 ministers reported on the rolls (1916). No account has been taken here of the gains made by the merging bodies between 1916 and 1918.

The United Lutheran Church in America not only brought together three general bodies, each of which had its historical beginnings far back in colonial times, but it restored the organic union between the Lutherans of the North and South which had been broken by the War between the States.

There is a native bent among Lutherans for unity. They are not unionists, seeking to make the unity of the church manifest in external organization, where real inner unity does not exist. They put unity in the faith first, and where this is found to exist the desire to unite finds expression in one organization upon a common confession or doctrinal basis.

Out of this deep concern for the faith and unity therein came several free Lutheran diets and general conferences, looking to complete understanding and harmonious cooperation between these three general bodies and extending over the period from 1877 to 1902. Committees and commissions were appointed for the purpose of arranging for the conduct of home-mission enterprises, without friction or interference with one another, and for cooperation in liturgical reforms. Especially noteworthy among these was the joint committee to prepare "A Common Service for all English-speaking Lutherans." Through the work of this committee "The Common Service" was completed in 1887 and was adopted by each of the three bodies. The hymnal was finished in 1917 and published in the Common Service Book of the Lutheran Church. This Common Service Book was authorized by the United Lutheran Church in America at the time of its organization in 1918. The work of this joint committee had much to do with preparing the way for the merger of the three constituent bodies.

The third important cooperative undertaking which contributed directly and most effectually to the same end was the establishment of a joint committee with authority to arrange for a proper general celebration in 1917 of the four-hundredth anniversary of the Reformation. At the first meeting, September 1, 1914, the suggestion was made that the celebration should be marked by the union of the three bodies in the year 1917... The joint committee thereupon adopted the following: "Believing that the time has come for the more complete organization of the Lutheran Church in this country, we propose that the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod in the South, together with all other bodies one with us in our Lutheran faith, be united as soon as possible in one general organization, to be known as the United Lutheran Church in America."

The presidents of the three general bodies named in the resolution ... each ... assumed the responsibility of introducing the constitution and the proposed merger on the basis of it to the next convention of his own general body.

The constitution was approved by the General Synod in June 1917, by the General Council in October, and by the United Synod in the South in November. It was submitted by each of the three bodies to its district synods, and in each case was ratified by all of them, except by one of the synods composing the General Council—namely, the Augustana Synod—which declined to enter the merger and formally withdrew from the Council, November 12, 1918...

The First Convention of the United Lutheran Church in America ... was held in the city of New York, November 14–18, 1918.

[p. 955] At this convention there were present, from churches in Canada as well as the United States, 542 delegates—289 clerical and 253 lay delegates. These represented 43 constituent synods; 24 of these belonged to the General Synod, 13 to the General

Council, and 8 to the United Synod in the South; 2 district synods of the General Council were not represented. At this convention officers—president, secretary, and treasurer—were elected; the report of the joint committee on ways and means was heard and acted upon; the constitution and bylaws were adopted; a certificate of incorporation under the laws of the state of New York was secured and filed with the secretary of state; papers of conveyance and transfer of property and rights to the United Lutheran Church in America, severally signed by the president and secretary of each of the merging bodies, were read; and the United Lutheran Church by resolution accepted "the execution of the trusts relating to any property conveyed or to be conveyed under the action reported by the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod in the South." Boards were elected, among them an executive board, which was authorized and instructed to complete the work of merging.

Conventions have since been held biennially in October, as follows: Washington, D. C., 1920; Buffalo, N. Y., 1922; Chicago, Ill., 1924; Richmond, Va., 1926; Erie, Pa., 1928; Milwaukee, Wis., 1930; Philadelphia, Pa., 1932; Savannah, Ga., 1934; and Columbus, Ohio, 1936. The mergers of constituent synods of the three bodies which have taken place have reduced the number of such bodies. In 1918 there were in the United States 45 constituent synods, reduced by mergers and territorial rearrangements to 33 in 1936. In most cases the merging synods belonged to different general bodies before they entered the United Lutheran Church.

Doctrine. The doctrinal basis of the United Lutheran Church in America is given in its constitution, as follows:

SECTION 1. The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God and as the only infallible rule and standard of faith and practice, according to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged.

SECTION 2. The United Lutheran Church in America accepts the three ecumenical creeds—namely, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian—as important testimonies drawn from the Holy Scriptures, and rejects all errors which they condemn.

SECTION 3. The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the faith and doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, founded upon the Word of God, and acknowledges all churches that sincerely hold and faithfully confess the doctrines of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession to be entitled to the name of Evangelical Lutheran.

SECTION 4. The United Lutheran Church in America recognizes the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Large and Small Catechisms of Luther, and the Formula of Concord as in the harmony of one and the same pure scriptural faith.

Perhaps the most significant action taken in recent years was the adoption of the declaration concerning "The Word and the Scriptures." In these times when authority in religion has been made an issue, and much confusion is manifest, it is timely that a clearcut statement should be made pointing to the Word of God as the sole authority for faith and practice and to the Holy Scriptures as the divinely inspired record of God's revelation in His Word. In this declaration the United Lutheran Church recognized its own need, its responsibility for definite testimony to the whole Christian world, and a duty toward other Lutheran bodies. *Organization*. The polity of the United Lutheran Church in America, like that of other Lutheran bodies, is not fixed and essential... The synodical and congregational polity has thus varied somewhat.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 2,369,263 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 255). On the 1962 merger with the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church and others to form the Lutheran Church in America, see No. 993.]

997. Lutherans—Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod (Formerly Evangelical Lutheran Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States) SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 930, 931.

[p. 930] *History*. The history of the Wisconsin Synod goes back to the forties of the nineteenth century. The Missouri and the Buffalo synods were already at work in Wisconsin when Ehrenfried Seebach, a farmer of the town of Oakwood, near Milwaukee, appealed to the committee of the Langenberg Mission Society to send a faithful pastor to the flock of about 300 souls whose spiritual wants he was trying to supply by reading sermons in public gatherings and by instructing the children in the fundamentals of the Christian faith.

Pastor J. Weinmann was sent and began to minister to this congregation. Recognizing the great need of and opportunities for work among the German settlers, he prevailed upon Pastor J. Muehlhaeuser, then stationed in Rochester, N. Y., to come to Milwaukee, Wis. He arrived June 27, 1848, and began to preach and to sell Bibles and devotional books in the vicinity of Milwaukee, finally gathering a congregation in the city and serving it as its pastor.

On December 8, 1849, Muehlhaeuser, Weinmann, and W. Wrede founded the "First German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin." In the month of May 1850, the constitution they had drafted was submitted to and adopted by a gathering of 5 ministers, representing 18 congregations, at Granville, near Milwaukee.

The young synod began to expand along the shore of Lake Michigan, finally reaching Green Bay, Wis., then westward as far as La Crosse, Wis. The field was large, but there was a dearth of reliable preachers. Aid came to the body from the Langenberg and the Berlin mission societies, and the Home Mission Society of Pennsylvania. Among the pioneer ministers were: C. Goldammer, J. Bading, Ph. Koehler, W. Streissguth, E. Maverhoff, G. Reim, Ph. Fachtmann, Dr. E. Moldenhnke, and Dr. Th. Meumann.

To meet the demand for ministers and missionaries, the synod resolved to open a seminary and college. Pastor J. Bading was sent to Russia and Germany to gather funds and a library, but the German authorities withheld these funds when the synod in 1867 broke with its former friends by taking a clear-cut stand for a strictly confessional Lutheranism.

In 1863 the school was opened in a dwelling in Watertown, Wis., with Dr. E. Moldehnke in charge and 14 students in attendance. In 1865 the building of "Northwestern University" was dedicated, Prof. Adam Martin having been called as president. In 1866 Prof. Ad. Hoenecke was made professor of theology. Later [p. 931] the seminary was discontinued, the students being sent to St. Louis, Mo., for their theological training. It was reopened at Milwaukee in 1878, under Prof. Hoenecke, removed to Wauwatosa in 1893, and in 1929, to Thiensville, Wis.

When the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America was organized in 1872, the Wisconsin Synod was one of the constituent bodies. It is a member today, and takes part in the support of the Negro mission and African missions conducted by the conference.

In 1881 the synod entered Nebraska and in the nineties, the far Northwest—the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, where the work progressed so satisfactorily that each of these sections now is represented in the joint synod as a district.

In 1865 the "Gemeindeblatt" was founded, and the beginnings of the Northwestern Publishing House date back to 1876.

The Michigan Synod was organized in 1840 by F. Schmid and two other pastors. In 1831 the Basel Missionary Society sent Schmid to a number of Wuerttembergers who had settled in Washtenaw County, Mich. There he founded 20 congregations. The Michigan Synod in 1845 had three missionaries at work among the Indians at Sebewaing. On account of doctrinal differences most of the members withdrew to join other synods, and the synod passed out of existence in 1846. In 1860 Stephan Klingmann and Chr. Eberhardt arrived from Basel, and the second Michigan Synod was organized. In 1867 it joined the General Council but in 1888 withdrew on account of the "Four Points." In 1867 a building was erected in Saginaw, Mich., for a seminary. The first president, A. Lange, was soon succeeded by F. Huber.

The Minnesota Synod was organized by a group of five or six pastors of the Pennsylvania and the Pittsburgh synods at work in Minnesota, gathered together by "Father" J. Heyer. Among the founders were: Heyer, Blumer, Wier, Brandt, Mallison, and Thompson. Heyer was succeeded as pastor of Trinity of St. Paul and as leader of the group of Fachtmann. Aid came from the Pilger Missionary Institute of St. Crischona and from the General Synod. Now the names of E. A. Kuhn, F. Hoffmann, Seifert, C. J. Albrecht, Braun, and Hunzinger appear. There was a constant struggle between those who favored unionizing tendencies and those who were for uncompromising Lutheranism. The latter were rallied by J. H. Sieker, one of the first students of the Wisconsin Synod, Leaving the General Synod, the body sought fellowship in the General Council, but on account of the "Four Points" withdrew from the Council to join the other bodies in the organization of the Synodical Conference. In 1883 Dr. Martin Luther College was founded as a seminary and a college at New Ulm, Minn., Prof. O. Hoyer being chosen as its first president. The "Synodalbote" was published first in 1886. The Minnesota Synod carried on the missionary work in the territory that now forms the Dakota-Montana district of the joint synod.

The Joint Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan under this name the above three synods united in 1892. The theological seminary was to become common property, Dr. Martin Luther College was made a teachers' seminary, and Michigan Lutheran Seminary a preparatory school. The "Gemeindeblatt" was made the official organ of the three synods. In 1893 this body sent the first missionaries to the Apache Indians of Arizona. This remained the relation of the three bodies until 1917 when they entered into a still closer union under the name The Evangelical Lutheran Joint synod of Wisconsin and Other States.

Doctrine. "This synod accepts the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments as the divinely inspired and inerrant Word of God, and submits to this as the only infallible authority in all matters of doctrine, faith, and life.

"This synod also adheres to the Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church embodied in the Book of Concord of 1580, not insofar as, but because they are a correct presentation and exposition of the pure doctrine of the Word of God."—Constitution.

Organization. The synod is divided into eight districts.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1957), 342,993 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 255). For the participation of this body in the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America, see No. 994n.]

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

998. Man, Nature of—Body Shows Creator's Planning and Skill

SOURCE: [James Patterson MacLaren], *Know Thy Body*, by "Medicus" [pseud.] (London: Thorsons Publishers, Ltd., 1934), p. 182. Used by permission.

Written unmistakably on every cell, tissue, organ and gland of the body are the marks of a purposeful mind planning every detail for a definite function or end, and that with a fertility of device and a splendour of successful execution which made one time and again almost shout with rapture at the felicity of the solution...

Even Voltaire said: "If there was not a God it would be necessary to invent one."

999. Man, Nature of—Everlasting Life Through the Incarnation SOURCE: Edward White, *Life in Christ* (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), p. 236.

The one line of thought, transcending all natural ideas of man, which pervades John's Gospel, is—THE INCARNATION OF THE DEITY, of the LOGOS-THEOS, in the person of Jesus our Lord.—The other line of thought is the parallel affirmation from the lips of this Incarnate Deity, that MAN OWES THE PROSPECT OF EVERLASTING LIFE, not to his own nature, but to redemptive UNION WITH HIM, THE LIFE OF THE WORLD.

1000. Man, Nature of—Greek Philosophical View of Body as Prison of the Soul

SOURCE: Oscar Cullmann, *Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead*? (New York: Macmillan, 1958), pp. 19, 20. © 1958 by Oscar Cullmann. Used with permission of The Macmillan Company and The Epworth Press, London.

[p. 19] In Plato's impressive description of the death of Socrates, in the *Phaedo*, occurs perhaps the highest and most sublime doctrine ever presented on the immortality of the soul. What gives his argument its unexcelled value is his scientific reserve, his disclaimer of any proof having mathematical validity. We know the arguments he offers for the immortality of the soul. Our body is only an outer garment which, as long as we live, prevents our soul from moving freely and from living in conformity to its proper eternal essence. It imposes upon the soul a law which is not appropriate to it. The soul, confined within the body, belongs to [p. 20] the eternal world. As long as we live, our soul finds itself in a prison, that is, in a body essentially alien to it. Death, in fact, is the great liberator. It looses the chains, since it leads the soul out of the prison of the body and back to its eternal home. Since body and soul are radically different from one another and belong to different worlds, the destruction of the body cannot mean the destruction of the soul, any more than a musical composition can be destroyed when the instrument is destroyed.

1001. Man, Nature of, Mortal; to Be Immortalized

SOURCE: Edward White, Life in Christ (London: Elliot Stock, 1875), p. 225.

What then, if we may follow the natural and proper sense of these declarations of Christ [concerning the reception of eternal life through faith in Him], is the result to which they lead us?

Beyond all question it is THAT THE VERY OBJECT OF THE INCARNATION IS TO IMMORTALISE MANKIND; that man can *live for ever* only by spiritual union with the Incarnate Deity; that apart from such union man will *die, perish,* and *be destroyed*.

When we wish to express the idea of perpetual existence, or the loss of being, there is no language in which we can so naturally and properly convey our meaning as in these words of Christ. Some will *live for ever*, others will *perish*. Were it not for certain extrinsic considerations, derived from foreign fields of thought, no one would ever have imagined a different sense. Unless a reader had been warned beforehand that every man's soul, being destined by its nature to last for ever, and not to die—(being im-mortal)—he must therefore not put upon the terms of Christ's discourses any meaning which will contradict that doctrine of natural immorality,—he would not have dreamed of imposing such a figurative sense upon them, or of making *life eternal* stand for happiness, or *perishing* stand for endless misery. It is altogether due to foreign and unusual considerations, if readers have learned to take such words in an unnatural sense. For life signifies life, and to life for ever signifies to live for ever, and to perish signifies not to live for ever, but to lose organised and conscious being. That is the first and the natural meaning of the words.

1002. Man, Nature of — Psychosomatic Unity

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), pp. 229, 230. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 229] Now the way in which the notion to rebirth is emphasized in the New Testament in connection with eternal life is by the idea of resurrection. Rather than speaking of immortality of the soul, the New Testament, as we have seen, speaks of eternal life as something that will be accomplished by the power of God, who will raise up and transform the total personality of the individual; not just the soul, but all that is distinctive about him. Both Old and New Testament agree that the body and soul cannot be split apart. They are not two very different ingredients, poorly fused together. They form a unity. We are "psychosomatic" persons (*psyche*=soul, *soma*=body). We are not

just one or the other; we are both, together and indissolubly.

[p. 230] This means, then, that eternal life is a transforming, rather than a junking, of life on earth. The "body" stands for everything that we *do* and *are*, here on earth. Thus, to talk of the "resurrection of the body" is a way of saying that all that happens on earth concerns God, and that he will pick up, fulfill, and complete all our partial incomplete human efforts.

1003. Man, Nature of—Unity of Body and Soul

SOURCE: [Allan Farris], "Worship and Work" (pamphlet for Labour Sunday, 1958; Toronto: Department of Social Relations of the Canadian Council of Churches, 1958), p. [3].

For centuries the Church has been plagued with a non-biblical anthropology. She has been inclined to an anthropology which divided man into two parts, body and soul. The real man is identified with the soul and the body is considered at least as a burden to the soul, if not the occasion for the soul's sinning. Salvation, in the light of such a definition of man, is really concerned with delivering man from the trammels of the flesh. The body is not significantly involved in the salvation process. Such an anthropology and a corresponding soteriology became the occasion of the divorce of the spheres of the body and the soul. The body was involved in the material and the secular sphere; whereas the soul was involved in the intellectual and spiritual sphere. The secularizing of education has, of course, embarrassed the older understanding that mind and spirit were of the same order.

The logical outcome of such thinking is asceticism of which the more organized form is monasticism. From the spirit of monasticism the Church has never quite been able to deliver herself, in spite of the lusty protest of the Reformation. Today, however, newer Biblical studies are calling into question the older understanding of man, and with support from the personality sciences are emphasizing the unity of the body and soul. Now we are taught that man has not a body; he is a body—"an animated body". He has not a soul; he is a soul, and "body" is comprehended within the term soul. Both body and spirit, in inseparable conjunction, make up a man. Both body and spirit are essential to real manhood. For this reason the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body is taking on new meaning. Now this kind of thinking has tremendous significance for our present understanding of salvation. Salvation has to do with the whole man. Bodies, therefore, are also the object of the saving thrust of God. Where men are as animated bodies there is the locus of God's saving work.

1004. Marriage, Catholic Position on

SOURCE: John L. Thomas, *The Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pages as indicated. Copyright ? 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

[a. State's Power Over Marriage]

[p. 65] On the other hand, the Church maintains that the state has no direct or indirect power over the validity or licitness of the marriage of the Christians. It is conceded the right to prescribe reasonable regulations for the protection of public order, health, and safety and also to pass laws governing the merely civil effects of the contract. Further, in regard to marriages between the unbaptized the state can lawfully established establish impediments, even such as affect the validity of the contract; and prescribe other conditions, even affecting the validity of the contract; and prescribe other conditions, even affecting the validity, such as a requisite legal form for valid consent. It is generally held that the state has this power not as one of its proper functions but simply because there is no other competent authority to exercise it when the Church is not operative. Finally, when marriage has been or is to be contracted between a baptized and a nonbaptized person, the Church claims the same jurisdiction as in marriages between Christians.

[b. Primary of Marriage]

[p. 66] It follows that we can learn the purposes of marriage and its essential traits by studying the nature of man. Reason shows that the primary purpose of marriage is the fitting procreation and education of children, and all its other ends are related to this purpose. We arrive at this conclusion by considering the existing order of created nature in which marriage appears as the only suitable means of providing for these ends in a manner befitting the dignity of men and women. Thus, we logically conclude that it has been designed by "God, the Author of nature," for this purpose…

[p. 67] Marriage considered as a state or society represents the actual living out of this contract. It may be defined as the legitimate union or society of a man and woman established for the purposes of generating and educating children, for mutual aid, and for sexual companionship. Hence the essence of the act of marriage is the mutual conjugal consent; the essence of the marriage state is the mutual sharing of conjugal life together. *[c. Mixed Marriages]*

[p. 81] Catholics are forbidden to marry non-Catholics because such unions constitute a danger to the faith of both the Catholic partner and the children. The Code contains two impediments covering such marriages. One is termed "mixed religion" and renders *illicit* all marriages between Catholics and baptized non-Catholics. The other is termed "disparity of cult" and renders *invalid* all marriages between a Catholic and a non-Christian, that is, a person who is not baptized. If there are just and grave reasons for such a marriage, and if guarantees are offered that the faith of the Catholic party will be respected and that the children born to the union will be baptized and educated in the Catholic faith alone, a dispensation may be granted for a Catholic to enter such a marriage. We shall treat the whole problem of mixed marriage in a later chapter. [d. Validity of Marriage]

[p. 86] "Only those marriages are valid which are contracted before the pastor or the Ordinary of the place, or a priest delegated by either of these, and at least two witnesses" (Canon 1094 [of the Code of Canon Law]). The aim of this legislation is to safeguard the liberty of the contracting parties and to have assurance that the marriage has taken place validly. It is to be noted that the officiating priest does not administer the sacrament; the two contracting parties administer it to each other when they make the contract. The presence of the priest is required as a witness representing the Church. Also, as a representative of Christ he blesses the marriage.

There was no universal legislation on the form of celebration affecting the validity of marriage until the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century. From the beginning Christian couples had been urged to secure the blessing of the Church on their conjugal unions, but marriages celebrated without the presence of a priest were recognized as valid sacraments, inasmuch as the contract itself was the sacramental sign. However, these unwitnessed or "clandestine" marriages were open to abuse. The contract could later be repudiated by one or both the parties, and it was difficult to establish with certainty the validity of the marriage when no competent person had been present to make inquiries concerning the freedom of the parties to marry and the existence of annulling impediments. In order to stop this possible abuse of a sacred contract the first invalidating law was passed by the Council of Trent in 1563 and after some modifications was adopted in the present Code. The law applies to all who are baptized in the Western Catholic Church. Catholics of the various Oriental rites and all non-Catholics, when contracting marriage among themselves, however, are exempt from its provisions.

1005. Mary, Virgin, and Isis, Parallels Between SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 54. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

It is not difficult, then, to understand why the Romans, at first repelled by the strange rites of [the Egyptian mother-goddess] Isis, were later attracted by them; the ordinary woman, by the splendid processions and the novelty of what she saw; the educated, by the antiquity and impressiveness of the ritual, the beautiful drama, the tenderness of Isis, her rigorous rules of abstinence and purification, communion with deity, separation of her clergy from the world, and especially the final judgment and promise of a blissful hereafter with her, here emphasized more than in any other of her sister religions. She, as the "universal woman" and "queen of heaven" also attracted men as well as women. Her ritual bore a marked resemblance to that of early Christianity, as Sir James Frazer has pointed out:

Indeed the stately ritual with its shaven and tonsured priests, its matins and vespers, its tinkling music, its baptisms as aspersions of holy water, its solemn processions, its jewelled images of the mother of God, presented many points of similarity to the pomp and ceremonies of Catholicism.³⁶ [Note 36: *Adonis, Attis and Osiris* (2nd ed.; London), p. 347.]

Isis was, then, the *mater dolorosa* of paganism who sympathized especially with mothers in their sorrows and afflictions. In his prayer Lucius [Apuleius] says:

[Thou] by thy bounty and grace nourishest all the world, and bearest a great affection to the adversities of the miserable as a loving mother... Thou art she that puttest away all storms and dangers from men's life by stretching forth thy right hand ... and appeasest the great tempests of fortune...

It is, then, only natural that some students have seen her influence as "mother of sorrows" and "mother of Horus," in whom the Greeks saw their grief-stricken Demeter searching for her daughter Persephone raped by Pluto, on the Christian concept of Mary. The motif of mother and child appears in many statuettes which have been found in her ruined shrines on the Seine, Rhine, and Danube, and which the early Christians mistook for the Madonna and Child, and little wonder since it is still difficult to differentiate between the two types.

The epithet "Mother of God" (*Theotokos*) as applied to Mary seems to have been used at first by Alexandrian theologians at the close of the third century, although it does not appear in any extant writing of that period. It became common in the fourth, being used by Eusebius, Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus in Cappadocia and others, Gregory saying that "the man who does not believe Mary was the *Theotokos* has no part in God."

1006. Mary, Virgin, and the Mother-goddesses—Parallels in Modern Madonna Cults

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 122–124, 129–133.

[p. 122] The cult of this Phrygian divinity, variously called the Mother of the Gods, Cybele, the Great Mother or the Idaean Mother, was introduced into Rome in 204 B.C. ...

[p. 123] Although this cult was one of the last to yield to Christianity and persisted obstinately after most of the other pagan forms of worship had passed away, it left but few traces of its protracted dominance. To be sure points of contact with the Virgin Mary have been pointed out. One of Mary's titles, "the Mother of God" (Gran Madre di Dio), has inevitable reminiscences of the pagan "Mother of the Gods." Moreover, many a visitor to Rome and student of sculpture has commented on the resemblance between the statues of the two. Furthermore, we know that the shrine of the Virgin on Monte Vergine near Avellino in the Apennines not far from Naples, which is visited each year by thousands of pilgrims, attracted by the fame of the wonder-working image there, was once the site of a temple of the Great Mother. That they were confused in people's minds is shown by the question which an unbeliever addressed to Abbot Isidore of Pelusium in the sixth century. He asked what the difference was between the Magna [p. 124] Mater of the pagans and the Magna Mater Maria of the Christians. But mother-goddesses, whatever their origin or special characteristics, are bound to have certain features in common. Nor is there much reason for surprise in finding in Claudia's prayer to the Great Mother a tone analogous to that of any prayer to the sanctissima Maria in modern times: "Hear my prayer, thou who art the gentle mother of the gods." ...

[p. 129] The idea of the [the Egyptian goddess] Isis as the mother of the child Horus was in many minds transferred to Mary, mother of God. "Remember," said [p. 130] Gregory the Great, when issuing his instructions to a missionary to the Saxon heathens, "that you must not interfere with any traditional belief or religious observance that can be harmonized with Christianity." And the policy of the Church toward the Saxons was not unique. The same method was used in dealing with pagans everywhere. It was the bridge over which untold thousands passed from paganism to the new faith. Without this adaptability Christianity might not have succeeded. The shift from Isis to Mary was one of the easiest and most obvious. There are extant statuettes and figurines of Isis nursing Horus which are marked by a striking similarity to familiar representations of the Madonna and Child. It is said that sometimes images of this kind have been mistaken for

representations of Mary and Jesus and have actually been worshipped in Christian Churches...

[p. 131] Moreover, in the bedizened images of the Madonna in many Churches in southern Italy and elsewhere one cannot but see a repetition of the extravagant ornamentation that characterized some of the statues of Isis, such as the figure of the goddess described in an inscription in Spain, with its emeralds, pearls, and other jewels.

An interesting religious tradition lies in the statement of Mackenzie Wallace that an image of the Madonna, of especial sanctity, was from time to time taken by rich residents of Moscow to their houses. Its presence there was believed to bring a blessing on the family. This practice is one of great antiquity, for we know that the image of Isis was sometimes taken to the house of a devotee and left there for a brief period. Whether the modern practice is derived directly from the ancient is difficult to say. The evidence is hardly conclu- [p. 132] sive. But at least we have in the practice as it exists in the Madonna cult the survival of a belief that was well established in ancient times...

The similarity between the cult-epithets of Isis and those of the Virgin Mary has often been pointed out. While many of the parallels claimed, especially in the list given by Beauregard, are imaginary, others are undoubtedly valid and furnish us with additional evidence of the contact of the two cults. Corresponding to Isis Regina ["Isis the Queen"] are familiar appellations of the Virgin: Sovrana, Sovrana dell' Universo, Regina. To Isis Mater ["Isis the Mother"] corresponds the Christian Mater Domini ["Mother of the Lord"]; to Isis Furva ["Gloomy Isis"] the Madonna Addolorata, to Isis Pelagia ["Isis of the Sea"] the Regina Maris ["Queen of the Sea"] (Madonna del Porto Salvo), to Dea Potens ["the Powerful Goddess"] [p. 133] Maria della Potenza, to Isis Soteira ["Isis the Deliverer"] Madonna del Ajuto.

1007. Mary, Virgin, and the Virgin-goddesses

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 93-95.

[p. 93] There are indications that the veneration of Diana as a virgin goddess has contributed something to the worship of the Virgin Mary. We know that one of the earliest churches erected in honor of Mary occupied the site of the famous temple of Diana at Ephesus. For although the original divinity of this sanctuary was an Asiatic goddess, she had been identified with the Greek Artemis and ultimately with the Roman Diana...

[p. 94] It is only in the same limited way that Diana's appellation of queen of heaven can be said to have influenced the designation of the Virgin Mary as queen or sovereign of the uni- [p. 95] verse.³ [Note 3 cites Alfonsus de Liguori, *The Glories of Mary*, for these titles.] For other pagan divinities had contributed their quota to the establishment of this idea in the minds of the people. The Roman Juno had been called queen; the Greek Hera had borne the same title; the Carthaginians had their queen of heaven (Dea Caelestis); the Egyptian Isis, the Phoenician Astarte, and the Babylonian Mylitta had all been queens of heaven. The source of this appellative as applied to Mary is as multiplex as the title of immaculate virgin.

To the local epithets of Diana given above there are parallels in the case of the Madonna. For just as the ancients spoke of Diana of the Aventine or Diana of Tifata or Diana of Ephesus, modern churchmen speak of the Madonna of Monte Vergine, the Madonna of Pompeii, the Madonna of Einsiedeln, and many others. But here again the Madonna cult has been influenced not merely by Diana but by a practice that was

common to many pagan cults and is illustrated by such examples as Juno of Argos, Juno of Lanuvium, and Venus of Cyprus, of Cythera, and of Mount Eryx.

1008. Mary, Virgin, Assumption of, a Dogma Based on Tradition SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Ordeal of Christianity* (New York: Association Press, 1957), pp. 43, 44. Copyright 1957 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

[p. 43] Even in his bull proclaiming the dogma of the Assumption of the Virgin, Pius XII has no historical or scriptural authority to adduce. The Assumption rests entirely on tradition, and it is a tradition with such a murky and disputed background that one wonders what goes on in the mind of a Catholic trained in methods of historical research and scholarship—such a man, for ex- [p. 44] ample, as Carlton J. H. Hayes, former ambassador to Spain and former head of the department of history at Columbia University—when he is faced with the demand that he believe such an anti-intellectual conception on pain of risking eternal damnation. Perhaps that is the sort of Catholic Pope Pius had in mind when, in his address to the bishops, he said: "Even though to someone certain declarations of the church may not seem proved by the arguments put forward, his obligation to obey still remains." Tertullian could say, *Credo quia incredible* ["I believe because it is unbelievable"], but that certainly is not the voice of this age.

1009. Mary, Virgin, Assumption of, Not Taught in the Early Church SOURCE: Joh[an]n J. Ign[atz] von Döllinger, *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus [pseud.] (2d ed.; London: Rivingtons, 1869), pp. 34, 35.

[p. 34] Neither the New Testament nor the Patristic writings tell us anything about the destiny of the Holy Virgin after the death of Christ. Two apocryphal works of the fourth or fifth century—one ascribed to St. John, the other to Melito, bishop of Sardis—are the earliest authorities for the tradition about her bodily assump- [p. 35] tion. It is contained also in the pseudo-Dionysius; he and Gregory of Tours brought it into the Western Church. But centuries passed before it found any recognition. Even the Martyrology of Usuard, used in the Roman Church in the ninth century, confined itself to the statement that nothing was known of the manner of the holy Virgin's death and the subsequent condition of her body.

1010. Mary, Virgin, Exaltation of, as Most Honored of Saints

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), p. 39.

The Blessed Virgin Mary.

199. Whom should we honor and invoke more than any other saint? We should honor and invoke the Blessed Virgin Mary more than any other saint. 200. Why should we honor the Blessed Virgin more than any other saint? We should honor the Blessed Virgin more than any other saint

- 1) because she is the Mother of God,
- 2) because she is also our Mother,
- 3) because she is the Queen of all the angels and saints,
- 4) because her intercession is most powerful.

"Behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. Because He that is mighty hath done great things to me" (Luke 1, 48. 49)...

Application. Love to pray to the saints in Heaven. Have a filial confidence in Mary, your heavenly Mother. Devoutly honor St. Joseph. Honor your patron saint and celebrate his feast. Strive to become holy like the saints. If they could become saints, you can also.

1011. Mary, Virgin, Exaltation of, From Early Times

SOURCE: Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. by Neil Buchanan, Vol. 4 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898), pp. 314–316.

[p. 314] Mary takes the first place among the saints. She came into [p. 315] notice even in the first three centuries. So early began the legends and apocryphal narratives that dealt with her; her place in the Symbol [creed] next the Holy Spirit insured a lofty position to her for all time. Pierius, Alexander of Alexandria, and Athanasius, already called her mother of God, and her virginity was maintained before, during and after the birth, the birth itself being embellished with miracle, as in the case of the Gnostics. But Mary obtained her chief, her positively dogmatic significance from the fact that the dogma of the Incarnation became the central dogma of the Church. Even the arguments of Irenaeus are in this respect very significant (Mary and Eve); but it was only from the fourth century that the consequences were drawn. It would lead us too far to give here a history of mariolatry even in outline. The orthodox Fathers of the Greek Church in the fourth century were still comparatively reserved. Ambrose and Jerome, above all, in their controversy with Jovinian, initiated the Church in the worship of Mary. Ambrose who exerted so strong an influence upon Augustine is especially to be mentioned as patron of this worship. He taught that Mary took an active share in the work of redemption, and already applied Gen. III., 3 to the holy virgin. In his time, again, the fables about Mary, which had long been in existence, began to be recognized as authoritative in the Church. All that had been sung in her praise by extravagant Latin, Greek, and Syrian poets and novelists, was consolidated into a kind of doctrine. It was believed as early as the end of the fourth century that Mary had not died. [p. 316] but had been removed from the earth by a miracle. Yet the Arabian Collyridians, who presented her with offerings of breadcakes, as if she had been a goddess, were anathematised (Epiph[anius] H[eresies] 78). The Nestorian controversy brought Mary into the centre next Christ. She was the rock from which was hewn the deified body of the God-Logos. Nestorius cried in vain to Cyril, and with him to the whole Church, "Don't make the virgin into a goddess"; at Ephesus Cyril exalted her for ever in the Catholic Church above all creatures, above Cherubim and Seraphim, and set her at the right hand of the Son. He started the

permutatio nominum by which everything held true of the Son might be said to a great extent of the mother, because without her there would have been no God-man. She now really became a factor in dogma, which cannot be said of any saint or angel; for the name "she who bore God" (bride of the Holy Spirit) was thoroughly meant. It may be said in many respects that the orthodox now taught regarding Mary what the Arians had taught regarding Christ; she was a demi-god mediating between God and men.

1012. Mary, Virgin, Exaltation of—Mary Regarded as "Life" of Her Devotees

SOURCE: Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, *The Glories of Mary of Mary* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1902), pp. 17, 18, 43, 44.

[p. 17] As the glorious Virgin Mary has been raised to the dignity of Mother of the King of kings, it is not without reason that the Church honors her, and wishes her to be honored by all, with the glorious title of Queen. No sooner had Mary consented to be Mother of the Eternal Word, than she merited by this consent to be made Queen of the world and of all creatures. "Since [p. 18] the flesh of Mary," remarks the Abbot Arnold of Chartres, "was not different from that of Jesus, how can the royal dignity of the Son be denied to the Mother?"

And if Jesus is the King of the universe, Mary is also its Queen, and as Queen she possesses, by right, the whole kingdom of her Son. Hence as many creatures as there are who serve God, so many they are who serve Mary: for as angels and men, and all things that are in heaven and on earth, are subject to the empire of God, so are they also under the dominion of Mary!

Mary, then, is a Queen: but, for our common consolation, be it known that she is a Queen so sweet, clement, and so ready to help us in our miseries, that the holy Church wills that we should salute her in this prayer under the title of Queen of mercy...

[p. 43] To understand why the holy Church makes us call Mary our life, we must know that as the soul gives life to the body so does divine grace give life to the soul; for a soul without grace has the name of being alive, but is in truth dead, as it was said of one in the Apocalypse, *Thou hast the name of being alive, and thou art dead*. Mary, then, in obtaining this grace for sinners by her intercession, thus restores them to life. So that to have recourse to Mary is the same thing as to find the grace of God. The Church applies to her the following words: *He that shall find me shall find life, and shall have salvation from the Lord*. "Listen," exclaims St. Bonaventure on these words, "listen, all you who desire the kingdom [p. 44] of God: honor the most blessed Virgin Mary, and you will find life and eternal salvation."

St. Bernardine of Sienna says that if God did not destroy man after his first sin, it was on account of his singular love for this holy Virgin, who was destined to be born of this race. Hence St. Bernard was right in exhorting us "to seek for grace, and to seek it by Mary;" meaning that if we have had the misfortune to lose the grace of God, we should seek to recover it, but we should do so through Mary; for though we may have lost it, she has found it; and hence the saint calls her "the finder of grace."

1013. Mary, Virgin, Exaltation of, Recent Emphasis on SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Ordeal of Christianity* (New York: Association Press, 1957), pp. 48, 49. Copyright 1957 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

[p. 48] There is also an offensive aimed at the minds of those with no intellectual pretensions who nevertheless are [p. 49] seeking spiritual satisfactions beyond those experienced in the past. This consists in the tremendous emphasis now being placed by the church on the cultivation of the cult of the Virgin, mother of God and Co-Redemptrix of humanity. This sentimentalized form of popular worship (for that, despite all theological protestations to the contrary, is what this appeal to the intercession of Mary is fast becoming) is sweeping the rank-and-file Roman Catholic population of the world... [This] is happening in Catholic congregations, not only in consequence of the proclamations of new dogmas concerning the Virgin, but in the multiplication and exploitation of shrines where the Virgin, but in the multiplication and exploitation of shrines where the Virgin is supposed to have made recent miraculous appearances (the Catholic historian, Philip Hughes, lists four such in France alone during the last century; and the appearance of Fatima in Portugal—now the most exploited of all because it has to do directly with the church's struggle against communism—is so recent that one of the children to whom the appearance was granted is still alive); ... the multiplication of novenas where the intervention of the Virgin is invoked for every purpose from winning a husband or a job to curing tuberculosis, or the development of a popular Catholic hymnology of the "O mother dear, remember me," variety...

1014. Mary, Virgin, Immaculate Conception of, and Alleged Sinless Life

SOURCE: "Impeccability and Predestination of Mary," *The Sign*, 21 (August, 1941), 48, 49. Copyright 1941 by The Passionist Missions, Inc., Union City, N.J. Used by permission. [FRS No. 52]

[p. 48] Impeccability and Predestination of Mary

... Catholic doctrine teaches that the Blessed Virgin Mary was not only conceived immaculate, that is without the slightest stain of original sin, but was without the smallest actual sin throughout the whole course of her life. Our Lady had free will, since she was a perfect human being, but because of her intimate association with God, His divine grace so richly endowed her, and His providence watched over her with such loving care, that no breath of sin ever sullied the purity of her soul. She was not only without sin, original or actual, but she was also in a certain sense incapable of sinning because of a special privilege.

[p. 49] Her freedom from actual sin was the result of her confirmation in good, which accompanied her immaculate conception, at the moment when her soul was infused into her body. Her preservation from original sin also included her preservation from concupiscence, that disorderly affection in the human soul that inclines men to sin, though it is not sin itself. It was the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas that Mary enjoyed the special privilege of impeccability only after the incarnation of Christ, but his opinion is no longer tenable, after the declaration of the doctrine of her Immaculate Conception (*Tract. de Beat. Virg. Art. III, De Impeccab. n. 13, Lepicier.*)

1015. Mary, Virgin, Immaculate Conception of, as Defined by the Pope, 1854

SOURCE: Pope Pius IX, Decree on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 211, 212.

[p. 211] Since we have never ceased in humility and fasting to offer up our prayers and those of the Church to God the Father through his Son, that he might deign to direct and confirm our mind by the power of the Holy Ghost, after imploring the protection of the whole celestial court, and after invoking on our knees the Holy Ghost the Paraclete. under his inspiration we PRONOUNCE, DECLARE, AND DEFINE, unto the glory of the Holy and Indivisible Trinity, the honor and ornament of the holy Virgin, the Mother of God, for the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the increase of the Christian religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and in our own authority, that THE DOCTRINE WHICH HOLDS THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY TO HAVE BEEN, FROM THE FIRST INSTANT OF HER CONCEPTION, BY A SINGULAR GRACE AND PRIVILEGE OF ALMIGHTY GOD, IN VIEW OF THE MERITS OF CHRIST JESUS THE SAVIOUR OF MAN- [P. 212] KIND, PRESERVED FREE FROM ALL STAIN OF ORIGINAL SIN, WAS REVEALED BY GOD, AND IS, THEREFORE, TO BE FIRMLY AND CONSTANTLY BELIEVED BY ALL THE FAITHFUL. Therefore, if some should presume to think in their hearts otherwise than we have defined (which God forbid), they shall know and thoroughly understand that they are by their own judgment condemned, have made shipwreck concerning the faith, and fallen away from the unity of the Church; and, moreover, that they, by this very act, subject themselves to the penalties ordained by law, if, by word or writing, or any other external means, they dare to signify what they think in their hearts.

1016. Mary, Virgin, Immaculate Conception of, Only a Modern Dogma

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, revised by D. S. Schaff, "Immaculate Conception," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 5, pp. 455, 456. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 455] The doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary is a modern dogma of the Roman Catholic Church which declares the mother of Jesus absolutely free from all implication in the fall of Adam and its consequences. Like most doctrines, it was the result of a long development, and embodies in its history the story of a struggle between the Thomist and Scotist parties in the Church which was not ended till 1854. At the Council of Trent the Franciscans demanded the explicit exception of Mary in the dogmatic decree on the universality of original sin, and found valuable support from the learned Jesuits Lainez and Salmeron. The Dominicans entered a lively protest, and when the perplexed legates asked for instructions from Rome, they were ordered to try to satisfy both factions. In this spirit was drawn up the decree on original sin published June 17, 1546. For a time the more soberminded, even among the Jesuits, held to the decree. Bellarmine declared the object of the festival to be simply the conception, not the immaculate conception, of Mary. Petavius, while personally believing in the immaculate conception, denied that it was of faith. Even when, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the Spanish Franciscans, aided by the Jesuits, stirred up fresh excitement over the question, and Philip III. and Henry IV. sent embassies to Rome, the apostolic preserved its diplomatic attitude. In 1617 Paul V. forbade both parties to engage in public disputes on this question, and Gregory XV. extended this prohibition even to private discussion, answering to the king of Spain that the eternal wisdom had not yet revealed the heart of the mystery to men. But the tendency in Rome favored the Scotist view more and more. Alexander VII, called the view very ancient and pious, while still declining to pronounce the opposite view heretical. Clement IX. gave an octave to the feast of the conception of the Virgin Mary; Clement XI. raised the festival in 1708 to the rank of a holy day of obligation for the whole Church. Under Gregory XVI. a strong inclination toward dogmatic definition showed itself. Several French bishops and one German received permission in 1844 to insert the term "immaculate" in the mass of the festival. Pius IX. had a special, almost romantic, devotion to the Virgin, to whose protection he attributed his preservation on the occasion of his flight from the Vatican in 1848. While still an exile, he asked the bishops, in his encyclical of Feb. 2, 1849, to say how far a dogmatic definition would agree with their wishes and those of their people. A number of voices were raised in warning, and only three fourths of the bishops agreed with the pope's desire; but the influence of the Jesuits was too powerful to be resisted. Perrone had already published (1847) an extended treatise to prove that the question was ripe for decision. In 1850 Pius named a commission to investigate the question, in which Perrone and his fellow Jesuit, Passaglia, were the most influential members. It reached no result until 1853, when it reported that no evidence from Scripture was needed for a dogmatic declaration, but that tradition alone sufficed, and that even this need not be shown in an unbroken line up to the time of the apostles.

Since these views were in harmony with the inclination of the pope, he called together in the autumn of 1854 a number of prelates (54 cardinals and about 140 bishops), who, in a preliminary meeting greeted the papal decision with loud applause. On Dec. 8 the pope solemnly took his seat in St. Peter's; the dean of the Sacred College came before him, and in the name of the whole Church begged him to pronounce a final decision on the question which had so long been discussed...

[p. 456] The dogma was not sanctioned by an ecumenical council; but since the Vatican Council of 1870 declared the pope infallible, independent of a council, the decree of 1854 must be received as an infallible utterance, and cannot be changed.

1017. Mary, Virgin, Immaculate Conception of—Significance SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 164.

The sinlessness of the Virgin Mary and the personal infallibility of the Pope are the characteristic dogmas of modern Romanism, the two test dogmas which must decide the ultimate fate of this system. Both were enacted under the same Pope, and both faithfully reflect his character. Both have the advantage of logical consistency from certain premises, and seem to be the very perfection of the Romish form of piety and the Romish principle of authority. Both rest on pious fiction and fraud; both present a refined idolatry by clothing a pure humble woman and a mortal sinful man with divine attributes. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception, which exempts the Virgin Mary from sin and guilt, perverts Christianism into Marianism; the dogma of Infallibility, which excepts the Bishop of Rome from error, resolves Catholicism into Papalism, or the Church into the Pope. The worship of a woman is virtually substituted for the worship of Christ, and a man-god in Rome for the God-Man in heaven.

1018. Mary, Virgin, John the Baptist, and Jesus (Moslem View of) SOURCE: Koran Sūra iii. 38, 42, 45–47 (preceded by commentary 56, on Sūra iii. 31–63, and accompanied

by footnotes as indicated), in *The Holy Qur–an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 1, pp. 130, 131, 133–135. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C. [p. 130]

C[ommentary] 56 (iii. 31–63.).—God's truth is continuous, and His Apostles From Adam, through Noah and Abraham, Down to the last of the Prophets, Muhammad, Form one brotherhood. Of the progeny

Of 'Imrān, father of Moses and Aaron,

Sprang a woman, who devoted

Her unborn offspring to God.

The child was Mary the mother of Jesus.

Her cousin was the wife of the priest

Zakarīya, who took charge of Mary.

[p. 131]

To Zakarīya, in his old age, was born A son Yahyā, amid prodigies: Yahyā was the herald of Jesus The son of Mary, and was known As John the Baptist. Jesus Was of virgin birth And performed many miracles. But those to whom he came as Prophet Rejected him, and plotted for his death. Their plots failed, for God's Plan Is above man's plots. So will it be With Islam, the Truth from all eternity.... [p. 133] 38. There did Zakarīya

Pray to his Lord, saying:

"O my Lord! Grant unto me

From Thee a progeny

That is pure: for Thou

Art He that heareth prayer!³⁸⁰

[Note 380: The birth of Mary, the mystic mother of Jesus, of John the Baptist, the precursor of Jesus, and of Jesus, the mystic prophet of Israel, whom Israel rejected, occurred in that order chronologically, and are told in that order. They are all inter-connected. Zakarīya prayed for no ordinary son. He and his wife were past the age of parenthood. Seeing the growth of the mystic girl Mary, he prayed for some mystic child from God.—"from Thee, a progeny that is pure". Perhaps he had adoption in his mind. Did he want to adopt Mary? To his surprise, he is given a son in the flesh, ushered in by a mystic Sign.]...

[p. 134] 42. Behold! the angels said:

"O Mary! God hath chosen thee

And purified thee—chosen thee

Above the women of all nations.^{382,}

[Note 382: Mary the mother of Jesus was unique, in that she gave birth to a son by a special miracle, without the intervention of the customary physical means. This of course does not mean that she was more than human, any more than that her son was more than human. She had as much need to pray to God as anyone else. The Christian dogma, in all sects except the Unitarian, holds that Jesus was God and the son of God. The worship of Mary became the practice in the Roman Catholic Church, which calls Mary the Mother of God. This seems to have been endorsed by the Council of Ephesus in 431, in the century before Muhammad was born to sweep away the corruptions of the Church of Christ.]...

45. Behold! the angels said:

"O Mary! God giveth thee

Glad tidings of a Word

From Him: his name

Will be Christ Jesus,

The son of Mary, held in honour

In this world and the Hereafter

And of (the company of) those

Nearest to God;

[p. 135] 46. "He shall speak to the people

In childhood and in maturity.³⁸⁸

[Note 388: The ministry of Jesus lasted only about three years, from 30 to 33 years of his age, when in the eyes of his enemies he was crucified. But the Gospel of Luke (ii. 46) describes him as disputing with the doctors in the Temple at the age of 12, and even earlier, as a child, he was "strong in spirit, filled with wisdom" (Luke ii. 40). Some apocryphal Gospels describe him as preaching from infancy.]

And he shall be (of the company)

Of the righteous."

47. She said: "O my Lord!

How shall I have a son

When no man hath touched me?"

He said: "Even so:

God createth

What He willeth:

When He hath decreed

A Plan, He but saith

To it, 'Be,' and it is!"

[EDITORS' NOTE: The commentary and notes are no part of the Koran itself, and represent the views of the commentator.]

1019. Mary, Virgin, Venerated but Not "Adored"

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), p. 275. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

MARY. A great and popular veneration of Mary, the Mother of God (*Theotokos*), existed in the early Church long before any special feast was instituted in her honor. To

her is accorded a veneration (hyperdulia) that transcends the honor given to any other

saint (*dulia*). Her dignity as the Mother of the Incarnate Word of God, and the spiritual privileges conferred on her by reason of this dignity, raise her beyond all created spirits to the exalted position of "Queen of all Saints." On the other hand, she still remains a mere creature in all her glory. The Church has never "adored" Mary or accorded her any honors that are reserved for Divinity.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The distinction between "adoration" (Latin *latria*) and "veneration" (Latin *hyperdulia*), notes Jaroslav Pelikan (*The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, pp. 134, 135), is difficult to reproduce in English, and more difficult to observe in Roman Catholic religious practice.]

1020. Mary, Virgin, Virtues of

SOURCE: Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, *The Glories of Mary* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1902), pp. 159, 160.

[p. 159] Although there is little recorded in the Gospels of Mary's virtues in detail, yet when we learn from them that she was full of grace, this alone gives us [p. 160] to understand that she possessed all virtues in a heroic degree. St. Ambrose says, "Mary was such that her life alone was a model for all." And then he concludes in the following words: "Let the virginity and life of Mary be to you as a faithful image, in which the form of virtue is resplendent. Thence learn how to live, what to correct, what to avoid, and what to retain." Humility being the foundation of all virtues, as the holy Fathers teach, let us in the first place consider those how great was the humility of the Mother of God.

1021. Mary, Virgin, Worship of, Reference to, in Koran

SOURCE: Koran, Sūra v. 119, in *The Holy Qur-an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 1, p. 280. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

119. And behold! God will say:"O Jesus the son of Mary!Didst thou say unto men,

"Worship me and my mother As gods in derogation of God"?" He will say: "Glory to Thee! Never could I say What I had no right (To say). Had I said Such a thing, Thou wouldst Indeed have known it."

1022. Mass—Benefits Extend to the Dead

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests,* trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), p. 259. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

Pastors should next teach that such is the efficacy of this Sacrifice that its benefits extend not only to the celebrant and communicant, but to all the faithful, whether living with us on earth, or already numbered with those who are dead in the Lord, but whose sins have not yet been fully expiated.

1023. Mass—Charity Toward the Dead

SOURCE: Joseph Husslein, *The Souls in Purgatory*, p. 31. Copyright 1924 by The America Press, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 126.]

Our offerings for the dead will naturally be proportioned to our means. But all are able to show from time to time their charity to the dead, and to remember their own dear departed. Catholics should show by their example that they realize that Masses are of all but infinitely greater importance at the passing of the soul into eternity than precious caskets and mounds of flowers. The beauty of modest flowery wreaths is not indeed out of place to cheer the living and may well be a sweet act of charity to them in their desolation; but the Masses for the dead are the one supreme thing to bear in mind. Let retrenchments be made anywhere except here. Let there be, not one only, but many Masses; and let the souls not be forgotten with the months and years. Yet how often is not the contrary the practice of thoughtless Christians, who while meaning to be kind in their lavish funeral expenses are in reality unspeakably cruel to their dead, cherishing the lifeless form, and leaving the soul to smart in pain.

1024. Mass, Luther's View of

SOURCE: *Luther's Primary Works*, ed. by Henry Wace and C. H. Buchheim (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896), pp. 323, 324.

[p. 323] God (as I have said) never has dealt, or does deal, with men otherwise than by the word of promise. Again, we can never deal with God otherwise than by faith in the word of His promise. He takes no concern with our works, and has no need of them, though it is by these we deal [p. 324] with other men and with ourselves;—but He does require to be esteemed by us truthful in His promises, and to be patiently trusted as such, and thus worshipped in faith, hope, and love. And thus it is that He is glorified in us when we receive and hold every blessing not by our own efforts, but from His mercy, promise, and gift. This is that true worship and service of God which we are bound to render in the mass. But when the words of the promise are not delivered to us, what exercise of faith can there be? And without faith who can hope? who can love? without faith, hope, and love, what service can there be? There is no doubt therefore that at the present day the whole body of priests and monks, with their bishops and all their superiors, are idolaters and living in a most perilous state, through their ignorance, abuse, and mockery of the mass, or sacrament, or promise of God.

1025. Mass, Protestant Episcopal View Concerning Sacrifice of SOURCEProtestant Episcopal Church, The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (as revised A.D. 1801), art. 31, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 507. (The same wording appears in the 1945 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer*.)

The Offering of Christ once made is *that* perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

1026. Mass—a Sacrifice

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXII (Sept. 17, 1562), On the Sacrifice of the Mass, canons 1–3, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 184, 185.

[p. 184] CANON I.—If any one saith, that in the mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God; or, that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat: let him be anathema.

CANON II.—If any one saith, that by those words, *Do this for the commemoration of me* (Luke xxii. 19), Christ did not institute the apostles priests; or, did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his own body and blood: let him be anathema.

CANON III.—If any one saith, [p. 185] that the sacrifice of the mass is only a sacrifice of praise and of thanksgiving; or, that it is a bare commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or, that it profits him only who receives; and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions, and other necessities: let him be anathema.

1027. Mass—Sacrifice Explained

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), pp. 73, 74.

[p. 73] The Holy Sacrifice of Mass.

355. What means: to offer sacrifice?

To offer sacrifice means: to offer God a visible gift whole and entire.

[p. 74] 356. Why do we offer sacrifice?

We offer sacrifice to adore God as the Lord of all things.

- 357. What is required for a sacrifice?
- For a sacrifice is required
- 1) a visible gift,
- 2) a priest who offers it to God,
- 3) an altar on which it is offered.

1028. Mass, Sacrifice of, Compared With Calvary

SOURCE: Herbert Vaughan, *The People's Manual.—The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass* ([St. Louis]: P. Fox, 1881), pp. 42, 43.

[p. 42] So far as the practical effects produced upon the soul are concerned, the Holy Mass has in some sense the advantage over Calvary; for, given the same dispositions, it is more profitable for us to assist day by day at the Sacrifice of the Mass than it would have been [p. 43] to have been present once upon Calvary. And, the reason is this. In the Mass Jesus Christ dispenses and applies to the soul, according to its dispositions, that which was won, but not dispensed, on the Cross. On the Cross we were redeemed; but on the Altar "the work of our redemption is carried out."

1029. Mass—Sacrifice Same as That of the Cross

SOURCE: Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 258, 259. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 258] We therefore confess that the Sacrifice of the Mass is and ought to be considered one and the same Sacrifice as that of the cross, for the victim is one and the same, namely, Christ our Lord, who offered Himself, once only, a bloody Sacrifice on the altar of the cross. The bloody and unbloody victim are not two, but one victim only, whose Sacrifice is daily renewed in the Eucharist, in obedience to the command of our Lord: *Do this for a commemoration of me*.

The priest is also one and the same, Christ the Lord; for the ministers who offer Sacrifice, consecrate the holy mysteries, not in their own person, but in that of Christ, as the words of consecration itself show, for the priest does not say: *This is the body of Christ*, but, *This is my body;* and thus, acting in the Person of Christ the Lord, he changes the substance of bread and wine into the true substance of His body and blood...

This being the case, it must be taught without any hesitation that, as the holy Council (of Trent) has also explained, the sacred and holy Sacrifice of the Mass is not a Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving only, or a mere commemoration of the Sacrifice performed on the cross, but also truly a propitiatory Sacrifice, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious to us. If, therefore, with a pure heart, a lively faith, and affected with an inward sorrow for our transgressions, we immolate and offer this most holy victim, we shall, without doubt, obtain mercy from [p. 259] the Lord, and grace in time of need; for so delighted is the Lord with the odor of this victim that, bestowing on us the gift of grace and repentance, He pardons our sins. Hence this usual prayer of the Church: *As often as the commemoration of this victim is celebrated, so often is the work of our salvation being done;* that is to say, through this unbloody Sacrifice flow to us the most plenteous fruits of that bloody victim.

1030. Meats, Offered to Idols

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, p. 222. Copyright 1954 by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Inasmuch as most meat eaten by the lower strata of the Roman world came from sacrificial animals, the fierce campaign of Apollonius [a philosopher of Tyana] against all sacrifices not only opposed the religious practices in vogue among Jews and gentiles, but also the dietary habits of almost every inhabitant of the empire.

1031. Medes, and Persians—the Name "Medes" Used

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, p. 37. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

Ecbatana [capital of Media] was captured [by Cyrus; see No. 544] and its wealth of gold, silver, and precious objects was carried off to Anshan (550).

Media ceased to be an independent nation and became the first satrapy, Mada. Nevertheless, the close relationship between Persians and Medes was never forgotten. Plundered Ecbatana remained a favorite royal residence. Medes were honored equally with Persians; they were employed in high office and were chosen to lead Persian armies. Foreigners spoke regularly of the Medes and Persians; when they used a single term, it was "the Mede."

1032. Medes—Median Empire

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 31–33. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

[p. 31] The three Medias were inhabited by Median tribes—Busae, Paretaceni, Struchates, Arizanti, and Budii—to which was added the non-Iranian priestly tribe of the Magi. These Medes were still half-nomads. On the Assyrian reliefs they are depicted with short hair confined by a red fillet and with short curled beard; over a tunic is worn the sheepskin coat, still the traveler's best friend in the bitter winter of the plateau, which also required high-laced boots to plow through the deep snows. They were armed with only the long spear and were defended by the rectangular wicker shield. With these seminomads, aided by the Persians, Phraortes dared to attack Assyria, only to meet defeat and death in battle (653). Parsa [Persia] again became independent. Two years later (651), Cyrus I [grandfather of Cyrus the Great] joined with Elam in sending aid to Shamash-shum-ukin of Babylon, who was in revolt against his brother Ashurbani-apal of Assyria; ...

Cyaxares (Uvakhshatra) had succeeded his father Phraortes; appropriately he bore the surname of the wargod Verethragna. The [p. 32] army was remodeled along modern lines and was divided into spearmen, bowmen, and cavalry. It would seem that it was Cyaxares who also changed the clothing and weapons. Two guite different forms are regularly illustrated on the sculptures at Persepolis. The Mede is at once distinguished by the wearing of the more original Iranian costume. On his head is the round, nodding felt cap with neck flap. A tight, long-sleeved leather tunic ends above the knee and is held in by a double belt with round buckle; over the tunic might be thrown on ceremonial occasions a cloak of honor. Full leather trousers and laced shoes with projecting tips indicated that their wearers spent much of their time on horseback. A short, pointed beard, a mustache, and hair bunched out on the neck were all elaborately curled, while earrings and necklace gave added ornament. The chief offensive weapon remained the spear of cornel wood with a flanged bronze point and the base held by a metal ferrule. To this spear many warriors added the bow, held in an extraordinarily elaborate bow case and serviced by arrows from a quiver. The Median costume is sharply contrasted with the form labeled Persian, distinguished by the fluted felt hat, the ankle-length flowing robe, and the lowlaced shoes.

With the Median army reorganized, the threat to Assyria became extreme. Ashurbani-apal died, and even weaker successors did not dare to dissipate their strength by aiding their nominal allies such as Parsa. The successors of Ariaramnes and Cyrus were again forced to become vassals of Cyaxares. Once more the Assyrians were driven back, and Nineveh was actually under siege by the Medes when news arrived that Scythians had poured through the gate between the Caucasus Mountains and the Caspian Sea. Defeated by their chief, Madys, son of Protothyes, Cyaxares had to pay tribute for twenty-eight years until he killed their drunken leaders at a banquet.

Nineveh was destroyed in 612. Amid the ruins, Cyaxares, now known in Babylonia as king of the Umman Manda (from his conquest of the Scythian hordes), made peace with Nabopolassar. Two years later, by the defeat of Ashur-uballit at Harran, Cyaxares destroyed the last pretense of Assyrian rule and won all northern Mesopotamia. [p. 33] Since the road to the south was closed by the alliance with the Chaldean, who also held Susa, Cyaxares followed the Zagros as it bends westward into the cold uplands of Armenia, where other Iranian bands had destroyed the kingdom of Haldia and introduced their own Indo-European speech. The fertile valleys of Armenia led down through the Anti-Taurus into the broad plains of Cappadocia and to the river Halys, frontier of Lydia. Five years of warfare ended in a drawn battle at the time of a solar eclipse (May 28, 585) and a peace by which the Halys remained the boundary. The Cadusians along the Hyrcanian Sea refused submission, but the ruler of Parthia admitted himself a vassal.

Four great powers—Media, Chaldaea, Lydia, and Egypt—divided among themselves the whole of the Near East, but, of these, only Media could be called an empire. Far more significant, Media represented the first empire founded by northern warriors who spoke an Iranian language and thought in northern terms.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Median Empire was roughly contemporary with the Neo-Babylonian Empire of Nabopolassar, Nebuchadnezzar, and their successors down to Nabonidus and Belshazzar. However, Media fell to Cyrus the Persian before Babylon did. Those commentators who consider Media as the second

empire of Daniel 2 and 7, following Babylon, generally hold that the author of Daniel was a later writer who was mistaken in the facts of the Babylonian period.]

1033. Megiddo, Mound of

SOURCE: Robert M. Engberg, "Megiddo—Guardian of the Carmel Pass," *BA*, 3 (December, 1940), 41–44. Used by permission.

[p. 41] If, at the beginning of the twentieth century, you had travelled along the southwestern edge of the Plain of Esdraelon in northern Palestine, you would have passed an oval, flat-topped hill which the natives would have told you was Tell el-Mutesellim. Its thirteen acre top, high above the road, would have been covered with waving grain if you had arranged your trip during the spring, the best of all the seasons in Palestine, and the sides of the mound would have been blanketed with richly colored anemones. If you looked closely among the rocks you might also have found delicate wild cyclamen, much smaller than the hothouse variety we know in this [p. 43] country, but just as colorful. And if your eyes were especially keen you would have observed among the dirt and rocks small pieces of pottery, edges worn smooth from exposure over many centuries. Since that time the world has come to know this mound as Megiddo or Armageddon... The history of the city of Megiddo had long been known to Bible readers and historians, but its exact location was a matter of dispute until archaeologists in this century began their systematic search for evidence at Tell el-Mutesellim...

Grain no longer grows at Megiddo and the mound is quite a bit lower, but instead we have a vast body of knowledge of the ancient cities which from sometime in the fourth millennium to about 350 B.C. played their part in the growth of civilization in the Near East, and which served as the guardian of the most important pass through Mount Carmel. Geography early decreed that the principal highway to and from Egypt and Mesopotamia should traverse Palestine, and it was discovered that the pass which led to Megiddo lay naturally on such a road. Access to this pass and the Plain of Sharon was probably one of the important reasons why the earliest settlers decided to build their homes at Megiddo.

Twenty times the city was built and twenty times it fell, beginning back around 3500 B.C., but each time there was something left by which to characterize the people who had put their efforts into making this richly historical city. Perhaps it was only a series of broken down foundations and scattered debris, but whatever remained after a city had collapsed was effectively preserved for our discovery, when the next community to build at Megiddo erected their homes, their granaries, their workshops, their administrative, and their defence structures. The builders did not stop to scrape away the underlying debris. They smoothed it over if necessary, and built on top, thus sealing everything beneath. They often lost small articles such as rings, or beads from a broken string, and in [p. 44] stumbling dropped pottery vessels which were allowed to lie where they fell or were carelessly kicked to the side of a floor. When they died, they were buried on the hill, or more usually in the cemeteries on the slopes, their mortuary gifts with them... This same process happened again and again, and today we are able to reconstruct to some extent what occurred here centuries ago.

1034. Megiddo—Stables of "Solomon"—(Rather of Ahab) in Megiddo SOURCE: Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land* (New York: Praeger, 1960), pp. 270, 271. Copyright 1960 by Kathleen M. Kenyon. Used by permission.

[p. 270] The rest of the area cleared [at the summit] was occupied by two great stable complexes. The more elaborate of these immediately adjoined the palace. It consisted of

a courtyard 55 metres square, flanked on one side by stables and on a second by long buildings which may have housed chariots. In the centre was a water-tank. The stables were made up of five units consisting of a central passage flanked on either side by a row of stables. At the end of each stall was a stone-cut manger and an upright monolith in which there was a tethering-hole. The whole group would have held one hundred and fifty horses. The second group of stables was composed of similar units. There did not in this case appear to be an enclosing courtyard, but the area was not completely excavated. This group may have housed another three hundred horses...

[p. 271] Thus, as at Samaria, the summit of the hill at Megiddo was at this stage occupied for official purposes. In spite of the attraction of the theory that the buildings represent one of Solomon's chariot cities, planning, building style and pottery evidence all point to the approximate contemporaneity of this stratum with the first layout of Samaria [about 850 B.C.]. Emphasis is, however, on garrison purposes rather than a royal residence, as is natural in view of the strategic importance of the site. As at Samaria, the mass of the population must have lived on the lower slopes, and some traces were observed of an outer city wall.

1035. Mennonite Bodies

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1002-1004.

[p. 1002] *History*. The origin of the denominations classed under the head of Mennonite bodies is traced by some to an early period in the history of the Christian Church. As various changes in doctrine and church organization came about, in both the East and the West, a number of communities, unwilling to accept them and preferring the simplicity of the Apostolic Church, remained more or less distinct through the Middle Ages. These communities received various names in different localities and in different centuries, but from the time of the first General Council at Nicea in the early part of the fourth century to the Conference of Dort, Holland, in 1632, they represented a general protest against ecclesiastical rule and a rigid liturgy, and an appeal for the simpler organization, worship, and faith of the apostolic age.

Present historical authorities, however, see little or no connection between these early independent movements and the present Mennonite Church, since those who founded the body to which present Mennonite bodies trace their origin came out from the Roman Catholic Church.

The first congregation of the church now known as Mennonite was organized in January 1525 at Zurich, Switzerland, by Conrad Grebel, Felix Mantz, George Blaurock, and others. They called themselves "Brethren" (Swiss Brethren), but were commonly known as "Täufer." Grebel and his friends had been ardent coworkers with Ulrich Zwingli, but withdrew from his leadership in 1523, when they realized that he would consent to a union of the church with the state, and that a church was to be established in which the whole population of the state would be obliged to hold membership. Zwingli's program called for the introduction of certain reforms in the existing Roman Catholic State Church. Grebel and his friends did not recognize infant baptism as scriptural. Hence they baptized again those who had been baptized in their infancy. For this reason they were called Anabaptists (Re-Baptizers). In 1534 the first Anabaptist congregations were organized in Holland by Obbe Philips. Two years later Obbe baptized Menno Simons (1496–1561), a converted Catholic priest. Menno soon became the most prominent leader of the "Obbenites," as the followers of Obbe Philips were called, in Holland and North Germany.

The name "Mennonite" dates from 1550, but would scarcely be recognized in Holland, where the usual name is "Doopsgezinden," or "Doopers," the Dutch equivalent for the English "Baptist." Similarly in parts of Germany, Switzerland, and Austria, the German form "Taufgesinnte," or "Täufer," was used to indicate Baptists, although this name was not applied to all Mennonites. It was to some of the Flemish Mennonites, who, upon the invitation of King Henry VIII, settled in England and became the pioneers of the great weaving industry of that country, that the Baptists of England were largely indebted for their organization as a religious body, although it was not as "Mennonites" that they were invited to come to England, since it is known that persons of this faith were severely persecuted in England in the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth along with other nonconformists.

The persecutions of the Mennonites were due to the fact that in all countries, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, church and state were united and dissenters were not tolerated. The number of Mennonites martyred is very great. Their Book of Martyrs (First German Edition, Ephrata, Pa., 1749; First English Edition, Lancaster, Pa., 1837; Second English Edition, Elkhart, Ind., 1886) is a ponderous volume. In the Netherlands the persecution was very severe, but by the second decade after Menno Simons' death his followers had increased to respectable numbers, since in many places the authorities had been slow [p. 1003] to carry out the decrees against them. The very presence of these numerous Mennonites proved the error of the supposition that the best interest of the state demands the toleration of only one creed within its realm. Holland became the first country to throw this principle overboard and grant religious freedom. After the founder of the Dutch Republic, William of Orange, had embraced the Reformed faith he ordered the cessation of persecution there (in 1577).

In Switzerland the persecution continued well into the seventeenth century. The last martyr was Hans Landis, the most prominent Mennonite bishop of that time, who was beheaded at Zurich in 1614. Thereafter many were imprisoned and some sentenced to the galleys.

After the Thirty Years' War (1618–48) Mennonites were permitted to settle in the Palatinate, in South Germany. Many fled to this province from Switzerland. When William Penn acquired Pennsylvania from the English Crown, he offered a home to all who were persecuted for their faith. The Mennonite pioneers in America were 13 families from Crefeld, Germany, who came on the ship Concord, in 1683, and settled at Germantown, now a part of Philadelphia. During the eighteenth century many Swiss Mennonites emigrated to Pennsylvania. They were for the most part poor. Their brethren in Holland formed an organization for the aid of those who did not have the means to go to America and contributed liberally for this purpose. Practically all the so-called Pennsylvania Dutch Mennonites are of Swiss descent. As their numbers increased during the first third of the eighteenth century, the Mennonites spread northward and westward from Germantown into Lancaster, Bucks, Berks, Montgomery, and other counties in Pennsylvania, and southward to Virginia, and from these original settlements they have since spread to western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and farther west, and to Canada. As these early settlers came in contact with the Indians, they often found that their nonresistant principles served as a better protection than the rifles and stockades of

most of the settlers, and there are but few records of injury of any kind inflicted upon them by the Indian tribes.

Since their settlement in this country a number of minor divisions have taken place among the Mennonites, occasioned by divergent views on some questions, but of late years the feeling has developed among nearly all branches that closer union and cooperation along certain common lines of gospel work would be desirable.

Doctrine. At a conference of some of the Mennonite groups in the Netherlands held at Dort, Holland, in 1632, a compilation of previous confessions of faith was made and called "A Declaration of the Christ Articles of our Common Christian Faith." This confession, containing 18 articles, was later accepted by the Alsatian Mennonites and is accepted by the great majority of the American Mennonite churches today.

A brief summary of these articles includes the following:

God the Creator of all things; the fall of man, through his disobedience; his restoration through the promise of the coming of Christ; the Advent of Christ, the Son of God; redemption has been purchased by His death on the cross for all mankind, from the time of Adam to the end of the world, who shall have believed on and obeyed Christ.

The law of Christ is contained in the Gospel, by obedience to which alone humanity is saved. Repentance and conversion, or complete change of life, without which no outward obedience to Gospel requirements will avail to please God, is necessary to salvation. All who have repented of their sins and believed on Christ as the Saviour, and in heart and life accept His commandments, are born again. As such they obey the command to be baptized with water as a public testimony of their faith, are members of the Church of Jesus Christ, and are incorporated into the communion of the saints on earth. By partaking of the Lord's Supper the members express a common union with one another and a fellowship of love for and faith in Jesus Christ. The washing of the saints' feet is an ordinance instituted, and its perpetual observance commanded, by Christ. The state of matrimony is honorable between those spiritually kindred, and such alone can marry "in the Lord" [see 1 Cor. 7:39].

The civil government is a part of God's ministry, and members are not permitted to despise, blaspheme, or resist the government, but must be subject to it in all things and obedient to all its commands that do not militate against the will and law of God, and should pray earnestly for the government and its welfare, and in behalf of their country. Christ has forbidden His followers the [p. 1004] use of carnal force in resisting evil and the seeking of revenge for evil treatment. Love for enemies cannot be shown by acts of hatred and revenge, but by deeds of love and good will. The use of all oaths is forbidden [see Matt. 5:34], as contrary to God's will, though simple affirmation is allowed.

Those who willfully sin against God are to be excluded from the rights and privileges of the church, but are to be kindly exhorted to amend their ways, the object of expulsion being the amendment, not the destruction, of the offender, and for the benefit of the church. Those who, on account of their obstinacy, are finally reproved and expelled from the church, because separated from God, must also be shunned socially, "that the openly obstinate and reprobate one may not defile others in the church," though in case of need they are to be kindly cared for, and admonished as those in need of spiritual help.

At the end of earth and earthly existence, all those who have lived and shall then be living are to be changed in a moment at the sound of the last trump, and are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ, where the good shall be separated from the evil; the good to enter into the heavenly joys prepared for them, the evil to depart forever from God's presence and mercy into the place prepared for the devil and his servants.

To the conviction that some of the requirements of civil law are contrary to the teachings of Christ is largely due the fact that the Mennonites have suffered so severely in past centuries, and have often been charged with being "clannish."

The Lord's Supper is observed twice a year in nearly all the congregations, and the great majority of them also observe the ordinance of washing the saint's feet in connection with and immediately after the Lord's Supper. In nearly all the Mennonite bodies baptism is by pouring.

Organization. With two exceptions the form of church government in the different bodies of the Mennonites is the same. The local church is autonomous, deciding all matters affecting itself. District or State conferences are established, in most cases, to which appeals may be made; otherwise the authority of the congregation or of a committee appointed by the congregation is final. All decisions of State or district conferences are presented to the individual congregation for ratification. The divinely appointed offices of the Church of Christ are held to be those of bishop (sometimes called elder), minister (pastor or evangelist), and almoner (deacon). The ministers are generally self-supporting, sharing the farming life or other occupations of the Mennonite communities.

1036. Mennonites—General Conference, Mennonite Church (Formerly, of North America)

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1046, 1047.

[p. 1046] History. In March 1859 two small Mennonite congregations in Lee County, Iowa, composed of immigrants from southern Germany, held a conference to discuss the possible union of all the Mennonite bodies in America. Until that time, while in a general way the different organizations had held to the same doctrines, they had not cooperated actively, or at least had taken no concerted part in any particular work. The resolutions adopted at this meeting drew the attention of all the Mennonite bodies. Among those especially interested was John Oberholzer, of Bucks County, Pa., who had taken advanced ground in the matter of aggressive work, and, together with 16 other ministers, having been charged with insubordination to the then established form of church government in his conference and having been disowned by that conference, had organized a separate conference in eastern Pennsylvania in October 1847. The publication by Oberholzer of the Religiöser Botschaffter, founded in 1852 and later styled Christlisches Volksblatt, gave wide publicity and strong support to the new union movement, which promised to advance along broader and more liberal lines than this conference permitted. The Iowa congregations extended a general invitation to all Mennonite congregations and conferences, and in May 1860, at West Point. Iowa. the first effort was made to hold a general conference of Mennonites in America. While this conference was not completely representative, questions of education, missions, and unity were discussed, and the organization of the General Conference of Mennonites in America was brought about. On the basis of uniting in the support of mission work, other congregations were soon added, and the membership and influence of the body grew rapidly. Many of the congregations whose members had come from Russia and Germany since 1850, and who had become acquainted with the movement before leaving Europe, joined the new organization. Among the Amish Mennonites who came from Europe and settled in Ohio about 1840 were some who favored greater leniency in discipline, and who separated from the Amish body on that account. They were known as the Apostolic Mennonite Church, but since the organization of the General Conference of Mennonites they have affiliated with that body.

The church is well organized and aggressive in the various lines of Christian effort, and is rapidly increasing in numbers in the United States and Canada.

[p. 1047] *Doctrine*. In doctrine this body is, with few exceptions, in strict accord with other Mennonites, the main difference being that in most of the congregations the passage in 1 Corinthians XI, 4–15, is not understood as making obligatory the use of a covering

for the head of female members during prayer and worship, and that the passage in John XIII, 4–15, is not generally believed to command the institution of an ordinance (that of foot washing) to be observed according to the example there described. In the matter of conformity to the world, some congregations adhere less strictly than others to the articles of faith adopted by the body as a whole. Their common ground of union is contained in the following confession:

This conference recognizes and acknowledges the sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the only and infallible rule of faith and life; for "other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." In matters of faith it is therefore required of the congregations which unite with the conference that, accepting the above confession, they hold fast to the doctrine of salvation by grace through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, baptism on confession of faith, the refusal of all oaths, the Christ-taught doctrine of a peace and nonresistance, and the practice of a scriptural church discipline.

Organization. The local church is autonomous in its government, although appeal may be made to the local and district conferences, which meet annually. The General Conference meets every 3 years, and is not a legislative, but an advisory body.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 35,531 (YAC, 1961, p. 256).]

1037. Mennonites—the Mennonite Church

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1015, 1016.

[p. 1015] *History*. The Mennonite Church, by far the largest of the different Mennonite bodies, represents the general trend of them all and is most closely identified with the history already given. In the controversy which resulted in the separation of the Amish Mennonite Church, it stood for the more liberal interpretation of the Confession of Faith, and has ever since included what may be called the conservatively progressive element of the Mennonite communities. It furnished the first Mennonite colony at Germantown, Pa., in 1683, and was the most important factor in the westward extension of the different communities mentioned in the general statement. It should be stated, however, that the Amish division did not occur until 1693.

Doctrine and Organization. The general Confession of Faith adopted at Dort, Holland, in 1632 is accepted in full. In polity, so far as the local church and district and State conferences are concerned, the church is in accord with most other Mennonite bodies.

The General Conference,³ [Note 3: Not to be mistaken for the General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America, p. 1040.] organized in 1898, meets every 2 years, but is regarded as merely an advisory body. Delegates are chosen from among the ministers and deacons of the various State conferences and they, together with the bishops, who are members of the conference by virtue of their office, decide all questions by majority of vote. All their ministers and deacons have the privilege of debate but have no vote. This General Conference furnishes the basis for the practical union of the Mennonite Church and what was formerly known as the Amish Mennonite Church. Three conferences of the former Amish Men- [p. 1016] nonite Church have been merged with the Mennonite conferences in which their congregations are located.

For a better understanding of the relations of these bodies, an historical sketch of the origin and development of the Amish Mennonites has been given on page 1006. [See No. 1036.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 72,138 (YAC, 1961, p. 256).]

1038. Mental Reservations, Catholic Doctrine of

SOURCE: Bertrand L. Conway, *The Question-Box Answers* (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 165, 166. [FRS No. 6.]

[p. 165] A mental reservation, or restriction, is the limitation of an affirmative or negative. If not verbally expressed, it can be either known by the circumstances or else it is purely mental. A purely mental reservation being equivalent [p. 166] to a lie, is never lawful. Reservation not purely mental—that is, equivocation—is in general forbidden, because language is intended to express thoughts, not to hide them. It is, however, allowed for a just cause, in virtue of the principle of morals, that we can lawfully perform an act having two effects, the one good and the other evil, whenever the good effect is paramount to the bad. Thus, a servant could say to a visitor whom her mistress did not want to receive, "Not at home," or a priest or any professional man when asked a secret could answer, "I do not know"; in both instances the limiting of the negation can be gathered from the circumstances.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The author contends that the Catholic teaching is "much more strict than that of Protestant writers and theologians, such as Melancthon, Bodin, Gentilis, Grotius, Pufendorf, Heineccius, Cocceius, Jeremy Taylor, Johnson, Paley, and others, who permit lying when the person addressed has no right to the truth."]

1039. Messiah, Coming of—Talmudic Warning Against Calculation of Time

SOURCE: Talmud *Sanhedrin* 97*b*, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), p. 659. Used by permission.

R. Samuel b. Nahmani said in the name of R. Jonathan: Blasted be the bones of those who calculate the end.⁶ [Note 6: I.e., Messiah's advent.] For they would say, since the predetermined time has arrived, and yet he has not come, he will never come.

1040. Messiah, Coming of—Talmudic Warning Against Revelation of Time

SOURCE: Talmud *Megillah 3a*, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 195–1952), pp. 9, 10. Used by permission.

[p. 9] The *Targum* of the Prophets was composed by Jonathan ben Uzziel under the guidance of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, and the land of Israel [thereupon] quaked

over an area of four hundred *parasangs* by four hundred *parasangs*, and a *Bath Kol* came forth and exclaimed, Who is this that has revealed My secrets to mankind? Jonathan b. Uzziel thereupon arose and said, It is I who have revealed Thy secrets to mankind. It is fully known to Thee that I have not done this for my own honour or for the honour of my father's house, but for Thy honour I have done it, that dissension may not increase in

Israel. He further sought to reveal [by] a targum [the inner meaning] of the Hagiographa,

but a *Bath* [p. 10] *Kol* went forth and said, Enough What was the reason?—Because the date of the Messiah is foretold in it.² [Note 2: The reference is probably to the Book of Daniel.]

1041. Messiah, Expectations of, Among Jews

SOURCE: Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Bks., 1957), p. 5. Used by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc., New York.

In [Second Esdras, or *Fourth*] *Ezra* the Messiah is shown as the Lion of Judah at whose roar the last and worst beast—now the Roman eagle—bursts into flame and is consumed; and again as the Son of Man who first annihilates the multitudes of the heathen with the fire and storm of his breath and then, gathering together the lost ten tribes out of alien lands, establishes in Palestine a kingdom in which a reunited Israel can

flourish in peace and glory. According to *Baruch* there must come a time of terrible hardship and injustice, which is the time of the last and worst empire, the Roman. Then, just when evil has reached its greatest pitch, the Messiah will appear. A mighty warrior, he will rout and destroy the armies of the enemy; he will take captive the leader of the Romans and bring him in chains to Mount Zion, where he will put him to death; he will establish a kingdom which shall last until the end of the world. All the nations which have ever ruled over Israel will be put to the sword; and some members of the remaining nations will be subjected to the Chosen People. An age of bliss will begin in which pain, disease, untimely death, violence and strife, want and hunger will be unknown and in which the earth will yield its fruits ten-thousand-fold. Would this earthly Paradise last for ever or for some centuries only, pending its replacement by an otherworldly Kingdom? On this matter opinions differed but the question was in any case an academic one. Temporary or eternal, such a Kingdom was worth fighting for; and these apocalypses had at least established that in the course of bringing the Saints into their Kingdom the Messiah would show himself invincible in war.

1042. Messiah, of Roman Empire—Augustus Believed to Be SOURCE: M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, Vol. 1 (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 43. Used by permission.

The leading ideas of Virgil and Horace were the ideas of thousands and thousands in the Roman Empire, who believed with Horace (for whom personally it might, no doubt, have been a poetic flight only) that Augustus was one of the mightier gods, Mercury or Apollo or Hercules, who appeared among men ($\dot{\epsilon}\pi\iota\phi\alpha\nu\eta\varsigma$), that he was the Messiah and the Saviour of the mighty and holy Roman Empire.

1043. Messiahs, False, Before and After Fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70) SOURCE: "Messiah," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959), cols. 1308, 1309. Copyright 1959 by Encyclopedia Publishing Company, Ltd. Used by permission of I. J. Carmin-Karpman, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

[col. 1308] Messianic emotionalism became intense shortly before 70 CE Nu- [col. 1309] merous false m.'s now appeared, the New Testament vividly reflecting the messianic ferment at this time. The belief in a M. grew even stronger after the destruction of the Second Temple (70 CE), and critical world events affecting the Jews invariably sharpened anticipation of his advent. Frequent predictions as to its timing were based on the Book of Daniel and other biblical passages. The widespread Jewish revolt of 115–117 certainly had a messianic content, and during the last revolt against the Romans, BAR KOKHBA was acclaimed M. (131).

1044. Messiahs, False, in Early Christian Times

SOURCE: Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Bks., 1957), pp. 5, 6. Used by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc., New York.

[p. 5] As, under the rule of the procurators, the conflict with Rome became more and more bitter, messianic phantasies became with many Jews an obsessive preoccupation. According to Josephus it was chiefly the belief in the imminent advent of a messianic king that launched the Jews upon the suicidal war which ended [p. 6] with the capture of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. Even Simon barCochba, who led the last great struggle for national independence in A.D. 131, was still greeted as Messiah. But the bloody suppression of that rising and the annihilation of political nationality put an end both to the apocalyptic faith and to the militancy of the Jews.

1045. Methodists—African Methodist Episcopal Church

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1184, 1185.

[p. 1184] *History*. Soon after the Revolutionary War Negro members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in different places, dissatisfied with conditions, began to hold separate services, hoping thus to secure larger privileges and more freedom of action than they believed were possible in continued association with their white brethren and also to avoid certain humiliating discriminations practiced against them. They styled themselves, for the most part, African Methodists, simply because they were of African descent and Methodists, and not because they thought of permanently dissociating themselves from the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Thus, as early as 1787, a company of Negro Methodists in Philadelphia withdrew, built a chapel, and obtained a Negro preacher through ordination by Bishop White of the Protestant Episcopal Church. In 1793 Bishop Asbury dedicated the Bethel Church in Philadelphia, built by Richard Allen, a well-to-do Negro, and the platform adopted by the congregation included the statement following:

We consider every child of God a member of the mystical body of Christ, *** yet in the political government of our church we prohibit our white brethren from electing or being elected into any office among us, save that of a preacher or public speaker.

[p. 1185] As reasons for this action they gave the inconveniences arising from white people and people of color mixing together in public assemblies, more particularly in places of public worship.

In 1799 Allen was ordained deacon and the church, according to an arrangement already made, remained under the discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the jurisdiction of a white elder. This arrangement, however, did not work very well and contentions between the white and Negro Methodists of the city increased to such an extent that an appeal was made to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. The court declared in favor of the Bethel Church, which thus became an independent body. In 1814 the Methodist Episcopal elders announced that the white preachers could no longer maintain pastoral responsibility for the Negro congregation, and in 1816 Richard Allen and 15 others called together a number of similar societies, which had been formed in New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, to meet in Philadelphia to organize a church of Negro persons with autonomous government. This convention was held in April of that year and resulted in the organization of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. The movement received the cordial assistance and sympathy of a number of white persons, among whom were Dr. Benjamin Rush, Robert Ralston, William McKean, and Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Having become a distinct body by reason of separation from the Methodist Episcopal Church they found it necessary at this first General Conference to elect one of their own body who was adequate to be set apart in Holy Orders to superintend the connection then formed. Rev. Richard Allen, who had been ordained to preach by Bishop Asbury 17 years previously, was unanimously elected to that office and April 11, 1816, was solemnly set apart to the episcopal office by prayer and imposition of the hands of five regularly ordained ministers, one of whom, Absalom Jones, was a priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church under the diocese of the Right Reverend Bishop White, of Pennsylvania.

For the first 20 years the operations of the new denomination were confined chiefly to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland. Later they were extended to the New England States, New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Kentucky, and Louisiana, in the last State being represented in New Orleans alone. Previous to the Civil War comparatively little was done in the Southern States, but during the war, through the influence of two chaplains in the United States Army, Rev. W. H. Hunter and Rev. H. M. Turner, and of some Negro soldiers who were also preachers, two organizations were formed on the South Atlantic coast. After the war the church extended rapidly throughout the South, and today it is represented in each of the original slave States, while its northern field includes the Northern States from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the Province of Ontario in Canada.

Doctrine and Organization. As already indicated, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, in doctrine and polity, is in substantial agreement with the Methodist Episcopal Church. The governing bodies are the General Conference, annual conference, district conference, quarterly conference, and church conference. Bishops preside over general and annual conferences, presiding elders at district and quarterly conferences, and the preacher in charge at the church conference and all boards of the local church.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1951), 1,166,301 (*YAC*, 1961. p. 256). This is the largest Negro Methodist body. Third in membership, next to the A.M.E. Zion Church, is the Christian Methodist Episcopal Church (originally the Colored branch of the M.E. Church, South), with a 1951 membership of 392,167 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 74, 256).]

1046. Methodists—African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1195, 1196.

[p. 1195] History. Among the early independent Negro Methodist congregations in this country was one organized in New York City in 1796 by James Varick, Abraham Thompson, William Miller, and others, who were members of the John Street Methodist Episcopal Church. Their desire to have a separate organization in which "they might have opportunity to exercise their spiritual gifts among themselves, and thereby be more useful to one another," was occasioned largely by the "caste prejudice which forbade their taking the sacrament until the white members were all served," by the desire for other church privileges denied them, and by the conviction that it would assist in the development of a ministry adapted to their needs. The first church was built in the year 1800 and was called "Zion." The next year it was incorporated as the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and articles of agreement were entered into with the Methodist Episcopal Church by which the latter supplied them with ordained preachers until the year 1820. Meanwhile the organization of the Union Church of Africans in Wilmington, Del., and of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, Pa., as separate and distinct denominations, caused considerable uneasiness and the Zion Church made application to the Methodist Episcopal Church for the ordination of some of its local preachers as elders. To this no answer was given, and in 1820 as the congregation had developed several preachers of ability and had fellowship and union with churches which had been formed at New Haven, Conn., Philadelphia, Pa., Newark, N. J., and on Long Island, N. Y., it decided to abrogate the agreement with the Methodist Episcopal Church to supply its pulpits.

The first annual conference was held in Mother Zion Church, corner of Church and Leonard Streets, New York City, June 21, 1821. At that time the denomination consisted of 6 churches, 19 preachers, and 1,426 members. As they had no ordained elders, the conference was presided over by Rev. William Phoebus, of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and Rev. Joshua Soule (afterwards a bishop in the Methodist Episcopal Church) acted as secretary. James Varick, who was active and influential, and generally spoken of as the founder of the denomination, was made district chairman.

The second annual conference, which was also the first General Conference, met in Wesley Church, Lombard Street, Philadelphia, May 16, 1822, and was presided over by Abraham Thompson. After some routine business, it adjourned to meet, July 18, in Mother Zion Church, New York City. In the meantime, on June 17, James Varick, Abraham Thompson, and Levin Smith were ordained elders by Dr. James Covel. Sylvester Hutchinson, and William Stillwell, white elders of the Methodist Episcopal Church. On July 21, at this conference, six persons were elected deacons in the forenoon and elders in the afternoon, and James Varick was elected the first superintendent, or bishop, of the denomination. No other general conference was held until 1827, when Christopher Rush was elected the second bishop of the denomination. After Bishop Varick's death, in 1827, Bishop Rush served alone until 1840, when William Miller was elected as his associate. It was not until 1848 that the present name of the church was adopted, when it was learned that a group of Negro members had withdrawn from George Street Methodist Episcopal Church at Philadelphia, led out by Richard Allen for the same reason the New York group had withdrawn from the John Street Church in New York. The Philadelphia group gave its organization the name of the African Methodist Episcopal Church. The word "Zion" was added by the New York group out of respect to its first church. In 1848 the name A. M. E. Zion Church was approved as the permanent title of the church organized in 1796.

The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church did not begin operations in the South until 1863, when Bishop Joseph J. Clinton sent Elder James W. Hood to North Carolina and Elder Wilbur G. Strong to Florida and Louisiana, though work was not begun until the following January. The appointment to North Carolina was specially fortunate, and churches sprang up rapidly. Men only just emancipated from the yoke of slavery felt themselves called to enter the ministry and to preach the gospel to their own people. Before the year closed the North Carolina Conference was organized, the parent of several large conferences in that and neighboring States. The success in Florida, Louisiana, [p. 1196] and Alabama was not so phenomenal, but the missionary effort in these States proved to be most fruitful, especially in Alabama. So successful were the efforts of these early missionaries that, when the General Conference met in 1880 at Montgomery, Ala., 15 annual conferences had been organized in the South.

The General Conference of 1880 was an important one. Livingstone College was established at Salisbury, N. C., Rev. C. R. Harris being its first principal. Two years later, on his return from England, where he had collected \$10,000 for the college, Rev. Joseph C. Price, considered one of the greatest champions of Negro citizenship, was made president and continued in this office until his death in 1893. The Star of Zion, the chief weekly organ of the church, was adopted by this General Conference as a permanent organ of the denomination, and the first organized missionary effort was instituted by the formation of a Board of Missions and a Woman's Missionary Society.

At the General Conference of 1892 the denomination took a forward move by the organization of the departments of missions and education, which have been productive of large and far-reaching results in promoting the cause of education and missions at home and in foreign fields. The founding of the publication house and the placing in it of a printing plant for publishing literature of all kinds used by the church, and for carrying

on a general printing business, was one of the notable achievements of the church in that year. The A. M. E. Zion Quarterly Review, issued first in 1889, was adopted as denominational periodical in 1892.

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrine the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church is in entire accord with the Methodist Episcopal Church, accepting the Apostles' Creed and adhering strictly to the doctrine of the new birth, regeneration followed by adoption, and entire sanctification. It recognizes the Scriptures as written by holy men as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. In polity, also, it is in substantial agreement with that church, having the same system of conferences—quarterly, annual, and general. The itinerancy is maintained throughout all ranks of ministers. A bishop holds office for life or during good behavior.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 780,000 (YAC, 1961, p. 256).]

1047. Methodist—The Methodist Church

a. Combined Methodism

SOURCE: Walter G. Muelder, "Methodism," in Robert S. Bilheimer, *The Quest for Christian Unity* (New York: Association Press), pp. 158–163. Copyright 1952 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 158] Methodism's theological perspectives are best understood in relation to what some of its leaders have considered to be the cardinal principles of protestantism, and especially of the evangelical revival of the eighteenth century. The power of the Wesleyan movement was in part due to the timeliness of its message. Certain emphases in its theology reflect the needs of that age and the spirit of both intellectual and practical relevance in succeeding centuries.

Among the cardinal principles of protestantism which Methodists stress are: (1) the authority of Scripture; (2) the right of private judgment, with its implications for the idea of tolerance and religious liberty; (3) justification by faith; (4) freedom of will (breaking sharply here with predestination); (5) the sanctity of the common life; and (6) faith as both a human and a divine act, stressing moral and rational elements in faith, the divine initiative through grace, and the importance of religious experience.

The preaching of John Wesley was an Arminianism that announced salvation as available to all men and not simply to an elect few. Christ died for all men, and any man is free to [p. 159] accept this salvation. All could become actual sons of God. To the gospel of God's grace was added the idea of conscious salvation. Those whose sins God forgives, he assures by an inner voice that they are his children. God's grace is constantly available to men and endows them daily with strength for the work of life. There is thus a great stress on the work of the Holy Spirit. Along with a doctrine of justification by faith, Wesley laid on his converts the responsibilities of love. The new life in Christ could be made perfect in love, sanctification as well as justification being embraced in salvation. Forgiveness and sanctification are the two cardinal factors in the idea of salvation. Forgiveness, based on atonement, is the ground of the Christian life; yet sanctification dominates Wesley's thought because salvation is seen as a process directed to the perfect, real change of the individual. As justified by faith, man is accepted by God as one of His children; but this experienced judgment of grace stands in tension with the coming judgment of works, the final salvation for which the maturing power of sanctification will qualify him.

Methodism owes much to the Church of England. Not least is the fact that her Articles of Religion are the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England reduced to twenty-five. The Articles of Religion, however, are not a confining theological fence. They provide a significant historical point of reference; but they are also a starting point of theological exploration. Taken by themselves, they do not fully express the experimental spirit of Methodism as an individual and social force.

One of the summaries of distinctive Methodist emphasis which Wesley formulated says:

What was their fundamental doctrine? That the Bible is the whole and sole rule both of Christian faith and practice. [p. 160] Hence they learned, (1) That religion is an inward principle; that it is no other than the mind that was in Christ; or, in other words, the renewal of the soul after the image of God, in righteousness and true holiness. (2) That this can never be wrought in us, but by the power of the Holy Ghost. (3) That we receive this, and every other blessing, merely for the sake of Christ: and (4) That whosoever hath the mind that was in Christ, the same is our brother, and sister, and mother.

In 1777, John and Charles Wesley prepared a hymnal intended for "the Use of Christians of all Denominations." Its preface sounds a significant ecumenical note:

The ease and happiness that attend, the unspeakable advantages that flow from, a truly catholic spirit, a spirit of universal love (which is the very reverse of bigotry), one would imagine, might recommend this amiable temper to every person of cool reflection. And who that has tasted of this happiness can refrain from wishing it to all mankind? ... It is with unspeakable joy, that these observe the spirit of bigotry greatly declining (at least, in every Protestant nation of Europe), and the spirit of love proportionably increasing. Men of every opinion and denomination now begin to bear with each other. They seem weary of tearing each other to pieces on account of small and unessential differences; and rather desire to build up each other in the great point wherein they all agree—the faith which worketh by love, and produces in them the mind which was in Jesus Christ. It is hoped, the ensuing collection of Hymns may in some measure contribute, through the blessing of God, to advance this glorious end, to promote this spirit of love, not confined to any opinion or party. There is not a hymn, not [p. 161] one verse, inserted here, but what relates to the common salvation; and what every serious and unprejudiced Christian, of whatever denomination, may join in.

The Wesleys may have been in error in some details of theological selection in the verses and hymns, but the spirit which animated their evangelical fervor has left a deep imprint on Methodist readiness for ecumenical experience.

In addition to doctrinal dependence, we may note other significant factors of indebtedness to the Church of England which help in understanding the order and organization of Methodism. There is, first of all, a rich churchly heritage and tradition which assisted Methodism from being confined as a merely sect institution. The fervor of evangelical Christianity was fed by the many-sidedness of the great Anglican tradition. Secondly, Methodism inherited a dignified worship and historic liturgy. The rituals of baptism, marriage, ordination, burial ceremonies, and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper owe much to the Prayer Book of the Church of England. So also is the tradition of an official and dignified hymnody. Thirdly, the form of church government is based on the Low Church Anglican concepts of church polity. Wesley held with Luther that there is no form of church government prescribed in Scripture, but held that the episcopal form was not contrary to Scripture. The conception of ministerial orders and the nature of their functions are Anglican. Methodism approved, adopted, and used the forms and methods of a historic ministry. These it adapted to the social and historical circumstances of the

people whom it served. Thus, for example, the episcopacy has never in Methodism been considered a "third order," but rather the investiture of an "elder" with certain definite executive functions and powers. As a consequence, the Methodist [p. 162] bishops "not only have no power to ordain a person for the episcopal office till he be first elected by the General Conference, but they possess no authority to ordain an elder or a traveling deacon till he be first elected by a yearly Conference."

The functioning organization of the Methodist Church comprises a General Conference for the entire church, Jurisdictional Conferences for the church in the U.S.A., Central Conferences for the church outside the United States of America, and Annual Conferences as the fundamental bodies in the church. The General Conference meets quadrennially and is composed of not less than six hundred or more than eight hundred delegates, equally divided among ministers and laymen (including laywomen), all elected by Annual Conferences. The General Conference has full legislative power over all matters distinctively connectional. The bishops are elected in Jurisdictional Conferences, which otherwise are functional auxiliary bodies to promote the general interests of the church. The Annual Conference-composed of both ministers and lavmen-is the basic body in the church. As such, it has reserved the right to vote on all constitutional amendments, on the election of all delegates to General, Jurisdictional, and Central Conferences, on all matters relating to ministerial relations and ordination, except that lay members may not vote on matters of ordination, character, and Conference relations of ministers. In addition to the Conferences, there are the episcopacy and the Judiciary. A council of bishops provides administrative leadership and presidential supervision for the jurisdictions and areas. The Judiciary functions as a supreme ecclesiastical court...

There are about nine million members of the Methodist Church in the U.S.A., served through about forty thousand preaching places. In all, there are twenty-three bodies in the [p. 163] country bearing the Methodist name. Most of these represent schisms or withdrawals from other Methodist bodies. In addition, there are about a dozen groups which may be termed quasi-Methodist sects. They profess to be Wesleyan in doctrine, they were organized by Methodists and drew their original members mainly from the Methodist constituency. About two dozen other sects espouse the sanctification doctrine promulgated by early Methodist preachers. The fifty or more sects traceable to Methodist have a combined membership of nearly ten million persons. The Methodist Church is widely distributed over the nation, with special strength in the middle western and southern states.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Methodist Church, whose 9,815.460 members (1959; see YAC, 1961, p. 256) constitute the largest Protestant denomination in the United States, was formed by the union, in 1939, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church. For their history, see *b*, *c*, and *d* below. For Presbyterian proposal that the Methodist enter a further interdenominational merger, see Nos. 664, 665.]

b. The Former Methodist Episcopal Church SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1096–1101.

[p. 1096] *History*. The first interest of the Wesleys in America was connected with a philanthropic movement started by Governor Oglethorpe in Georgia in 1733. They had apparently attracted his attention by their manner of life at Oxford, and in 1735 he invited them to come as spiritual advisers to his colony. Both accepted the invitation, and John Wesley remained until 1738, though Charles Wesley returned earlier. It was at this time

that they first came into relations with the Moravians, through the colony established in the same vicinity by Count Zinzendorf.

In 1760 Philip Embury, a Weslevan local preacher from Ireland, landed in New York with members of his Irish class, and 6 years later he gathered for regular worship a company of Methodists, who in 1768 erected and dedicated a [p. 1097] chapel, since known as the "John Street Church." About the same time Robert Strawbridge, also an Irish Weslevan preacher, assembled a small company in Frederick County, Md. Subsequently itinerant preachers were sent over by John Wesley, among them Thomas Rankin and Francis Asbury, and in 1773 the first annual conference was held in Philadelphia. During the Revolutionary War, notwithstanding the general adverse circumstances and the fact that Asbury alone of all the preachers sent over by Wesley remained in this country, the membership increased from 1,160 in 1773 to 14,988 in 1784. The declaration of peace found the societies still connected with the Church of England, though without leaders or church privileges, as many of the clergy had left their parishes, and consequently neither baptism nor the Lord's Supper was administered. On representation being made to Wesley, he set apart Dr. Thomas Coke, a presbyter of the Church of England, as superintendent and commissioned him to ordain Francis Asbury as joint superintendent with himself. Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey were also ordained as presbyters (or elders) for America. They arrived in America in the latter part of 1784, and on December 24 what has been known as the "Christmas conference" began in Baltimore, Md., 60 preachers meeting with Dr. Coke and his companions. A letter from Wesley was read announcing the preparation of a liturgy to be used by the traveling preachers, and the appointment of "Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury to be joint superintendents over our brethren in North America, as also Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to act as elders among them by baptizing and administering the Lord's Supper." It was also stated that as "our American brethren are now totally disentangled both from the state and the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again, either with the one or with the other. They are now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the Primitive Church "

The conference then proceeded to form a Methodist Episcopal Church, and elected both Coke and Asbury superintendets or bishops. The Order of Worship and Articles of Religion prepared by Wesley were adopted, one article being added, recognizing allegiance to the United States Government; the rules and discipline were revised and accepted; and a number of preachers were ordained.

The first General Conference was held in 1792, and after that it was held quadrennially...

The church has not been free from disagreements. In 1792 James O'Kelley, ofVirginia, with a considerable body of sympathizers, withdrew because of objec- [p. 1098] tion to the episcopal power in appointing the preachers to their fields of labor, and organized the "Republican Methodists," who later joined with others in what has become known as the "Christian Church" [now part of the United Church of Christ]. Between 1813 and 1817 many of the Negro members in various sections of the Middle Atlantic States, believing that they were not treated fairly by their white brethren, withdrew and formed separate denominations of Negro Methodists, such as the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the Union Church of Africans (now the Union American Methodist Episcopal Church), and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

In 1830 the Methodist Protestant Church was organized as the outcome of a movement against episcopal power and for lay representation in church government. In 1843 the Wesleyan Methodist Connection was organized in the interests of a more emphatic protest against slavery and in objection to the episcopacy. Two years later the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, withdrew because of the antislavery agitation. The latest division was that of the Free Methodists, in 1860, on differences concerning secret societies, discipline, and certain doctrines, particularly sanctification. The other Methodist denominations in the United States arose otherwise than as secessions from the parent Methodist body...

In 1935 the Committee on Union, appointed by the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal, the Methodist Episcopal, South, and the Methodist Protestant churches submitted a plan of union [completed in 1939]...

[p. 1099] *Doctrine.* In theology the Methodist Episcopal Church is Arminian, and its doctrines are set forth in the Articles of Religion, Wesley's published sermons, and his Notes on the New Testament. These emphasize belief in the Trinity, the fall of man and his need of repentance, freedom of the will, sanctification, future rewards and punishments, and the sufficiency of the Scriptures for salvation. The doctrine of sanctification or Christian perfection, as held by Methodist, and which is regarded as distinctively a Methodistic doctrine, does not imply an absolute and sinless perfection, but "a freedom from sin, from evil desires and evil tempers, and from pride." It is regarded as not usually, if ever, attained at the moment of conversion, but as being attainable by faith and that only, and members are exhorted to seek it in this life.

Two sacraments are recognized: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The first is administered both to infants and adults; as to the mode, sprinkling is preferred, though in the case of adult converts, choice of sprinkling, pouring, or immersion is given. The one condition required of those who seek admission to church membership is "a desire to flee from the wrath to come and to be saved from their sins."Each applicant is expected to evidence this desire by a variety of proofs, indicating the purpose to lead an honorable, peaceful, modest life, abstaining from anything that "is not for the glory of God." There are certain special advices to church members in regard to temperance, marriage and divorce, amusements, etc...

[p. 1100] The General Conference is the highest body in the church and is the general legislative and judicial body... It con- [p. 1101] venes quadrennially and is composed of ministerial and lay delegates in equal numbers.

c. The Former Methodist Episcopal Church, South SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1144, 1145.

[p. 1144] *History*. The early history of Methodism in America was closely identified with slave-holding sections. The southern colonies furnished the majority of the young men who entered the ministry of the church during the Revolutionary War, and out of approximately 15,000 members of the Methodist societies in 1783, only about 2,000 resided in what, in later years, were known as the "free States." All the conferences between 1776 and 1808 were held either in Baltimore or in that region, and six out of the nine bishops elected previous to 1844 had been natives of slaveholding States. Nevertheless, the Methodist preachers of the time were, with practical unanimity, opposed to human bondage.

The "Christmas Conference" of 1784, which organized the scattered congregations into the Methodist Episcopal Church, enacted a specific rule which required all

slaveholding members, under penalty of expulsion for noncompliance, to emancipate their slaves; but it stirred up so much strife, and proved to be so impracticable of execution, that in less than 6 months it was suspended. After various and somewhat conflicting measures had been adopted, the General Conference of 1808 provided that thereafter each annual conference should deal with the whole matter according to its own judgment. In 1816 this provision was modified by another statute which remained in force until 1844, to the effect that no slaveholder should be appointed to any official position in the church, if the State in which he lived made it possible for him to liberate his slaves. This compromise proceeded upon the supposition that, while slavery was an evil to be mitigated in every possible way, it was not necessarily a sin.

In 1844 a new issue was raised. Bishop James O. Andrew, of Georgia, a man of high Christian character and "eminent beyond almost any living minister for the interest that he had taken in the welfare of the slaves," became by inheritance and by marriage a nominal slaveholder. Under the laws of Georgia it was not possible for him or his wife to free their slaves. He was therefore exempt, as scores of other southern ministers were, from the operation of the law of 1816. In the General Conference of 1844, held in New York, a preamble and resolution were adopted calling attention to the embarrassment which would result from this connection with slavery in the bishop's exercise of his office as an itinerant general superintendent, and declaring it "the sense of this General Conference that he desist from the exercise of his office so long as this impediment remains." The southern delegates resented this action, which virtually deposed him from the episcopacy, and entered a protest against it. They said that if Bishop Andrew had violated any law of the church they did not object to his being put upon trial for the offense; but they did object to his deposition by mere majority vote, and without any specific allegation based upon the law of the church being brought against him. Such action they regarded as a flagrant violation of the constitution of the church, according to which, as they interpreted it, the episcopacy was not a mere office subject to the control of an omnipotent General Conference, but a coordinate and independent branch of the church government. The result was that after long debate, conducted for the most part in an admirably Christian spirit, a provisional plan of separation was adopted, to become come effective whenever the southern conferences should deem it necessary. A convention of representatives from the southern conferences was held at Louisville, Ky., and on May 17, 1845, by an almost unanimous vote, the plan of separation was approved. and the annual conferences in the slaveholding States were erected into a distinct ecclesiastical connection, separate from the jurisdiction of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the name chosen for the new body being the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Its first General Conference was held at Petersburg, Va., in 1846...

[p. 1145] The southern church began with2 bishops, Joshua Soule and James O. Andrew, and 16 annual conferences. In 1846 there were 1,519 traveling preachers, 2,833 local preachers, 327,284 white members, 124,961 Negro members, and 2,972 Indian members, or a total of 459,569...

The Civil War of 1860–65 wrought havoc. Hundreds of church buildings were burned or dismantled, college buildings were abandoned, and the endowments were swept away. During the war the annual conferences met irregularly or in fragments; the General Conference of 1862 was not held; and the whole order of the itinerancy was interrupted...

By 1866 the membership had been reduced to 511,161, showing a loss of 246,044. Threefourths of the Negro members had joined either the African Methodist churches, or the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose representatives were to be found everywhere throughout the South. The remainder formed, in 1870, an independent organization, the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, cooperating in that organization.

In spite of these facts the work of reconstruction was begun at once... In 1874 the first fraternal delegation from the Methodist Episcopal Church was received...

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrine the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is in agreement with other branches of Methodism throughout the world, putting special emphasis upon the universality of the atonement, the witness of the Spirit, and the possibility of holiness in heart and life.

In polity it is in close accord with the Methodist Episcopal Church and emphasizes the episcopate.

d. The Former Methodist Protestant Church SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936 Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 1115, 1116.

[p. 1115] *History*. The general revolt against ecclesiastical rule which characterized the earlier years of the last century was the occasion for the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church. The Methodist Episcopal Church at that time vested an unlimited legislative, executive, and judicial power in the ministry, to the exclusion of all the lay

members...
In 1827 a convention was called which formally petitioned the General Conference of 1828 to concede the principle of lay representation in all the conferences of the church.
The reply was unfavorable and the petitioners were charged with being disturbers of the peace of the church... [p. 1116] A number of local independent societies were organized, and a convention was held in Baltimore in November 1828, where a provisional organization was formed under the name of The Associated Methodist Churches. Two years later another convention was held at the same place, and the Methodist Protestant Church was formed, enrolling 83 ministers and about 5,000 members...

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrine the Methodist Protestant Church stands on the same basis as the Methodist Episcopal Church. In polity, however, there are certain radical differences. The Methodist Protestant Church has no bishops or presiding elders and no life officers of any kind. It makes ministers and laymen equal in number and in power in the legislative bodies of the church.

1048. Methodists—Wesleyan Methodist Church (Formerly, Connection) of America

SOURCE: CRB, 1936 Vol. 2, pp. 1124, 1125.

[p. 1124] *History*. The various divisions of Methodism have separated from the parent body on questions of ethics, polity, and nationality, and not for doctrinal reasons; and the Wesleyan Methodist Connection (or Church) of America shares with the other Methodist bodies the inheritance of its history and literature from the period of John Wesley's conversion to the date of its own organization as a separate denomination in 1843.

As the question of the enslaving of the colored race in America began to compel attention not only in political life, but in church life, there arose within the Methodist Episcopal Church many earnest opposers of slavery. Their activities were opposed by some of the ecclesiastical authorities of the church, resulting in the expulsion of a number of persons and the withdrawal of others. [p. 1125] The stand taken by these persons was that the Bible and early Methodist authorities united in declaring slavery to be wrong, and the church should not condemn liberty of testimony and free discussion. These persons joined forces, and in 1841 a conference was formed in Michigan which took the name of Wesleyan Methodist. The next year a paper was issued in Massachusetts called "The True Wesleyan," with Rev. Orange Scott as editor. In November 1842 Rev. J. Horton and Rev. L. R. Sunderland became identified with this movement and in December were joined by Rev. Luther Lee and Rev. L. C. Matlock. The result was the formation

on May 31, 1843, in Utica, N. Y., of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection (or Church) of America. About 6,000 members united in this organization. At first these churches were all located in the northeastern States, but missionary and evangelistic evangelic activities have since built up churches throughout the United States and in eastern Canada.

With the passing of slavery in the Civil War, one of the issues that called the church into existence ceased to exist. Numerical losses were sustained in this period, but the conviction prevailed that other important issues of a spiritual and reform character should continue to be maintained, chief of which were the advocacy of the experience of entire sanctification and the prohibition of the liquor traffic.

Doctrine. In doctrine the church is in accord with historic Methodism. It holds that man is not only justified by faith in Christ, but also sanctified by faith. Special emphasis is placed upon this experience, and it is defined in the Discipline in the following manner: Article of Religion XIV—Entire Sanctification

Entire sanctification is that work of the Holy Spirit by which the child of God is cleansed from all inbred sin through faith in Jesus Christ. It is subsequent to regeneration, and is wrought when the believer presents himself a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God, and is thus enabled through grace to love God with all the heart and to walk in His holy commandments blameless. Entire sanctification as a separate Article of Religion, distinct from that of regeneration, appeared in the Book of Discipline in 1849.

The great cardinal doctrines of Christianity as interpreted in the general standards of Methodism are received by this church. Briefly stated, the Wesleyan Methodist Connection (or Church) of America believes: (1) In one God revealed in the Holy Trinity: The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; (2) in the divine inspiration of the authority of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, and that they contain all things necessary to salvation; (3) that man is born with a fallen nature, and is therefore inclined to sin and that continually; (4) that the atonement through Christ is for the whole human race, and that whosoever repents and believes on the Lord Jesus Christ as his Saviour is justified and regenerated and saved from the dominion of sin; (5) that believers are sanctified wholly subsequent to conversion through faith in Christ; (6) in the bodily resurrection of Christ, and His return, in the resurrection of the dead, and in the final judgment.

Organization. Though it is not an episcopal body, this church conforms in its general features to the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, with a quarterly conference,

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

annual conferences, and a ... General Conference, which meets every 4 years, [and] is the lawmaking body of the connection, limited by a constitution.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 43,392 (YAC, 1961, p. 256).]

1049. Millennium—Definition (Word Not in Bible)

SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1933), p. 579. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

Preliminary we note that the word "millennium" does not occur in the Bible. It is a coined word, which, however, has obtained the sanction of general usage because it has proved a convenient substitute for the phrase "thousand years", which phrase occurs six times in the first seven verses of Revelation XX.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Merriam-Webster unabridged dictionary defines the word *millennium* literally as "a thousand years," and notes that "some believe that" Christ will reign on earth during that period. In *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Vol. 7, p. 374) the word is presented in terms of the popular view that the millennium is a reign of Christ and the saints *on earth* for a thousand years or an unmeasured period before the end of the world.]

1050. Millennium, Earthly Kingdom During, Not in Scripture SOURCE: MacCulloch, "Eschatology," in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 5, p. 388. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

In spite of the fact that, save in the Apocalypse, the NT did not speak of the Millennium, and that Christ does not connect the Parousia with the establishment of an earthly Kingdom, this belief had an extraordinary hold on the minds of [early] Christians. Doubtless a misunderstanding of the Apocalypse gave the belief a certain authority, but it is rather from its Jewish antecedents that its popularity and the elaboration of its details are to be explained.

1051. Millennium, Earthly Rule of Christ in, Not Scriptural SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1933) p. 590. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

There is not a word or hint to warrant the idea that the thousand years [of Revelation 20] were to be a period during which Jesus Christ would reign in bodily presence over the world and with Him the people of God in their resurrection bodies.

Surely if the current millennial doctrines were right as to their essential features there would be something to support them in the millennium passage itself; and conversely, since they find not a word of support therein, we are bound to reject them as unscriptural, unless other Scriptures afford clear proof that Christ and His resurrected people will reign during the thousand years over the earth peopled with unregenerate Jews and Gentiles, the Jews being restored to their ancient territory and invested with world supremacy.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In other works Mauro shows the "other Scriptures," namely, the kingdom prophecies, commonly adduced for such a doctrine do not support it. See also No. 1052.]

1052. Millennium, Jewish-Kingdom View of, Not in Prophecies SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans 1933), p. 580. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

Moreover, to many of those who look for an earthly millennium, such as indicated above, it will be characterized prominently by the fulfilment of the ancient Jewish dreams of restored nationalism, the destruction of all natural enemies and world-hegemony for the Jewish nation. Those Jewish expectations, which are founded upon a miscalled "literal" interpretation of certain OT prophecies, include the re-birth of "Israel after the flesh"; their reoccupation of the territory promised to Abraham (from the great sea to the river Euphrates); and their national exaltation to the place of world-supremacy and lordship over the nations; the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem, and the restoration of the Aaronic priesthood together with the sacrifices, feasts and ceremonies of the Mosaic ritual.

As to these views and expectations it will suffice to say at this point that there is not the slightest support for any of them in the millennium passage itself [Rev. 20:1, 7], for that short passage says not a word concerning the conditions of human life on earth during the thousand years. The facts in that regard are: first, that the current millennial doctrines derive absolutely nothing from that passage except the name; and second, that the prophecies, which are supposed to predict a coming era of national glory for Israel and of blissful conditions of life for the Gentiles, contain nothing whereby that supposed era can be identified with the thousand years of Revelation XX.

1053. Millennium—Not a Halfway Mortal-Immortal State Between Present Conditions and Eternal State

SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1933), pp. 622, 623. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

[p. 622] The pre-millennialist is fully supported by Scripture in holding that there cannot be an era of earthly blessedness before the second advent of Christ...

[p. 623] Likewise the A-millennialists are right in holding that there is no earthly millennium of universal brotherhood of man—a half way state between the natural condition of man and the eternal bliss of the redeemed—intervening between the day of grace and the day of glory. This is perhaps the most distinctive feature of current millennialism and undoubtedly is the hardest to reconcile with the whole body of "the doctrine of Christ", as set forth in the Scriptures. Whether placed before or after the Second Advent, the difficulty of finding room for such an era in the future history of mankind as foreshown in Bible prophecy is not to be overcome by any reasonable process. That earth's population should be for a thousand years under the absolute sway of Him Who put away sin and vanquished death and yet be subject in a measure to both those dread powers; that the nations should be almost saved but not wholly, and other like ideas, are so incongruous and so destitute of scriptural support as fully to justify the extreme a-millennial position, were there not another view [see No. 1052] and one that avoids the described difficulty.

1054. Millennium, Theories of—History of Millennialism

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 58, 59. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 58] The Kingdom of God in the first two centuries was universally held to be eschatological and often millenarian. Origen interpreted it spiritually and Augustine identified it with the present reign of Christ in the world through his church; and thus both Origen and Augustine eliminated the millenarian interpretation. Medieval theologians identified the kingdom of God with the visible church, and the Reformers equated it with the invisible church. This interpretation of the Reformers may still be seen in contemporary scholars such as Vos and Allis who adhere to the Reformed Faith.

Under the influence of Ritschl the kingdom was viewed as a present spiritual reality in a way that was consonant with evolutionary philosophy. The activity of the Gospel in the world was interpreted in line with the movement of evolutionary progress which was destined to make the world the scene of the realization of the fullness of God's kingdom.

A reaction arose in liberal scholarship with Schweitzer and Weiss who represented Jesus as teaching that the kingdom was only eschatological and apocalyptic and that the world was immediately to come to its end when God would set up the kingdom. Most subsequent liberal studies have retained the view that the Gospels represent Jesus as teaching that the world would end apocalyptically within a generation and that at this point Jesus was in error. Critics have attempted to obviate this difficulty either by excising the apocalyptic element as unessential, irrelevant to the kernel of Jesus' true teaching, or by setting it aside as unauthentic by literary and historical [p. 59] criticism. Others have attempted to find some solution which would admit a present kingdom in his teachings as well as a future apocalyptic kingdom.

Recent conservative students have concerned themselves particularly about the pros and cons of the millennial interpretation of the kingdom. Premillennialism in America has been largely identified with the dispensational view, which distinguishes between the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God and ignores the purpose of Jesus to establish a present spiritual kingdom. A strong reaction to this type of premillennialism has arisen in amillennialism, which interprets the kingdom largely in terms of a present spiritual reality in the invisible church and denies any future millennial kingdom.

From this review of the history of interpretation, several important conclusions are to be noted. 1. Many conservative students have withdrawn from the movements of contemporary criticism and have not been concerned with the problems which have been raised by the many recent critical discussions. 2. The problem of whether the kingdom of God is both present and future has challenged both liberals and conservatives. The search still goes on to find a key which will provide an essential unity between these two aspects and which will do justice to the data of the Gospels. 3. Most conservative studies have been concerned with only one aspect of the kingdom, viz., the character of its eschatological phase, whether it will involve an earthly reign of Christ or not. Amillennialists deny the future earthly reign of Christ; premillennialists, at least of the dispensational persuasion, tend to minimize if not to deny a present spiritual kingdom inaugurated by Christ.

1055. Millennium, Theories of—History of Millennialism SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 234–236, 238, 239. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 234] Whatever there was of chiliasm in the ancient Church was overwhelmingly premillennarian...

[p. 235] Medieval chiliasm was just as uniformly of the postmillenarian type as ancient chiliasm had been of the premillennarian type...

The connection of the status of the Church with the form which chiliastic ideals assumed was close indeed. Its closeness can be gauged by the fact, that ancient Premillennialism began to wane as soon as the persecutions ceased, and that medieval Postmillenarianism appeared only when the dangers and the limitations of hierarchical absolutism became undeniably manifest. This connection receives further illustration from the fact that ancient Premillennialism needed no repression but died of itself when the Church had won social recognition and political standing; while medieval Postmillennialism had to be driven out by the one dominant Church and had to be forced into hiding and even then did not die but lived on, deriving continually new strength from the persistence and increase of the evils which it condemned and against which it was the protest.

[p. 236] The modern age has fallen heir to both, the ancient political-social and the medieval ecclesiastical interpretation of the Christian hope for human history. There may

have been little actual continuity in the traditions, but the fact remains that, no sooner had the Reformation begun, but the double attempt was made of turning it in the direction of the realization of the Pure Church of the Holy Spirit and the Saints and at the same time employing it in the services of economic amelioration and political revolution. It is significant for the mind of the Reformers, that they rejected and resisted both attempts; it is also significant, that both attempts originated with one and the same group, the Anabaptists.

For thus it fell out, that this double heritage from the Christian past became the rather characteristic possesson first of all of the sects, while in the established Churches there was no room for it. There was, moreover, a significant difference as to the possibility of realization between the two parts of this double heritage: the premillennial hope for the social-political realm had first to be transmuted into a postmillennial form before it allowed of human attempts to realize it; but the ideal of the Pure Church of the Spirit was postmillennial in its origins and as such had no need to wait for the visible return of the Lord but permitted directly of attempts to realize it. As a consequence, the sects and dissenters in the main continued the social-political ideal as a hope, while they in the main developed a tendency to present themselves as the realization of the ecclesiastical-religious ideal...

[p. 238] If we want to understand the later prevalence of Christian chiliasm among American Protestants, we must above all bear in mind this fundamental fact, that in virtue of its beginnings and early history America was predisposed to just such a development. The actual detailed forces which brought Christian chiliasm to the fore in our country wrought their effects, and can therefore be understood, only against that larger background...

[p. 239] A factor which affected America specifically was, of course, the fact that American hospitality had already attracted and was continuing to attract to our shores all kinds of European chiliasts for the purpose of escaping from their unfavorable situations. Moreover, it is said that after 1843 American evangelism and revivalism has never lost the premillenarian note; and the revivalists and evangelists have widely influenced and brought down to a common level the orthodoxy of the Churches of Calvinistic provenance here...

Finally, the fact is well known, that modernism or neoprotestantism has adopted the Christian concept of the kingdom as the symbol for its own cultural hopes and has thereby temporarily given great encouragement and deceitful friendship to the Postmillenarians. When neoprotestantism at the beginning of the present century began its triumphant march through America, the association of liberalism with Postmillennialism and, by way of reaction, of fundamentalism with Premillennialism became practically unavoidable.

1056. Millennium, Theories of—Medieval Augustinian View SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 147, 148. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 147] Augustine, bishop of Hippo, ... sought [p. 148] a new philosophy of history with which to meet the puzzling crises of his own day. The Roman empire, which had been the organizing and stabilizing power of the world, was slowly tottering to its complete collapse. The sack of Rome by Alaric in 410 and the subsequent invasion of North Africa, Augustine's own country, by the barbarian hordes prompted Augustine to rethink the whole position of the Christian church. In his famous work, *The City of God*,

he advanced the doctrine that the city or commonwealth of the world was doomed to perish, whereas the "city of God," the church, was continuing and taking its place. He taught that the "city of God" was identical with the church, and that as the latter grew in power and influence it would gradually bring all men under its sway and would introduce the reign of righteousness.

This doctrine of Augustine became the basis for the temporal claims of the Roman church. If the kingdom was to grow irresistibly until it dominated the earth, and if the visible church was identical with the kingdom, then the visible church could rightfully assume political power, and could make its conquests by force.

A second consequence of Augustine's teaching was the concept that the church must gradually increase in numbers and in possessions until it should achieve world dominion. The fact that it had become the state religion of the empire seemingly corroborated this thought. When the political structure of the empire crashed, Augustine felt that stability and survival could be achieved by the church as the "city of God." The system of the world might be passing away, but the church, being divine in origin, would endure.

To reach this conclusion Augustine had to employ an allegorical method of interpretation that divested Scripture of literal meaning and that emptied it of any certain significance. He taught that the millennium is the era beginning with the first advent of Christ and continuing to the second advent; that the "first resurrection" is spiritual; that the binding of Satan has already been completed; and that the reign of Christ is now in progress.

Since Christ must reign "till he hath put all his enemies under his feet" (1 Cor. 15:25), from this philosophy one would deduce logically that the present era must continue until the church is triumphant. Augustine's view was later adopted by Thomas Aquinas, and became the official teaching of the Roman church.

1057. Millennium, Theories of—Medieval Chiliasm

SOURCE: Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium* (Fair Lawn, N.J.: Essential Bks., 1957), pp. xiii, xiv. Used by permission of Oxford University Press, Inc., New York.

[p. xiii] The Middle Ages had inherited from Antiquity—from the Jews and early Christians—a tradition of prophecy which during those same centuries took on a fresh and exuberant vitality. In the language of theology-which seems here the most appropriate language—there existed an eschatology, or body of doctrine concerning the final state of the world, which was chiliastic in the most general sense of the term meaning that it foretold a Millennium, not necessarily limited to a thousand years and indeed not necessarily limited at all, in which the world would be inhabited by a humanity at once perfectly good and perfectly happy. Offering so much solace of a kind which the official teaching of the medieval Church withheld, this eschatology came to exercise a powerful and enduring fascination. Generation after generation was seized at least intermittently by a tense expectation of some sudden, miraculous event in which the world would be utterly transformed, some prodigious final struggle between the hosts of Christ and the hosts of Antichrist through which history would attain its fulfillment and justification. Although it would be a gross over-simplification to identify the world of chiliastic exal- [p. xiv] tation with the world of social unrest, there were many times when needy and discontented masses were captured by some millennial prophet.

1058. Millennium, Theories of—Modern Amillennialism

SOURCEMerrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 151–154. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 151] The amillennial interpretation holds that the passage in Revelation 20:1–8 does not refer to a period to come *after* the conquest of the world by the gospel, but that it is either a description of the current period before the return of the Lord, or else that it has no particular significance. The argument of the amillenarians is that the passage in Revelation is highly figurative, that it occurs only in one place in the most symbolic book of the Bible, and that its main concept of the thousand years is never found elsewhere in Scripture. It is therefore a relatively unimportant aspect of eschatology which cannot be used to establish any chronological sequence of events or any very definite scheme of the last things.

Amillennialism has been adopted in the last twenty-five years by those who have not found the postmillennial position tenable, but who are not fully satisfied with premillennialism. Amillennialism is not strictly novel, either. It can be traced back as far [p. 152] as Augustine, and perhaps earlier. It asserts the personal return of Christ to claim His church, to overthrow antichrist, and to judge the world, but it does not regard the millennium as a period of definable length intervening between the appearing of Christ and the establishment of the eternal state. Augustine contended that it was equivalent to the present era, in which Satan is restrained while the gospel is preached. Mauro advanced the theory that it represents the spiritual triumph of the martyrs who are now reigning with Christ an opinion echoed by others including Hamilton, who adds that the believers are now reigning upon the earth.

The defense of the amillennial position is both negative and positive. Negatively the amillenarian objects to what he calls the crass materialism of the premillennial system...

[p. 153] The kingdom in Revelation is treated as already existent (1:6, 9), and should not therefore be relegated to the distant future, subsequent to the return of Christ. Jesus came "preaching the kingdom" (Mark 1:14, 15; Matt 4:23; John 3:5), a ministry which was continued by His successors, notably Paul (Acts 20:25). From this the amillenarian argues that Jesus did establish the kingdom in a spiritual sense, and that the reference to "reigning" in Revelation 20 is to be understood in the same way...

The amillenarian customarily interprets the "first resurrection" of Revelation 20:5 as figurative... [p. 154] Thus the second resurrection of Revelation 20:12–15 becomes the final physical resurrection of all the dead righteous and unrighteous alike, from all eras...

It should be said that the advocates of the amillennial view generally believe in the personal return of Christ, and that they are much less likely than the postmillennarian school to equate it with the achievement of an evolutionary goal or with the acme of social progress. Amillennialism does not necessarily reject the concept of a real return of Christ at the consummation of the age.

1059. Millennium, Theories of—Modern Amillennialism, Definition and Emphasis of

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 55, 56. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 55]The most recent volume [seting forth amillennialism] has come from Professor Louis Berkhof, President-Emeritus of Calvin Theological Seminary, entitled *The Kingdom of God*. This study is of especial interest to the present survey because its two final chapters deal with the kingdom of God as a millennial hope. In them Professor Berkhof insists that there is no biblical ground for a belief in a literal earthly millennial phase of the kingdom, and he raises five objections to the chiliastic interpretation which constitute one of the most concise and sane criticisms of the position to be found in contemporary literature because they are addressed to the basic premillennial position rather than to the special dispensational interpretation of it [see Nos. 1071, 1072].

Throughout these amillennial books runs a negative emphasis. Far more effort is expended in denying the premillennial view and in attacking its weaknesses than there is upon the positive position which these authors espouse. This position has come to be known as amillennialism. The kingdom of God will not involve a reign of Christ on earth for a thousand years, as Revelation 20 seems to teach, after the second [p. 56] advent of Christ and before the final judgment. The Old Testament prophecies which seem to envisage such an earthly kingdom are not to be interpreted literally but spiritually. They realize their fulfillment in the church, the new people of God, which has now entirely supplanted Israel as a nation so far as God's redemptive purposes are concerned. The kingdom of God is entirely a spiritual thing, a present reality. The millennial reign of Christ in Revelation 20 is also to be interpreted spiritually. It may refer to the present reign of Christ in the world through the church and in the lives of God's people, a view which originated with Augustine; or it may refer to the souls of Christians who have been martyred as they now reign with Christ in heaven in the intermediate state.

1060. Millennium, Theories of—Modern Amillennialism, Definition and Views of

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 35–37. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 35] The third generic view [besides pre- and postmillennialism] of the

interpretation of the facts of Scripture relating to eschatology, is called *Amillennialism*. The name itself is unfortunate in that it would seem to indicate that its advocates do not believe in the thousand year period of Revelation 20. The name literally means "no millennium," while as a matter of fact its advocates believe that the millennium is a spiritual or heavenly millennium, rather than the earthly one of a literal reign of Christ on earth before the final judgment. From one point of view it might be called a variety of postmillennialism, since it believes that the spiritual or heavenly millennium *precedes* the Second Coming of Christ. The only mention in the Bible of a kingdom of Christ limited to a 1000 years is in the 20th chapter of the Revelation where it is said that the "souls" are seen reigning with Christ during the 1000 years. A thousand, the number of perfection or completion, is held to be the symbolic reference to the perfect period, or the complete period between the two comings of Christ.

The picture of eschatological events, without any discussion at present of the supporting any discussion at present of the supporting Scripture passages, is as follows. Like the premillennialist we [the amillennialists] view the world as a mixture of good and evil up to the time of the Rapture [see No. 1521]. We have no hope or expectation that the whole world will grow better and better until it is all converted to Christianity. We expect that wars will continue [p. 36] right up to the time of the end when Christ comes to set things right. We expect the elect to be gathered out of an evil world, though we do believe that the command of Christ to preach the gospel to the whole world must be obeyed, and that it is our duty to endeavor to establish a Christian society as far as it is in our power to do so, but while we have the obligation to do this, we by no means expect that the whole of society will be Christianized. In fact, we expect the forces of evil to grow more and more violent in their opposition to Christianity and Christians. This is no

way excuses us from the attempt to propagate Christian principles as well as the gospel in the world.

At the close of the present age we expect the forces of evil to head up in a powerful combination of political, economic and religious power led by the Antichrist. At the close of the reign of the Antichrist or Man of Sin, he institutes a terrible persecution against the Christian Church (not against the Jews as some premillennialists assert). In this terrible tribulation vast numbers of Christians are killed, but at the climax, when the hosts of Satan seem to be on the point of complete victory, during the battle of Armageddon, Christ appears in the Shekinah glory, the resurrection of all men takes place, and the transfigured bodies of the dead and living saints are caught up to welcome their Saviour. Then, as a terrible outpouring of the wrath of God occurs, smiting the unbelieving nations of the world into destruction, the Jewish people look "on Him whom they pierced," repent and believe instantaneously in their Messiah. Simultaneously with their conversion and regeneration by the Holy Spirit, as they see Christ coming on the clouds, they too are transfigured with the living Church of Christ of the ages. This completes the number of the elect, and from that point onward there is no more salvation for men.

As soon as the rapture is consummated, Christ and His Church return to earth for the Great White Throne Judgment, or, since [p. 37] the descriptions of the Judgment in the Bible do not *necessitate* believing that it occurs on the earth, perhaps this judgment occurs in the air after the rapture. It is not clear from Scripture as to what happens to the resurrected bodies of the wicked. Certainly they are revivified if not transfigured, and since they gather instantaneously after their resurrection before the Great White Throne, for the final Judgment, and since eternal punishment concerns the soul rather than the body of man, there is reason to believe that the resurrected bodies of the wicked have superhuman qualities, though they certainly are still sinful bodies, filled with corruption and evil, marred by the deformities of sin. At any rate they "hear the voice of the Son of Man and live," at the same time as the righteous dead.

After the Judgment, the eternal kingdom of God is established in the new heaven and on the new earth, for the old heaven and the new earth are passed away. The chief characteristics of the new heaven and the new earth will be the absence of sin and evil, the eternal manifestation of the presence of the Triune God before the eyes of the Redeemed, and the perfection of the glorious new earth. This will continue through all eternity.

1061. Millennium, Theories of—Modern Amillennialism, Variations in SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 258, 259, 261–263. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 258] The amillennial millennium is of an entirely different order than either the premillenarian or the postmillenarian millennium, which are both conceived as still future periods of human history next to the present and the prechristian periods of history on this earth...

[p. 259] There is need of recognizing variations in Amillennialism. It is far from being a perfectly unified system or scheme of eschatology. It is quite clear that Hamilton limits the thousand years of the reign with Christ to the disembodied spirits in heaven; but it is equally certain, that this is not what Augustine, the father of the amillennial view, did. He embraced in that reign also the believers who do battle here on earth with lusts, and the elders who rule in and over the churches. In a sense, the elimination of these two modes of ruling with Christ may be hailed as a simplification and improvement upon the Augustinian Amillennialism; but it should at any rate be recognized, that it is not the only type of Amillennialism...

[p. 261] Again, it is very much to be doubted, whether all Amillenarians of today are agreed with Hamilton's representation of the amillenarian position of the subject of the conversion of the Jews. It is to be feared, that some are not ready to concede such a conversion at the end of time at all, and that many will not agree either with him or among themselves as to the details even when they do expect a national conversion of Israel...

[p. 262] In his [Hamilton's] judgment Amillennialism is in general agreement with Premillennialism in its conception of what precedes the rapture [see No. 1521] and of the order in which it precedes the rapture, and that it is [p. 263] in general agreement with Postmillennialism in its conception of what follows the rapture and of the order of those later events. This is no doubt correct in the main, and to understand this relationship will help us to correlate the three main eschatological views.

1062. Millennium, Theories of—Post- and Pre-millennialists Both Have Future Millennium

SOURCE: Philip Mauro, *Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1933), p. 579. Copyright 1933 by Philip Mauro. Used by permission.

Both pre- and post-millennialists hold that the millennium is a definite era of earth's future history [see editors' note below], a golden age, presenting the greatest possible contrast to all previous ages in that peace, health and prosperity will prevail during the whole millennial period throughout the world. Both schools are in agreement that it will be the long looked for era in which the lion will lie down with the lamb, and the nations of the world will beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning hooks, and will not learn war any more.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In attributing the belief in an *earthly* millennium to "both pre- and postmillennialists," Mauro apparently is unaware that Seventh-day Adventists, though premillennialists, are exceptions to this generalization (see No. 7n).]

1063. Millennium, Theories of—Post-millennialism, as Defined by Hamilton

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 31–33. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 31] Post-millennialism ... teaches that a thousand years of peace and righteousness will precede the Second Coming of Christ. The postmillenialist looks for the conversion of practically the whole world through the preaching of the Gospel in this dispensation. Then, with the establishment of justice and righteousness throughout the world, with the elimination of war and evil, the world will enter into the Golden Age when righteousness shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea and every knee shall bow and every tongue confess Jesus as Lord and Saviour. They expect the world to become better and better, until at last truly Christian government is established all over the world, the hosts of Satan are defeated, and Satan himself vanquished from the earth.

As a part of the universal reign of righteousness the teaching of the New Testament that the Jews will be converted to Christianity, (Rom. 11:26), follows as a logical corollary. The postmillennialists deny that there will be any national restoration of the Jews as a nation in Palestine [see No. 1073n]. All that the New Testament teaches is that

the Jews will be saved, not that they will again become a separate nation. If that should occur it would be entirely apart from the fulfillment of prophecy.

Postmillennialists do not dwell much on the question of the binding and loosing of Satan, mentioned in the 20th chapter of the Revelation. What is to occur would be purely figurative, referring to the limiting of Satan's power through the triumphs of [p. 32] Christ and the Gospel ushering in the millennium preceding the coming of Christ. They would declare that it is quite possible that at the close of the 1000 years of peace there might be a flare up of Satanic power to be destroyed by the appearance of Christ on the clouds in glory.

They hold that when the prophecies of the end time are fulfilled, at the sound of the trumpet, all the dead, both saved and unsaved, will be raised, while the righteous will be raptured with glorified bodies of living believers, to meet the Lord in the air during the battle of Armageddon. After the welcome, the vials of God's wrath will be poured out on the earth, destroying the wicked, overturning the armies of the Antichrist at the conclusion of the battle of Armageddon, (which begins just before the coming of Christ in the clouds), and Christ will judge the earth in the judgment of the Great White Throne. This judgment will be the same as the judgment of the sheep and the goats, and the judgment scene of II Thes. 1:7–10.

After the final judgment, Christ turns over the kingdom to the Father, and the eternal kingdom of Christ will be established. The new heavens and earth will come into existence with the coming to earth of the new Jerusalem pictured in Rev. 21–22...

[p. 33] World War No. I, shattered the hopes of the advocates of peace through international cooperation, in the Hague Peace Congress. The failure of the League of Nations and the breaking of World War No. II, have given the final death blow to any hopes of the ushering in of an era of universal peace and joy through the interplay of forces now in action in the world.

1064. Millennium, Theories of—Post-millennialism Created by Whitby and Vitringa

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 32, 33. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 32] A new and different interpretation was created by Daniel Whitby (1706) who thought that the world was to be [p. 33] completely evangelized and the Church to rule the world. Vitringa (d. 1722) applied this view to the interpretation of the Revelation producing postmillennialism. He followed the historical interpretation for the first nineteen chapters and interpreted the first part of chapter twenty as a future era when the Church would reign over the world after the destruction of anti-Christian Rome. The millennium was thus placed in the future but before the return of Christ; and the meaning of "postmillennialism" is that Christ's return would occur only after the millennial period. One of the most famous exponents of this view was David Brown (1891), one of the co-editors of the widely used Jamieson, Fausset and Brown's *Commentary on the Bible*.

1065. Millennium, Theories of—Post-millennialism, Development and Decline of

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 147, 149–151. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 147] The postmillennial school interprets the passage [Rev. 20:1–8] as figurative, and asserts that a return of Christ to judge the earth and to set up the eternal kingdom comes at the end of the millennium. Its teaching assumes that the gospel of Christ will slowly but surely subdue all nations; that the kingdom of God is identical with the church; and that when the church has done its work of extending the spiritual sway of Christ over the entire earth that His personal advent may be expected.

The postmillennial school had its roots historically in the teaching of Augustine, bishop of Hippo [see No. 1056]...

[p. 149] The form of postmillennialism which is more familiar today began in the eighteenth century with Daniel Whitby, a Unitarian commentator who shared in the production of the *Paraphrase and Commentary on the New Testament* published in London in 1703 in collaboration with Patrick, Arnold, Lowth, and Lowman. Whitby's principles can be stated in four general propositions:

- 1. The "first resurrection" is not to be taken as a literal physical resurrection of the dead. It is a revival of the genuine spirit of the martyrs in the church, and is ecclesiastical, spiritual, and national.
- 2. The millennium is yet to come. It will be preceded by a triumph over the papacy and heathenism in general, and will begin with the conversion of the world at large. At this point Whitby differed from Augustine, who identified the millennium with the present age. In this respect Augustine was more nearly an amillenarian than Whitby.
- 3. Satan will no longer trouble men. He will be bound and inactive.
- 4. The church will triumph completely, and will fill the earth with its benevolent rule. At the close of the period there will be a short rebellion; the final judgment will take place; and Christ will establish His eternal kingdom.

Whitby's view, although admittedly a new hypothesis, became very popular and prevailed in American Protestantism throughout most of the nineteenth century.

To those living in that "Great Century" from the close of the Napoleonic wars in 1815 to the opening of the first world war in 1914, the postmillennial view seemed to be justified by historical events. The increase of colonies and protectorates established by "Christian" nations in Africa and in Asia opened new doors for propagation of the Christian faith. The growth of a sense of missionary responsibility led to the founding of new societies and to expansion into the South Sea Islands, China, India, Africa, and other places. The agitation for the international peace table at the Hague convinced many people that war would shortly be outlawed, and that the settlement of disagreements by force of arms would cease. Literacy and education increased. All of these factors produced a feeling of optimism which was embodied in the preaching that "the kingdom is coming."

The liberal wing of Christianity that had adopted the philosophy of evolution modified the postmillennialism of its orthodox [p. 150] forbears by substituting social change and a general triumph of righteousness for the personal return of Christ. Judgment was interpreted to be the inexorable working of the social process by which evil would be surmounted and ultimately discarded. On both sides of the theological fence men felt that the age of righteousness was about to be ushered into existence...

The spectacle of so-called [p. 151] Christian nations bent on the destruction of each other, the curtailment of missionary endeavor which was the inevitable result of war, the rise of Communism in Russia which transformed a former "Christian" nation into an

atheistic state and which has brought 800,000,000 people behind the iron curtain, the wholesale murder of entire populations such as the Jews in Germany and the farmers of the Ukraine in Russia, demonstrate quite clearly that human nature has not become Christian and that the millennium has not yet arrived...

The old optimism has been eclipsed by a hopelessness that is quite its opposite, and the postmillennial concept of a world rapidly on its way to realizing the kingdom of God as the latter is defined in the New Testament has proved illusory.

1066. Millennium, Theories of—Postmillennialism Fifty Years Ago and Now

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 46–48. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 46] Fifty years ago, it was possible to look upon the kingdom of God as a new principle, supernatural to be sure, which had been set at work in the hearts of men, which was destined to permeate like leaven all human relationships and slowly but steadily transform human society on this earth so that eventually God's will would be done among all men in all areas of life, and thus God's kingdom would come, B. B. Warfield was sure that a golden age was ahead for the church when the Gospel of Christ had conquered the world. "The earth-the whole earth-must be won to Christ before He comes..."⁶ [Note 6: Biblical Doctrines (New York: Oxford University Press, 1929), p. 663. These words are taken from his essay, "The Millennium and the Apocalypse" which was originally published in *The Princeton Theological Review* in 1904.] "There is a 'golden age' before the Church—at least an age relatively golden gradually ripening to higher and higher glories as the Church more and more fully conquers the world and all the evil of the world" (p. 664). This interpretation [p. 47] has come to be known as postmillennialism, for it is held, as Warfield indicates, that Christ will not return to earth until after a golden age or millennium on earth when Christ through his Church has conquered the world...

This interpretation of the kingdom has not sustained itself after two world wars, a world-shaking depression, and the veritable incarnation of satanic evils which the present generation is witnessing. However, an article appearing recently in a scholarly journal defending the postmillennial interpretation [p. 48] of the Scriptures as a necessity to bolster a sound Christian optimism indicates that the position is not altogether dead.¹⁰ [Note 10: *Cf.* Allan R. Ford, "The Second Advent in Relation to the Reign of Christ," *The Evangelical Quarterly* XXIII (1951), pp. 30–39.]

1067. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Early Church View SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, p. 31. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

In this survey of the early centuries we have found that the Church interpreted the book of Revelation along futurist lines [see editors' note below]; i.e., they understood the book to predict the eschatological events which would attend the end of the world. The Antichrist was understood to be an evil ruler of the end-times who would persecute the Church, afflicting her with great tribulation. Every church father who deals with the subject expects the Church to suffer at the hands of Antichrist. God would purify the Church through suffering, and Christ would save her by His return at the end of the Tribulation when He would destroy Antichrist, deliver His Church, and bring the world to an end and inaugurate His millennial kingdom. The prevailing view is a posttribulation premillennialism. We can find no trace of pretribulationism in the early church; and no

modern pretribulationist has successfully proved that this particular doctrine was held by any of the church fathers or students of the Word before the nineteenth century.

[EDITORS' NOTE: To the early-church premillennialists the fulfillment of most of these prophecies was necessarily future in their day, but they saw them as already begun and in progress. For the vast difference between this view and what is today understood as futurism, see No. 1255. Although most premillennialists in the various churches today are Futurists, such an outlook is a modern development.]

1068. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Early Expectation of a Golden Age on Earth

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, p. 48. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

We have seen that the earliest interpretation of the kingdom of God was primarily an eschatological one and promised a golden age on the earth [see No. 1050] *after* the glorious return of Christ. This premillennial interpretation, as it is now called, has persisted throughout the history of the church although it has never been dominant since the second and third centuries A.D.¹¹ [Note 11: *Cf.* D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1945) for a history of the millennial interpretation of the kingdom.]

1069. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Early Fathers' Interpretation of Revelation 20

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 154, 155. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 154] The premillennial interpretation of eschatology in general [see No. 1073] and of Revelation in particular holds that the passage in Revelation [p. 155] 20:1–8 should be treated as a definite link in a chronological chain of text, and that it should be interpreted as literally as possible. Chapter 19 is the climax of the present age, when the Lord Jesus Christ returns in person to judge the earth and to defeat the armies of the antichrist who have received his mark and who have worshiped his image. At the consummation Satan is bound, and is cast into the abyss of darkness for a period of one thousand years, while the antichrist and his religious associate, the false prophet, are remanded to the lake of fire. The saints, now triumphant, will reign with Christ upon the earth, and the martyrs will be resurrected to share in the victory.

At the end of the thousand years Satan will be loosed from his imprisonment to test the strength of the new order. He will succeed in gaining a following from those nations on the periphery of the kingdom who have perhaps never given to Christ more than a grudging obedience. Their invasion of the kingdom and their siege of the capital city, presumably Jerusalem ("the beloved city"), will be terminated by swift and summary retribution. The utter doom of Satan and the judgment of the dead at the great white throne will follow immediately, and the descent of the eternal city of God will conclude the process of redemption.

The history of the premillenarian position is at least as old as either of the other views and in general it seems to accord better with such eschatological allusions as can be found in the earliest writings of the church fathers.

1070. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism, "Historic," and Its Variations

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 21–23. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 21] There have been many premillennialists in the past who have held to the view which we will call "historic premillennialism" [see No. 1073n]... [p. 22] The view ... is as follows:

- 1. Preceding the Second Coming of Christ the Antichrist will gather his followers for a great assault on the church of Christ. For some time he appears to be practically victorious, and institutes a great tribulation for the church, which passes through the tribulation.
- 2. At the close of this tribulation period Christ is suddenly seen appearing on the clouds of heaven, the dead in Christ rise first, the living elect are transfigured and the people of Israel look on Him whom they have pierced, repent and are saved, and the whole elect people of God are then raptured [i.e., snatched away] to meet the Lord in the air.
- 3. Christ then descends to the earth with His Bride, the Church, destroys the Antichrist and at the judgment of the Sheep and Goats, separates the righteous from the unrighteous, condemning the latter to eternal punishment.
- 4. Christ then sets up His millennial kingdom, ruling over the nations with a rod of iron, after the binding of Satan at the beginning of the millennium.
- 5. At the close of the millennium Satan is loosed from his prisonhouse, gathers the nations, in numbers as the sands of the seas, to war against the saints, but they are destroyed by fire from heaven.
- [p. 23] 6. Then follows the resurrection of the wicked, and the great White Throne Judgment (Rev. 20:11–15).
- 7. This in turn is followed by the new heaven and the new earth (Rev. 21), and the setting up of the eternal kingdom of God.

Even among these who hold to the "historic premillennialism," there is little agreement as to many details of the theory. Some hold that the millennial kingdom will be predominantly Jewish, with Christian Gentiles in a rather subordinate place, while others hold that the martyrs, and those who worshipped not the beast nor his image nor had his mark upon their forehead and hand, will occupy the ruling place during the millennium. Others believe that the Jews reign as unconverted Israelites during a restoration of the Jewish kingdom of Palestine, under a theocracy, with the church in heaven. Others hold that the whole church of Christ will reign during the millennium, with no distinction between Jews and Gentiles. There is a great deal of confusion as to the place of the restored temple worship during the millennium, while the premillennialists in general experience much difficulty in reconciling Old Testament eschatological prophecies with New Testament prophecies concerning the Second Coming. There is also much confusion as to the relationship between the transfigured saints with spiritual bodies, and the untransfigured "nations" over whom Christ reigns, during the millennium.

1071. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism, "Historic," and Vagaries of the System

SOURCE: C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 109, 110. Copyright © 1958 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 1109] In 1888 S. H. Kellogg wrote an article defending premillennialism in which he pointed out that many of the doctrines which were associated with the premillennialist position by its critics were merely vagaries of the system. He summed up the fundamental theological position of historic premillennialism [see No. 1073n] in four succinct points, and even a cursory reading of these shows clearly that dispensational distinctions are not a vital part of the doctrine. These four points are as follows:

- (1) The Scriptures teach us to expect on the earth a universal triumph of the gospel, and a prolonged supremacy of righteousness and truth.
- (2) They also teach that we are to expect a personal, visible return of the risen and ascended Christ, in the glory of his Father.
- (3) The teachings of the Scripture forbid us to place the predicted reign of righteousness on this side of the personal [p. 110] advent; they therefore compel us to place it on the other side of that event. Whence it follows that we must conclude that—
- (4) The purpose of the return of Christ to the earth is to set up and administer the promised kingdom of righteousness, by establishing over the whole earth a theocratic government, vested in the Son of man and his risen and glorified people who shall have believed on him up to the time of his appearing.

Kellogg considered such doctrines as "the restoration of Israel, and the position of that nation in the expected new order of things; the interpretation of the prophecies concerning the anti-christ; the distinction in time between the resurrection of the righteous and that of the wicked, etc.," to be doctrines more or less associated with this position. All of these, of course, are very closely associated with dispensationalism. It is into this category of peripheral doctrines that all the rest of the dispensational distinctions must also be classified. Premillennialism can be defined as a theological entity distinct from its dispensational trappings; and historically, it has been so defined and defended apart from dispensationalism. This interpretation of the relation between the two positions has been verified by recent developments within the premillennialist camp. I refer to the growing awareness among them that the dispensationalist interpretation of the Kingdom and Church is not entirely satisfactory. In spite of the long-standing claim made by some contemporary dispensationalists that all premillennialist must of logical necessity be dispensationalist, the opinion to the contrary seems to be gaining ground.

1072. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism, "Historic," Versus Dispensationalist Alterations

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 252, 253. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 252] Modern alterations in what is historically known as Premillennialism give one pause to think and to wonder. In the first place, they include several details which the general run of Christians, even of premillenarian Christians, fail to discover in Holy Writ. In the second place, as far as these alterations have their beginnings with the Catholic Apostolic Church ["Irvingites"] and the Plymouth Brethren, the question may legitimately be raised, whether those new details whose scriptural basis is not apparent have been discovered at all in an honest and unadulterated attempt to understand the Scriptures. One may not overlook the fact, that the first group harbors prophetism of so high a rank as to authorize it to revive an apostolate and to institute what is difficult to class except as a new sacrament. And, though the Plymouth Brethren apparently go not so far toward inspirationalism, they also without question lean in that direction in virtue of the all sufficient guidance which they claim to receive of the Holy Spirit...

In how far can the Pretribulationists and the Ultradispensationalists [or dispensationalists] rightfully demand to be classed with the Historic Premillenarians and to be viewed as the legitimate continuation of ancient Premilleniarism? We lack no evidence for the difference of the latter from such an ancient Premillenarian as Ireneus, who laid the foundations for the Reformed doctrine of the Covenants in his defense of the unity of the Bible over against the Gnostic heresy. And the theory of the former, that the believers will be raptured [taken up] before the anti-christian tribulation, flatly contradicts specific utterances of Ireneus and Lactantius and [p. 253] finds extremely little support, if any, among the other ancient Premillenarians.

It is this assumption of a pretribulation rapture of the saints, which introduces in modern Premillennialism a futurism which definitely separates it from the understanding of the Apocalypse which prevailed among the ancient Premillennialists. That assumption compels them to date the antichristian persecution and tribulation and the anti-christian power itself, it would seem, somewhere in the indefinite future as long as the first resurrection and the rapture have not yet occurred. Here is the place where the feature of the imminence of the return of Christ plays its role in these systems. This return is imminent in the sense that it may happen at any time; but by that same token the appearance and rule of antichrist is not imminent, and its presence now can not be thought of, since it follows upon the rapture of the saints. But such an idea of the antichrist the ancient Premillennialist definitely did not cherish, since they all with one accord saw the antichristian power already manifest and at work in persecuting the Christians: to them it was the pagan Roman imperial rule.

1073. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Literalist Interpretation

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 38–40, 42–44. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 38] One of the principal teachings of premillennialism is that the prophecies of the Old Testament must be interpreted literally unless the language of the Bible clearly indicates that a figure of speech is used by the author. Since the Old Testament contains definite promises of certain blessings to Israelites, it is claimed that those literal blessings must be given to the racial Israelites and to them alone, regardless of their rejection of Christ as Saviour. Since the Messiah is promised a reign upon the throne of David, it is held that the throne of David will again be established in Jerusalem, and all the nations of the world will go up to Jerusalem to worship, during a thousand year millennial kingdom...

[p. 39] Let us look for a moment at the various features of this kingdom which come from a literal interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies. Israel is to be restored to Palestine; other nations exist elsewhere but they are subservient to the Jews, (Is. 60:1– 22); people will have mortal bodies, live in houses, eat of physical vineyards, bear children, be subject to sickness and death, though not to the same degree as at present, (Zech. 14); the temple and the temple service will be restored with bloody sacrifices as sin-offerings to make atonement for the people, (Ezek[.] 45:17); the temple priests will teach the people the difference between clean and unclean things; the tribes of the earth will come up to Jerusalem yearly to keep the feast of the tabernacles. To this picture obtained from a literal interpretation of the Old Testament prophecies [see No. 1052] the premillennialists add that while the Messiah will reign in righteousness and every knee will bow to Him and confess Him as Lord, the nations of Gentiles will, in the main, be rebellious at heart, so that Christ reigns over them with a rod of iron, until they all rebel at the close of the millennium. This is the picture of a physical, earthly kingdom which a literal interpretation of all the prophecies of the Old Testament gives. The premillennialist insists that if we do not believe in this picture of the future, we [p. 40] reject the "plain teaching of Scripture," and are guilty of distorting the Word of God...

[p. 42] We must dwell still further upon this incongruous spectacle, in order to emphasize the hopeless maze of difficulties into which a literal interpretation of *all* the Old Testament prophecies plunges us. According to a literal interpretation of Ezekiel 40– 48 the whole ceremonial law is to be again set up in Israel. There will be meal-offerings. trespass-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, as well as burnt-offerings, (Ezek. 42:13; 45:17). The pass- [p. 43] over and the feast of unleavened bread will again be celebrated, (Ezek. 45:21–22). The priests will have to observe the elaborate ritual of changing their robes before and after ministering in the temple holy place, "that they sanctify not the people with their garments" (Ezek. 44:19). The whole precious doctrine of the individual priesthood of believers will apparently have to be discarded then, for only the priests can approach and enter the holy place in the temple before the Holy of Holies, where God's Shekinah glory dwells, (Ezek. 42:14)... "No foreigner, uncircumcised in heart and *uncircumcised in flesh*, shall enter into my sanctuary, of any foreigners that are among the children of Israel"! (Ezek. 44:9)... Is it not plain that the principle of literal interpretation of *all* Old Testament prophecies is reduced to an absurdity by the mere contemplation of such a prospect during the alleged millennium? Christ Himself provided the true memorial of His death, in the Lord's Supper, and that was to be observed only "till He come," when the need for a memorial would be done away, and it, together with all other "former things have passed away" (Rev. 21:4).

But if the premillennialist admits that we are not to expect *all* these prophetic details, including even circumcision, to be fulfilled during the millennium, then the whole argument for the literal ful [p. 44] fillment of all Old Testament prophecies must be abandoned, for there is nothing to indicate that these last eight chapters in Ezekiel are figures of speech. However, if it is admitted that there is a possible symbolic interpretation for even a few of these passages, then certainly the same principle of interpretation can be used for other similarly difficult prophecies.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Not all premillennialists hold all these literalist views, but "historic," or traditional, premillennialism (see Nos. 1070, 1071) has always included a millennial reign of saints with the returned Christ over the still-mortal nations, on a partly renovated earth, ending with the close of human probation. This form of premillennialism is characterized, in varying degrees, by a literalism that often holds that ancient prophecies apply to Israel in the future, but the system is to be distinguished from the ultraliteralist Jewish chiliasm (as in the above extract) which is a central doctrine of the modern futuristdispensationalism, and which many regard as the normal type of premillennialism. It must also be differentiated from the distinctive historicist (both Millerite and Seventh-day Adventist). The Millerites, holding that the Second Advent closes probation and that there will be no one on earth during the millennium except the glorified saints (see No. 1077), naturally rejected the Literalists' "Judaizing" view (see No. 896) of a return of the Jews as preliminary to a leading role in the millennium (see No. 1052). To speak in the 1840's of "rejecting the return of the Jews" or "advocating the literal return of Israel" meant merely rejecting or accepting the *doctrine* that such a return was foretold in prophecy, for the prospect of an actual Jewish state in Palestine was not yet visible. The "nonrestorationist" view sees the present Jewish state in Palestine as a political and social phenomenon unrelated to the restoration prophecies (see Nos. 897, 1063), which envision something quite different—a Messianic theocracy, the kingdom of Christ. The Millerite view, namely, that the restoration prophecies were either (1) conditional, (2) fulfilled in the return from ancient exile, or (3) applicable to the gathering of the spiritual seed of Abraham (both Jew and Gentile) to the new earth (see Nos. 893, 895, 1078, 1084), was adopted by the Seventh-day Adventists (see SDACom 4:25-38; 7:884-887), who, however, shifted the saints' inheritance of the new earth from the beginning of the millennium to the end.]

1074. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism—Millerite View

SOURCE: G. F. Cox, *Letters on the Second Coming of Christ* (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), pp. 26, 27.[p. 26] Those [Bible] passages usually relied on to prove a millennium of *any character*, point evidently to a period and a state in which.—

- 1. All other kingdoms, and of necessity their works, will be destroyed, so that no other kingdom or adverse power can be left upon the earth.
- 2. It has been shown that this kingdom of Christ will be *perpetual*, everlasting, "forever, even forever and ever."
- 3. That this kingdom excludes "warfare" to the church and individuals, and "war" from the world.
- 4. That death is destroyed in that kingdom, or is swallowed up in victory.
- 5. That there will be ONE FOLD and ONE SHEPHERD, in a sense that has never yet ex- [p. 27] isted, and in a sense that cannot exist with the present organized state of man.
- 6. God's will is to be done in that kingdom AS it IS in heaven—in EARTH as in heaven... The millennium state includes *a* resurrection from the dead, and *a* coming of Christ. [EDITORS' NOTE: The Millerites saw in the millennium the beginning of the eternal kingdom of the immortalized saints, on the renewed earth (see Nos. 1077, 1078, 1085). The Seventh-day Adventists inherited the Millerite view with this exception: they teach that the saints are in heaven during the thousand years, and that the earth, renewed at the end of the period, becomes their eternal home.]

1075. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialism Versus

Postmillenialism in America

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 231–234. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 231] If we wish to understand American chiliasm, we must pay attention not so much to the peculiar sects which America has produced nor to the groups which have found a refuge here from oppression, but to this diffused chiliasm in the American evangelical churches.

Most prominent is the chiliasm of the premillennial type. From time to time it has held interdenominational or undenominational conferences which went by the name of prophetic conferences be- [p. 232] cause their main concern was with the as yet unfulfilled prophecies of the Bible...

Here was the setting up of an interdenominational creed in which members of various denominations united, though they belonged to creedally widely differing churches. And their declaration of belief in the imminence of Christ's return suggests, that they were Premillenarians of a very definite and specific type [that is, mostly futurist, and largely dispensationalist], since not all Premillenarians speak of Christ's return as imminent...

Postmillennialism probably was not so long ago the equal to Premillenialism in extent and influence in America. Indeed, American Christian sentiment long appeared to be so completely divided between these two types of chiliasm, that the impression was abroad that as a matter of course every Christian is a chiliast, and that many American writers took very little note, if any, of the amillenarian position. On this point so well informed a postmillenarian writer as Dr. James H. Snowden, agreed with he representative premillenarian writer W. E. Blackstone, whom otherwise he earnestly opposed. Of the two types, the [p. 233] premillenarian is apt to attract the bulk of public attention, because it expects and announces catastrophic events to usher in the kingdom, while the Postmillenarians expect the kingdom to come gradually and unspectacularly through the operation of the preaching of the Gospel and the work of the Holy Spirit... Now, there can be no doubt about the mutual attraction which fundamentalism and Premillenarianism on the one hand and modernism and Postmillenarianism on the other have for each other. It is true, the attraction implies distinction: Postmillenarians need not subscribe to modernism; in fact, if they do, they are bound to drop the hope of Christ's return from their thought and thereby to lose their Christian faith. And fundamentalists need not be Premillenarians: they can equally well live and labor under the amillenarian banner. Yet the fact of the affinities mentioned above can not be denied.

What binds Premillenarianism and fundamentalism together is the fact that both are bound to be strongly supernaturalistic, since both look forward to the visible return of Christ, of which His Supper is a constant reminder. Modernism banishes the supernatural, and Postmillenarianism can and does postpone all [p. 234] obtrusively supernatural occurrences until the glorious final state of the Church shall have run its course. In so far it holds little or nothing that would clash with the modernistic outlook upon future earthly human history. In fact, if the return of Christ be dropped from the postmillenarian scheme, what remains can with a minimum of alteration pass for evolutionary humanistic modernism. These facts will tend to operate in the direction of fraternization between modernism and Postmillennialism and of an alliance between fundamentalism and Premillen[n]ialism. But they make such fraternization and alliance by no means safe and wise.

1076. Millennium, Theories of—Premillennialists in England in 1831 SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Civil Disabilities of the Jews," in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 1, pp. 145, 146.

[p. 145] The Christian believes as well as the Jew, that at some future period the present order of things will come to an end. Nay, many Christians believe [in 1831] that the Messiah will shortly establish a kingdom on the earth, and reign visibly over all its inhabitants. Whether this doctrine be orthodox or not we shall not here inquire. The number of people who hold it is very much greater than the number of Jews residing in England. Many of those who hold it are distinguished by rank, wealth, and ability. It is preached from pulpits, both of the Scottish and of the English church. Noblemen and members of Parliament [p. 146] have written in defence of it. Now wherein does this doctrine differ, as far as its political tendency is concerned, from the doctrine of the Jews? If a Jew is unfit to legislate for us because he believes that he or his remote descendants will be removed to Palestine, can we safely open the House of Commons to a fifth-monarchy man, who expects that before this generation shall pass away, all the kingdoms of the earth will be swallowed up in one divine empire?

1077. Millennium, Theories of—Three Views (in 1841) Summarized SOURCE: A[lexander] C[ampbell], "The Coming of the Lord," *The Millennial Harbinger*, 5 (Jan., 1841), 8, 9.

[p. 8] *Mr. Begg's Theory* [James Begg of Scotland, a "Literalist" premillennialist].— Israel shall return to their own land. Jerusalem will be rebuilt. The Lord will descend from heaven and dwell in Jerusalem—"Then the moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." He will continue his personal presence on earth certainly 1000, and probably 365,000 years. The nations will go to see him, and to worship in Jerusalem, and keep the annual feasts. The Man of Sin shall be destroyed by the Lord in person or by the brightness of his coming, and the race of evil doers shall generally be cut off. A resurrection of the saints and martyred witnesses of Christ precede[s] the millennial reign. This is the first resurrection, and shall precede the second from 1000 to 365000 years. The earth and the atmosphere will be changed. A more genial climate and a more fruitful soil will reward the labors of the husbandman. Still the earth's identity and its present localities shall continue; and "although it will be a period of unprecedented holiness and happiness, neither sin nor death will be wholly excluded." "The child shall die a hundred years old; and the sinner being a hundred years old, shall be accursed." And, therefore, during the millennial dispensation this world will be the abode of men in the flesh, who will have intercourse with the immortal men who are reigning with Christ. But of the nature of the employment of the reigning saints, and of their intercourse with mortal men, he has no knowledge.

A short apostacy will succeed the Millennium. Satan will be set free from his captivity, but will ultimately be destroyed. Then comes the general resurrection of all that died during the Millennium, and those who were not raised at its commencement, which will be followed with the general judgment and eternal rewards and punishments.

Mr. Miller's Theory [William Miller's "Adventist," or Millerite, premillennialism].— This is bolder and more intelligible than any of the moderns. According to this view, the general conflagration, the resurrection of the dead saints, the transformation of the living, and the personal and glorious return of the Lord, must precede the Millennium. "The Millennium is a state of personal, glorious, and immortal reign on the new earth-a new dispensation, new heavens [p. 9], and new earth." The wicked, their counsels and works, will all be destroyed at the coming of the Lord. The thousand years of millennial glory and bliss will transpire "between the two resurrections"—that of the righteous and of the wicked; the latter having been slain at the commencement of the Millennium, and all the living saints changed. There will be neither birth nor death, conversion nor apostacy during one thousand years. Gog, and Magog can be found only in the wicked spirits who lived and died before the Millennium, and who, when reanimated at its close, will lay siege to the New Jerusalem; but will be judged, and cast down to hell by fire from heaven falling upon them in the very act of their rebellion. The Millennium will commence, or rather this world will come to an end, in the year 1843, or 1847 at farthest. The day of judgment will then commence, and will continue for the whole thousand years; at the end of which the wicked shall be raised and sentenced to everlasting ruin.

The Protestant Theory [the then-predominant postmillennialism].—The Millennium, so far as the triumphs of Christianity is concerned, will be a state of greatly enlarged and continuous prosperity, in which the Lord will be exalted and his divine spirit enjoyed in an unprecedented measure. All the conditions of society will be vastly improved; wars shall cease; and peace and good will among men will generally abound. The Jews will be converted, and the fullness of the Gentiles will be brought into the kingdom of the Messiah. Genuine Christianity will be diffused through all nations; crimes and punishments will cease; governments will recognize human rights, and will rest on just and benevolent principles. Conversions will not only be genuine, but early and general. Large measures of divine influence will be vouchsafed. One extended and protracted series of revivals will keep pace with the exigencies of society. The seasons will become more mild; climates more salubrious, health more vigorous, labor less, lands more fertile, and the animal creation more prolific: for the knowledge of the glory of God shall cover the whole earth as the waters cover the channel of the sea. The Millennium is to precede

the coming of the Lord, the general conflagration, and the creation of new heavens and earth.

Such are the chief attributes of the Millennium according to the more prominent theories of the present day. There are others different in some of their accidents; but in the main we have their essential features in those three.

1078. Miller, William, Teaching of, on the Second Advent SOURCE: William Miller, *Apology and Defence* (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1845), pp. 7–9, 11.

[p. 7] I found it plainly taught in the Scriptures that Jesus Christ will again descend to this earth, coming in the clouds of heaven, in all the glory of his Father: ... that at his coming the bodies of all the righteous dead will be raised, and all the righteous living be changed from a corruptible to an incorruptible, from a mortal to an immortal state, that they will all be caught up together to meet the Lord in the air, and will reign with him for ever in the regenerated earth: ... that the bodies [p. 8] of the wicked will then all be destroyed, and their spirits be reserved in prison until their resurrection and damnation: and that when the earth is thus regenerated, the righteous raised, and the wicked destroyed, the kingdom of God will have come, when his will will be done on earth as it is done in heaven, that the meek will inherit it, and the kingdom become the saints[']. I found that the only millennium taught in the word of God is the thousand years which are to intervene between the first resurrection and that of the rest of the dead, as inculcated in the xx of Revelation; and that it must necessarily follow the personal coming of Christ and the regeneration of the earth: that till Christ's coming and the end of the world, the righteous and wicked are to continue together on the earth, ... so that there can be no conversion of the world before the advent: and that as the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, is ... the same for which we look, according to the promise of Isa. lxv. 17, and is the same that John saw in vision after the passing away of the former heavens and earth; it must necessarily follow that the various portions of Scripture that refer to the millennial state, must have their fulfillment after the resurrection of all the saints that sleep in Jesus. I also found that the promises respecting Israel's restoration, are applied by the apostle to all who [p. 9] are Christ's,—the putting on of Christ constituting them Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise...

Another kind of evidence that vitally affected my mind, was the chronology of the Scriptures. I found, on pursuing the study of the Bible, various chronological periods extending, according to my understanding of them, to the coming of the Savior...

[p. 11] Reckoning all these prophetic periods from the several dates assigned by the best chronologers for the events from which they should evidently be reckoned, they all would terminate together, about A.D. 1843.

1079. Millerites—Adherents in All Denominations in America SOURCE: [Josiah Litch], "The Rise and Progress of Adventism," *The Advent Shield and Review*, 1 (May, 1844), 90

We have no means of ascertaining the number of ministers, and others, who have embraced the Advent faith. We only know that there are several hundred congregations, and a still larger number of ministers, who have publicly professed the faith, besides many who still remain in the churches of the land. Those who have espoused this cause have honestly believed in the coming of the Lord "about A.D. 1843." And, as honest men, they have kept to their work of sounding the alarm. All peculiarities of creed or policy have been lost sight of, in the absorbing inquiry concerning the coming of the heavenly Bridegroom. Those who have engaged in this enterprise are from all the various sects in the land. Protestant Episcopal, Methodist Episcopal, Methodist Protestant, Primitive Methodist, Wesleyan Methodist, Close Communion Baptist, and Open Communion Baptist, Calvinistic and Arminian Baptists, Presbyterians, Old and New School Congregationalists, Old and New School Lutheran, Dutch Reformed, &c., &c.

1080. Millerites, Claimed Fulfillment of Rev. 14:6, 7.

SOURCE: [Josiah Litch], "The Rise and Progress of Adventism," *The Advent Shield and Review*, 1 (May, 1844), 86, 87.

[p. 86] We look upon the proclamation which has been made, as being the cry of the angel who proclaimed, "*the hour of* [p. 87] *his judgment is come*." (Revelation xiv. 6, 7) It is a sound which is to reach all nations; it is the proclamation of "*the everlasting gospel*," or "*this gospel of the kingdom*." In one shape or other, this cry has gone abroad through the earth wherever human beings are found, and we have had opportunity to hear of the fact.

2

1081. Millerites — Disappointment (October, 1844), Aftermath of

SOURCE: Joshua V. Himes, "Provision for the Destitute," The Midnight Cry, 7 (Oct. 31, 1844), 140.

As many of our brethren and sisters have disposed of their substance, and given alms, agreeable to Luke 12:33, in the confident expectation of the speedy coming of the Lord, I wish to have immediate provision made for the comfort and wants of all such persons, and families, by the advent brethren.

1082. Millerites — Disappointment (October, 1844)—Mistake Admitted SOURCE: Editorial, "The Present and the Past," *The Midnight Cry*, 7 (Oct. 31, 1844), 140.

We have been mistaken in a belief to which we thought ourselves conducted by the word and Spirit, and Providence of God. But the *Word* stands sure, however we may err: and the promise is true: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God." The Lord will lead his obedient children. We have an unwavering trust that He will cause our disappointment and trial to work together for our good. We shall humbly watch the providences of God, and we know he will vindicate his truth and faithfulness. Let him be honored, though we may be humbled.

1083. Millerites, Doctrines of, Briefly Summarized

SOURCE: "Boston Second Advent Conference," in The Signs of the Times, 3 (June 1, 1842), 69.

We therefore recommend that ... all persons who reject the doctrines of temporal millennium and the restoration of the Jews to Palestine [see No. 1073n], either before or after the Second Advent, and who believe the Second Advent of Christ and the *first* resurrection to be the next great events of prophetic history, be invited to enroll their names as member[s] of this conference [the 12th "Second Advent Conference" of the Millerites].

RESOLUTIONS ...

Resolved, That the time has fully come for those, who believe in the Second Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ in 1843, to show their faith by their works...

Resolved, That we regard the notion of a Millennium previous to the coming of Christ, when all the world shall be converted, and sinners in great multitudes saved, as a fearful delusion...

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Resolved, That no portion of the New Testament scriptures give[s] the most indirect intimation of the literal restoration of the Jews to old Jerusalem; we believe that the arguments drawn from the Old Testament prophecies are based on a mistaken view of those prophecies; and that they have been fulfilled in what the gospel has already done, or remain to be fulfilled in the gathering all the spiritual seed of Abraham into the New Jerusalem...

Resolved, That the notion of probation after Christ's coming, is a lure to destruction, entirely contradictory to the word of God, which positively teaches that when Christ comes the door is shut, and such as are not ready can never enter in.

1084. Millerites, Doctrines of, Clarified

SOURCE: "Declaration of Principles" by the Adventists assembled in Boston, Anniversary Week, May, 1843, in *The Signs of the Times*, 5 (June 7, 1843), 107, 108.[p. 107]

TO THE PUBLIC,-

As the principles and views of the Adventists [see No. 7] are so little understood, and have been so often assailed and misrepresented, we deem it proper to present a brief statement of them to the world, together with the position we occupy...

We believe that the Scriptures teach the personal coming of Christ again in the fullness of times to this earth in the glory of his Father, to judge the quick and the dead, and reward every man according to his works.

We believe that the prophecies, the events of which were to precede the final consummation of all things, have been all literally fulfilled and that the closing scenes of this world's history are the only remaining portions of unfulfilled prophecy; and that the advent of our Savior is the next expected event.

We believe that when he is revealed, he will raise all the righteous dead, change the righteous living in the twinkling of an eye, and gather them to himself, destroy the wicked out of the earth, cause the elements of our heaven and earth to melt with fervent heat, and burn up all the works that are therein. Nevertheless, according to his promise, we look for a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.

We believe that the earth thus renewed will be the eternal abode of the righteous, where the saints of the Most High will possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever; and that Christ will then sit on the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end...

We believe that none can enter that abode of righteousness without repentance and faith in Christ, nor unless they possess that holiness without which no man can see the Lord...

We believe that in the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began, the wildemess will become again like Eden, and the desert like the garden of the Lord; that the tabernacle of God will be with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people...

We believe [that] those portions of the word of God which are adduced in support of the theory of a temporal millennium and the return of the carnal Jews to Palestine, are glorious predictions relating to the renovated earth, and the restoration of the righteous, the true Israel of God, in their resurrection bodies to the new earth...

We also believe the signs foretold, which were to precede and indicate when the coming of Christ was nigh at the door, have been seen, and that the prophetic periods all terminate in the present Jewish year, commencing in 1843. A mere *point* of time, however, is not an essential part of our belief. Our faith rests on the fact that the

fulfillment of prophecy indicates that the Judge is nigh, even at the door; and the coming of Christ will be our constant expectation from this hour, till the parting skies shall reveal him. We believe the vision is yet for an appointed time; but at the end it will speak and not lie; if it appear to tarry, we shall wait it, because, at the time appointed it will surely come, it will not tarry. And, till he come, we expect the way of life will be the same narrow path that few will find; that the Man of Sin will continue to make war with the saints and prevail against them—the tares and wheat grow together, and Christians continue to live as pilgrims and strangers on the earth, and that men will speak ill of them—the friendship of the world being enmity with God.

We have no confidence whatever in any visions, dreams, or private revelations. "What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord." We repudiate all fanaticism, and everything which may tend to extravagance, excess, and immorality, that shall cause our good to be evil spoken of.

Our sole object in this enterprise, is to spread abroad a knowledge of the truth that the kingdom of God will shortly come, when his will will be done on earth as it is in heaven; and to endeavor, by the blessing of God, to arouse the church and the world to a sense of the nearness of that event, that those who wish for salvation may possess the faith of our father Abraham, who believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness...

[p. 108] As Adventists, we meet on common ground, and accord to all what we claim for ourselves, the right of individual opinion on all questions of denominational interest, and freely act in harmony with all, of whatever name or denomination, who live righteously, soberly, and godly, loving the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. We ask none to lay aside their own views on doctrinal points, nor wish to give prominence to the sectarian belief of any. [Signed by]

N. N. Whiting Com [and others]

1085. Millerites, Doctrines of, Versus Postmillennialism and Literalist Premillennialism

SOURCE: [Josiah Litch], "The Rise and Progress of Adventism," *The Advent Shield and Review*, 1 (May, 1844), 47, 48.

[p. 47] THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ADVENTISTS [Millerites] AND MILLENISTS [postmillennialists], is,—The ADVENTISTS believe in a pre-millennial and personal advent of Christ from heaven, to glorify his saints and to take vengeance on his foes. While the MILLENISTS believe in the universal spiritual reign of Christ a thousand years, before his second personal advent.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN ADVENTISTS AND MILLENNARIANS ["Literalist" premillennialists], is—The MILLENNARIANS believe in the pre-millennial advent of Christ, and his personal reign for a thousand years before the consummation or end of the present world, and creation of the new heavens and earth, and the descent of the NEW JERUSALEM. While the ADVENTISTS believe the end of the world or age, the destruction of the wicked, the dissolution of the earth, the renovation of nature, and the descent of the New Jerusalem, will be at the beginning of the thousand years. *The Millennarians* believe in the return of the Jews, as such, either before, at, or after the advent of Christ, to Palestine, to possess that land a thousand [p. 48] years, while *the Adventists* believe that all the return of the Jews to that country, will be the return of all the pious Jews who have ever lived, to the inheritance of the new earth, in their resurrection state [see No. 1073n]. Then *Abraham, Isaac,* and *Jacob,* with all their *natural seed* who have been of the faith of Abraham, together with all *pious Gentiles,* will stand up together, to enjoy an *eternal* inheritance, instead of possessing Canaan for a thousand years.

THE MILLENNARIANS ["Literalist" premillennialist] believe a part of the heathen world will be left on the earth, to multiply and increase, during the one thousand years, and to be converted and governed by the glorified saints during that period; while the Adventists believed that when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, ... one part will go away into everlasting (eternal) punishment, but the righteous into life eternal. They cannot see any probation for any nation, either Jew or Gentile, after the Son of Man comes in his glory, and takes out his own saints from among all nations...

The *Millennarians* believe that the saints must have mortal men in a state of probation, for a thousand years, as their subjects, in order for them to reign as kings; for, say they, how can they reign without subjects? To which ... it is replied, Adam had dominion given him, but not a dominion over man. It was a "dominion over all the earth," and all its creatures. So also the kingdom Christ will give to the saints when he comes in his glory, is "the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world" [see Matt. 25:34]. Just the dominion which Adam had, will belong to the saints.

1086. Millerites — Prophetic Date (1844) Held Correct, Event in Error SOURCE: Joseph Marsh, Editorial, *Voice of Truth*, Nov. 7, 1844, quoted in *The Advent Review*, 1 (August, 1850), 7.

Since the tenth day of the seventh month has passed, and we are disappointed in not seeing our Lord, it seems necessary to define our position again. This we most cheerfully do. But first please indulge us a few moments, in expressing our great disappointment in not seeing our Lord at the time expected. We did believe that he would come at that time; and now, though we sorrow on account of our disappointment, yet we rejoice that we have acted according to our faith. We have had, and still have, a conscience void of offence, in this matter, towards God and man. God has blessed us abundantly, and we have not a doubt but that all will soon be made to work together for the good of his dear people, and his glory.

We cheerfully admit that we have been mistaken in the *nature* of the event we expected would occur on the tenth day of the seventh month; but we cannot yet admit that our Great High Priest did not *on that very day*, ACCOMPLISH ALL THAT THE TYPE WOULD JUSTIFY US TO EXPECT. WE NOW BELIEVE HE DID.

1087. Millerites, Twofold Message of

SOURCE: "General Conferences on the Second Advent," *The Signs of the Times*, 5 (May 10, 1843), 75. It is proposed by the friends of the Advent cause, (if time continue) to hold

conferences in New York, Philadelphia and Boston, during the Anniversaries in May. We have large and convenient places secured in each of the above cities, for the meetings.

The object of these conferences will be to give light on the great question of the Advent near, and the nature of the Kingdom of God.

1088. Miracles, and God's Sovereignty

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), pp. 83, 84. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 83] The Bible speaks a great deal about the "mighty deeds" which the Lord of history performs. And there is probably no greater stumbling block for the modern reader than these miracles. (Here we will deal only with the Old Testament miracles. Chapter 9

discusses Jesus' miracles.) It seems impossible to a twentieth century reader that axheads should float, or that sticks should change to snakes, or that city walls should crumble because a trumpet was blown. What about it? ...

There is a false way of getting at the problem that must be shattered. This is the view that says that to believe in miracles takes a monumental act of faith, while not to believe in miracles is simply common sense, because miracles cannot happen. Notice carefully that the claim, "Miracles cannot happen," is just as dogmatic a statement, just as much an act of faith, as the claim, "Miracles can happen." Each statement implies a whole view of the universe to which the speaker has committed himself. The choice, then, is not a choice between faith [p. 84] or non-faith. It is a choice between rival faiths. One person is saying, "I believe in a universe in which God can work in ways that I may not totally understand." The other person is saying, "I believe in a universe in which God can work in which nothing can happen that I don't understand."

1089. Miracles, of Christ, Attributed to Psychic Power

SOURCE: Edward Macomb Duff and Thomas Gilchrist Allen, *Psychic Research and Gospel Miracles* (New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1902), part 3, chap. 1, p. 211.

§. We believe that the inequiry which concludes our last chapter of Part II answers itself. If it is a demonstrable fact that the evangelists represent Jesus as performing superphysical works of the same kind as those performed to-day, and as recognizing and utilizing like conditions, then two facts are proved: evangelical veracity and Christ's inerrant psychic insight.

In this chapter we shall try to make plain from the data supplied by the evangelists that the latter do so represent and report their Hero; viz., as the great psychic healer who was the first to discover those conditions of psycho-therapeutics which twentieth century enlightenment is just beginning to find out new.

1090. Mithraism, and Christianity

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), pp. 210, 211.

[p. 210] The two opposed creeds [Christianity and Mithraism] moved in the same intellectual and moral sphere, and one could actually pass from one to the other without shock or interruption... [p. 211] The religious and mystical spirit of the Orient had slowly overcome the whole social organism and had prepared all nations to unite in the bosom of a universal church.

1091. Mithrais—Devotion of Worshipers Shames Christians SOURCE: Tertullian, *The Chaplet (De Corona*), chap. 15, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 103.

Blush, ye fellow-soldiers of his, henceforth not to be condemned even by him, but by some soldier of Mithras, who, at his initiation in the gloomy cavern, in the camp, it may well be said, of darkness, when at the sword's point a crown is presented to him, as though in mimicry of martyrdom, and thereupon put upon his head, is admonished to resist and cast it off, and, if you like, transfer it to his shoulder, saying that Mithras is his crown. And thenceforth he is never crowned; and he has that for a mark to show who he is, if anywhere he be subjected to trial in respect of his religion; and he is at once believed to be a soldier of Mithras if he throws the crown away—if he say that in his god he has his crown. Let us take note of the devices of the devil, who is wont to ape some of God's things with no other design than, by the faithfulness of his servants, to put us to shame, and to condemn us.

1092. Mithraism, Spread of, in Roman Empire

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 59–61. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 59] The most popular of the Near-Eastern cults was that of Mithra which spread over the West at the beginning of our era, reached its zenith in the third century, and ended with Theododius' repressive legislation at the close of the fourth. Mithra had his origin in Zoroastrianism, for a time the religion of the Persian Empire. Because of its great similarities in organization and doctrines Mithraism became the rival of Christianity among the Eastern religions in the latter's long struggle with Roman paganism. Its appeal was varied: its human qualities of fraternity, democracy, and faith, its antiquity and impressive ritual, its clerical organization, its doctrine of purification from sin, its high system of ethics and, following Zoroastrianism, its doctrine of antagonistic powers of good and evil ever struggling for mastery in the world, and especially its final judgment and clear promise of a blessed hereafter. Furthermore, it was freer of sex impurities than its sister religions. As most of its features are found in Christianity, when the latter became victorious, Mithra's followers easily passed into it or into Manichaeism, which has been called "the final assault made by Persia on the Occident," the heretical faith which assimilated the adoration of Zoroaster with that of Christ, and which reached Italy at the end of the third century and Africa in the fourth, where the youthful Augustine for a season was interested in it. Again, we have no definite evidence that Mithraism became a part of official Roman paganism before the middle of the third century at least, but there are numerous proofs that it enjoyed imperial favor for centuries...

[p. 60] Remains of the struggle are found in two institutions adopted from its rival by Christianity in the fourth century, the two Mithraic sacred days, December twenty-fifth, *dies natalis solis*, as the birthday of Jesus, and Sunday, "the venerable day of the Sun," as

Constantine called it in his edict of 321.

When Mithraism reached Italy in the first century B.C. its roots already ran far into the past...

With the Persian conquest Zoroastrianism spread through the Euphrates valley and in Babylon became modified by contact with Chaldean astrology and the worship of Babylonian Marduk. Here Mithra was identified with the Sun-god Shamash, god of righteousness and order... [p. 61] It was in Asia Minor, perhaps during the religious ferment started by Alexander, that the new religion, Mithraism, took the definite form

which we know in its Roman period when Mithra was the supreme Sun-god *invictus*, identified by the Romans with Sol or its Genius.

1093. Mockers, Derided

SOURCE: William Blake, "Mock On," in Burton Stevenson, comp., *The Home Book of Quotations* (New York: Dodd, 1947), p. 113:7.

Mock on, mock on, Voltaire, Rousseau;

Mock on, mock on; 'tis all in vain!

You throw the dust against the wind,

And the wind blows it back again.

1094. Modernism, Described

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 12. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

The history of the last five decades has been largely under the aegis of a triumphant modernism. Basically, modernism is evolutionary naturalism applied to the Bible and to

Christianity. By it the supernatural in the origins and nature of Christianity was sacrificed by the accommodation of Christian theology to the data of the scientific method and the dicta of the scientific mind. Hence, by presupposition, there could be no Virgin Birth, no miracles, and no Resurrection as the Bible taught. Modernism was based on higher criticism's view of the Bible. The books are redated in accordance with evolutionary naturalism; ethical monotheism is tolerated only later than polytheism, and the writing of the prophetic sections is placed after the events. Modernism developed a new theology concerning Christ, man, sin, salvation, the Church, and the Church's mission. To say the least, the content of modernism was not the content of biblical theology. The departure from biblical concepts was radical.

1095. Monasticism, Koran on

SOURCE: Koran, Sura Ivii. 27, in *The Holy Qur-an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 2, pp. 1506, 1507. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 1506] We sent after them Jesus the son of Mary, And bestowed on him The Gospel; and We ordained In the hearts of those Who followed him Compassion and Mercy. [p. 1507] But the Monasticism Which they invented For themselves, We did not Prescribe for them: (We commanded) only The seeking for the Good Pleasure of God: but that They did not foster As they should have done. Yet We bestowed, on those Among them who believed, Their (due) reward, but Many of them are Rebellious transgressors.

1096. Monasticism, Origin of

SOURCE: Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), p. 58. Copyright 1950 by Will Durant. Used by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc.

As the Church ceased to be a set of devotees and became an institution governing millions of men, she tended to adopt a more lenient view of human frailty, and to tolerate, sometimes to share, the pleasures of this world. A minority of Christians held such condescension to be treason to Christ; they resolved to gain heaven by poverty, chastity, and prayer, and retired completely from the world. Possibly Ashoka's missionaries (*c*. 250 B.C.) had brought to the Near East the monastic forms as well as the theory and ethics of Buddhism; and pre-Christian anchorites like those of Serapis in Egypt, or the Essence communities in Judea, may have transmitted to Anthony and Pachomius the ideals and methods of the strictly religious life. Monasticism was for many souls a refuge from the

chaos and war of the barbarian invasions; there were no taxes in the monastery or the desert cell, no military service, no marital strife, no weary toil; ordination to the priesthood was not required of a monk; and after a few years of peace would come eternal bliss.

Egypt, whose climate almost invited monasticism, teemed with anchoritic and cenobitic monks, following the solitary habits of Anthony, or the community life that Pachomius had established at Tabenne. The Nile was banked with monasteries and convents, some containing as many as 3000 monks and nuns. Of the anchorites Anthony (*c*. 251–356) was by far the most renowned... Only less famous was Pachomius, who (325) founded nine monasteries and one nunnery; sometimes 7000 monks who followed his rule gathered to celebrate some holy day. These cenobites worked as well as prayed; periodically they sailed down the Nile to Alexandria to sell their products, by their necessities, and join in the ecclesiastical-political fray.

1097. Mother Goddesses—Madonna of Sumero-Babylonian Religion SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic [Mythology]* (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), p. 341. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York.

In the Tammuz hymns Ishtar is repeatedly addressed as "my lady" in Sumerian, and as *bêlti*, "my lady," in Accadian texts. *Bêlti*, "my lady," is characteristic of the addresses to Zarbanit, wife of Marduk, and B \Box l and B \Box lti of Babylon usurped the *rôle* of Tammuz and Ishtar in the late period. Zarbanit is also addressed as *bêlit–ni*, "our lady," the

probably origin of the Syriac title of the goddess who loved Tammuz, namely BaltŒn. The Babylonian title "our lady," for the sister, wife, and lover of Tammuz and Adonis was, therefore, current among West Semitic peoples in the periods preceding and following the rise of Christianity, and may have been transferred to the Virgin Mary as "Our Lady," Madonna.

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1098. Nazarene, Church of the

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 458-461.

[p. 458] *History*. I. Near the close of the nineteenth century, a movement for the spread and conservation of Scriptural holiness in organized church form developed almost simultaneously in various parts of the United States. This movement was similar to that of the previous century historically known as the Wesleyan revival. There was manifested everywhere a spontaneous drawing in the unity of the Spirit toward closer affiliation of those of like precious faith which finally culminated in the organization of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene.

The great impulse of this movement has been the emphasis placed by the Scriptures upon the facts that, in the atonement, Jesus Christ has made provision not only to save men from their sins, but also to perfect them in love.

II. On May 12, 1886, a number of the brethren in Providence, R. I., interested in promoting the Wesleyan doctrine and experience of entire sanctification, organized and held weekly religious services... On July 21, 1887, the People's Evangelical Church was organized with 51 members... On November 25, 1888, the Mission Church, Lynn, Mass., was organized... On March 13 and 14, 1890, representatives from these churches and other evangelical holiness organizations in southern New England, assembled at Rock, Mass., and organized the Central Evangelical Holiness Association... Within the following year the Mission Church, Malden, Mass., the Emmanuel Mission Church, North Atleboro, Mass., and the Bethany Mission Church, Keene, N. H., were organized.

In January 1894 William Howard Hoople, a businessman in New York City, founded a mission in Brooklyn, which, in the following May, was organized as an independent church, with a membership of 32, and called Utica Avenue Pentecostal Tabernacle... The following February the Bedford Avenue Pentecostal Church was organized, in an abandoned church building, and a little later, the Emmanuel Pentecostal Tabernacle. In December 1895 delegates from these three churches formed the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America, adopting a constitution, a summary of doctrines, and bylaws...

On November 12, 1896, a joint committee from these two associations met in the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., to formulate some plan of union... This meeting resulted in the union of the two bodies. It was agreed that the work should be continued under the name of the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America.

III. In October 1895 a number of persons, under the leadership of Rev. Phineas F. Bresee, D. D., and Rev. J. p. Widney, LL. D., formed the First Church of the Nazarene, at Los Angeles, Calif... As a result of this organization, a number of churches sprang into existence, reaching as far east as Chicago.

IV. As these two bodies came to know more of each other, it was felt that they should unite; and, after consultation by delegates from one body to the other, the following basis of union was prepared and unanimously adopted by both bodies. The first union assembly was held in Chicago, in October 1907...

[p. 459] It was agreed that the name of the united body should be, "The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene."

V. In 1894 the first organization of the New Testament Church of Christ was effected by Rev. R. L. Harris, at Milan, Tenn., with 14 members. This church was

deemed necessary to conserve the work of holiness, and soon spread throughout western Texas and Arkansas...

In 1898 the first holiness churches were organized in Texas by Rev. Thomas Rogers and Rev. Dennis Rogers, who came from California.

In 1900 the first Independent Holiness Church was organized by Rev. C. B. Jernigan, at Van Alstyne, Tex., and the denomination grew and prospered until in 1903, there were 20 church organizations.

The legal representatives of the Independent Holiness Church and the New Testament Church of Christ met at Rising Star, Tex., in November 1904, where a joint committee framed a manual and statement of doctrine and basis of union. The union was fully consummated at Pilot Point, Tex., in November 1905, and the united body adopted the name Holiness Church of Christ.

VI. At the general assembly of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, at Chicago, in 1907, in response to an invitation, several persons were present from the Holiness Church of Christ... Provisional arrangements were made for incorporating this church into the general body, upon proper action on their part. Upon the invitation of the Holiness Church of Christ, the second general assembly convened at Pilot Point, Tex... The motion [to unite] was adopted ... at 10:40 a. m., Tuesday, October 13, 1908.

VII. In the year 1898 Rev. J. O. McClurkan and a few of God's children called a meeting of the holiness people of Tennessee and adjacent States to be held in Nashville. At this convention an association was formed known as the Pentecostal Alliance, which name was afterward changed to the Pentecostal Mission...

The union of the Pentecostal Mission with the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene ... on February 13, 1915, ... was effected at Nashville, Tenn...

VIII. In November 1901 the first stage in the present holiness church movement in the British Isles began, when Rev. George Sharpe, who had been for over 13 years a preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church, accepted a call to [p. 460] the Congregational Church at Ardrossan, Scotland. In September 1905 he was accepted as the minister of Parkhead Congregational Church, Glasgow, Scotland, where, after a strenuous, successful, and glorious ministry of 13 months, he was evicted for preaching Bible holiness.

On September 30, 1906, the first services of the first distinctively holiness church were held in the Great Eastern Roads Hall, Glasgow. The charter members numbered 80. Other churches were organized and became the Pentecostal Church of Scotland. Visits of Dr. E. F. Walker and Dr. H. F. Reynolds to Scotland, and a visit of Rev. George Sharpe and Mrs. Sharpe to the fourth general assembly, at Kansas City, Mo., led the way to union with the Church of the Nazarene, which was consummated in November 1915.

IX. The general assembly of 1919, in response to memorials from 35 district assemblies, changed the name of the organization to "Church of the Nazarene."

X. For many years a holiness movement had been developing in Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana. It was originated by a group of Methodist laymen, and formally organized at Jamestown, N. Dak., in 1907, as The Laymen's Holiness Association... Evangelists and workers engaged in a widespread program of holiness evangelism and camp-meeting promotion. In 1922 more than 1,000 people who were identified with The Laymen's Holiness Association, under the leadership of these ministers, united with the Church of the Nazarene.

Doctrine. In doctrine the Church of the Nazarene is essentially in accord with historic Methodism. It stands for apostolic purity of doctrine, primitive simplicity of worship, and pentecostal power in experience, it being generally regarded that the primary dispensational truth is that Jesus Christ baptizes believers with the Holy Spirit, cleansing them from all sin and empowering them to witness the grace of God to men. This church stands particularly for this truth and experience, which the general assembly has expressed in the following terms:

We believe that entire sanctification is that act of God, subsequent to regeneration, by which believers are made free from original sin, or depravity, and brought into a state of entire devotement to God, and the holy obedience of love made perfect.

It is wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, and comprehends in one experience the cleansing of the heart from sin and the abiding, indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, empowering the believer for life and service.

Entire sanctification is provided by the blood of Jesus, is wrought instantaneously by faith, preceded by entire consecration; and to this work and state of grace the Holy Spirit bears witness.

This experience is also known by various terms representing its different phases, such as "Christian perfection," "perfect love," "heart purity," "the baptism with the Holy Spirit," "the fullness of the blessing," and "Christian holiness."

The Church of the Nazarene recognizes that the right and privilege of men to church membership rests upon their being regenerate, and would require only such statements of belief as are essential to Christian experience and the maintenance of that condition. Whatever is not essential to life in Jesus Christ may be left to individual liberty of Christian thought. That which is essential to Christian life lies at the very basis of their associated life and fellowship in the church, and there can be no failure to believe this without forfeiting Christian life itself, and thus the right of all church affiliation.

While emphasizing the baptism with the Holy Spirit as a definite experience of divine grace, the Church of the Nazarene never has taught, nor does it now teach, or countenance teaching, that speaking in tongues is a manifestation attendant upon, or an evidence of, the baptism with the Holy Spirit.

While standing especially for the great dispensational truth that Jesus Christ baptizes believers with the Holy Spirit, cleansing them from all sin, the Church of the Nazarene also emphasizes the great cardinal doctrines of Christianity. Briefly stated, the Church of the Nazarene believes:

[p. 461] (1) In one God—the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; (2) in the plenary inspiration of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, and that they contain all truth necessary to faith and Christian living; (3) that man is born with a fallen nature, and is, therefore, inclined to evil, and that continually; (4) that the finally impenitent are hopelessly and eternally lost; (5) that the atonement through Jesus Christ is for the whole human race; and that whosoever repents and believes on the Lord Jesus Christ is justified and regenerated and saved from the dominion of sin; (6) that believers are to be sanctified wholly, subsequent to regeneration, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; (7) that the Holy Spirit bears witness to the new birth, and also to the entire sanctification of believers; (8) in the return of our Lord, in the resurrection of the dead, and in the final judgment.

... The Church of the Nazarene believes in the Bible doctrine of divine healing, and urges its people to offer the prayer of faith for the healing of the sick. Providential means and agencies when necessary are not to be refused.

Its position upon temperance and prohibition is stated in the following terms:

The Holy Scriptures and human experience alike condemn the use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage. The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for such purposes is a sin against God and the human race. Total abstinence from all intoxicants is the Christian rule for the individual...

Organization. The ecclesiastical organization is representative, thus avoiding the extremes of episcopacy on the one hand and the unlimited congregationalism on the other... The churches in a particular area are united to form an assembly District... The 45 districts elect both ministerial and lay delegates to the general assembly, which meets once in 4 years.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Membership (1959), 300,771 (YAC, 1961, p. 253).]

1099. Nebuchadnezzar, Accession of, According to Berosus SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* x. 11. 1; translated by Ralph Marcus, Vol. 6 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 279, 281. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 279] His [Nebuchadnezzar's] deeds are also mentioned by Berosus in the third book of his History of Chaldaea, where he writes as follows. "When his father Nabopalasaros [Nabopolassar] heard that the satrap appointed over and Egypt and the districts of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia had revolted from him, being no longer himself able to endure hardships, he placed a part of his force at the disposal of his son Nebuchadnezzar, who was in his prime, and sent him out against this [p. 281] satrap. Then Nebuchadnezzar engaged the rebel, defeated him in a pitched battle and brought the country which was under the other's rule into his own realm. As it happened, his father Nabopalasaros fell ill at about this time in the city of Babylon and departed this life after reigning twenty-one years. Being informed, not long after, of his father's death, Nebuchadnezzar settled the affairs of Egypt and the other countries and also gave orders to some of his friends to conduct to Babylon the captives taken among the Jews, Phoenicians, Syrians and peoples of Egypt with the bulk of his force and the rest of the booty, while he himself set out with a few men and reached Babylon through the desert. There he found the government administered by the Chaldaeans and the throne preserved for him by the ablest man among them; and, on becoming master of his father's entire realm, he gave orders to allot to the captives, when they came, settlements in the most suitable places in Babylonia."

1100. Nebuchadnezzar, Accession of—Ancient Babylonian Record SOURCE: The Babylonia Chronicle, tablet BM 21946, obverse, lines 1–16, 20, transl., in D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings*, (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1956), pp. 67, 69. Used by permission.

[p. 37] 1. In the twenty-first year the king of Akkad stayed in his own land, Nebuchadnezzar his eldest son, the crown-prince,

2. mustered (the Babylonian army) and took command of his troops; he marched to Carchemish which is on the bank of the Euphrates,

3. and crossed the river (to go) against the Egyptian army which lay in Carchemish,

4. ... fought with each other and the Egyptian army withdrew before him.

5. He accomplished their defeat and to non-existence [beat?] them. As for the rest of the Egyptian army

[p. 69] 6. which had escaped from the defeat (so quickly that) no weapon had reached them, in the district of Hamath

7. the Babylonian troops overtook and defeated them so that not a single man [escaped] to his own country.

8. At that time Nebuchadnezzar conquered the whole area of the Hatti-country.

9. For twenty-one years Nabopolassar had been king of Babylon.

10. On the 8th of the month of Ab he died (lit. 'the fates'); in the month of Elul Nebuchadnezzar returned to Babylon

11. and on the first day of the month of Elul he sat on the royal throne in Babylon.

12. In the 'accession year' Nebuchadnezzar went back again to the Hatti-land and until the month of Sebat

13. marched unopposed through the Hatti-land; in the month of Sebat he took the heavy tribute of the Hatti-territory to Babylon.

14. In the month of Nisan he took the hands of Bel and the son of Bel and celebrated the *akitu* (New Year) festival.

15. In the first year of Nebuchadnezzar in the month of Sivan he mustered his army

16. and went to the Hatti-territory, he marched about unopposed in the Hatti-territory until the month of Kislev...

20. ... Then in the month of Sebat he marched back to Babylon.

[EDITORS' NOTE: See Berosus' version of this narrative (No. 1099). This Babylonian tablet gives us the exact date of Nebuchadnezzar's accession. The years of his reign were already known beyond doubt from an astronomical tablet of his 37th year (see No. 452). Nabopolassar died on Ab 8 (approximately Aug. 16), and Nebuchadnezzar was enthroned in Babylon on Elul 1 (approximately Sept. 7), in 605 B.C. Note that dating sequence (lines 1, 12, 15) demonstrates the Babylonian "accession-year" method of numbering regnal years. First, Nebuchadnezzar's campaign in Hatti-land (Syria-Palestine) takes place in the 21st year of Nabopolassar; then the last portion of that year, between Nebuchadnezzar's accession (Elul 1) and the next New Year's Day, is called the "accession year"; only then begins the "first year" of Nebuchadnezzar, on Nisan 1, several months after his accession. The ellipses and the brackets (except for page numbers) are in the translation.]

1101. Nebuchadnezzar—Dealings With Captives

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "King Joiachin in Exile," *BA*, 54 (December, 1942), 51, 52, 54, 55. Used by permission.

[p. 51] More than a third of a century ago the German excavators of Babylon cleared the ruins of a remarkable vaulted building near the famous Ishtar Gate. Just southwest of the building in question lay the ruins of the great palace of the Chaldean kings, called "The House at which Men Marvel." According to the excavators, the vaulted building represents the substructure of the Hanging Gardens, counted by the Greeks as one of the Seven Wonders of the World... However this may be, there can be no doubt that the vaulted rooms (fourteen in number) represent the substructure of an important public building, probably one of the main depots for the distribution of supplies from the royal storehouses. In favor of this more prosaic interpretation are the location of the building at the Ishtar Gate and the discovery of nearly 300 cuneiform tablets relating mostly to the distribution of a stair-well, where they had fallen when the upper stories of the structure collapsed.

The contents of the tablets, in Dr. Weidner's resume, prove to be extraordinarily interesting, since they list payment of rations in oil and barley, etc., to captives and skilled workmen from many nations, all living in and around Babylon between the years 595 and 570 B.C. Among them are Yaukin [Jehoiachin], king of Judah, and five royal princes, as well as numerous other men of Judah; the sons of Aga, king of Ascalon in the

land of the Philistines, together with mariners and musicians from that seaport; mariners and craftsmen from Tyre, Byblus and Arvad in Phoenicia; Elamites, Medes and Persians; many Egyptians, who were mariners, ship-builders, horse-trainers and monkey-trainers (among their names are Necho, Psammetichus, Haryotes and perhaps Apries); Ionian carpenters and ship-builders, all with Carian or Lycian (localities in Asia Minor) names; and finally a number of Lydians. When all the tablets have been cleaned and published in detail, they will provide rich material for the study of the [p. 52] international relations of Babylonia in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar...

A number of other Biblical names occur among the persons receiving rations in these tablets. Shelemiah, Semachiah (both also found in the Lachish Letters), Kenaiah (known from the Elephantine Papyri and from an early Jewish seal), Gaddiel, Or-melech are specifically mentioned by name; Shelemiah is called "gardener." A century later Jews had already become so numerous and so important in the economic life of Babylonian that they figured largely in the business transactions for such houses as that of Murashu and Sons at Nippur.

As pointed out by Dr. Weidner, this distribution of rations undoubtedly means that Joaichin was free to move about Babylon and was not in prison. His imprisonment was then a later event, perhaps brought about by an attempt at escape in connection with intrigues or actual revolt in Judah. One such movement is mentioned in (*Jer.* 28:1–4); the prophet Hananiah son of Azariah ("Azur," also mentioned in the Lachish Letters) of Gibeon predicted that Joiachin would be restored to his throne within two years. Since his prophecy is dated 594 B.C. and one of the tablets mentioning Joiachin is dated in 592, it follows that Joiachin's status was not seriously affected by this particular incident. Some later event was therefore responsible for his incarceration...

[p. 54] The new documentation brings other confirmations of the authenticity of the Book of Ezekiel—small but none the less significant, especially when added to the accumulated mass of archaeological illustrations of Ezekiel. On pp. 31f. of his book Torrey insists that Ezekiel paints the [p. 55] material situation of the exiles in impossibly bright colors: the prophet lived in a house; he possessed an iron pan and a balance; he could eat wheat, barley, beans, lentils, millet and spelt. Quite aside from the fact that such circumstances are far from being luxurious, is the fact that at least one of the Jews listed in Weidner's tablets is expressly termed a "gardener," and that skilled craftsman [i.e. craftsmen] were in great demand, since rations for many hundreds of them from all parts of the Near East are recorded on these same tablets. Torrey's statement that the Jewish exiles under Joiachin were "not farmers" and that "artisans (craftsmen) could have found no means of support" are thus directly disproved by our new source of information (*cf. II Kings 24:14ff*).

1102. Nebuchadnezzar—Dealings With Jehoiachin, in Babylon, Archeological Confirmation of

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, Archeology and the Old Testament, pp. 17, 18. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 17] Another instance of minute and extraordinary confirmation of the sacred record is found among some three hundred cuneiform tablets unearthed near the Ishtar Gate in the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar II and dating between 595 and 570 B.C. In the lists of rations paid to craftsmen and captives who lived in or near the capital at that time occurs the name of "Yaukin, king of the land of Yahud"—none other than "Jehoiachin,

king of Judah" (11 Kings 25:27–30), who was taken captive to Babylon after Nebuchadnezzar's first conquest [i.e. second in view of that of Dan. 1:2] of Jerusalem, taken out of confinement by Nebuchadnezzar's successor, Evil-merodach, and [p. 18] given a daily allowance of food all the days of his life.⁶ [Note 6 cites W. F. Albright in *BA*, 4, i.e., 5 (December, 1942), 49–55.] The five sons of Yaukin are mentioned three times in the tablets and are described as being in the hand of an attendant having the Jewish name Kenaiah. No doubt several or all of these sons lived to be included in the list of the seven sons of Jehoiachin given in I Chronicles 3:17, 18.

1103. Nebuchadnezzar, Religion of

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, A History of Babylonia and Assyria, (6th ed., rev.; New York: Abingdon, 1915), Vol. 2, p. 544.

To all his virtues and all his faults Nebuchadnezzar added deep piety. He was a polytheist, worshiping especially Marduk, god of the mighty temple of E-sagila in Babylon, and Nabu, god of the great temple E-zida in Borsippa. He was, however, careful to pay due homage to gods many and lords many in different cities of his empire, and to these ... he likewise dedicated temples.

1104. Neo-orthodoxy, Defined

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 77. Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

Like fundamentalism, neo-Reformation theology is a reaction against liberal accommodation to culture. However, neo-Reformation theology is more sophisticated, and it takes for granted some ideas stressed by the liberals but rejected by fundamentalists. Though fundamentalism seeks to return to a preliberal Christianity, neo-Reformation theology is intentionally postliberal.

1105. New Earth, Final Abode of the Saints

SOURCE: G. F. Cox, Letters on the Second Coming of Christ (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), pp. 43-45.

[p. 43] One thing ... we think we have fixed without a reasonable doubt; namely, that the millennium spoken of in the Bible, cannot take place in the present organized state of the world, or of its inhabitants. Man must be new-made, and so must be the world...

[p. 44] There is another fact settled. The new heavens and new earth are to be the *final* abode of the saints... "We look for a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." And Peter wrote his second epistle, that the disciples should not forget *this very promise.* ... John also fully and glorious points out the new heavens and earth as the final habitation of all the redeemed. And where this abode is to be, we gain additional light from the testimony of the four living creatures *who are before the throne,* and the four and twenty elders... [p. 45] They will reign on earth. They without doubt represent, with the four and twenty elders, the Jewish and Christian church, and the redeemed from all nations... No one would expect them to reign on earth as it now is; nor could they till ... the resurrection.

1106. Nicaea, Council of, and Nicene Creed

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 55–57. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 55] So it happened that Constantine, the patron of Christianity, who was looking to this religion to tie his empire together, no sooner became master of all the Roman world than he found this major Christian dispute [the Arian controversy] on his hands, more threatening than any political challenge to the unity of his realm. He was, of course, incapable of understanding the subtleties of theological distinctions in the debate. But

there was one thing on which he was determined; he meant to have internal peace. So in 325, the second year of his undivided rule, he summoned the Christian bishops to a council at Nicaea, near Nicomedia. Not all Christian bishops were [p. 56] invited. Less than a dozen were from the West, and the most important of the Western bishops, the bishop of Rome, was not among them. Burckhardt, with his usual jaundiced view of Constantine's relations with the church, says that "of the perhaps thousand bishops of the East only those received invitations from the imperial secretarial whose opinions could be swayed or overborne." The council had one purpose—to end the theological controversy which was rending the church and disturbing the empire by reaching an agreement on the nature of the Christian God.

Eusebius of Caesarea, who participated in that historic meeting, has painted a vivid picture of the assembling of that first general church council. He tells how more than three hundred bishops (other sources say there were exactly 318) came rushing to Nicaea with their attendants in a frenzy of excitement, many of them scarred by what they had undergone in Diocletian's persecution, with eyeless sockets, disfigured faces, twisted and withered limbs, paralyzed hands. Constantine himself presided, a glittering figure in his imperial robes, which were no longer the austere purple garment worn by the emperors in Rome but were the jewel-encrusted, multicolored brocades thought proper to an Eastern monarch.

At the start, the bishops were divided nearly evenly between those who supported the Arian view and those who favored that of Athanasius. Eusebius, who had Arian leanings, proposed a formula in words quoted directly from the New Testament, but the Athanasian party would have none of that because it seemed that the Arians might accept it and still hold their own views. The New Testament writers had never said anything about the

ousia [essence] of either the Father or the Son. It was probably Bishop Hosius who

introduced the word *homoousion* [of the same essence]. Since he had great influence with Constantine, the imperial weight was thrown into that side of the scales. After more days of inconclusive debate the impatient emperor intervened to demand that this statement of the Athanasian view should be adopted. Only two bishops voted against it. Thus, it came to pass that, out of an assembly which partook more of the character of a political convention than a [p. 57] religious convocation, there emerged that Nicene Creed, which to this day is the standard of orthodoxy in the Roman, Eastern, Anglican, and some other churches.

1107. Nineveh, Fall of, Dated by a Babylonian Tablet as Having Taken Place in 612 B.C.

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 43, 44. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 43] A Babylonian tablet ... was deciphered in 1923, which showed that the fall of Nineveh did not take place in 606 B.C. as the [p. 44] older textbooks had surmised, but in 612 B.C. This has found its way into recent text-books of history, but as our commentaries have not yet been replaced by new ones, the necessary corrections have not been made there.

1108. Nineveh, Medieval Knowledge Concerning

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1908), pp. 5, 6.

[p. 5] It was in the Middle Ages that men began to travel over the great valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, seeking some signs of its former magnificence and power. Perhaps the earliest of the intelligent travelers was the rabbi Benjamin, son of Jonah, of the city of Tudela in the kingdom of Navarre. He set out from home about 1160 A.D. and journeyed overland across Spain and France and Italy. Thence he passed on to Greece and to Constantinople. After visiting the sacred places in Palestine he went over the desert, by way of Tadmor, to Mosul on the Tigris. What a wonderful journey that was, in that distant day! At Mosul he wrote in his journal these words: "This city, situated on the confines of Persia, is of great extent and [p. 6] very ancient; it stands on the banks of the Tigris, and is joined by a bridge to Nineveh. Although the latter lies in ruins, there are numerous inhabited villages and small towns on its site. Nineveh is on the Tigris distant one parasang from the town of Arbil." These words introduced the long-lost city of Nineveh to the modern world, while the modern world was still latent in the Middle Ages. Benjamin had seen the mounds beyond the river and knew that beneath them lay all that remained of ancient Nineveh. Babylon he probably did not see, for the mention which he makes of it scarcely seems to be in the words of an eve-witness.

From the time of Benjamin onward the sites of Babylon and of Nineveh were visited again and again by passing travelers, but the day of scientific exploration was long deferred, and only came with the nineteenth century.

1109. Nineveh—Site Forgotten in Time of Xenophon, Two Centuries After Its Destruction

SOURCE: Xenophon *Anabasis* iii. 4. 10; translated by Carleton L. Brownson, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1944), pp. 467, 469. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 467] From this place they marched one stage, six [p. 469] parasangs, to a great stronghold, deserted and lying in ruins. The name of this city was Mespila,¹ and it was once inhabited by the Medes. The foundation of its wall was made of polished stone full of shells, and was fifty feet in breadth and fifty in height. Upon this foundation was built a wall of brick, fifty feet in breadth, and a hundred in height; and the circuit of the wall was six parasangs.

[Translator's note 1; p. 468] The ruins which Xenophon saw here were those of Nineveh, the famous capital of the Assyrian Empire. It is curious to find him dismissing this great Assyrian city (as well as Calah above) with the casual and misleading statement that "it was once inhabited by the Medes." In fact, the capture of Nineveh by the Medes (c. 600 B.C.) was the precise event which *closed* the important period of its history, and it remained under the control of the Medes only [p. 469] during the succeeding half-century, *i.e.* until the Median Empire was in its turn overthrown by the Persians (549 B.C.). Xenophon, then, goes but one unimportant step backward in his historical note—perhaps because he did not care to go farther, perhaps because he was unable to do so.

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1110. Objectivity, Anecdote Illustrating

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), Foreword, p. vi. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The *New Yorker* published a cartoon which showed a harassed salesman in a bookstore confronted by a determined matron demanding "an unbiased history of the Civil War from a Southern point of view." With the best intentions in the world to achieve objectivity, those who write the history of Christianity can hardly claim a greater degree of success. There is, in church history, a Roman Catholic point of view, an Eastern Orthodox point of view, a Protestant-Anglican point of view (with Calvinist, Lutheran, and Anabaptist refinements), and none of us ... can escape from the one in which we are at home.

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1111. Paganism, Described as Satan's Counterfeit of Christianity

SOURCE: Tertullian, On Prescription Against Heretics, chap. 40, trans. in ANF, Vol. 3, pp. 262, 263.

[p. 262] The devil, ... by the mystic rites of his idols, vies even with the essential portions of the sacraments of God. He, too, baptizes some—that is, his own believers and faithful followers; he promises the putting away of sins by a laver (of his own); and if my memory still serves me, Mithra there, (in the kingdom of Satan,) sets his marks on the foreheads of his soldiers; celebrates also the oblation of bread, and introduces an image of a resurrec- [p. 263] tion, and before a sword wreathes a crown. What also must we say to (Satan's) limiting his chief priest [the Roman *flamen Dialis*] to a single marriage? He, too, has his virgins; he, too, has his proficients in continence.

1112. Paganism, Roman, Suppressed by Theodosius I

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 28, Vol. 3 (London: Methuen & Co., 1897), pp. 188, 208.

[p. 188] The ruin of Paganism, in the age of Theodosius I [A.D. 379–395], is perhaps the only example of the total extirpation of any ancient and popular superstition; and may therefore deserve to be considered as a singular event in the history of the human mind. The Christians, more especially the clergy, had impatiently supported the prudent delays of Constantine and the equal toleration of the elder Valentinian; nor could they deem their conquest perfect or secure, as long as their adversaries were permitted to exist...

[p. 208] The generation that arose in the world after the promulgation of the Imperial laws [forbidding the pagan worship] was attracted within the pale of the Catholic Church: and so rapid, yet so gentle, was the fall of Paganism that only twenty-eight years after the death of Theodosius the faint and minute vestiges were no longer visible to the eye of the legislator.

1113. Papacy, Absolutism of, Unsound Foundation for SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, p. 180– 183.

[p. 180] The idea of Papal absolutism and Infallibility, like that of the sinlessness of Mary, can be traced to apocryphal origin. It is found first in the second century, in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, which contain a singular system of speculative Ebionism, and represent James of Jerusalem, the brother of the Lord, as the Bishop of Bishops, the centre of Christendom, and the general Vicar of Christ; he is the last arbiter, from whom there is no appeal; to him even Peter must give an account of his labors, and to him the sermons of Peter were sent for safe keeping.

In the Catholic Church the same idea, but transferred to the Bishop of Rome, is first clearly expressed in the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, that huge forgery of Papal letters, which appeared in the middle of the ninth century, and had for its object the completion of the independence of the Episcopal hierarchy from the State, and the absolute power of the Popes, as the legislators and judges of all Christendom. Here the most extravagant claims are put into the mouths of the early Popes, from Clement (91) to Damasus (384), in the barbarous French Latin of the Middle Ages, and with such numerous and glaring anachronisms as to force the conviction of fraud even upon Roman Catholic scholars. [p. 181] One of these sayings is: 'The Roman Church remains to the end free from stain of heresy.' Soon afterwards arose, in the same hierarchical interest, the legend of the donation of Constantine and his baptism by Pope Silvester, interpolations of the writings of the Fathers, especially Cyprian and Augustine, and a variety of fictions embodied in

the Gesta Liberii and the Liber Pontificalis, and sanctioned by Gratianus (about 1150) in

his Decretum, or collection of canons, which (as the first part of the Corpus juris

canonici) became the code of laws for the whole Western Church, and exerted an extraordinary influence. By this series of pious frauds the mediaeval Papacy, which was the growth of ages, was represented to the faith of the Church as a primitive institution of Christ, clothed with absolute and perpetual authority.

The Popes since Nicholas I. (858–867), who exceeded all his predecessors in the boldness of his designs, freely used what the spirit of a hierarchical, superstitous, and uncritical age furnished them. They quoted the fictitious letters of their predecessors as genuine, the Sardican canon on appeals as a canon of Nicaea, and the interpolated sixth canon of Nicaea, 'the Roman Church always had the primacy,' of which there is not a syllable in the original; and nobody doubted them. Papal absolutism was in full vigor from Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII. Scholastic divines, even Thomas Aquinas, deceived by these literary forgeries, began to defend Papal absolutism over the whole Church, and the Councils of Lyons (1274) and of Florence (1439) sanctioned it, although the Greeks soon afterwards rejected the false union based upon such assumption.

But absolute power, especially of a spiritual kind, is invariably intoxicating and demoralizing to any mortal man who possesses it. God Almighty alone can bear it, and even he allows freedom to his rational creatures. The reminiscence of the monstrous period when the Papacy was a football in the hands of bold and dissolute women (904–962), or when mere boys, like Benedict IX. (1033), polluted the Papal crown with the filth of unnatural vices, could not be quite forgotten. The scandal of the Papal schism (1378–1409), when two and even three rival Popes excommunicated and cursed each other, and laid all Western Christendom under the ban, excited the moral indignation of all good men in Christendom, and called forth, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, the three Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, [p. 182] which loudly demanded a reformation of the Church, in the head as well as in the members, and asserted the superiority of a Council over the Pope.

The Council of Constance (1414–1418), the most numerous ever seen in the West, deposed two Popes—John XXIII. (the infamous Balthasar Cossa, who had been recognized by the majority of the Church), on the charge of a series of crimes (May 29, 1415), and Benedict XIII., as a heretic who sinned against the unity of the Church (July 26, 1417), and elected a new Pope, Martin V. (Nov. 11, [1417]), who had given his adhesion to the Council, though after his accession to power he found ways and means to defeat its real object, i.e., the reformation of the Church.

This Council was a complete triumph of the Episcopal system, and the Papal absolutists and Infallibilists are here forced to the logical dilemma of either admitting the validity of the Council or invalidating the election of Martin V. and his successors. Either course is fatal to their system. Hence there has never been an *authoritative* decision on the oecumenicity of this Council, and the only subterfuge is to say that the whole case is an extraordinary exception; but this, after all, involves the admission that there is a higher power in the Church over the Papacy.

The Reformation shook the whole Papacy to its foundation, but could not overthrow it. A powerful reaction followed, headed by the Jesuits. Their General, Lainez, strongly advocated Papal Infallibility in the Council of Trent, and declared that the Church could

not err only because the Pope could not err. But the Council left the question undecided, and the Roman Catechism ascribes infallibility simply to 'the Catholic Church,' without defining its seat. Bellarmin advocated and formularized the doctrine, stating it as an almost general opinion that the Pope could not publicly teach a heretical dogma, and as a probable and pious opinion that Providence will guard him even against private heresy. Yet the same Bellarmin was witness to the innumerable blunders of the edition of the Latin Vulgate prepared by Sixtus V., corrected by his own hand, and issued by him as the only true and authentic text of the sacred Scriptures, with the stereotyped forms [p. 183] of anathema upon all who should venture to change a single word; and Bellarmin himself gave the advice that all copies should be called in, and a new edition printed with a lying statement in the preface making the printers the scape-goats for the errors of the Pope! This whole business of the Vulgate is sufficient to explode Papal Infallibility; for it touches the very source of divine revelation. Other Italian divines, like Alphonsus Liguori, and Jesuitical text-books, unblushingly use long-exploded mediaeval fictions and interpolations as a groundwork of Papal absolutism and Infallibility.

It is not necessary to follow the progress of the controversy between the Episcopal and the Papal systems during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is sufficient to say that the greatest Catholic divines of France and Germany, including Bossuet and Möhler, together with many from other countries, down to the 88 protesting Bishops in the Vatican Council, were anti-Infallibilists; and that popular Catechisms of the Roman Church, extensively used till 1870, expressly denied the doctrine, which is now set up as an article of faith necessary to eternal salvation.

1114. Papacy—As Variously Defined

SOURCE: A Catholic Dictionary, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.; 1958), p. 366. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

Papacy (Low Lat. *papa*, pope; late Lat. from Gk. *pappas*, father). i. The office of pope (q.v.)

ii. The system of ecclesiastical government in which supreme authority is vested in the pope.

iii. The series of popes taken collectively.

iv. The period of office of any one pope.

1115. Papacy—Bishop of Rome, First Aggressiveness of

SOURCE: Charles Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims* (11th ed.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1920), pp. 95, 96. Used by permission.

[p. 95] It is towards the end of the second century, when the line of Roman bishops comes into clearer historical light, that we begin to discern dimly the first beginnings of their claim to be successors of St. Peter; and it is in A.D. 196, in the person of Victor, that we have our first anticipation of the aggressive spirit which is to be a distinguishing characteristic of the see of Rome in later ages. Victor ventured in a domineering spirit to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches who held to their Johannine tradition and insisted on keeping Easter on the day of the Jewish passover, whatever day of the [p. 96] week that might be. This arbitrary act on Victor's part brought down upon him the 'sharp rebukes' of a number of bishops, and amongst them of the great St. Irenaeus, who contended that variety in ecclesiastical custom had never hitherto been a bar to fellowship, because such 'difference only serves to commend the unity of the faith.' Victor stood reproved. His excommunication failed. It was a mere 'attempt'—not in the

sense that he did not actually issue the sentence, for Eusebius tells us that he did; but simply because it was ignored, and the question of Easter observance remained an open one till the Council of Nicaea closed it.

1116. Papacy—Bishop of Rome Freed by Removal of Capital to Constantinople, Catholic View on

SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), pp. 11–13. [FRS No. 36.]

[p. 11] But from the hour when Constantine, in the language of the Roman law, "Deo jubente," by the command of God, translated the seat of empire to Constantinople, from that moment there never reigned [p. 12] in Rome a temporal prince to whom the Bishops of Rome owed a permanent allegiance. From that hour God Himself liberated His Church [see No. 1137]. It was from the first involved in the principles of the supernatural sovereignty of the Church on earth, that it should be one day free from all temporal allegiance, though as yet its liberation was not accomplished. David possessed the promise of the kingdom of Israel; but he waited long. Jeroboam had the promise of the ten tribes; but he was a usurper, because he grasped it before the time. The Church followed not the example of Jeroboam, but that of David, whose Son it its own divine Head. It waited until such time as God should break its bonds asunder, and should liberate it from subjection to civil powers, and enthrone it in the possession of a temporal sovereignty of its own. Therefore, in that day when the first Christian emperor withdrew himself into the far East, he abandoned Rome and Italy; and the "donation" of Constantine, as it is called, expresses not a fact, but a principle. Constantine signed no instrument of donation; but the manner of conceiving and of speaking, in those simple ages, so represented the provi- [p. 13] dential fact of the donation of God. God gave to the Vicar of His Son the possession of the city in which thirty of his predecessors had sealed their testimony with their blood. The donation of Constantine consisted in the simple providential fact, that he departed from Rome to Constantinople, moved by an impulse from God Himself.

1117. Papacy—Bishop of Rome Gains Supremacy SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), pp.

285, 286.

[p. 285] The patriarch of Constantinople, however, remained virtually only primus [p.

286] *inter pares* [first among equals], and has never exercised a papal supremacy over his colleagues in the East, like that of the pope over the metropolitans of the West; still less has he arrogated, like his rival in ancient Rome, the sole dominion of the entire church. Toward the bishop of Rome he claimed only equality of rights and co-ördinate dignity.

In this long contest between the two leading patriarchs of Christendom, the patriarch of Rome at last carried the day. The monarchical tendency of the hierarchy was much stronger in the West than in the East, and was urging a universal monarchy in the church.

1118. Papacy—Bishop of Rome Heir of Imperial Rome SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 287.

Then, too, considered even in a political point of view, old Rome had a far longer and grander imperial tradition to show, and was identified in memory with the bloom of the empire; while New Rome [Constantinople] marked the beginning of its decline. When the Western empire fell into the hands of the barbarians, the Roman bishop was the only

surviving heir of this imperial past, or, in the well-known dictum of Hobbes, "the ghost of the deceased Roman empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof."

1119. Papacy—Bishop of Rome in the Seat of the Caesars SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 168, 169. Used by permission.

[p. 168] The removal of the capital of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330, left the Western Church, practically free from imperial power, to develop its own form of organisation. The Bishop of Rome, in the seat of the Caesars [see No. 1359], was now the greatest man in the West, and was soon forced to become the political as well as the spiritual head. To the Western world Rome was still the political capital-hence the whole habit of mind, all ambition, pride, and sense of glory, and every social prejudice favoured the evolution of the great city into the ecclesiastical capital. Civil as well as religious disputes were referred to the [p. 169] successor of Peter for settlement. Again and again, when barbarians attacked Rome, he was compelled to actually assume military leadership. Eastern Emperors frequently recognized the high claims of the Popes in order to gain their assistance. It is not difficult to understand how, under these responsibilities, the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, established in the pre-Constantine period, was emphasized and magnified after 313 [Edict of Milan]. The importance of this fact must not be overlooked. The organisation of the Church was thus put on the same divine basis as the revelation of Christianity. This idea once accepted led inevitably to the mediaeval Papacy.

1120. Papacy — Bishop of Rome, Peter's Successor (Jerome on) SOURCE: *The Letters of St. Jerome*, Letter 15, To Pope Damasus, secs. 1, 2, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 6, p. 18.

Since the East, shattered as it is by the long-standing feuds, subsisting between its peoples, is bit by bit tearing into shreds the seamless vest of the Lord, ... I think it my duty to consult the chair of Peter...

Yet, though your greatness terrifies me, your kindness attracts me. From the priest I demand the safe-keeping of the victim, from the shepherd the protection due to the sheep. Away with all that is overweening; let the state of Roman majesty withdraw. My words are spoken to the successor of the fisherman, to the disciple of the cross. As I follow no leader save Christ, so I communicate with none but your blessedness, that is with the chair of Peter. For this, I know, is the rock on which the church is built! This is the house where alone the paschal lamb can be rightly eaten. This is the ark of Noah, and he who is not found in it shall perish when the flood prevails.

1121. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—"Another God on Earth" SOURCE: Christopher Marcellus, Oration in the Fifth Lateran Council, Session IV (1512), in Mansi *SC*, Vol. 32, col. 761. Latin.

For thou art the shepherd, thou art the physician, thou art the director, thou art the husbandman; finally, thou art another God on earth.

1122. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—Decisions Same as God's SOURCE: Augustinus Triumphus, *Summa de Potestate Ecclesiastica* ("Summary Concerning Ecclesiastical Power") (Augustae Vindelicorum [Augsburg]: [Johannes Schüssler], 1483), questio 6, "De Papalis Sentencie Apellatione," fol. [61 v]. Latin.

The second reason is accepted on the part of the pope. For the pope alone is said to be the vicar of God; wherefore only what is bound or loosed by him is held to be bound and loosed by God Himself. Therefore the decision of the Pope and the decision of God constitute one decision, just as the opinion of the Pope and of his assistant are the same. Since, therefore, an appeal is always made from an inferior judge to a superior, just as no one is greater than himself, so no appeal holds when made from the Pope to God, because there is one consistory of the Pope himself and of God Himself, of which consistory the Pope himself is the key-bearer and the doorkeeper. Therefore no one can appeal from the Pope to God, as no one can enter into the consistory of God without the mediation of the Pope, who is the key-bearer and the doorkeeper of the consistory of eternal life; and as no one can appeal to himself, because there is one decision and one court [curia] of God and of the Pope.

1123. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—Power to Modify Divine Laws

SOURCE: Lucius Ferraris, "Papa," art. 2, in his *Prompta Bibliotheca* ("Handy Library"), Vol. 6 (Venetiis [Venice]: Gaspar Storti, 1772), p. 29. Latin.

The pope is of so great authority and power that he can modify, explain, or interpret even divine laws... Petrus de Ancharano [d. 1416] very clearly asserts this in *Consil.* 373, no. 3 verso: "The pope can modify divine law, since his power is not of man, but of God, and he acts in the place of God upon earth, with the fullest power of binding and loosing his sheep."

1124. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—"Primacy Over World" SOURCE: Council of Florence, Session XXV (July 6, 1439), Definitio, in Mansi *SC*, Vol. 31, col. 1031. Latin.

We define that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff holds the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is [1] the successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles; and [2] the true vicar of Christ, [3] the head of the whole church, and [4] the father and doctor of all Christians; and that to him, in the blessed Peter, was given, by our Lord Jesus Christ, full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal church, as is contained also in the acts of the ecumenical councils, and in the sacred cannons.

1125. Papacy, Claims Made for the Pope—Triple Kingship

SOURCE: Lucius Ferraris, "Papa," art. 2, in his *Prompta Bibliotheca* ("Handy Library"), Vol. 6 (Venetiis [Venice]: Gaspar Storti, 1772), p. 26. Latin.

Hence the Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of heaven and of earth and of the lower regions [*infernorum*].

1126. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—"Vicar of the Son of God" SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), pp. 46, 140, 141.

[p. 46] The highest power in the world, the Vicar of the incarnate Son of God, ... sat in his tribunal...

[p. 140] So in like manner they say now, See this Catholic Church, this Church of God, feeble and weak, rejected even by the very nations called Catholic. There is Catholic France, and Catholic Germany, and Catholic Italy, giving up this exploded figment of the temporal power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. And [p. 141] so, because the Church seems weak, and the Vicar of the Son of God is renewing the Passion of his Master upon earth, therefore we are scandalised, therefore we turn our faces from him.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Manning is writing in English, but in Latin "Vicar of the Son of God" is *Vicarius Filii Dei*, as the phrase occurs in the Donation of Constantine, where it is applied to Peter.]

1127. Papacy, Claims of—Bishop of Rome Peter's Successor (Leo I)

SOURCE: Pope Leo I, Extracts trans. in Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 85, 86. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 by Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[Translator's note; p. 85] Leo I (440–61) made frequent use of the Petrine theory. In brief this theory is that to Peter as the prince of the apostles was committed the supreme power over the church. To him the keys were intrusted in a special manner. In this consisted his primacy, his superiority over the other apostles. This primacy or first rank he communicated to his successors, the bishops of Rome, who, by virtue of being his successors, held the same primacy over the church and over all other bishops as Peter held over the other apostles. The passage on which this theory is based is found in Matt. 16:18 f: "And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt be loosed in heaven."

We offer the following detached passages from the works of Leo I to illustrate his conception of the theory.

[Migne, Vol. 64] Col. 628. Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, caused his truth to be promulgated through the apostles. And while this duty was placed on all the apostles, the Lord made St. Peter the head of them all, that from him as from their head his gifts should flow out into all the body. So that if anyone separates himself from St. Peter he should know that he has no share in the divine blessing...

Col. 995. Constantinople has its own glory and by the mercy of God has become the seat of the empire. But secular matters are based on one thing, ecclesiastical matters on another. For nothing will stand which is not built on the rock [Peter] which the Lord laid in the foundation [Matt. 16:18]... Your city is royal, but you cannot make it [p. 86] apostolic [as Rome is, because its church was founded by St. Peter].

Col. 1031. You will learn with what reverence the bishop of Rome treats the rules and canons of the church if you read my letters by which I resisted the ambition of the patriarch of Constantinople, and you will see also that I am the guardian of the catholic faith and of the decrees of the church fathers...

Col. 881. Believing that it is reasonable and just that as the holy Roman church, through St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, is the head of all the churches of the whole world, etc.

Col. 147. This festival should be so celebrated that in my humble person he [Peter] should be seen and honored who has the care over all the shepherds and the sheep committed to him, and whose dignity is not lacking in me, his heir, although I am unworthy.

1128. Papacy, Claims of—Dictates of Hildebrand (Gregory VII) SOURCE: Gregory VII, *Dictatus Papae* ("Dictates of the Pope"; sometimes called the Dictates of Hilderbrand), Latin text in Karl Hofmann, *Der "Dictatus Papae" Gregors VII* (Paderborn [Germany]: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1933), p. 11.

1. That the Roman Church was founded by the Lord alone.

2. That the Roman Pontiff alone is justly called universal.

3. That he alone can depose bishops or restore them...

9. That all princes should kiss the feet of the pope alone...

12. That it is lawful for him to depose emperors...

18. That his sentence ought not to be reviewed by any one; and he alone can review [the decisions] of all.

19. That he ought to be judged by no one...

22. That the Roman Church never erred; nor will it, according to Scripture, ever err...

27. That he can absolve subjects from their allegiance to unrighteous [rulers].

1129. Papacy, Claims of-"Every Human Creature" Subject to

SOURCE: Pope Boniface VIII, Bull Unam Sanctam, 1302, in Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History, Vol. 3 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 189–), No. 6, pp. 20– 23 (from Latin text of Mury, Revue des Questions Historiques, Vol. 46, pp. 225, 256, based on the facsimile from the Papal Regesta).

[Translator's note; p. 20] The bull Unam Sanctam, while an obscurely worded document, furnishes a convenient example of the reasoning of those who strove to exalt the papal power to the highest point. The theory of the two swords is taken from Saint Bernard (Epist. CCLVI.), other portions almost literally from Aegidius Romanus, a well known political writer of the time, who is supposed by some to have drafted the bull itself. The more comprehensive claims of the bull have been so attenuated by the official interpretation of succeeding popes that the claim directly to control the secular government is surrendered...

Although the authenticity of the bull has been questioned, it is recorded in the Papal Registers, is appended to the civil law in the *Extravagantes*, and was formally sanctioned by Leo X. in the Fifth Lateran Council. An interesting discussion of the bull and its origin is to be found in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for 1879, vol. 26, pp. 91ff.

That there is one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church we are im- [p. 21] pelled by our faith to believe and to hold-this we do firmly believe and openly confess-and outside of this there is neither salvation or remission of sins, as the bridegroom proclaims in Canticles, "My dove, my undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother; she is the choice one of her that bare her." The Church represents one mystic body and of this body Christ is the head; of Christ, indeed, God is the head. In it is one Lord, and one faith, and one baptism. In the time of the flood, there was one ark of Noah, pre-figuring the one Church, finished in one cubit, having one Noah as steersman and commander. Outside of this, all things upon the face of the earth were, as we read, destroyed. This Church we venerate and this alone, the Lord saying through his prophets, "Deliver my soul, O God, from the sword; my darling from the power of the dog." He prays thus for the soul, that is for Himself, as head, and also for the body which He calls one, namely, the Church on account of the unity of the bridegroom, of the faith, of the sacraments, and of the charity of the Church. It is that seamless coat of the Lord, which was not rent, but fell by lot. Therefore, in this one and only Church, there is one body and one head,—not two heads as if it were a monster-namely, Christ and Christ's Vicar, Peter and Peter's successors, for the Lord said to Peter himself, "Feed my sheep:" my sheep, he said, using a general term and not designating these or those sheep, so that we must believe that all the sheep were committed to him. If, then, the Greeks, or others, shall say that they were not entrusted to Peter and his successors, they must perforce admit that they are not of Christ's sheep, as the Lord says in John, "there is one fold, and one shepherd."

In this Church and in its power are two swords, to wit, a spiritual and a temporal, and this we are taught by the words of the Gospel, for when the Apostles said, "Behold, here are two swords" (in the Church, namely, since the Apostles were speaking), the Lord did not reply that it was too many, but enough. And surely he who claims that the temporal sword is not in the power of Peter has but ill understood the word of our Lord when he said, "Put up thy sword in its scabbard." Both, therefore, the spiritual and the material swords, are in the power of the Church, the latter indeed to be used for the Church, the former by the Church, the one by the priest, the other by the hand of kings and soldiers, but by the will and sufferance of the priest. It is fitting, moreover, that one sword should

be under the other, and the temporal authority subject to the spiritual power. For [p. 22] when the Apostle said, "there is no power but of God and the powers that are of God are ordained," they would not be ordained * [Note *: I.e., disposed in an orderly manner.] unless one sword were under the other, and one, as inferior, was brought back by the other to the highest place, † [Note †: Mr. Henderson suggests (Select Hist. Documents, 436) "were guided by the other to the performance of the most exalted deeds." That is, at least, intelligible, while the literal translation here given and the numerous French and German renderings cited by Mury, Revue des Questions Historiques, vol. 26, pp. 107, 108, are none of them clear.] For, according to the Holy Dionysius, the law of divinity is to lead the lowest through the intermediate to the highest. Therefore, according to the law of the universe, things are not reduced to order directly, and upon the same footing, but the lowest through the intermediate, and the inferior through the superior. It behooves us, therefore, the more freely to confess that the spiritual power excels in dignity and nobility any form whatsoever of earthly power, as spiritual interests exceed the temporal in importance. All this we see fairly from the giving of tithes, from the benediction and sanctification, from the recognition of this power and the control of these same things. For the truth bearing witness, it is for the spiritual power to establish the earthly power and judge it, if it be not good. Thus, in the case of the Church and the power of the Church, the prophecy of Jeremiah is fulfilled: "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms"—and so forth. Therefore, if the earthly power shall err, it shall be judged by the spiritual power; if the lesser spiritual power err, it shall be judged by the higher. But if the supreme power err, it can be judged by God alone and not by man, the apostles bearing witness saying, the spiritual man judges all things but he himself is judged by no one. Hence this power, although given to man and exercised by man, is not human, but rather a divine power, given by the divine lips to Peter, and founded on a rock for Him and his successors in Him [Christ] whom he confessed, the Lord saying to Peter himself, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind," etc. Whoever, therefore, shall resist this power, ordained by God, resists the ordination of God, unless there should be two beginnings, as the Manichaean imagines. But this we judge to be false and heretical, since, by the testimony of Moses, not in the beginnings, but in the beginning. God created the heaven and the earth. We, moreover, proclaim, declare [p. 23] and pronounce that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.* [Note *: This famous concluding sentence has been robbed of all political significance by the interpretation of Leo X., who declared that "every human being" meant "all Christian believers," which reduces the meaning to a commonplace of Catholic theology.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Latin text (in David S. Schaff, *The Middle Ages* [Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 5. New York: Scribner, 1910], part 2, p. 28) has *omni humanae creaturae* ("every human creature") and it is so translated in *The Papal Encyclicals in Their Historical Context*, ed. by Anne Fremantle (New York: Putnam, 1956), p. 74.]

1130. Papacy, Claims of — "I Am Caesar" (Boniface VIII) SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), p. 413. Used by permission.

The papal theory ... made the Pope alone God's representative on earth and maintained that the Emperor received his right to rule from St. Peter's successor... It was upheld by Nicholas I., Hildebrand, Alexander III., Innocent III., and culminated with Boniface VIII. at the jubilee of 1300 when, seated on the throne of Constantine, girded

with the imperial sword, wearing a crown, and waving a sceptre, he shouted to the throng of loyal pilgrims: "I am Caesar—I am Emperor."

1131. Papacy, Claims of—Obedience to Pope as to God (Leo XIII) SOURCE: Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter, "On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens," dated January 10, 1890, trans. in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903), p. 193.

But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself.

1132. Papacy, Claims of—Pope in Place of God on Earth (Leo XIII) SOURCE: Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter "The Reunion of Christendom," dated June 20, 1894, trans. in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903), p. 304.

We [the pope] hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty.

1133. Papacy, Claims of, to Universal Sovereignty

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), p. 120. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

What the papacy aimed at was not simply to *be* a temporal power by reason of sovereignty over a little Italian state, but to exercise a universal sovereignty over all sovereigns by reason of the spiritual office of the pope, who was to be the master and arbiter of all other temporal authorities.

The development of that ideal, the partial achievement of it, and some of the reactions against it are what we must now consider. Lest this should seem to the modern reader a threshing over of old straw and a discussion of dead issues, there should perhaps be inserted here a reminder that all the popes of the last six centuries have worn the triple tiara. According to present-day Roman Catholic authorities, its three crowns signify "universal episcopate, supremacy of jurisdiction, and universal supremacy." In the coronation of all popes—including Pius XII, on March 12, 19, 1939 [and presumably any thereafter]—the tiara is placed on the candidate's head with the words: "Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns and know that thou art Father of princes and kings, Ruler of the world, Vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ." If this phraseology had not been sanctified by long usage, it would not have been coined in this generation to express the relation of the pope to the political and social order; but it would not have been created in the first place if it had not meant then what it says—"Ruler of the world."

1134. Papacy—Code of Justinian Recognizes Roman Pope's Headship Over All the Churches (A.D. 533)

SOURCE: Justinian, Letter to Pope John, incorporated in the letter of Pope John to the emperor in The Code of Justinian, Book I, title 1, 8 (numbered title 1, 4 in S. P. Scott's English version), *The Civil Law*, Vol. 12, pp. 11–13. Copyright 1932 by The Central Trust Company, Cincinnati. Used by permission of Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, as one of the copyright owners, and John M. Rankin, as trustee, and the beneficiaries of the trust created under the Last Will & Testament of Elizabeth W. Scott, deceased.

[p. 11] The following is the text of the letter of the Emperor Justinian, Victorious, Pious, Happy, Renowned, Triumphant, always Augustus, to John, Patriarch, and most Holy Archbishop of the fair City of Rome:

With honor to the Apostolic See, and to Your Holiness, which is, and always has been remembered in Our prayers, both now and formerly, and honoring your happiness, as is proper in the case of one who is considered as a father, We hasten to bring to the knowledge of Your Holiness everything relating to the condition of the Church, as We have always had the greatest desire to preserve the unity of your Apostolic See, and the condition of the Holy Churches of God, as they [p. 12] exist at the present time, that they may remain without disturbance or opposition. Therefore, we have exerted Ourselves to unite all the present the East and subject them to the See of Your Holiness, and hence the questions which have at present

arisen, although they are manifest and free from doubt, and, according to the doctrine of your Apostolic See, are constantly firmly observed and preached by all priests, We have still considered it necessary that they should be brought to the attention of Your Holiness. For we do not suffer anything which has reference to the state of the Church, even though what causes the difficulty may be clear and free from doubt, to be discussed without being brought to the notice of Your Holiness, because you are the head of all the Holy Churches, for We shall exert Ourselves in every way (as has already been stated), to increase the honor and authority of your See...

[p. 13] (3) Moreover, we recognize four Sacred Councils, that is to say, the one composed of three hundred and eighteen Holy Fathers who assembled in the City of Nicea; and that of the hundred and fifty Holy Fathers who met in this Imperial City; and that of the Holy Fathers who first congregated at Ephesus; and that of the Holy Fathers who met at Chalcedony [i.e. Chalcedon], as your Apostolic See teaches and proclaims. Hence, all priests who follow the doctrine of your Apostolic See believe, confess, and preach these things.

(4) Wherefore We have hastened to bring to the notice of Your Holiness, through the most blessed Bishops Hypatius and Demetrius (so it may not be concealed from Your Holiness), that these tenets are denied by some few wicked and judaizing monks, who have adopted the perfidious doctrines of Nestor.

(5) Therefore We request your paternal affection, that you, by your letters, inform Us and the Most Holy Bishop of this Fair City, and your brother the Patriarch, who himself has written by the same messengers to Your Holiness, eager in all things to follow the Apostolic See of Your Blessedness, in order that you may make it clear to Us that Your Holiness acknowledges all the matters which have been set forth above, and condemns the perfidy of those who, in the manner of Jews, have dared to deny the true Faith. For in this way the love of all persons for you, and the authority of your See will increase, and the unity of the Holy Church will be preserved unimpaired, when all the most blessed bishops learn through you and from those who have been dispatched by you, the true doctrines of Your Holiness. Moreover, We beg Your Blessedness, to pray for Us, and to obtain the beneficence of God in Our behalf.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Evidently this letter of Justinian to the pope must have been sent before the 26th of March, 533, for he mentions it in a letter of that date to Epiphanius, Archbishop of Constantinople: "The same emperor [Justinian] to Epiphanius the most holy and blessed archbishop of this royal city and the ecumenical patriarch... We have published a sacred edict, which also Your Holiness knows, through which We have refuted the madness of the heretics, not at all through changing, or planning to change or through neglecting the ecclesiastical status which has obtained, with the help of God, up to now, which also your Blessedness knows, but through everything preserving the unity of the sacred churches with the most holy pope and patriarch of the older Rome, to whom We have written similar things regarding this. For neither do We permit that anything which pertains to the state of the church not be referred to His Blessedness, as being head of all the most holy priests of God, and since as often as heretics have sprung up in these regions, they have been eliminated by the sentence and right judgment of that venerable see" (trans. from

the Greek text in the Code of Justinian, book 1, title 1, 7, in *Corpus Iuris Civilis* Kruger's ed., vol. 2 [Berlin: Weidmann, 1954], p. 8).]

1135. Papacy—Constitution of Justinian Decrees Pope of Rome First Pontiff

SOURCE: Justinian, 131st Novella (New Constitution), chaps. 1, 2, in *The Civil Law*, trans. by S. p. Scott, Vol. 17, p. 125. Copyright 1932 by The Central Trust Company, Cincinnati. Used by permission of Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, as one of the copyright owners, and John M. Rankin, as trustee, and the beneficiaries of the trust created under the Last Will & Testament of Elizabeth W. Scott, deceased. ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST NEW CONSTITUTION.

The Emperor Justinian to Peter, Most Glorious Imperial Praetorian Prefect. *PREFACE*.

We enact the present law with reference to ecclesiastical rules and privileges and other subjects in which holy churches and religious establishments are intrusted. *CHAPTER I.*

CONCERNING FOUR HOLY COUNCILS.

Therefore We order that the sacred, ecclesiastical rules which were adopted and confirmed by the four Holy Councils, that is to say, that of the three hundred and eighteen bishops held at Nicea, that of the one hundred and fifty bishops held at Constantinople, the first one of Ephesus, where Nestorius was condemned, and the one assembled at Chalcedon, where Eutyches and Nestorius were anathematized, shall be considered as laws. We accept the dogmas of these four Councils as sacred writings, and observe their rules as legally effective.

Chapter II.

CONCERNING THE PRECEDENCE OF PARTRIARCHS.

Hence, in accordance with the provisions of these Councils, We order that the Most Holy Pope of ancient Rome shall hold the first rank of all the Pontiffs, but the Most Blessed Archbishop of Constantinople, or New Rome, shall occupy the second place after the Holy Apostolic See of ancient Rome, which shall take precedence over all other sees.

1136. Papacy—Different Order of Popes After 537 SOURCE: Charles B,mont and G. Monod, *Medieval Europe From 395 to 1270* (New York: Henry Holt, 1902), pp. 120, 121.

[p. 120] Down to the sixth century all popes are declared saints in the martyrologies. Vigilius (537–555) is the first of a series of popes who no longer [p. 121] bear this title, which is henceforth sparingly conferred. From this time on the popes, more and more involved in worldly events, no longer belong solely to the Church; they are men of the state, and then rules of the state. Gregory [I] the Great, who merited canonisation, began the evolution which opened the way to such high destinies for the bishopric of Rome.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Some writers hold that the beginning of Vigilius' legitimate pontificate should be reckoned from 538 rather than 537, because his deposed predecessor, Silverius, did not die until June, 538. Thus held Archibald Bower (*The History of the Popes*, Vol. I, 1847 ed., p. 349) and Philip Schaff (*History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3, 1902 ed., p. 327). However, *The Catholic Encyclopedia* and other modern Catholic reference works give 537.]

1137. Papacy—Donation (Forged) of Constantine Cited as Basis of Territorial Sovereignty

SOURCE: Christopher B. Coleman, *The Treatise of Lorenzo Valla on the Donation of Constantine*, pp. 1–4, 11, 13, 17 (including translation from the text of the Donation in the Decretum of Gratian, or Concordia Discordantium Canonum, Part 1, Distinctio 96, chap. 14). Copyright 1922 by Yale University Press, New Haven. Used by permission.

[p. 1] The Donation of Constantine [is] ... the most famous forgery in European history.

The Donation of Constantine (Constitutum Constantini), written probably not long after the middle of the eighth century, became widely known through its incorporation in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (about 847–853). Parts of it were included in most of the medieval collections of canon law; Anselm's, Deusdedit's, and Gratian's great work (the Decretum, or Concordia discordantium canonum). It purports to reproduce a legal document in which the Emperor Constantine the Great, reciting his baptism and the cure of his leprosy at the hands of Sylvester, Bishop of Rome 314–336, confirmed the privilege of that pontiff as head of all the clergy and supreme over the other four patriarchates; conferred upon him extensive imperial property in various parts of the world, especially the imperial Lateran palace, and the imperial diadem and tiara, and other imperial insignia; granted the Roman clergy the rank of the highest Roman orders and their [p. 2] privileges; gave Sylvester and his successors freedom in consecrating men for certain orders of the clergy; it tells how he, Constantine, recognized the superior

dignity of the Pope by holding the bridle of his horse; grants Sylvester Rome, all of Italy, and the western provinces, to remain forever under the control of the Roman See; and states his own determination to retire to Byzantium in order that the presence of an earthly emperor may not embarrass ecclesiastical authority. This remarkable document was almost universally accepted as genuine from the ninth to the fifteenth century.

The question of the position of the bishop of Rome in the Christian Church lacks but a few generations of being as old as Christianity itself. His relation to secular governments became an acute problem as soon as the imperial government broke down in Italy, and has remained so to the present moment. For centuries the Papacy was the strongest institution in western Europe. While its control at any one time rested principally on the power it actually possessed and on the ability of its representatives. legal theories and historical documents played a not inconsiderable part in its rise and decline. Of these documents the Donation of Constantine was perhaps the most spectacular, even though it was not the most important. It was cited by no less than ten Popes of whom we know, to mention no lesser writers, in contentions for the recognition of papal control, and contributed not a little to the prestige of the Papacy. On the other hand, when its spuriousness became known, the reaction against it, as in Luther's case, contributed powerfully to the revolt from Rome.... [p. 3] Valla's treatise ... in effect established for the world generally the proof of the falsity of the Donation. Moreover, for the first time, he used effectively the method of studying the usage of words in the variations of their meaning and application, and other devices of internal criticism which are the tools of historical criticism today. So, while Valla's little book may seem slight beside later masterpieces of investigation and beside systematic treatises in larger fields, it is none the less a landmark in the rise of a new science...

Valla wrote his Discourse on the Forgery of the alleged Dona- [p. 4] tion of Constantine (Declamatio de falso credita et ementita donatione Constantini, also referred to as Libellus, and Oratio) in 1440, when he was secretary to Alfonso, king of Aragon, Sicily, and Naples. It may well be considered as part of the campaign which that king was conducting against Pope Eugenius IV in furtherance of his claims to Italian territories...

[p. 11] The Donation of Constantine [text]...

The Emperor Constantine the fourth day after this baptism conferred this privilege on the Pontiff of the Roman church, that in the whole Roman world priests should regard him as [p. 13] their head, as judges do the king... As the Blessed Peter is seen to have been constituted vicar of the Son of God [Latin, Vicarius Filii Dei] on the earth, so the Pontiffs who are the representatives of that same chief of the apostles, should obtain from us and our empire the power of a supremacy greater than the clemency of our earthly imperial serenity is seen to have conceded to it, choosing that same chief of the apostles and his vicars to be our constant intercessors with God. And to the extent of our earthly imperial power, we have decreed that his holy Roman church shall be honored with veneration, and that more than our empire and earthly throne the most sacred seat of the Blessed Peter shall be gloriously exalted, we giving to it power, and dignity of glory, and vigor, and honor imperial. And we ordain and decree that he shall have the supremacy as well over the four principal seats, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, as also over all the churches of God in the whole earth. And the Pontiff, who at the time shall be at the head of the holy Roman church itself, shall be more exalted than, and chief over, all the priests of the whole world, and according to his judgment everything which is provided for the service of God and for the stability of the faith of Christians is to be administered... [p. 17] Wherefore, in order that the supreme pontificate may not deteriorate, but may rather be adorned with glory and power even more than is the dignity of an earthly rule; behold, we give over and relinquish to the aforesaid our most blessed Pontiff, Sylvester, the universal Pope, as well our palace, as has been said, as also the city of Rome, and all the provinces, places and cities of Italy and the western regions, and we decree by this our godlike and pragmatic sanction that they are to

be controlled by him and by his successors, and we grant that they shall remain under the law of the holy Roman church.

1138. Papacy—Donation of Pippin (Pepin) Bestows Territorial Sovereignty (A.D. 756)

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 94, 95. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 94] Pippin revisited Italy at the pope's invitation, took the exarchate of Ravenna away from the king of the Lombards, and gave it to the pope.

[p. 95] What Pippin actually did was to give him the keys of the city and a formal deed of gift for them, and these together were taken to Rome and laid on the tomb of St. Peter...

This was the beginning of the temporal sovereignty of the papacy. The year was probably 756. The questions are: Just what did the pope and his successors get from Pippin, and how valid was the title? After the Lombards had captured Ravenna (five vears before the "donation") there was no exarch, because the Eastern emperor never authorized the king of the Lombards to act as his representative. Since there was no exarch there was no exarchate. The Lombard king simply took a piece of territory by the sword and his only certificate of title was the fact of military conquest. All that Pippin could take from him, and consequently all that he could transfer to the pope, was the sovereign rule over the seized territory. But what territory? Of course it included the city of Ravenna and its vicinity. The fact that the city had long been the seat of the emperor's lieutenant, or exarch, for the administration of as much of Italy as he could dominate, is irrelevant in this connection, because Pippin, never having been exarch, could not transfer the exarch's authority (whatever it was). No sort of legality or "legitimacy" attached to any of these transfers. The famous Donation of Pippin was simply the act of transferring to the pope his title, such as it was, to the conquered territory—Ravenna and an adjacent district called the Pentapolis. But it did give the pope the new status of sovereign over something, and that claim to papal sovereignty was soon to attach itself, on flimsy but sufficient grounds, to a larger and more important area, to Rome and the extensive States of the Church in central Italy. As to Ravenna, it soon broke away and became an independent state, then was under the sway of Venice for a long time, and did not again become a part of the papal dominion until Julius II, the "Pope in armor," sent his own army against it early in the sixteenth century.

1139. Papacy—Donatio of Pippin (Pepin)—Territorial Sovereignty SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 4 (New York: Scribner, 1903), pp. 234, 235.

[p. 234] To such a height of blasphemous assumption had the papacy risen already as to identify itself with the kingdom of Christ and to claim to be the dispenser of temporal prosperity and eternal salvation...

[p. 235] But by this gift of a foreign conqueror he [the pope] became a temporal sovereign over a large part of Italy, while claiming to be the successor of Peter who had neither silver nor gold, and the vicar of Christ who said: "My kingdom is not of this world." The temporal power made the papacy independent in the exercise of its jurisdiction, but at the expense of its spiritual character.

1140. Papacy—Donation of Pippin (Pepin), Territory Granted by SOURCE: Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 104, 105 (trans. from Duchesne, Liber Pont., I, p. 454). Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons, renewal copyright 1933 by Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[p. 104] The most Christian king of the Franks [Pippin] despatched his counsellor Fulrad, venerable abbot and priest, [p. 105] to receive these cities, and then he himself straightway returned to France with his army. The aforesaid Fulrad met the representatives of King Aistulf at Ravenna, and went with them through the various cities of the Pentapolis and of Emilia, receiving their submission and taking hostages from each and bearing away with him their chief men and the keys of their gates. Then he went to Rome, and placed the keys of Ravenna and of the other cities of the exarchate along with the grant of them which the king had made, in the confession of St. Peter,¹ [Note 1: The grave of St. Peter is under the high altar of St. Peter's in Rome. In front of the grave and on the same level with it is a large open space to which one descends by a flight of steps. This open space in front of the tomb is called the "confession of St. Peter."] thus handing them over to the apostle of God [Peter] and to his vicar the holy pope and to all his successors to be held and controlled forever. These are the cities: Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Conca, Fano, Cesena, Sinigaglia, Forlimpopoli, Forli with the fortress of Sussubium, Montefeltre, Acerreagium, Monte Lucati, Serra, San Marino, Bobbio, Urbino, Cagli, Lucioli, Gubbio, Comacle; and also the city of Narni, which in former years had been taken from the duchy of Spoleto by the Romans.

1141. Papacy—Donation of Pippin (Pepin), Upward Step in Power SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 119, 120. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 119] The two centuries of the crusades were approximately the period in which the papacy was rising to the dangerous summit of its worldly power and was beginning to experience the ebbing of its political authority though not of its claims to exercise it... Before the Donation of Pippin (756) the pope was the proprietor of vast estates. In the absence of competent civil authorities, he had the responsibility for carrying on the functions of government over a considerable area. After the Donation, he was one of the sovereign powers of Europe. This was a step in the evolution of the papal power, but it was only in- [p. 120] cidentally related to the development of the kind of power which was most significant [the exercise of a universal sovereignty over all sovereigns].

1142. Papacy, Empire of, From Ruins of Roman Empire SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), p. 150. Used by permission.

The Roman Christian Church was a church of world-wide importance and power, and her bishop the most influential. Out of the ruins of political Rome, arose the great moral Empire in the "giant form" of the Roman Church. In the marvellous rise of the Roman Church is seen in strong relief the majestic office of the Bishop of Rome.

1143. Papacy, Empire of, Successor to Roman Empire SOURCE: [Joseph Turmel] *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages,* by André Lagarde [pseudonym] (New York: Scribner, 1915), pp. v, vi. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Sribner's Sons.

[p. v] The Empire was falling into decay. The Barbarians knew that its life was failing, that the old organism was worn out, and they hastened to take possession of the remains. From every direction they came for the spoils. The Saxons and the Angles settled in Great Britain; the Franks invaded [p. vi] Northern Gaul; the Visigoths made Spain and the region south of the Loire their own; the Burgundians took possession of the upper valley of the Rhone; the Vandals made conquests in Africa. The Ostrogoths and

Lombards were waiting for their turn to come. Among these new invaders, some were heretics, others were pagans. What is to become of the church? Are its days numbered, and is the Empire to bring it down as its companion into an open tomb?

No, the Church will not descend into the tomb. It will survive the Empire. It will have to pass through days of distress. It will witness calamity after calamity, ruins heaped upon ruins. But in the midst of the greatest sadness, it will receive precious consolations. One after another, these barbarian peoples will submit to its laws, and will count it a glory to be the Church's children. The frontiers of the Church will be extended; its institutions, for a moment shaken by the Barbarians, will be consolidated, developed, and will adapt themselves to their surroundings. The papacy, most sorely tried of all, will make a new advance. At length a second empire will arise, and of this empire the Pope will be the master—more than this, he will be the master of Europe. He will dictate his orders to kings who will obey them.

1144. Papacy, Great Builders of

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. as indicated below. Used by permission.

[a. Leo I (440–461)]

[p. 182] "The first Pope in the proper sense of the word" was Leo I., called the Great (440–461)... [p. 183] Heresies rent the East and ignorance was fast covering the West. Western Christendom must be consolidated and disciplined so that it could meet the crudeness and heresy of the powerful invaders and overcome both. The See of St. Peter must replace the tottering imperial power...

Leo possessed those qualifications which made him the master spirit of his age and the "Founder of the mediaeval Papacy." Lofty in his aims, severe and pure in life, of indomitable courage and perseverance, inspired by a fanatical belief in the Petrine theory, uncompromisingly orthodox, the great first theologian in the Roman Chair, he made the first clear-cut exposition of the extreme limits and prerogatives of the mediaeval Papacy...

[p. 184] Possessed of a capacity for complex rule, an extraordinary organiser and administrator, he used all his ability to make Christianity and the Papacy the one great world power. Twice he saved Rome from the barbarians, once in 452 when Attila, King of the Huns, was persuaded to withdraw without attacking the city, and again in 455 when the Vandal leader, Genseric, was induced to spare the capital from fire and murder. He drove heresy out of Italy and suppressed it in Spain. He ... even asserted his supremacy over the Eastern Church.

[b. Gregory I, the Great (590–604)]

[p. 185] If Leo drew the outline of the mediaeval Papacy, Gregory made it a living power. He issued the first declaration of independence and assumed actual jurisdiction over the whole Western Church...

[p. 188] Gregory's policy was to uphold and extend the Petrine theory to the utmost, although personally refusing the title of "Universal Bishop." ...

[p. 189] Under Gregory's able management papal power was consolidated and made supreme in Western Europe. He systematized papal theology, and perfected and beautified the Church liturgy... [p. 190] From priest to bishop he corrected the clergy and urged upon them celibacy. He restored discipline throughout the Church and patronised all sorts of charity... Monasticism, which he himself had adopted with all his heart, he encouraged and improved by restoring the early rigid discipline... [p. 191] In addition to these multitudinous duties, he was virtual King of Italy... He held the haughty Lombards in check and converted them to Christianity. He extended his authority over Africa, Spain, Gaul, England, and Ireland and even claimed jurisdiction over the East. He was the first Pope to become in act and in influence, if not in name, the temporal sovereign of the West...

[p. 192] When Gregory the Great closed his remarkable career (604) the Papacy of the Middle Ages had been [p. 193] born and in form resembled the Empire. The head of the Church was known as "Pope." Because of his peculiar personal holiness he could be judged by none, though himself judge of all. The hierarchy of officers had been practically completed. The laity was distinctly cut off from the clergy, and deprived of powers exercised in the first and second centuries. The election of the clergy had changed from a democratic to an aristocratic process. There was a marked evolution in rites and ceremonies.

[c. Gregory VII (1073)]

[p. 445] In 1073 the Church had been raised from the lowest condition to a comparatively high moral plane by the imperial reforms, the labours of earnest German Popes, the Clugniac reformation, and the Hildebrandine Popes...

For twenty-five years Hildebrand had been the power behind the papal throne. He had largely moulded the policy of eight successive Popes...

[p. 448] The papal philosophy of Gregory VII. [Hildebrand] was based upon the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals [see No. 884]. His conception of the Pope is summed up in the famous *Dictatus Papae* [see No. 1128] in which he makes the successor of St. Peter God's representative on earth, the absolute sovereign of the Church, and the supreme feudal lord of the world. This ideal he sought to realise in every particular. The clergy, according to his theory, were wholly dependent upon the Pope's will and must be absolutely free from every vice and worldly influence in order that they might labour only to save men's souls. Hence, he believed in the great need of reformation and in the correction of all abuses. The laity, from Emperor to slave, were entirely subjected to the Pope and his clergy in both temporal and spiritual matters, and therefore must render absolute obedience to the commands of the Church...

[p. 449] In his first efforts to realise his lofty ideal, Gregory VII. desired to unite all Christendom under the suzerainty of the Pope and through this submission to conquer the world for God...

[p. 469] The Church to him was a grand secular power, resting on spiritual foundations, which had to employ worldly means against the other secular powers. Europe was a chessboard and with the hand of a skilled master he moved kings, queens, knights, and bishops. His schemes were worthy of the plotter—his courage became defiance in danger—his forces were handled with consummate skill—his fatal thrusts were driven home with his teeth clenched—if he seemed to yield it was only to gain a greater advantage. As Pope he was over all, the source of all law, judged by none, and responsible to God alone. Under this conviction, intensified as the years passed, he lived in perpetual conflict, and died a refugee from the capital of his great ecclesiastical Empire...

[p. 470] Gregory VII. was the creator of the political Papacy of the Middle Ages because he was the first who dared to completely enforce the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. He found the Pope elected by the Emperor, the Roman clergy, and the people; he left the election in the hands of an ecclesiastical College of Cardinals. He found the Papacy dependent upon the Empire; he made it independent of the Empire and above it. He declared the states of Europe to be fiefs of St. Peter and demanded the oath of fealty from their rulers. He found the clergy, high and low, dependent allies of secular princes and kings; he emancipated them and subjected them to his own will. He reorganised the Church from top to bottom by remodelling the papal curia, by establishing the College of Cardinals, by employing papal legates, by thwarting national churches, by controlling synods and councils, and by managing all Church property directly. He was the first to enforce the theory that the Pope could depose and confirm or reject kings and Emperors. He attempted to reform the abuses in the Church and to purify the clergy. Only partial success attended these efforts, but triumph was to come later on as a result of his labours. His endeavour to realise his theocracy was grand but impracticable as proved by its failure. It was like forcing a dream to be true; yet Innocent III. almost succeeded in western Europe a little more than a century later. The impress of Gregory VII.'s gigantic ability was left upon his own age and upon all succeeding ages.

[d. Innocent III (1198–1216)]

[p. 549] The first step in Innocent's plan was to make himself the political head of Europe. In Italy he first made himself absolute sovereign of Rome by removing all vestiges of imperial rule... [p. 550] From rome he gradually extended his sway over the rest of Italy... His leadership was generally recognised and he was called "The Father of His Country." "Innocent III. was the first Pope who claimed and exercised the rights of an Italian Prince." When Emperor Otto IV., ceded all the lands claimed by the Papacy under grants from former rulers, an indisputable title to the papal states was established...

[p. 562] The Lateran Council in 1215 defined heresy and formulated complete regulations for its suppression.

Not only was Innocent III a great defender of Church dogmas, a master-organiser of the hierarchy, and an administrator without a peer in Church history, but he was also a far-reaching and sincerely intelligent reformer. The judicial reforms were necessary to round out Innocent's theory of Church government...

[p. 563] He endeavoured to abolish all those debilitating corruptions which prevented the realisation of his ideal priesthood; namely, pluralism, luxury, rapacity, pride, arrogance, and other evils...

[p. 564] The doctrinal changes instituted by Innocent III. were likewise important. The dogma of transubstantiation was canonised by the Lateran Council in 1215. Before that time there had been many and divergent views concerning this important subject. [See Nos. 1732–1738.] ... Heresy was more clearly defined than ever and the Inquisition was canonised. At the same time the unity of the Church on its doctrinal side was given greater emphasis...

[p. 565] Innocent III. as head of the great Church easily outranked every ruler of his day and stands high among the greatest leaders of the Middle Ages and of all ages...

[p. 566] No other wearer of the papal tiara has left behind him so many results pregnant with good and ill for the future of the Church. Under him the Papacy reached the culmination of its secular power and prerogatives. The principles of sacerdotal government [p. 567] were fully and intelligently elaborated. The code of ecclesiastical law was completed and enforced. All the Christian princes of Europe were brought to recognise the overlordship of the successor of St. Peter. All the clergy obeyed his will as

the one supreme law. Heresy was washed out in blood. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and the dreams of Hildebrand had been realised. Yet in this very greatness, wealth, and strength, were the germs of weakness and disease which were eventually to overthrow the great structure reared by Innocent III. and his predecessors.

1145. Papacy, Gregory I, the Great (590–604), Greatness of

SOURCE: F. J. Foakes-Jackson, "The New West and Gregory the Great," in the composite work *An Outline* of *Christianity* (New York: Bethlehem Publishers, 1926), Vol. 2, p. 153.

Towards the close of the sixth century the Roman Church was ruled by Gregory I, a pope (590–604) who, if his personal character and the circumstances of his age be taken into account, is perhaps the greatest of all those who filled the chair of St. Peter...

1146. Papacy—Hierarchy Perfected in 13th Century

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 575, 576. Used by permission.

[p. 575] During this period [the thirteenth century] the organisation of the papal hierarchy was perfected. At the head stood the all-powerful and absolute Pope as God's agent on earth; hence, at least in theory and claim, he was the ruler of the whole world in temporal and spiritual affairs. He was the defender of Christianity, the Church, and the clergy in all respects. He was the supreme censor of morals in Christendom and the head of a great spiritual despotism. He was the source of all earthly justice and the final court of appeal in all cases. Any person, whether priest or layman, could appeal to him at any stage in the trial of a great many important cases. He was the supreme lawgiver on earth, hence he called all councils and confirmed or rejected their decrees. [p. 576] He might, if he so wished, set aside any law of the Church, no matter how ancient, so long as it was not directly ordained by the Bible or by nature. He could also make exceptions to purely human laws and these exceptions were known as dispensations. He had the sole authority to transfer or depose bishops and other Church officers. He was the creator of cardinals and ecclesiastical honours of all kinds. He was the exclusive possessor of the universal right of absolution, dispensation, and canonisation. He was the grantor of all Church benefices. He was the superintendent of the whole financial system of the Church and of all taxes. He had control over the whole force of the clergy in Christendom, because he conferred the *pallium*, the archbishop's badge of office. In his hands were kept the

terrible thunders of the Church to enforce obedience to papal law, namely, excommunication and the interdict.

1147. Papacy, "Holy Synod of Constance" Demands Obedience of (1415)

SOURCE: Council of Constance, trans. in Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 328, 329. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 by Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[p. 328] This holy synod of Constance, being a general council, and legally assembled in the Holy Spirit for the praise of God [p. 329] and for ending the present schism, and for the union and reformation of the church of God in its head and in its members, in order more easily, more securely, more completely, and more fully to bring about the union and reformation of the church of God, ordains, declares, and decrees as follows: And first it declares that this synod, legally assembled, is a general council, and represents the catholic church militant and has its authority directly from Christ; and everybody, of whatever rank or dignity, including also the pope, is bound to obey this council in those things which pertain to the faith, to the ending of this schism, and to a general reformation of the church in its head and members. Likewise it declares that if anyone, of whatever rank, condition, or dignity, including also the pope, shall refuse to obey the commands, statutes, ordinances, or orders of this holy council, or of any other holy council properly assembled, in regard to the ending of the schism and to the reformation of the church, he shall be subject to the proper punishment; and unless he repents, he shall be duly punished; and if necessary, recourse shall be had to other aids of justice.

1148. Papacy—King and Subject Judged by Pope

SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), p. 46.

The deposing power of the Pope,—what was it but that supreme arbitration whereby the highest power in the world, the Vicar of the incarnate Son of God, anointed high priest, and supreme temporal ruler, sat in his tribunal, impartially to judge between nation and nation, between people and prince, between sovereign and subject? The deposing power grew up by the providential action of God in the world; to subjects obedience, and princes clemency.

1149. Papacy—King Versus Pope, Alternating Dominance

SOURCE: Carl Conrad Eckhardt, *The Papacy and World-Affairs* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 1. Copyright 1937 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

Under the Roman Empire the popes had no temporal powers. But when the Roman Empire had disintegrated and its place had been taken by a number of rude, barbarous kingdoms, the Roman Catholic church not only became independent of the states in religious affairs but dominated secular affairs as well. At times, under such rulers as Charlemagne (768–814), Otto the Great (936–73), and Henry III (1039–56), the civil power controlled the church to some extent; but in general, under the weak political system of feudalism, the well-organized, unified, and centralized church, with the pope at its head, was not only independent in ecclesiastical affairs but also controlled civil affairs. The church interfered in secular affairs on the basis of its theory of the relation of church and state, which was formulated in substance by Augustine (354–430) and given wider and more definite application by such popes as Gregory VII (1073–85), Innocent III (1198–1216), Boniface VIII (1294–1303), and others.

1150. Papacy—King Versus Pope—Controversy With Emperor Henry IV

SOURCE: Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 146, 155–159. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 by Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[Translator's note; p. 146] Gregory VII met with vigorous opposition from the German clergy as well as from the king when he attempted to enforce his laws against simony and the marriage of the clergy... Gregory ... defended his decrees against simony and the marriage of the clergy, and announced his determination to hold fast to them and to compel the whole world to accept them...

Henry's answer to this message and letter was given at a national synod at Worms, Jan. 24, 1076. This synod deposed Gregory and ... Gregory replied by excommunicating and deposing the king...

[p. 155] THE FIRST DEPOSITION AND EXCOMMUNICATION OF HENRY IV BY GREGORY VII, 1076.

Greg. VII. Reg., III, no. 10 a; Jaffé, II, pp. 223 ff; Doeberl, III, no. 9...

St. Peter, prince of the apostles, incline thine ear unto me, I beseech thee, and hear me, thy servant, whom thou hast nourished from mine infancy and hast delivered from

mine enemies that hate me for my fidelity to thee. Thou art my witness, as are also my mistress, the mother of God, and St. Paul thy brother, and all the other saints, that thy holy Roman church called me to its government against my own will, and that I did not gain thy throne by violence; [p. 156] that I would rather have ended my days in exile than have obtained thy place by fraud or for worldly ambition. It is not by my efforts, but by thy grace, that I am set to rule over the Christian world which was specially intrusted to thee by Christ. It is by thy grace and as thy representative that God has given to me the power to bind and to loose in heaven and in earth. Confident of my integrity and authority, I now declare in the name of omnipotent God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that Henry, son of the emperor Henry, is deprived of his kingdom of Germany and Italy; I do this by thy authority and in defence of the honor of thy church, because he has rebelled against it. He who attempts to destroy the honor of the church should be deprived of such honor as he may have held. He has refused to obey as a Christian should, he has not returned to God from whom he had wandered, he has had dealings with excommunicated persons, he has done many iniquities, he has despised the warnings which, as thou art witness. I sent to him for his salvation, he has cut himself off from thy church, and has attempted to rend it asunder; therefore, by thy authority, I place him under the curse. It is in thy name that I curse him, that all people may know that thou art Peter, and upon thy rock the Son of the living God has built his church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it...

[Translator's note:] Various parts of Germany were already in revolt against Henry IV, and the immediate effect of the papal excommunication was to strengthen the rebellious party. Being almost deserted, Henry found himself unable to refuse the demands of the rebels. He agreed to submit to Gregory in all things, and rescinded the edicts by which he had deposed him. He also called on all his subjects to submit to the pope...

[p. 157] LETTER OF GREGORY VII TO THE GERMAN PRINCES CONCERNING THE PENANCE OF HENRY IV AT CANOSSA, *CA.* JANUARY 28, 1077.

Greg. VII. Reg., IV, nos. 12, 12 a; Jaffé, II, pp. 256 ff; Doeberl, III, no. 13...

[Translator's note; p. 158] ... Fearing that he would be permanently deposed if the pope should come to Germany and sit with his rebellious subjects in judgment on him, he [Henry] determined to forestall matters by going to see the pope in Italy. So he fled from Speier and hastened as rapidly as possible into Italy. He came to Canossa, where he humbled himself before Gregory and received absolution. It was at least a diplomatic triumph for Henry, because he had kept the pope from coming to Germany and uniting with his rebellious nobles, who would have labored hard to secure the permanent deposition of Henry. The final decision of the matter was indeed left to the pope and the diet which was to be held in Germany, but the pope did not go to Germany, and Henry was able to point to the fact that he had received papal absolution...

Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to all the archbishops, bishops, dukes, counts, and other princes of the German kingdom, defenders of the Christian faith, greeting and apostolic benediction.

Since you have made common cause with us and shared our perils in the recent controversy, we have thought it only right that you should be informed of the recent course of events, how king Henry came to Italy to do penance, and how we were led to grant him absolution.

According to the agreement made with your representatives we had come to Lombardy and were there awaiting those whom you were to send to escort us into your land. But after the time set was already passed, we received word that it was at that time impossible to send an escort, because of many obstacles that stood in the way, and we were greatly exercised at this and in grave doubt as to what we ought to do. In the meantime we learned that the king was approaching. Now before he entered Italy he had sent to us and had offered to make complete satisfaction for his fault, [p. 159] promising to reform and henceforth to obey us in all things, provided we would give him our absolution and blessing. We hesitated for some time, taking occasion in the course of the negotiations to reprove him sharply for his former sins. Finally he came in person to Canossa, where we were staying, bringing with him only a small retinue and manifesting no hostile intentions. Once arrived, he presented himself at the gate of the castle, barefoot and clad only in wretched woollen garments, beseeching us with tears to grant him absolution and forgiveness. This he continued to do for three days, until all those about us were moved to compassion at his plight and interceded for him with tears and prayers. Indeed, they marvelled at our hardness of heart, some even complaining that our action savored rather of heartless tyranny than of chastening severity. At length his persistent declarations of repentance and the supplications of all who were there with us overcame our reluctance, and we removed the excommunication from him and received him again into the bosom of the holy mother church. But first he took the oath which we have subjoined to this letter, the abbot of Cluny, the countess Matilda, the countess Adelaide. and many other ecclesiastic and secular princes going surety for him. Now that this arrangement has been reached to the common advantage of the church and the empire, we purpose coming to visit you in your own land as soon as possible. For, as you will perceive from the conditions stated in the oath, the matter is not to be regarded as settled until we have held consultation with you. Therefore we urge you to maintain that fidelity and love of justice which first prompted your action. We have not bound ourself to anything, except that we assured the king that he might depend upon us to aid him in everything that looked to his salvation and honor.

1151. Papacy—King Versus Pope—Gregory and Henry at Canossa (1077)

SOURCE: Louis L. Snyder, ed., *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 31–33. Copyright © 1958 by Rutgers, The State University. Used by permission.

[p. 31] The central governing institution for the better part of the Middle Ages was the imperial-papal partnership, in which the German kings played an important role. Both sides claimed to be entitled to the dominant place: The German kings insisted that they were the Holy Roman Emperors, and the Pope claimed temporal as well as spiritual powers.

[p. 32] The issue came to a head during the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073–1085), who, until his election to the papacy, bore the name of Hildebrand. One of the most celebrated of all popes, Gregory was small and unattractive in person, but he possessed a genius for leadership and a mastery of statecraft rivaling Napoleon's. Advocating an elaborate theory of papal absolutism, he applied himself diligently to the task of

achieving a theocratic society, with himself at the head. In his *Dictatus Papae* he declared that "the Pope is the only person whose feet are kissed by all Princes." Only churchmen, he contended, should confer the symbols of ecclesiastical authority on elected bishops.

At this time Henry IV, Emperor of Germany (1056–1106), decided to test the theory of papal overlordship. Gregory warned him to "treat with more honor the head of the Church, that is, St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles." Henry, thereupon, wrote a stinging and discourteous reply, beginning:

Henry, King not by usurpation, but through holy ordination of God, to Hildebrand, at present not Pope but false monk. This is the salutation you deserve, for you have never held any office in the Church without making it a source of confusion and a curse to Christian men, instead of an honor and a blessing. The letter ended with the words: "I, Henry, King by the grace of God, do say unto thee: 'Come down, come down, and be damned through all the ages'"

The ambitious and energetic Gregory realized that this was a struggle to the end. In a brilliant gamble that the public would support him, he countered by excommunicating the recalcitrant German king [see No. 1150]. The German feudal and ecclesiastical lords, most of whom were envious of Henry and desired a limitation of his power, promptly advised him that unless he were freed within a year from the anathema of excommunication, he would be deposed. Fully cognizant of the meaning of the ultimatum, Henry swallowed his pride and agreed to make amends.

As the year 1076 drew to a close Henry set out upon a journey to Italy to come to terms with Gregory. In January, 1077, he reached the small town of Canossa, where Gregory was stopping at the castle of the Countless of Tuscany on his way to Germany [p. 33] to attend a German council. For three days and three nights Henry stood outside the castle, stripped clear of all his regalia, "wretched, barefooted, and clad in wool," waiting for the forgiveness of the Pope. The spectacle of the mightiest king in Christendom humbling himself in this sensational fashion was one to amaze the whole Christian world—king, lord, and peasant alike.

Canossa marked a high-water mark of papal power in the Middle Ages. Henry had shrewdly impaled Gregory on the horns of a dilemma. Should the pontiff ignore him and assume the dictatorship of German affairs, or should he receive him as a penitent and grant him absolution? As a good Catholic, there was only one course open to Gregory. Henry, on the other hand, had to forget his pride if he wished to rebuild his fortunes.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: For Gregory VII's own account of the submission at Canossa, see No. 1150.]

1152. Papacy—King Versus Pope—Interdict, Example of SOURCE: *Translation and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 29, 30.

[p. 29] INTERDICT ON FRANCE IN 1200.

Martène, Thesaurus Anecdot., IV, p. 147. Latin.

[Translator's note:] In 1193 Philip Augustus married Ingeburg of Denmark, but divorced her on the very day following the ceremony. Pope Innocent III. refused to sanction the decree, and when, three years later, Philip married Agnes of Meran he found the whole power of Rome directed against him. He refused to yield, and finally in 1200 the pope laid all France under the interdict from January to September, when the king was forced to give way. See Geraud, "Ingeburge de Danemark," in Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes, T. I., 2d series, pp. 1–27 and 93–118.

Let all the churches be closed; let no one be admitted to them except to baptize infants; let them not be otherwise opened except for the purpose of lighting the lamps, or when the priest shall come for the Eucharist and holy water for the use of the sick. We permit mass to be celebrated once a week on Friday early in the morning to consecrate the Host for the use of the sick, but only one clerk is to be admitted to assist the priest. Let the clergy preach on Sunday in the vestibules of the churches, and in place of the mass let them disseminate the word of God. Let them recite the canonical hours outside the churches, where the people do not hear them; if they recite an epistle or a gospel let them beware lest the laity hear them; and let them not permit the dead to be interred, nor their bodies to be placed unburied in the cemeteries. Let them, moreover, say to the laity that they sin and transgress grievously by burying bodies in the earth, even in unconsecrated ground, for in so doing they arrogate to themselves an office pertaining to others. Let them forbid their parishioners to enter churches that may be open in the king's territory, and let them not bless the wallets of pilgrims except outside the churches. Let them not celebrate the offices in Passion week, but refrain even till Easter day, and then let them celebrate in private, no one being admitted except the assisting priest, as above directed; let no one communicate even at Easter, except he be sick and in danger of death. During the same week, or on Palm Sunday, let them announce to their parishioners that they may assemble on Easter morning before the church and there have permission to eat flesh and consecrated bread. Women are expressly forbidden to be admitted into the churches for purification, but are to be warned to gather their neighbors together on the day of purification and pray outside the church, nor may the women who are to be purified enter even to raise their children to the sacred font of baptism until they are admitted by the priest after [p. 30] the expiration of the interdict. Let the priest confess all who desire it in the portico of the church; if the church have no portico we direct that in bad or rainy weather, and not otherwise, the nearest door of the church may be opened and confessions heard on its threshold (all being excluded except the one who is to confess) so that the priest and penitent can be heard by those who are outside the church.* [Note *: Geraud remarks that this was almost equivalent to a formal prohibition of confession.] If, however, the weather be fair, let the confession be heard in front of the closed doors. Let no vessels of holy water be placed outside of the church, nor shall the priests carry them anywhere, for all the sacraments of the church beyond these two which were reserved *†* [Note *†*: I.e., infant baptism and the viaticum.] are absolutely prohibited. Extreme unction, which is a holy sacrament, may not be given.

1153. Papacy—King Versus Pope—John of England Submits, 1213 SOURCE: King John of England, Declaration of Submission, trans. in Henry Bettenson, ed., *Documents of the Christian Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 231, 232. Used by permission.

[Introductory note; p. 231] In 1209 Innocent excommunicated John. When this failed of the desired effect he declared John deposed in 1212 and invited the French king to invade the country. Thereupon John submitted and made this declaration to the papal legate Pandulf, at Dover, 15 May 1213; the act of surrender was renewed at London before Nicholas, Bishop of Tusculum, where the homage was performed. It is unknown whether the surrender was suggested from Rome, or offered by John.

John, by the grace of God king of England, lord of Ireland, duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, earl of Anjou... We, having offended God and our mother the holy Church in many things, and being on that account known to need the Divine mercy, ... offer and freely grant to God and His holy apostles Peter and Paul, and the holy Roman Church, our mother, and to our lord the Pope Innocent and his catholic successors, the whole realm of England and the whole realm of Ireland with all their rights and appurtenances, for the remission of our sins and those of all our race, as well quick as dead; and from now receiving back and holding these, as a feudal dependant, from God and the Roman Church, ... do and swear fealty for them to the aforesaid our lord the Pope Innocent and his catholic successors and the Roman [p. 232] Church... Moreover, in proof of this our perpetual obligation and concession, we will and establish that from the proper and

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

special revenues of our realms aforesaid, ... the Roman Church receive 1000 marks sterling each year, ... 700 to wit for the realm of England, and 300 for the realm of Ireland; saving to us and our heirs, our rights, liberties, and royalties. All which, as aforesaid, we willing them to be ratified and confirmed in perpetuity bind ourselves and our successors not to contravene. [Latin from Stubbs, W., S[*elect*] C[*harters*], 9th rev. ed. H. W. C. Davies. Oxford, 1913.]

1154. Papacy—King Versus Pope—John's Overlord, Innocent III, Annuls the Magna Charta

SOURCE: A. C. Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 554, 555. Used by permission.

[p. 554] When the English barons wrested from the stubborn king the great Magna Charta in 1215, Pope Innocent III. championed the cause of the king, his vassal, against the barons. He called a council, annulled the Magna Charta, issued a manifesto against the barons, and ordered the bishops to excommunicate them. He suspended Archbishop Langton from office for siding with the barons against the king and directly appointed [p. 555] the Archbishop of York.

1155. Papacy—Low Ebb in 18th Century

SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 25–27. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 25] We should not seek to minimise the importance of the decline of the great Catholic empires; but we should recognise that something subtler and deeper than any shift in world political power was operating against the Church in the eighteenth century. This was the growth of Eratianism (named from the Swiss theologian, Erastus), or, as the

French thinkers called it, *Etatism*, the enlarged sense of the omnicompetence of the State to control all aspects of a country's life, including its religion. The Church called this Gallicanism...

The exalted and new notion which the eighteenth century entertained of the functions of the State was bound to lead it into conflict with the claims of the Church. If the prince was now to be the "father of his people," if, with Louis XIV, he was to cry *l'Etat*, *c'est*

moi then it [p. 26] followed that he would resent much more keenly any interference from Rome (for instance in the appointment of bishops) and that many aspects of life which had hitherto belonged to the spiritual sphere (such as marriage, education, or charity) would come increasingly under state control...

But, although that great Pope Innocent XI (1676–89) had withstood Louis XIV at the height of his power on the matter of episcopal appointments in France, no eighteenth-century Pope measured up to Innocent's stature, and the position of the papacy, and with it the vitality and influence of the spiritual power, declined ominously.

Two events, both belonging to the second half of the eighteenth century, illustrate all too clearly the new weakness that had overtaken the papacy. In 1782 Pope Pius VI made the journey to Vienna to try to persuade the Emperor Joseph II to desist from his ecclesiastical policies... That Pius made the journey, and that he failed in his mission, were perhaps equally significant; the papacy was now very near its nadir.

But the other event had the more lasting consequences; this was the suppression of the Jesuits throughout the world, by Pope Clement XIV in the year 1773 ... [p. 27] "for

the sake of peace, ... and because the Society can no longer attain the aims for which it was founded, and on secret grounds which We enclose in our heart."

1156. Papacy—Low Ebb of Power in Late 18th Century SOURCE: K[arl] R[udolf] Hagenbach, *History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries,* trans. by John F. Hurst (New York: Scribner, 1869), Vol. 2, p. 432.

Pope Pius VI, whom the changed times did not permit to summon heretical sovereigns to the threshold of the Apostolic church, was compelled—since all written attempts had failed—to use the last resort of a journey to Vienna, in the year 1782. An old man, of handsome appearance and form, and, though unhealthy, yet eloquent and gifted with a melodious voice, he was self-sufficient enough to suppose that important results could follow this journey. But he achieved no more than to be treated with great respect, and to leave behind with the people, on whom he had pronounced his blessing, an imposing impression. He did not rescue a single cloister whose downfall had been determined.

1157. Papacy, Opposition to, in French Revolution SOURCE: [John Emerich Edward Dalberg] Acton, *Lord Acton on the States of the Church* (reprint; Portsmouth, R.I.: F. E. Lally, 1940), p. 26.

She [the Church] had resisted the outward assault of the Protestant Reformation to be sapped by the Revolution which had its seat in Catholic countries, and extensively prevailed in the Church herself. The spirit of opposition to the Holy See grew in energy, and the opposition to its system and ideas spread still more widely.

1158. Papacy, Pius VI Marks Low Ebb of, at End of 18th Century SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 37, 38, 52. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 37] Rome had not hitherto been confronted, without prior consultation, with anything like this entire reorganization of the French Church, this turning of the hierarchy of her authority upside down, this spoliation presented as a *fait accompli*. It was [p. 38] more than even Pius VI, an elderly and conciliatory pontiff, whose reign came at the conclusion of a long period of decline in the power and prestige of Rome, was prepared to accept. On July 10, 1790, he wrote to Louis XVI telling him he should not approve the new laws. But the Pope's letter arrived on July 23, and the King had [already] approved the Civil Constitution...

[p. 52] And, if Rome was to blame [for French Catholic disunity during the Revolution], this was less because Pius VI was infirm of purpose than because in the eighteenth century the authority, throughout Europe, of the Holy See had sunk lower than at any time since the confused years before the advent of Hildebrand in the eleventh century.

1159. Papacy—Plans of French to End the Papacy (1797) SOURCE: Archibald Alison, *History of Europe*, Vol. 1, chap. 26 (New York: Harper, 1852), pp. 543, 544.

[p. 543] One of the first measures of the new gov- [p. 544] ernment [the Directory] was to despatch an order to Joseph Bonaparte at Rome, to promote, by all the means in his power, the approaching revolution in the papal states; and, above all things, to take care that, at the pope's death [he was ill, 1797], no successor should be elected to the chair of St. Peter.

1160. Papacy, Plans of the French to Destroy (1798)

SOURCE: George Trevor, *Rome: From the Fall of the Western Empire* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1868), pp. 439, 440.

[p. 439] The object of the French directory was the destruction of the pontifical government, as the irreconcilable enemy of the republic... The aged pope [Pius VI] was summoned to surrender the temporal government; on his refusal, he was dragged from the altar... His rings were torn from his fingers, and finally, after declaring the temporal power abolished, the victors carried [p. 440] the pope prisoner into Tuscany, whence he never returned (1798).

The Papal States, converted into the *Roman Republic*, were declared to be in perpetual alliance with France, but the French general was the real master at Rome... The territorial possessions of the clergy and monks were declared national property, and their former owners cast into prison. The papacy was extinct: not a vestige of its existence remained; and among all the Roman Catholic powers not a finger was stirred in its defence. The Eternal City had not longer prince or pontiff; its bishop was a dying captive in foreign lands; and the decree was already announced that no successor would be allowed in his place.

1161. Papacy — Pope, Captivity of (1798)—Account of Events, Feb. 10–25

SOURCE: John Adolphus, The History of France, Vol. 2 (London: George Kearsley, 1803), pp. 364–369.

[p. 364] Berthier advanced to the city by forced marches; summoned the castle of St. Angelo [Feb. 10th.], allowing only four hours for its evacuation by the papal troops; the convicts were set at liberty; the gates of the city secured by the French; the pope, all the cardinals except three, and the whole people of Rome, made prisoners at discretion...

[p. 365] Shortly afterwards [Feb. 15th.], Berthier made his triumphal entry into Rome; and a tree of liberty being planted on the capitol, ... a proclamation was issued, declaring ... a free and independent republic, under the special protection of the French army. A provisional government was acknowledged, as established by the sovereign people; and every other temporal authority emanating from the pope was suppressed, nor was he any longer to exercise any function... [p. 366] The territory of the Roman republic was declared to comprehend all that remained under the temporal authority of the pope after the treaty of Campo Formio...

[p. 367] As a refinement in the art of insult, the day selected for planting the tree of liberty and deposing the pontiff was the anniversary of his accession to the sovereignty; and while he was, according to custom, celebrating divine service in the Sistine chapel and receiving the congratulations of the cardinals, Haller, the commissary-general of the French army, and Cervoni, abruptly rushed in, and announced the termination of his authority. The pope had scarcely recovered from the shock of this intelligence, when Cervoni offered him a national cockade, which he rejected with dignity; and he heard with fortitude that his Swiss guards were dismissed, and republican soldiers placed in their stead. Pursuing [p. 368] the same style of mockery, the invaders compelled the cardinals to perform a grand mass and Te Deum, to thank God for events which they could not fail most severely to deplore; public preachers were employed to reconcile the people to the change, and to argue from Scripture that, as disciples of reason and votaries of religion, they were bound to submit to whatever form of government it had pleased Providence to set over them...

Whether retained by force, deluded by promises, or rendered inert by age, the pope remained, after the abrogation of his authority, a prisoner in his own [p. 369] palace. The

French first seized on it as barracks, and in less than a week confined him to his own rooms, putting the seal of confiscation on all his effects. Even the furniture of his apartments was at length contemplated with a greedy eye, and the unfortunate pontiff was removed from Rome to Sienna [Feb. 20th to 25th.], where he was received with consolatory sympathy by the Augustine monks, and lodged in their convent*. [Note *: ... He was removed, according to the caprice or policy of his persecutors, at all hours in the night and day, to many cities in Italy, where he was exhibited in chains, and at length confined in a fortress at the top of the Alps, where, under the old French government, it was sometimes customary to send regiments by way of punishment. In the course of the ensuing year it was deemed necessary to remove him to Valence, where he terminated his days amid the horrors of neglect and insult...]

1162. Papacy — Pope, Captivity of (1798)—Dissolution of Pope's Rule, Feb. 15

SOURCE: Richard Duppa, *A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government. 1798* (2d ed.; London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1799), pp. 46, 47.

[p. 46] That the head of the church might be made to feel with more poignancy his humiliating situation, the day chosen for planting the tree of liberty on the capitol was the anniversary of his election to the sovereignty [Feb. 15]. Whilst he was, according to custom, in the Sistine chapel, celebrating his accession to the papal chair, and receiving the congratulations of the Cardinals, Citizen Haller, the commissary-general, and Cervoni, who then commanded the French troops within the city, gratified themselves in a peculiar triumph over this unfortunate potentate. During that ceremony they both entered the chapel, and Haller announced to the sovereign Pontiff on his throne, that his reign was at an end.

[p. 47] The poor old man seemed shocked at the abruptness of this unexpected notice, but soon recovered himself with becoming fortitude; and when General Cervoni, adding ridicule to oppression, presented him the national cockade, he rejected it with a dignity that shewed he was still superior to his misfortunes. At the same time that his Holiness received this notice of the dissolution of his power, his Swiss guards were dismissed, and Republican soldiers put in their place.

1163. Papacy — Pope, Captivity of (1798)—Exile (Feb. 20) and Death (1799)

SOURCE: R[ichard] Duppa, A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government. 1798 (3d ed., London: John Murray, 1807), pp. 50–52, 54.

[p. 50] The time, however, was arrived, when it became more desirable to send him [the Pope] entirely out of the way, in order that his effects might be disposed of with a better grace...

[p. 51] It was decreed that he should go; and on the morning of the 20th of February, about seven o'clock, he left Rome, accompanied by three coaches of his own suite, and a body of French cavalry, to escort him safe into Tuscany; and on the 25th arrived at Siena, where he was requested to remain till further orders. Here he was received into the monastery of S. Barbara of the order of S. Augustin, whose members sorrowfully wel- [p. 52] comed him at the gate, and offered all that their Convent could bestow, to console him under his misfortunes.

An earthquake having taken place at Siena in the month of May, the Pope was removed to a Carthusian Convent within two miles of Florence...

[p. 54] He was suffered to remain in the Carthusian Convent until the 27th of March, 1799. He was then removed to Parma; from whence he was conducted to Briancon in France, and afterward to Valence, where he died on the 29th of August of the same year.

1164. Papacy — Pope, Captivity of (1798), Thought a Death Blow to the Papacy

SOURCE: Joseph Rickaby, "The Modern Papacy," in *Lectures on the History of Religions*, Vol. 3, [lecture 24, p. 1] (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1910). Used by permission.

When, in 1797, Pope Pius VI. fell grievously ill, Napoleon gave orders that in the event of his death no successor should be elected to his office, and that the Papacy should be discontinued.

But the Pope recovered; the peace was soon broken; Berthier entered Rome on 10th February 1798, and proclaimed a Republic. The aged Pontiff refused to violate his oath by recognizing it, and was hurried from prison to prison into France. Broken with fatigue and sorrows, he died ... [in] August 1799, in the French fortress of Valence, aged 82 years. No wonder that half Europe thought Napoleon's veto would be obeyed, and that with the Pope the Papacy was dead.

1165. Papacy—Pope, Captivity of (1798), Thought Fatal to the Church SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, pp. 147, 148.

[p. 147] The tricoloured flag floated on the top of the Castle of St. Angelo. The successor of St. [p. 148] Peter was carried away captive by the unbelievers. He died a prisoner in their hands; and even the honours of sepulture were long withheld from his remains.

It is not strange that, in the year 1799, even sagacious observers should have thought that, at length, the hour of the Church of Rome was come. An infidel power ascendant, the Pope dying in captivity, the most illustrious prelates of France living in a foreign country on Protestant alms, the noblest edifices which the munificence of former ages had consecrated to the worship of God turned into temples of Victory, or into banquetinghouses for political societies, or into Theophilanthropic chapels, such signs might well be supposed to indicate the approaching end of that long domination.

But the end was not yet. Again doomed to death, the milk-white hind was still fated not to die. Even before the funeral rites had been performed over the ashes of Pius the Sixth, a great reaction had commenced, which, after the lapse of more than forty years, appears to be still [in 1840] in progress.

1166. Papacy, Restored a Few Months After Exiled Pope's Death SOURCE: Arthur Robert Pennington, *Epochs of the Papacy* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1881), pp. 450, 452.

[p. 450] Many of the men in those days [of 1798] imagined that the dominion of the Pope had come to an end, and that the knell of the temporal power was then sounding among the nations. This supposition, however, proved to be erroneous. The French republicans were very anxious that Rome should not have another Pope. But as the reverses of the revolutionary armies had left Southern Italy to its ancient masters, the cardinals were able to proceed to an election at Venice. They elected, on March 14th, 1800, Barnabas Chiaromonti, who assumed the name of Pius VII.

The first transaction of this Pope was a negotiation with the government of France, of which Napoleon Buonaparte was the First Consul...

[p. 452] He [Napoleon] felt that, as the large majority of the inhabitants of France knew no other form of faith than Romanism, it must become the established religion of the country. Accordingly we find that he now began negotiations with the Pope, which issued in a Concordat in July, 1801, whereby the Roman Catholic religion was once more established in France. He also left Pius in possession of his Italian principality.

1167. Papacy, Restored From Desperate Position by Concordat With Napoleon (1801)

SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 60, 61. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 60] It is important to remember how desperate was the position from which the Concordat with Napoleon saved the Catholic Church; it may be that it was one more ominous than any to which she had been driven throughout the centuries of her history, since the time of the persecutions under the Roman Empire. Harassed in the land of France, traditionally her "eldest daughter," it was the same story in Belgium (now [since 1793] annexed to France), in the Rhineland (also annexed), in Italy, controlled by anticlericals dependent upon France, in England and Ireland, where the movement for Catholic emancipation had been rejected by King George III, in Poland, partitioned by non-Catholic powers. Even in Austria, where "Josephism" survived, the Church was far from free, while the governments in Portugal and Spain were anti-clerical. The Concordat which Pius VII signed with Napoleon, followed as it was by another in Italy, and by provisional arrangements in Germany, … served the immediate and vital purpose of enabling the life of the Church to be lived in relative security over much of Europe...

However, ... in publishing the Concordat, in April 1802, the First Consul published alongside it, without any previous consultation with Rome, what were called the "Organic Articles," designed to regulate the administration of the Church in France. His excuse was that he was [p. 61] only publishing the police regulations which the Concordat had allowed him to make for the maintenance of public order, but a glance at the articles in question shows ... that he was, in fact, concerned to subject the Church, even in matters evidently spiritual, to the control of the State.

1168. Papacy—Treaty of 1801 With Napoleon

SOURCE: E. de Pressensé, *The Church and the French Revolution*, trans. by John Stroyan (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1869), pp. 454, 455.

[p. 454] Thus was concluded this famous Concordat, the principal clauses of which we reproduce:—

"The Government of the Republic acknowledges that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, is the religion of the great majority of the French. His Holiness equally acknowledges that this same religion has drawn, and still expects at this moment the

greatest good and *èclat* from the establishment of the Catholic worship in France, and the particular profession which the First Consul of the Republic makes of it. Consequently, after this mutual acknowledgment, as well for the good of religion as for the maintenance of internal tranquillity, they have agreed to this which follows: Article 1st, 'The Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, shall be freely exercised in France. Its worship shall be public, conformed to the police regulations which the Government shall judge necessary for the public tranquillity.'["] Then follows the article which announces the new circumscription of the dioceses, and demands of the French incumbents a friendly

resignation, if they do not wish that the government of the bishoprics should be authoritatively provided for by new incumbents. Article 4 was thus worded:—

[p. 455] "The First Consul of the Republic shall nominate, within the three months which shall follow the publication of the bull of His Holiness, to the archbishoprics and bishoprics of the new circumscription. His Holiness will confer the canonical institution, according to the forms established with regard to France, before the change of Government." Article 6 reduces the political engagements of the new bishops to a simple oath of fidelity to the Government. It was understood that, if in their diocese or elsewhere, there was formed any plot to the prejudice of the State, they should give notice of it to the Government. Article 10 declared that the bishops shall nominate to the cures, but that their choice shall fall only on persons approved by the Government.

The last articles stipulate that, for the sake of peace and the happy re-establishment of the Catholic religion, His Holiness shall not in any way disturb the acquirers of alienated ecclesiastical property; that the Government shall secure to the bishops and parish priests a suitable maintenance; and, in fine, that it shall possess the same rights and prerogatives enjoyed by the ancient Government. A last clause declared that a new Convention should be necessary, in case that one of the successors of the First Consul should be Protestant.

Thus the Papacy obtained, despite itself, it is true, the exorbitant right of deposing the bishops, but in return, the civil power nominates the new incumbents under the reserve of the confirmation of the Papal bulls.

1169. Papacy—Treaty of the Lateran (With Mussolini), 1929 SOURCE: *A Catholic Dictionary*, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.; 1958), p. 282. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

Lateran, the Treaty of the. A treaty made between the Holy See (Pope Pius XI) and the Kingdom of Italy (King Victor Emmanuel III) on Feb. 11, 1929, and ratified on the following June 8, whereby "was adequately assured to the Holy See all that was necessary to provide due liberty and independence for the spiritual government of the diocese of Rome and of the Catholic Church in Italy and throughout the world. It therefore declared the 'Roman Question' ... to be definitely and irrevocably settled and done away with and recognized the Kingdom of Italy under the dynasty of the House of Savoy and with Rome as its capital" (art. 26). By this treaty Italy recognizes the *de iure*

and *de facto* international sovereignty of the Holy See with its absolute sole jurisdiction over a state called the City of the Vatican ... and guarantees its freedom and independence; certain public services (railway, post-office, etc.) are supplied by Italy; the person of the pope is inviolable and sacred, and cardinals enjoy the honours of princes of royal blood, and wherever resident in Rome are Vatican citizens; certain other ecclesiastics residing outside the City are given immunities; the Vatican and Italy have ordinary diplomatic relations; in a particular case or as a general rule the Italian government will see to the punishment in its own territory of crimes committed in the City, which in turn will extradite immigrant Italians accused of acts considered criminal by both states; ecclesiastical sentences on clergy and religious in spiritual and disciplinary matters shall have full juridical effect in Italy; the Holy See wishes to remain outside the rivalries and conferences of other states, unless appealed to in its spiritual capacity; the Vatican City is therefore a permanently neutral and inviolable territory; the Law of Guarantees ... and cognate legislation is abrogated, etc. Associated with this treaty was a domestic concordat and a financial convention whereby the Italian state paid

to the Holy See the sum of 81/3 million pounds in cash and 11 million pounds in Italian state bonds, which was accepted in restitution for material damage consequent on the loss of the States of the Church... The treaty and concordat were incorporated in the constitution of the new Italian republic after World-War II.

1170. Papacy—Treaty With Mussolini Heals Wound, 1929

SOURCE: San Francisco Chronicle, Tuesday, Feb. 12, 1929, p. 1. Used by permission. [FRS No. 8.] [Headlines:] Mussolini and Gasparri Sign Historic Roman Pact ...

[Heat Wassel a CM and Wassel

Heal Wound of Many Years ...

Rome, Feb. 11 (AP)—The Roman question tonight was a thing of the past and the Vatican was at peace with Italy. The formal accomplishment of this today was the exchange of signatures in the historic Palace of St. John lateran by two noteworthy plenipotentiaries, Cardinal Gasparri for Pope Pius XI and Premier Mussolini for King Victor Emmanuel III.

In affixing the autographs to the memorable document, healing the wound which has festered since 1870, extreme cordiality was displayed on both sides.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The "Roman question" was occasioned by the pope's retiring indoors in protest as the voluntary "prisoner of the Vatican" in 1870, when the newly unified Kingdom of Italy took over the papal territories. No pope since 1870 had put his foot outside the Vatican until this pact of 1929 gave Pius XI sovereign status as ruler over tiny Vatican City.]

1171. Papacy — Vatican Intellectual Policy

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Ordeal of Christianity* (New York: Association Press, 1957), pp. 44–46. Copyright 1957 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

[p. 44] But *Humani Generis*, the encyclical of 1950, is in many respects the most revealing document on the intellectual policy of the modern papacy. It lays down the limits inside which Roman Church scholarship must operate. Prof. Georges A. Barrois, once a Dominican on the faculty of colleges in France and the Catholic University at Washington, D.C., who is now a professor at Princeton Theological Seminary, has

pointed out that *Humani Generis* was produced to crack down on the recent suggestions of certain Catholic scholars—especially a number of Dominicans and Jesuits in France—looking toward a redefinition of the church's conception of dogma, tradition, and theology. To understand how brusquely all such innovations in thought are condemned and how strictly the control of the pope over the limits of research and speculation is asserted, one must read the full text of this too little known document. Unfortunately, it has appeared in English translation only once, so far as I know, in this country—in the *New York Times* of Aug. 22, 1950—and Prof. Barrois says that this version for reasons unknown omits two important paragraphs.

[p. 45] In this encyclical Pius XII professes sympathy with the work of scholars, but insists this must not go beyond what the Vatican says is permissible. When certain French Dominicans proposed that dogma and theology be seen as products of the time in which they emerge and interpreted in this light—divine truth being, indeed, eternal, but man's perception inevitably limited by his finite nature—and when certain French Jesuits proposed that the church go back to the tradition of the very early church fathers (and I do not need to point out what *that* would do to the three recently proclaimed dogmas of Papal Infallibility, the Immaculate Conception, and the Assumption of the Virgin), they were wandering into forbidden territory. One proof that they were so doing, the encyclical holds, is to be seen in their increasing friendliness with theologians of non-

Roman churches. This trend toward a common position on important questions of Christian teaching the pope condemns as the work of misguided advocates of what he calls "irenics"—in itself a revealing commentary on the papacy's oft-declared desire for Christian reunion.

In conclusion, this encyclical resorts to a specific illustration to show Catholic scholars what the limits are within which they must confine their work. The first three chapters of Genesis, it says, must be accepted as literally and historically true. The creation and fall happened exactly as reported there. There is no myth; and, if the sacred writer did employ some metaphor, that does not affect the historical accuracy of the whole account. Since the pope says this is truth—historic and scientific as well as theological truth—it becomes for every Catholic scholar what some philosophers call a "given."

The present pope's allocution to his bishops is nota- [p. 46] ble for two things: its flat assertion that the church has authority to settle issues of politics, economics, and social relationships entirely outside the issues Pius XII says men call "matters strictly religious," and, in the second place, its scarcely veiled warning to Catholic laity against wandering outside papally prescribed boundaries either in their thinking or writing.

1172. Passover, Edict on, From Persian King to Jews in Egypt SOURCE: A. Cowley, ed. and trans., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923), No. 21, pp. 62, 63. Used by permission.

[p. 62] It was Ezra who made modern Judaism, by instituting (or re-instituting) the ceremonial law and formulating regulations for the national festivals. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah show this as clearly as the earlier literature shows the lack of them. The reason why he was able to enforce the Law and thus prevent its falling (again?) into neglect, is that he had the support of the Persian king. Why this was so, what caused the Persian kings to take so much interest in the Jews, whether it was part of a general policy of religious tolerance or was due to special circumstances, must remain matters of speculation. The fact at any rate is evident from what we are told of Cyrus (e.g. in Isaiah 45^{1+}), Cambyses in pap. $30^{13, 14}$ and Darius here. What has hitherto seemed incredible is that they should have concerned themselves with details of ceremonial, as in the letter of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7, but the present papyrus [no. 21, quoted below] (and the style of other letters in this collection) removes all reason for doubting the genuiness of the Persian letters in Ezra... Whether the instruction as to the manner of keeping the festival come directly from the king, or are issued by Hananiah on his own authority, depends mainly on the meaning of חחשל in 1.3... As to Hananiah, there is no evidence for identifying him with any person of that name mentioned in the book of Nehemiah. His arrival in Egypt (38⁷) seems to have led to trouble. Was this due to his stirring up religious zeal or national feeling in the colony and encouraging animal sacrifices which were resented by the Egyptian? And was this the cause of the destruction of the temple soon after (no. 30)?

The papyrus is written on both sides, 11. 1–7 on the obverse, 11. 8–11 on the reverse—an insignificant document for so important a communication...[p. 63] [Papyrus no. 21:] ¹To my brethren, ²Yedoniah and his colleagues the Jewish garrison, your brother Hananiah. The welfare of my brethren may the gods seek. ³Now this year, the 5th year of King Darius, word was sent from the king to Arsames, saying: ⁴In the month of Tybi (?) let there be a Passover for the Jewish garrison. Now you accordingly count fourteenM

⁵days of the month Nisan and keep the Passover, and from the 15th day to the 21st day of *Nisan* ⁶(*are*) *seven days of Unleavened bread*. Be clean and take heed. *Do no* work ⁷*on the* 15*th day and on the* 21*st day*. *Also* drink no *beer*, and anything at all *in* which *there is* leaven ⁸*do not eat, from the* 15*th day from* sunset till the 21st day of Nis*an, seven* ⁹*days, let it not be seen among you; do not bring* (it) into your dwellings, but seal (it) up during *those* days. ¹⁰*Let this be done as Darius* the *king commanded*. (Address.) ¹¹To my brethren Yedoniah and his colleagues the Jewish garrison, your brother Hanani*ah*.

1173. Passover—Manner of Observance in Mishnaic Times

SOURCE: Mishnah Pesahim (sections as indicated), trans. in The Babylonian Talmud, ed. by Isidore Epstein

(35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), *Pesahim* (folios and pages as indicated). Used by permission.

a. Mishnah 10.1, in Talmud 99b, p. 532

On the eve of Passover close to *minḥah* a man must not eat until nightfall. Even the poorest man in Israel must not eat [on the night of Passover] until he reclines; and they should give him not less than four cups [of wine], and even [if he receives relief] from the charity plate.

b. Mishnah 10.2, in Talmud 114a, p. 586

They filled the first cup for him; Beth Shammai maintain: He recites a blessing for the day [first], and then recites a blessing over the wine; while Beth Hillel rule: He recites a blessing over the wine [first], and then recites a blessing for the day.

c. Mishnah 10.3, in Talmud 114a, p. 587

They then set [it] before him. He dips the lettuce before yet he has reached the aftercourse of the bread. They set before him *mazzah*, lettuce [*hazareth*,] and *haroseth*

and two dishes, though the *haroseth* is not compulsory. R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok said: It is compulsory. And in the Temple they used to bring the body of the Passover-offering before him.

d. Mishnah 10.4, in Talmud 116a, p. 594

They filled a second cup for him. At this stage the son questions his father; if the son is unintelligent, his father instructs him [to ask]: 'Why is this night different from all [other] nights. for on all [other] nights we eat leavened and unleavened bread, whereas on this night [we eat] only [un]leavened bread; on all other nights we eat all kinds of herbs, on this night bitter herbs; on all other nights we eat meat roast, stewed or boiled, on this night, roast only. On all other nights we dip once, but on this night we dip twice.' And according to the son's intelligence his father instructs him. He commences with shame and concludes with praise; and expounds from 'a wandering Aramean was my father' until he completes the whole section.

e. Mishnah 10.5, 6, in Talmud 116a, 116b, pp. 595, 596

[116*a*; p. 595] Gamaliel used to say: Whoever does not make mention of [116*b*] these three things on Passover does not discharge his duty, and these are they: The Passover-offering, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs. The Passover-offering is [sacrificed] because the Omnipresent passed over the houses of our fathers in Egypt, as it is said, then ye shall say: It is the sacrifice of the Lord's Passover, for that He passed over etc. The unleavened bread is [eaten] because our fathers were redeemed from Egypt, as it is said, and they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt etc.

The bitter herb is [eaten] because the Egyptians embittered the lives of our fathers in Egypt, as it is said, and they made their lives bitter etc. In every generation a man is bound to regard himself as though he personally had gone forth from Egypt, because it is said, and thou shalt tell thy son in that day, saying: It is because of that which the Lord did for me when I came forth out of Egypt. Therefore it is our duty to thank, praise, [p. 596] laud, glorify, exalt, honour, bless, extol, and adore Him who wrought all these miracles for our fathers and ourselves: He brought us forth from bondage into freedom. from sorrow into joy, from mourning into festivity, from darkness into great light, and from servitude into redemption. Therefore let us say before Him, Hallelujah How far does one recite it? Beth Shammai maintain: Until 'as a joyous mother of children,' while Beth Hillel say: Until 'the flint into a fountain of waters,' and he concludes with [a formula of] redemption. R. Tarfon used to say 'Who redeemed us and redeemed our fathers from Egypt' but he did not conclude [with a blessing]. R. Akiba said: 'So may the Lord our God and the God of our father suffer us to reach other seasons and festivals which come towards us for peace, rejoicing in the rebuilding of Thy city and glad in Thy service, and there we will partake of the sacrifices and the Passover-offerings' etc. As far as 'blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast redeemed Israel.'

f. Mishnah 10.7, in Talmud 117b, p. 605

They filled the third cup for him. He then recites grace after meals. Over the fourth [cup] he concludes the *Hallel*, and recites the grace of song. Between these cups he may drink if he wishes; between the third and the fourth he may not drink.

g. Mishnah 10.8, in Talmud 119b, p. 617

One may not conclude after the Paschal meal [by saying], 'Now to the entertainment [apikoman].'

[EDITORS' NOTE: Brackets, except those for page and folio numbers, are in the source.]

1174. Passover — Time of Slaving Lamb in Christ's Day

SOURCE: Josephus *War* vi. 9. 3; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 499. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Accordingly, on the occasion of the feast called Passover, at which they sacrifice from the ninth to the eleventh hour, and a little fraternity, as it were, gathers round each sacrifice, of not fewer than ten persons (feasting alone not being permitted), while the companies often include as many as twenty, the victims were counted and amounted to two hundred and fifty-five thousand six hundred; allowing an average of ten diners to each victim, we obtain a total of two million seven hundred thousand, all pure and holy.

1175. Penance, Council of Trent on

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIV (Nov. 25, 1551), On the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, can. 1, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 115. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

If anyone saith that in the Catholic Church Penance is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord for reconciling the faithful unto God, as often as they fall into sin after baptism; let him be anathema.

1176. Pentecostal Bodies—Pentecostal Church of God of America, Inc. SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, p. 1353.

History. The denomination known as the Pentecostal Church of God of America, Incorporated, is not so very old as an organization but in beliefs and principles it dates back to the early days of Pentecost of the twentieth century, when a great pentecostal revival began about the year 1901. Shortly after this first great pentecostal outpouring the message of pentecost was spread over the country. Groups of people were forming churches and calls of help were being made, and it became evident that some general supervision of the work was necessary.

Several organizations were formed, the Pentecostal Church of God being among the first, but it was not until 1936 that the Pentecostal Church of God was incorporated in the State of Missouri.

Doctrine. This denomination believes that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, the product of holy men of old who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, and accepts the New Testament as its guide in matters pertaining to conduct and doctrine. It believes that there is one God, and He is manifested in three personalities—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, being coequal. Salvation is the gift of God to man, separate from works and the law, and is made operative by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. The new birth is necessary to all men.

God, through the Holy Spirit, definitely calls such as He desires to serve as ministers and specifically endues the one called with talents and gifts for that office. This church does not emphasize systematic theology.

Water baptism is by immersion in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The baptism of the Holy Spirit is a gift from God as promised through the Lord Jesus Christ to all believers in this dispensation; it is received subsequent to the new birth and is accompanied with the speaking in other tongues as the Holy Spirit gives utterance, as the initial sign and evidence.

Healing is for the physical ills of the human body and is wrought by the power of God through the prayer of faith and the laying on of hands...

This denomination believes in the resurrection of the just and the premillennial return of Christ. The one who physically dies in sin is hopelessly and eternally lost.

They believe that the Government is ordained of God and are thankful for the protection and the freedom to worship God, but as the Bible says, "Thou shalt not kill," they will be glad to be of service to the Government in any way consistent with noncombative service.

Organization. The denomination has a representative and congregational form of government.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1958), 103,500 (YAC, 1961, p. 257).]

1177. Pentecostal Bodies — United Pentecostal Church, Inc. SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1328, 1329, 1335, 1336.

[a. Former Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ]

[p. 1328] *History*. The Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ is the continuation of the great revival that began at Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, A.D. 33, and is founded upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner Stone (Acts 2:1–42). Although the true followers have been little known, yet from that time until now there have always been earnest contenders "for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3).

At various intervals throughout the past centuries, the followers of the apostolic faith and doctrine have become prominent through great revivals that have appeared in Great Britain, the United States, and Canada.

In the days of Tertullian (A.D. 207), Chrysostom (fourth century), Christians of the thirteenth century, the early Quakers, Wesley, Whitefield, and Irving the gifts and

manifestations of the apostolic church were much in evidence as the revival spirit swept over the country.

In Kansas (1901) the revival broke forth and moved southward to Texas, being known locally only, but finally reached Los Angeles, Calif. (1906), from whence it spread throughout the whole earth, entering into nearly every nation under heaven, penetrating the heathen darkness of India, China, Africa, and the isles of the sea, fulfilling the commission of our Lord: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15–20), and proclaiming the soon coming of the Lord.

So great was the awakening that in a few years in nearly every town of any size whatever there were witnesses to the Pentecostal outpouring of the spirit (Luke 24:48), and soon there began to appear in different localities places of worship, wherein the gifts of the Spirit were manifested, designating themselves by such names as The Apostolic Faith Mission, Pentecostal Mission, Apostolic Faith Assembly, Full Gospel Assembly or Mission, Assembly of God, etc., their one common aim being to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" in the days of the apostles, taking the Bible as their creed, discipline, and rule of order and charter.

The chief aim is to glorify God our Saviour, even Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works; that we should show forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvelous light; and that we may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom we shine as lights in the world, holding forth the Word of Life, to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide their feet into the way of peace (Tit. 2:13).

Doctrine. Our creed, discipline, rules of order, and doctrine are based on the Word of God as taught and revealed by the Holy Ghost.

We believe that all scripture is given by inspiration of God; that the only grounds upon which God will accept a sinner is repentance from the heart for the sins which he has committed: that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be observed: that the ordinance of foot washing is as much a divine command as any other New Testament ordinance, and Jesus gave us an example that we should do even as He had done; that Jesus is to come to earth again in person, a doctrine clearly set forth in apostolic times; that tithes and free-will offerings are God's plan to carry on His work; that all civil magistrates are ordained of God for peace, safety, and the welfare of all people, therefore, it is our duty to be in obedience to all requirements of the laws that are not contrary to the Word of God; that the people of God should have no connection whatever with labor unions, secret societies, or any other organization wherein there is a fellowship with unbelievers, bound by any oath; that the time draweth near for the coming of the Lord to make a change in the present order of things, and at that time all the righteous dead shall rise from their graves, [p. 1329] and we who are alive and living righteous before God shall be translated or "caught up" to meet the Lord in the air; that the distress upon the earth is the "beginning of sorrows" and will become more intense until there "shall be a time of trouble such as there never was since there was a nation even to that same time." and that period of "tribulation" will be followed by the dawn of a better day on earth; that for 1,000 years there shall be "peace on earth and good will toward men"; that in order to escape the judgment of God and to have the hope of enjoying the glory of life eternal, one must be thoroughly saved from his sins, wholly sanctified unto God and filled with the Holy Ghost; and when 1,000 years are finished there shall be a resurrection of the dead, who shall be summoned before the Great White Throne for their final judgment. Basically, our stand on the marriage and divorce issue is, that judgment begins at the house of God; but since the complications of individual cases are so many and so varied, we believe that no blanket rule can be made to apply to every case, and we feel we should leave the individual cases to the prayerful judgment of those having jurisdiction over them.

Our duty is to lift up the fallen, visit the sick, strengthen the weak, encourage the faint-hearted, comfort the feeble-minded, point the lost to the way of salvation, and urge all believers to seek a spirit-filled life (Eph. 5:18), and prepare for the coming of the Lord (Jas. 1:27).

Moreover, it is our indispensable duty, as partakers of the "royal priesthood" (I Peter 2:9), to offer supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks for all men; for kings, presidents, governors, magistrates, and all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty ([I] Tim. 2:1–4). And to submit ourselves to "every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well," so long as these ordinances do not infringe upon the liberty of service toward God according to the dictates of the heart of conscience (I Peter 2:13–17).

Organization. Each annual session of this body is known as the General Assembly of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ...

Each local church manages its own affairs so long as such local proceedings are done in harmony with the General Assembly...

[b. The Former Pentecostal Church, Inc.]

[p. 1335] *History*. In the beginning of this latter rain outpouring, as it is known among our particular group, there was no organization of any size, all were zealous to see the gospel spread, and they did not take time to organize. But in the year 1914 a conference was called at Hot Springs, Ark., during which a General Council of the Assemblies of God was formed. Later, because of what many believed to be new revelation of doctrine, this group was divided and two or three other smaller groups soon formed, among them being what is known as the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, composed of all nationalities. Believing this to hinder our organized effort to evangelize the world, from this group The Pentecostal Church, Inc., was formed, composed of white brethren only. Although we believe that all men are equal in the sight of God, we do not believe that a mixed group can reach every nationality in a successful manner. Therefore, it is our policy to endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace with all Spirit-filled children of God until we all come to the unity of the faith once preached by Jesus Christ and His Apostles.

Doctrine. We believe the Bible to be the inspired Word of God, insofar as it is correctly translated from the original writings (II Tim. 3:16).

"For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse" (Romans 1:20).

There is one everliving eternal God, who is a Spirit. (Isa. 44:6–8; Mark 12:29; John 4:24; I Cor. 8:6.) He manifested Himself in the Old Testament in various ways and under different names, such as God Elohim, God Almighty, El Shaddai, the "I AM THAT I AM," Jehovah, and especially Jehovah Lord, the redemptive Name.

In the New Testament this one true God was manifest in the flesh or in His Son, Jesus Christ, for, "when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law"; "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them"; "*** for in Him (Jesus) dweleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." "For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell"; "*** and without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

Man is triune spirit, soul, and body. God is triune, a trinity—three manifestations of one God, not three eternal distinct persons or Gods, as that is tritheism.

Jesus in His humanity, was man; in His deity, was God. His flesh was the Lamb or sacrifice of God (Heb. 10:10–20).

The Son of God is the only hope of the world. The Man, Jesus, is the mediator between God and man (I Tim. 2:5).

God is a multiple. That is, He has many names, offices, titles, many manifestations, such as God, Son of God, Son of Man, Lord of All, King, Shepherd, Priest, Holy One, Lamb, Alpha and Omega. He is all and in all. Amen.

In the beginning God created man innocent, pure, and holy; but through the sin of disobedience, Adam and Eve fell from their holy state, and God excluded them from Eden. Hence, by one man's disobedience, sin entered into the world. (Gen. 1:27; Rom. 5:12; Eph. 2:13).

Conversion or forgiveness of sins comes by repentance toward God through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, by confessing and forsaking our sins.

Immersion in water is for converted believers, who have turned from their sins and the love of the world, and should be administered by a duly authorized minister of the Gospel by authority, and in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, according to the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5), thus fulfilling Matt. 28:19.

Baptism in the Holy Spirit is for all believers, and is obtained by obedience (Acts 2:38; 5:31, 32); by asking for (Luke 11:13); by tarrying for (Luke 24:49); by faith (Gal. 3:14); and is accompanied by speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance.

Healing for the body was purchased by our Saviour, Jesus Christ, for "With His stripes we are healed" (Isa. 53:5); and intended for recognition and practice [p. 1336] by the church. "For they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover" (Mark 16:18); and "*** if you are sick, call for the elders of the church," as in James 5:14.

On the night of our Lord's betrayal, He ate the Passover Supper with His Apostles. He took bread and wine and blessed it, instituting the communion, saying, "This do in remembrance of me." (Luke 22:19). Paul instructed the church how to observe it. (I Cor. 11:23, 24.) There is a great spiritual significance in the partaking of the sacrament; also there is a natural side. We see this by the use of the literal bread and fruit of the vine.

The first example of foot washing was given by our Lord. (St. John 13:2–14.) To be blessed, it is well to do what He suggest (St. John 13:15–17; I Tim. 5:9, 10).

Godly living should characterize the life of every child of the Lord, and he or she should live according to the pattern and example given in the Word of God (Rom. 6:6; Titus 2:11, 12; I Peter 2:21–23); otherwise we shall not escape the judgment of the great day (Heb. 12:14; 1 Peter 1:15–17).

For a person to remain saved he must abide in the grace of God—grace means favor. A person sinning against God loses the favor or grace of God, and continuing to sin (without repentance) will eventually be cast into the lake of fire. God is able to keep us from falling, but we must keep ourselves in the love of God. (Jude 21.) The book of Jude tells us about the backsliders and their reward.

We understand the Scripture to teach restoration of all things, as was spoken by the mouth of the Holy Prophets since the world began; but we cannot find where the devil, his angels, and all sinners are included (Rev. 20:10).

We recognize the institution of human government as being of divine ordination and in doing so affirm unswerving loyalty to the Government of the United States; however, we take a definite position regarding the bearing of arms or the taking of human life. As followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, we believe in the implicit obedience to His commandments and precepts, which instruct us as follows: "Thou shalt not kill" (Ex. 20:13); "That ye resist not evil" (Matt. 5:39); "Follow peace with all men" (Heb. 12:14); etc. These we believe and interpret to mean Christians shall not shed blood nor take human life. [Compare the position of the Friends (Quakers), No. 779.]

Therefore, we propose to fulfill all the obligations of loyal, American citizenship but are constrained to declare against participating in war, armed insurrection, property destruction, and aiding or abetting in, or the actual destruction of, human life.

Furthermore, we cannot conscientiously affiliate with any union, boycott, or organization which will force or bind any of its members to belong to any organization, perform any duties contrary to their conscience, or receive any mark without their right to affirm or reject same.

"Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery." (Matt. 5:32; Matt. 19:9.) When this sin has been committed the innocent party may be free to remarry only in the Lord. It being our desire to raise a higher standard for the ministry, we recommend that they do not marry again.

We believe tithing is God's financial plan to provide for His work, and has been since the days of Abraham. Tithing came with faith under Abraham; Moses' law enjoined it, and Israel practiced it, when she was right with God; Jesus endorsed it (Matt. 23:23), and Paul said to lay by in store as God has prospered you. Do not rob God of His portion, viz, tithes and offerings...

That Jesus is coming again the second time in person, just as He went away, is clearly set forth by the Lord Jesus Himself and was preached and taught in the early Christian church by the Apostles; hence the children of God today are earnestly with hope looking forward to the glorious event. (Matt. 24; Acts 1:11; 3:19–21; I Cor. 11:26; Phil. 3:20, 21; 1 Thes. 4:14–17; Titus 2:13, 14.)

We believe there shall be a "great tribulation," which will be followed by the dawn of a better day on earth; and that for 1,000 years there shall be "Peace on earth, and goodwill toward men." (Isa. 65:17–25; Dan. 7:27; Micah 4:1, 2; Heb. 2:14; Matt. 5:5; Rom. 11:25–27; Rev. 20:1–5.)

When the 1,000 years are finished there shall be a resurrection of all the dead, who will be summoned before the Great White Throne for their final judgment, and all whose names are not found written in the Book of Life shall be cast into the lake of fire, burning with brimstone, which God hath prepared for the devil and his angels; Satan himself being cast in first. (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:7–15; 21:8.)

[EDITORS' NOTE: In 1945 the Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ and the Pentecostal Church, Inc., united to form the United Pentecostal Church, Inc.; the membership of the combined body in 1958 was 160,000 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 86, 257).]

1178. Pergamum, a Center of Idolatry

SOURCE: Tacitus *Annals* iv. 37; translated by John Jackson, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 65, 67. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 65] Since the deified Augustus had not forbidden [p. 67] the construction of a temple at Pergamum to himself and the City of Rome, ... I [Tiberius] followed the precedent already sealed by his approval, with all the more readiness that with worship of myself was associated veneration of the senate. But,though once to have accepted may be pardonable, yet to be consecrated in the image of deity through all the provinces would be vanity and arrogance.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Obviously, as the translator's note (p. 66) points out, the Pergamum temple to Augustus, authorized in 29 B.C., "is instanced by Tiberius as marking the definite inauguration of emperor worship in the provinces: see ...; D[io] Cass[ius] LI. 20." That was the first worship of a Roman emperor during his lifetime; in Rome itself emperors were not considered deified until after death. Since the enforcement of emperor worship was a principal cause of the persecution of Christians, some have seen in this the background of the characterization of Pergamum as the city "where Satan's seat is" (Rev. 2:13). Others find in "Satan's seat" an allusion to Pergamum's famed temple of Asclepius, the god of medicine and healing, in whose cult serpents were prominent; or, more often, to the great Altar of Zeus in that city (see *SDA-Com* 7:95, 96).]

1179. Persecution, Always Wrong

SOURCE: Thomas Clarke, *History of Intolerance*, Vol. 1 (Waterford, England: printed by John Bull, book seller, for J. R. Birnie, R. Farrell, and S. Phelan, etc., 1819), p. 3.

There are many who do not seem to be sensible that all violence in religion is irreligious, and that whoever is wrong, the persecutor cannot be right.

1180. Persecution, as Defined by Pope Pelagius I

SOURCE: Pope Pelagius I, Epistle 2 (formerly 3) to Narses, in MPL, Vol. 69, col. 1848.

Let not the idle talk of men hinder you, saying that the Church persecutes while she either restrains what is committed or seeks the salvation of souls. The circulators of rumor of this kind are wrong. No one persecutes except the one who forces to evil. Truly, now, he who either punishes the evil deed or prohibits its being done, he does not persecute, but loves. For if, as they think,no one is to be restrained from evil nor drawn back from evil to good, human and divine laws must be made void (laws) which decree both punishment for the evil ones and reward for the good at the recommendation of justice. Moreover both the authority of canonical Scripture and the truth of the rules of the Fathers teach us that schism is evil and that men of this kind ought to be repressed by outside forces.

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Pope Pelagius wrote "Narses, who seems to have shrunk from using violence, urging him to have no scruples in the matter. These letters are an unqualified defence of the principle of persecution" (James Barmby, "Pelagius I," in William Smith and Henry Wace, eds., *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. 4, [London: John Murray, 1887], p. 297).]

1181. Persecution, Attitude at Root of

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Sir James Mackintosh," in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. I, pp. 333, 334.

[p. 333] The doctrine which, from the very first origin of religious dissensions, has been held by all bigots of all sects, when condensed into a few words, and stripped of rhetorical disguise, is simply this: I am in the right, and you are in the wrong. When you are the stronger you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I [p. 334] shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.

1182. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Nero, 54–68), 64 SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 168, 169. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 168] The year of Nero's fire and the subsequent persecution of the Christians introduced Christianity to world notice although for long thereafter it remained a secret society under police surveillance. The disastrous fire began at the southeastern corner of the Circus Maximus, an area filled with inflammable wooden shops, on July 18, 64 and, accelerated by wind, burned for six days and nights and again, later, raged for two days, completely destroying three of the fourteen *regiones* of the city... [Tacitus] recounts how

Nero, when he learned at Antium that the fire was nearing his palace-the domus

transitoria (so-named from its passageway)—returned to the city and aided the distressed by opening to them the Campus Martius, the house and gardens of Agrippa, the Pantheon, and his own gardens across the Tiber, and by lowering the price of grain. Still, because of his well-known crimes, the rumor spread that he had instigated the fire either to get space for his proposed "Golden House" or, his imagination being fired by the sublimity of the terrible scene, to give him an opportunity to watch it from his private theater or the Tower of Maecenas where he might sing his aria on the subject of the

Destruction of Troy. But his *Troica*, unfortunately for this story, was first read in public a year later. To kill the rumor he placed the blame on the unpopular Christians...

In any case the mob, enraged not only by the loss of their homes but by the destruction of temples, statues, and other treasures of the Roman past, found a convenient scapegoat in the Christians, now distinguished from Jews, while the Empress Poppaea Sabina, a convert to Judaism, protected the latter. The Christians were particularly unpopular because of their prophesy [*sic*] of a final world conflagration on Christ's return. Tacitus says "vast numbers were convicted not so much on the count of arson as for their hatred of the human race"—since Jewish misanthropy was proverbial...

[p. 169] Tacitus tells realistically how "they were covered with wild beasts' skins and torn to death by dogs or were fastened on crosses and, when daylight failed, were burned to serve as lamps at night." This was in connection with Nero's "spectacle" in his Circus where he appeared in the habit of a charioteer or mounted on his car. Tacitus adds that, despite their deserved punishment, a sentiment of pity arose because of the belief that they were being sacrificed not for the State's welfare but because of one man's ferocity.

The site of this first Christian persecution was, as Tacitus tells us, in Nero's gardens beyond the Tiber. Here in an area at the foot of the Vatican Hill Nero held his chariot races. To the north lay the temple areas of Cybele and Mithra while on the *spina* of the Circus itself stood the red granite obelisk transported by Caligula from Heliopolis in Egypt, which today stands in the center of St. Peter's Piazza.

Juvenal, Tacitus' contemporary (*ca.* 60–140), alludes to the persecution twice. In Satire 1 (155–57) he speaks of burning live bodies and dragging them across the arena, while in 8 (235) he mentions the *tunica molesta* (shirt of evil), in which, lined with pitch, the victims were burned—the ordinary punishment at Rome for incendiaries. The earliest Christian writer to refer to the persecution was Melito, bishop of Sardis (*ca.* 170), a fragment of whose letter to Antoninus preserved by Eusebius couples Nero and Domitian as the only emperors who had slandered Christianity. Eusebius also says Nero was "the first of the emperors to be pointed our as a foe of divine religion."

[EDITORS' NOTE: Nero's predecessor Claudius exiled Jewish Christians, with other Jews in Rome, because of "Chrestus" (Suetonius *Lives of the Caesars* v. 25. 4)—possibly "Christus." See *SDACom* 6:359.]

1183. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Nero) SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 3, 5, 6.

[p. 3] [a.] Tertullian's Statement.

Liber apologeticus, ch. 5. Opera, ed. Oehler (Leipzig, 1853), Vol. I, p. 130 sq. Latin...

Nero was the first to rage with the imperial sword against this sect, then rising rapidly in Rome. But we even glory in such an author of our condemnation. For anyone who knows him cannot but see that nothing but what was pre-eminently good was condemned by Nero...

[p. 5] [b.] Account by Suetonius.

Vita Neronis, XVI; ed. Carl Roth, Leipzig (1891), p. 176 sq. Latin.

In his reign many things were severely censured and suppressed and many also instituted... Christians, a class of men of a new and vicious superstition, were subjected to severe punishments...

[c.] Account by Clement [of Rome].

First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. V, VI, VII. (Patres Apostoli., ed. Cotelerius, Antwerp, 1700.) Greek.

V. But to leave ancient examples, let us come to the recent champions...

Peter by unjust envy endured not one or two, but many sufferings; and so, made a martyr, he departed to the place of glory due him. On account of envy Paul obtained the reward of patience, after he had been seven times in bonds, and had been whipped and stoned. He preached in the East and in the West and received the glorious reward of his faith. He taught the whole world righteousness, and coming to the extreme West he suffered martyrdom...

VI. Unto these men of holy lives was joined a vast multitude of the elect who, suffering much disgrace and many torments on account of envy, were a most noble example for us. On account of envy, women were tormented; Danaides and Dirce, when they suffered severe and unjust punishments, persevered in their constant faith, and though [p. 6] weak in body received a glorious reward.

[d.] Account by Sulpicius Severus.

Chron. II. 29. Opera, ed. C. Halm, (1864). Corp. Script. Ecc. Lat. (Vienna), I. p. 83. Latin.

Then he began to rage against the Christians. Afterwards he even made laws forbidding the religion, and published edicts, ordering that Christianity should not exist. At this time Paul and Peter were condemned; one of them was beheaded. Peter was crucified.

1184. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Domitian, 81–96) SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 170. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Domitian, at the close of the first century (81–96), is credited by Christian writers with persecuting the followers of their religion. He championed the imperial cult to the exclusion of all others except that of Isis-Serapis to whom he erected a temple. For a century men had voluntarily taken an oath by the "Genius" of the Emperor but Domitian was the first to make it a real test of "personal" loyalty by compelling men to swear by it in all public documents. This caused trouble for both Jews and Christians since they alone refused to sanction his divinity... The Emperor's cousin, Flavius Clemens, consul of the year 95, and his wife Domitilla were condemned because they favored either Christianity or, perhaps, Judaism. One was executed and the other banished, though Domitian had named their sons his heirs. He condemned others also though he instituted no general persecution. Eusebius says he ordered the execution of the surviving family of Joseph and Mary and had the two grandsons of Judas (Jude), brother of Jesus, brought before him, but on finding that they were simple-minded let them go.

1185. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Trajan, 98–117), *c*. 112. *a*. Pliny (the Younger), Governor of Pontus and Bithynia, to the Emperor Trajan SOURCE: Pliny the Younger *Letters* x. 96, translated by William Melmoth, revised by W. M. L. Hutchinson, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), pp. 401, 403, 405. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 401] It is a rule, Sir, which I inviolably observe, to refer myself to you in all my doubts; for who is more capable of guiding my uncertainty or informing my ignorance? Having never been present at any trials of the Christians, I am unacquainted with the method and limits to be observed either in examining or punishing them. Whether any difference is to be made on account of age, or no distinction allowed between the youngest and the adult; whether repentance admits to a pardon, or if a man has been once a Christian it avails him nothing to recant; whether the mere profession of Christianity, albeit without crimes, or only the crimes associated therewith are punishable—in all these points I am greatly doubtful.

In the meanwhile, the method I have observed towards those who have been denounced to me as Christians is this: I interrogated them whether they were Christians; if they confessed it I repeated the question twice again, adding the threat of capital punishment; if they still persevered, I ordered them to be executed. For whatever the nature of their creed might be, I could at least feel no doubt that [p. 403] contumacy and inflexible obstinacy deserved chastisement. There were others also possessed with the same infatuation, but being citizens of Rome, I directed them to be carried thither.

These accusations spread (as is usually the case) from the mere fact of the matter being investigated and several forms of the mischief came to light. A placard was put up, without any signature, accusing a large number of persons by name. Those who denied they were, or had ever been, Christians, who repeated after me an invocation to the Gods, and offered adoration, with wine and frankincense, to your image, which I had ordered to be brought for that purpose, together with those of the Gods, and who finally cursed Christ—none of which acts, it is said, those who are really Christians can be forced into performing—these I thought it proper to discharge. Others who were named by that informer at first confessed themselves Christians, and then denied it; true, they had been of that persuasion but they had quitted it, some three years, others many years, and a few as much as twenty-five years ago. They all worshipped your statue and the images of the Gods, and cursed Christ.

They affirmed, however, the whole of their guilt, or their error, was, that they were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before it was light, when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god, and bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to any wicked deeds, but never to commit any fraud, theft or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they [p. 405] should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to partake of food—but food of an ordinary and innocent kind. Even this practice, however, they had abandoned after the publication of my edict, by which, according to your orders, I had forbidden political associations. I judged it so much the more necessary to extract the real truth, with the assistance of torture, from two female slaves, who were styled *deaconesses*: but I could discover nothing more than depraved and excessive superstition.

I therefore adjourned the proceedings, and betook myself at once to your counsel. For the matter seemed to me well worth referring to you—especially considering the numbers endangered. Persons of all ranks and ages, and of both sexes are, and will be, involved in the prosecution. For this contagious superstition is not confined to the cities only, but has spread through the villages and rural districts; it seems possible, however, to check and cure it. 'Tis certain at least that the temples, which had been almost deserted, begin now to be frequented; and the sacred festivals, after a long intermission, are again revived; while there is a general demand for sacrificial animals, which for some time past have met with but few purchasers. From hence it is easy to imagine what multitudes may be reclaimed from this error, if a door be left open to repentance.

b. The Emperor's Reply

SOURCE: Trajan, Letter to Pliny the Younger, quoted in Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 2 (8th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1903), pp. 46, 47.

[p. 46] You have adopted the right course, my friend, with regard to the Christians; for no universal rule, to be applied to all cases, can be laid down in this matter. They should not be searched for; but when accused and convicted, they should be punished; yet if any one denies that he has been a Christian, and proves it by action, namely, [p. 47] by worshipping our gods, he is to be pardoned upon his repentance, even though suspicion may still cleave to him from his antecedents. But anonymous accusations must not be admitted in any criminal process; it sets a bad example, and is contrary to our age.

1186. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Hadrian, 117–138) SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), p. 10.

Rescript of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus.

Justin Martyr, Opera. ed. Otto, Jena (1842), I, p. 273 sq. Greek.

I have received the letter written to me by your predecessor, Serenus Granianus, a most excellent man; and it does not seem well to pass over this report in silence, lest both the innocent be confounded and an occasion for robbery be given to false accusers. Accordingly, if the inhabitants are able to sustain their accusations openly against Christians, so as to charge them with something before the tribunal, I do not forbid them

to do this. But I do not permit mere tumultuous cries and acclamations to be used, for it is much more equitable that if anyone wishes to make accusation, you should know the charges. If, therefore, anyone charges and proves that the men designated have done anything contrary to the laws, you are to fix penalties in proportion to their transgressions. By Hercules, you shall take special care, if, out of calumny, anyone prosecutes one of them, to inflict on the accuser a more severe punishment for his villainy.

1187. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Marcus Aurelius, 161–180), 177, 180

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 171–173. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 171] Trajan's policy of clemency lasted until the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–180) and with that exception until the middle of the third century and the formidable persecution of Decius...

In the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the Stoic emperor, the Christian Church emerges again into the clear light of history, since it then suffered persecution in various parts of the Empire. This has caused many to denounce Marcus although his hostility to the Christians was merely the logical result of his training, since from boyhood he had been taught to regard the imperial cult and the imperial ideal as identical and to feel that Christianity opposed them. He seems to have ordered various governors to punish "sacrilege" which he regarded as the great crime of the Christians. In reference to the persecution in Gaul in 177 Eusebius says that the governor there had written for advice and the emperor's reply was that "they should be tortured to death, but that if any should recant they should be let go." Consequently, refractory citizens were to be beheaded and [p. 172] others sent to the beasts, i.e., the traditional methods of punishing citizens and non-citizens respectively. Marcus knew little about the Christians as he spent most of his reign engrossed in the war with the Quadi and Marcomanni on the Danube and was seldom in the capital. In his Meditations he mentions the Christians only once in reference to their "obstinacy" (XI:3). While some have explained that harsh indictment as an interpolation it was rather in harmony with the usual reaction of the better classes of the day. For the Christians by then were dangerous since they taught a corporate unity above that of the State. This seems sufficient reason why the best of emperors instituted a grave persecution...

Eusebius says Justin Martyr met his death at Rome in his reign and there were also martyrdoms in Pergamum, Africa and, above all, in Gaul where in 177 forty-eight Christians were killed, the only large-scale persecution of the second century. Eusebius, on the basis of a letter sent by the Gallic churches of Lugdunum (Lyon) and Vienna (Vienne) to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, details the tortures, imprisonments, and deaths at Lyon. Such martyrs were first excluded from houses, baths, markets, and all public places; then tortured and imprisoned and finally led into the Forum to be publicly interrogated by the tribune in the absence of the governor and, when the latter returned, brought before him where they were called parricides and cannibals and were again tortured with fiendish ingenuity. One of them, Blandina (17–19; 40–42; 55–56), was tortured by relays night and day till her body was torn apart but still breathed. Then she was bound to a stake in the arena and exposed to the wild beasts. When these refused to touch her she was again imprisoned and, finally, after scourging and again being offered

to the beasts, she, still breathing, was roasted and thrown into a net to be tossed by bulls, and finally died. Some of the dead were kept for days from burial, but at last the bodies had to be burned and the ashes thrown into the Rhone.

There is also an official narrative of the trials of Christians from Scillium in Numidian Africa before a Roman proconsul at Carthage in documents which can be dated 180, i.e., the last year of the reign of Marcus. Here the proconsul Saturninus asked the accused "to return to a right mind," i.e., swear by the Emperor's "genius," when one of them answered: "I do not recognize the empire of this world, but rather I serve that God [p. 173] whom no man has seen nor can see"; and another: "We have none other to fear save the Lord our God who is in heaven." Refusing a thirty-day reprieve they all, twelve in number, were sentenced "to suffer by the sword." With such treasonable answers, there could be no other solution possible.

1188. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Marcus Aurelius, 161–180), 177

SOURCE: Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 11–19.

[p. 11] The Persecution at Lyons and Vienne.

Eusebius: Historia Ecclesiastica, Book V. ch. I, 3ff. (ed. Dindorf, Vol. IV, Leipzig, 1871, pp. 183–198). Greek.

The servants of Christ, living at Vienne and Lyons in Gaul, to the brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia who have the same faith and hope of redemption that we have, peace, grace and glory from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord...

The magnitude of the tribulation here, the great fury of the heathen against the saints, and how much the blessed martyrs endured, we cannot fully recount, nor indeed is it possible to express these in writing. For with all his might the adversary broke loose upon us, showing even now how unrestrained his future coming would be. He tried every means of training and exercising his followers against the servants of God, so that not only were we excluded from houses, baths and markets, but also forbidden, every one of us, to appear in any place whatsoever.

But the grace of God fought against the adversary, rescued the weak, and arrayed firm pillars, able through patience to withstand every attack of the Evil One...

First, indeed, they endured nobly the sufferings heaped upon them by the general populace: clamors, blows, being dragged along, robberies, stonings, imprisonments, and all that an enraged mob loves to inflict on opponents and enemies. Then they were taken to the forum by the chiliarch and the ordained authorities of the city and were examined in the presence of the whole multitude. Having confessed, they were imprisoned until the arrival of the governor. When they were afterwards brought before him and he treated us with all manner of cruelty, Vettius Epagathus, one of the brethren, filled with love for God and his neighbor, interfered... [He] could not endure the [p. 12] unrighteous judgment against us, but was filled with indignation and demanded that he should be permitted to testify in behalf of the brethren, that there was no atheism nor impiety in us. Those about the tribunal cried out against him, and with reason, for he was a man of mark; and the governor denied his just request, but asked only this one question, if he also was a Christian; and on his confessing this most distinctly, placed him also in the number of the martyrs...

They with all eagerness finished the confession of martyrdom. But some appeared unprepared and untrained and still weak, unable to endure the strain of a great contest. Of these about ten became apostates, who caused us great pain and excessive sorrow, and weakened the zeal of the others who had not yet been seized, and who, although suffering all kinds of evil, were constantly with the martyrs and did not abandon them. Then indeed all were in great fear on account of the uncertainty of the confession, not fearing the sufferings to be endured, but looking to the end and fearing lest some one should apostatize. Yet those who were worthy were seized each day, filling up their number, so that all the zealous and those through whom especially our affairs had been managed were gathered together from the two churches. And some of our servants who were heathens were seized because the governor had ordered that we should all be examined in public.

These, by the wiles of Satan, fearing the tortures which they saw the saints suffering and urged by the soldiers to do this, accused us falsely of Thyestean banquets and Oedipodean incests and of deeds which it is not lawful for us to speak or think of, and which we do not believe men ever committed. When these accusations were reported all raged like wild beasts against us, so that even those who had previously restrained themselves on account of kinship, then became exceedingly enraged and gnashed their teeth against us...

[p. 13] The whole rage of the people, governor and soldiers was aroused exceedingly against Sanctus, deacon from Vienne, and against Maturus, a recent convert but a noble combatant, and against Attalus, a native of Pergamus, who had always been a pillar and a foundation in that place, and against Blandina through whom Christ showed that what appears mean, deformed and contemptible to men is of great glory with God through love for Him, shown in power and not boasting in appearance. For while we all, together with her mistress on earth, who was herself also one of the combatants among the martyrs, feared lest in the strife she should be unable to make her confession on account of her bodily weakness, Blandina was filled with such power that she was delivered and raised above those who took turns in torturing her in every manner from dawn till evening; and they confessed that they were defeated and had nothing more which they could do to her. They marvelled at her endurance, for her whole body was mangled and broken; and they testified that one form of torture was sufficient to destroy life, to say nothing of so many and so great tortures. But the blessed one, like a noble athlete, renewed her strength in the confession; and her comfort, refreshment and relief from suffering was in saving, "I am a Christian" and "Nothing vile is done by us."

Sanctus also himself, marvellously and beyond all men, endured nobly all human outrages, while the wicked hoped by the duration and severity of the tortures to wring from him something which he ought not to utter, he withstood them with such firmness, that he did not even tell his own name nor the nation nor the city whence he came, nor whether he was a bondsman or free, but to all questions he replied in the Roman tongue, "I am a Christian." ...

[p. 14] But the devil, thinking he had already consumed a certain Biblias, one of those who had recanted, wishing also to condemn her on account of blasphemy, led her to torture to compel her, as she was already feeble and weak, to utter impious things concerning us. But she recovered herself in her suffering and, as if aroused from a deep sleep and reminded by the present anguish of the eternal torture in hell, she contradicted

the blasphemers, saying: "How could they eat children for whom it is not lawful even to taste the blood of irrational animals?" And after that she confessed herself a Christian and was placed in the order of the martyrs...

The blessed Pothinus, who had been entrusted with the office of bishop in Lyons, was dragged to the tribunal. He was over ninety years of age and very weak in body, breathing with difficulty on account of his physical weakness, but invigorated with spiritual zeal because of [p. 15] his intense eagerness for martyrdom...

On being asked by the governor who was the god of the Christians, he said, "If you are worthy you shall know." Then he was dragged off harshly and endured many blows. Those near him struck him with their hands and feet in every manner, regardless of his age; those at a distance threw at him whatever they had in their hands; all thinking that they would sin extremely and be guilty of great impiety if any insult to him was omitted, for they thought thus to avenge their own gods. And scarcely breathing he was cast into prison and died after two days...

[p. 16] Maturus, Sanctus, Blandina and Attalus were therefore led to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre and, in order to give to the heathen public a spectacle of cruelty, a day was especially appointed for our people to fight with the wild beasts. Accordingly Maturus and Sanctus again passed through the whole torture in the amphitheatre...

But Blandina suspended on a stake was exposed as food for the wild beasts which should fall upon her. Because she seemed to be suspended in the manner of a cross and because of her earnest prayers, she encouraged the contestants greatly. They looking upon her in her conflict, beheld with their eyes, through their sister, Him who had suffered for them in order to persuade those who trust in Him that everyone who suffers for the glory of Christ has eternal fellowship with the living God. And as none of the beasts touched her at that time, she was taken down from the stake and led away again to the prison, to be preserved for another contest...

[p. 17] The greater part of those who had been apostates retraced their steps, were again conceived, again endowed with life, and learned to confess. And now living and strengthened they went to the tribunal, while God, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but mercifully inviteth to repentance, regarded them kindly, in order that they might again be questioned by the governor. For Caesar had written that these should be put to death, but if any should deny they should be dismissed. At the beginning of the festival held there, which is attended by throngs of people from all nations, the governor had the blessed ones brought to the judgment-seat to be a show and spectacle for the multitude. Therefore he examined them again, and as many as seemed to be Roman citizens he had beheaded, the others he sent to the wild beasts...

[p. 18] After all of these, on the last day of the contests, Blandina was again brought in together with Ponticus, a boy of about fifteen. These had been brought every day to witness the sufferings of the others, and had been urged to swear by the idols. But as they had remained firm and had despised the idols, the multitude was furious against them, so that they had no compassion for the youth of the boy nor the sex of the woman. But they subjected them to all the sufferings and led them through the whole round of torture, repeatedly urging them to swear, but not being able to accomplish this. For Ponticus, supported by his sister, so that even the heathen saw that she was encouraging and strengthening him, gave up his life after having nobly endured every torture... [Blandina] was thrown before a wild bull. She was well tossed about by the animal, but she did not feel her sufferings on account of her hope, trust and communion with Christ, and at last she [p. 19] too died...

The bodies of the martyrs after having been exposed and exhibited in every manner for six days, were afterwards burned and reduced to ashes by the lawless men and thrown in the river Rhone which flows close by, so that no remnants of them might still be seen on the earth. And they did this as if they were able to overcome God and prevent their coming to life again, in order, as some said, "that they may have no hope of a resurrection, trusting in which they bring to us a certain foreign and strange religion, and despise awful punishments and are ready with joy to suffer death. Now let us see whether they will rise again, and if their God is able to aid them and rescue them from our hands."

1189. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Septimius Severus, 193–211), 197, 198, 211

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 174. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Septimius [Severus] was the first emperor to assume the title *dominus* and the first to rely on the army for support. Although he personally favored the Christians (at least until 202), there were persecutions by provincial officials during his reign in Egypt—Alexandria and the Thebaid—and in the province of Africa in 197–198 and again in 211.

The former called forth Tertullian's defense of Christianity, the Apologeticus, in 197 and

perhaps his Ad Martyres.

1190. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Septimius Severus, 193–211), 202

SOURCE: Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 20, 21.

[p. 20] [a.] The Rescript of Septimius Severus [202].

Spartian, Vita Sept. Sev. Ch. 17 (Script. Hist. August., ed. Jordan et Essenhardt, I, p. 13). Latin.

Under threat of severe punishment he forbade men to become Jews. Moreover, he decreed the same in the case of Christians.

[b.] Account by Tertullian.

Ad Scapulam, 4 (I, p. 547 sq. ed. Oehler). Latin.

Even Severus himself, father of Antoninus, was mindful of the Christians. For the Christian Proculus, who was called Torpacion, procurator of Euhodias, and who had once wrought a cure for him with ointment, Severus sought out and kept in the palace until the time of his death. Antoninus, who was nourished on Christian milk, was very well acquainted with this man. The most noble women and men, whom Severus knew belonged to this sect, he not only did not harm, but he even [p. 21] set forth the truth by his own testimony and openly restored them to us from the raging populace.

[c.] Account by Eusebius.

Hist. Ecc., Bk. VI, ch. I, ed. Dindorf, Vol. IV, p[p]. 239-40. Greek.

When Severus set in motion a persecution against the churches, brilliant testimonies were given everywhere by the athletes of religion. Especially did these abound in Alexandria, whither athletes of God were sent in accordance with their worth, from Egypt and all Thebais, as if to a very great contest, and where they obtained their crowns from God through their most patient endurance of various tortures and kinds of death. Among these was Leonides, who was called the father of Origen, and who was beheaded, leaving his son still a young boy...

1191. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Maximinus Thrax, 235–238) SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), p. 21.

Account by Eusebius.

Hist. Ecc., Bk. VI, ch. 28, ed. Dindorf, Vol. IV, p. 273. Greek.

Maximinus Caesar succeeded to Alexander, Emperor of the Romans, who had ruled thirteen years. On account of his hatred for the household of Alexander, which contained many believers, he began a persecution, but commanded that the rulers of the churches alone should be put to death, on the ground that they were the authors of the teaching of the Gospels...

1192. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Decius, 249–251) SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 177. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Decius (249–251), a man of the old Roman type ... tarnished his name by carrying out the worst persecution of the century. A year before his proclamation he tried to compel Christians to sacrifice to the Roman gods. The persecution following was not motivated so much by his personal hostility to the Church as by his program of restoring the ancient institutions and religion of Rome which he felt was impossible if Christianity,

an *imperium in imperio* as it really was, continued. By Decius' time the Church contained nobles, the wealthy and educated classes. The emperor's claim to divinity was hateful to the Christians. Thus Decius made his persecution a test of loyalty and began it against the Church leaders. On January 20, 250, he imprisoned the Roman bishop, Fabianus, and for fifteen months there was a break in the "apostolic succession" until, during a lull in the persecution, Cornelius succeeded (251–253) only to be expelled by Decius' successor, Trebonianus Gallus (251–253).

By June 250 the persecution had become more severe; decrees were then sent out to the provinces that all, even priests of the pagan cults and children, must appear before committees of five and demonstrate their loyalty to the religion of Rome and receive a certificate-libellus-or suffer death. Many such libelli, dating from June twelfth to July fifteenth, have been found on papyrus in the Fayûm in Egypt, in which Christians swore that they had made offerings to the Roman gods. A typical one, found in 1893, was issued to one Aurelius Diogenes of Alexander Island, a man of seventy-two, who swore: "I have always sacrificed to the gods; and now, in your presence, and according to the terms of the edict, I have sacrificed, and [poured libations] and [tasted] the sacrificial victims, and I ask you to append your signature." Eusebius tells how Origen was imprisoned and tortured but was finally set free although he soon died of his sufferings. Porphyry, the Neo-Platonist and enemy of Christianity who died about 304, says thousands were slain. At the close of this eventful year the war against the Goths started again and Decius was slain in the following year, his death probably forestalling further persecution. It did not injure the Church greatly even though his successor Gallus continued it but his short reign made it ineffective. He did not renew Decius' decree which had imposed "universal sacrifices."

1193. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Valerian, 253–260), *c*. 257–259

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 177, 178. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 177] Valerian, formerly Decius' censor, on his accession was at first friendly to Christianity, but later was influenced against it by Macrianus, ruler of the Egyptian Synagogue. He was delayed in renewing Decius' persecu- [p. 178] tion by the military crisis, but later, to cover up his defeats at the hands of the Goths, he followed Nero's example of shifting the blame and popular ill-feeling against himself to the Christians. He began his persecutions with the higher clergy and on pain of death forbade Christian meetings and especially the entrance into cemeteries, around which since the days of the catacombs it had been customary to group workshops and Church administrative buildings. Later, many of the higher clergy and laity were executed and their property confiscated, among the former the Roman bishop Xystus (Sixtus) II (257–258).

The persecution seems to have lasted during parts of three years, but was ended around 259–260 with Valerian's capture by the Parthian king Sapor I.

1194. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Valerian, 253–260), *c*. 258 SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [185–]), pp. 22–25.

[p. 22] [a.] Cyprian's Letter.

Epist. 80. Opera, ed. G. Hartel, II, p. 839 sq. (Corp. Script. Ecc. Lat. III, 1871.) Latin. Those have returned whom I had sent to the City to discover and report to us as to the nature of the truth of the rescript concerning us. For many, various and uncertain were the rumors circulated. But the truth of the matter is this: Valerian had sent a rescript to the senate, that bishops, presbyters and deacons should be punished immediately, but that senators, nobles, and Roman knights should be degraded from their dignity, and furthermore despoiled of their goods, and if, after they had been deprived of their property, they should persist in being Christians, they too should be beheaded. Matrons should be deprived of their goods and sent into exile. Those of Caesar's household. whoever had confessed formerly or should confess now, should have their property confiscated and should be sent in chains by assignment to Caesar's estates. To his discourse, moreover, the Emperor Valerian added a copy of the letter which he sent to the governors of the provinces concerning us. This letter we hope daily will arrive, prepared according to the strength of the faith, ready to endure martyrdom, and expecting by the might and grace of God the crown of eternal life. Be it known to you, moreover, that Xistus was executed in the cemetery on the eighth before the Ides of August, and together with him four deacons. Indeed, the prefects in the city insist daily on this persecution. If any are brought before them, they are punished and their goods confiscated to the treasury.

I beg that this may be made known through you to the rest of our [p. 23] associates, so that everywhere by their encouragement the brotherhood may be strengthened and prepared for the spiritual conflict, that each of us may not think more of death than of immortality, and that, consecrated to the Lord, in full faith and all virtue, they may rejoice rather than fear in this confession in which they know that, as soldiers of God and Christ, they will not be destroyed but be crowned. I hope that you, dearest brother, will ever be strong in the Lord.

[b.] The Martyrdom of Cyprian.

Acta Proconsularia Cypriani. Opera, ed. G. Hartel, III, p. cx sqq. (Corp. Script. Ecc. Lat. III, 1871.) Latin.

In the fourth consulship of the Emperor Valerian and the third of Gallienus, on the third before the Kalends of September, in the council chamber of Carthage, Paternus, the proconsul, said to Bishop Cyprian: "The most sacred Emperors, Valerian and Gallienus, have thought fit to give me a letter according to which they have ordered that those, who do not practice the Roman religion, should recognize the Roman rites. I have asked, therefore, concerning your name; what do you answer me?" Bishop Cyprian said: "I am a Christian and a bishop. I have known no other gods except the true and only God, who made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is. To this God we Christians yield ourselves; to Him we pray by day and night for you, for all men, and for the safety of the Emperors themselves." Paternus, the proconsul, said: "Do you, then, persist in this purpose?" Bishop Cyprian replied: "A good purpose, which has known God, cannot be changed." Paternus, the proconsul, said: "Will you be able to depart into exile, then, to the city of Curubitana (Curubis) according to the decree of Valerian and Gallienus?" Bishop Cyprian said: "I depart." Paternus, the proconsul, said: "They have thought fit to write to me concerning not only bishops, but also presbyters. I wish, therefore, to learn from you who the presbyters are who abide in the city." Bishop Cyprian replied: "By your laws you have rightly and profitably decreed that there should be no informers; and hence they cannot be betrayed and denounced by me. But in their own cities they will be found." ...

[p. 24] Then Paternus, the proconsul, ordered the blessed bishop Cyprian to be led into exile. When he had remain[ed] there for a long time, the proconsul Galerius Maximus succeeded the proconsul Aspasius Paternus and ordered the holy bishop Cyprian to be recalled from exile and brought before him... And when he had been brought, Galerius Maximus, the proconsul, said to Bishop Cyprian: "You are Thascius Cyprian?" Bishop Cyprian replied: "I am." Galerius Maximus, the proconsul, said: "The most sacred Emperors have commanded you to sacrifice." Bishop Cyprian said: "I [p. 25] will not." Galerius Maximus said: "Reflect on it." Bishop Cyprian replied: "Do what you are ordered to do. In such a just case there is no need of reflection."

Galerius Maximus, having spoken with the council, pronounced the sentence weakly and reluctantly in the following words: "For a long time you have lived in sacrilege, you have gathered about you many associates in your impious conspiracy, you have put yourself in hostility to the Roman gods and to the sacred rites, nor could the pious and most sacred princes, Valerian and Gallienus, Emperors, and Valerian, the most noble Caesar, bring you back to the practice of their worship. And therefore, since you are found to be the author of the vilest crimes, and the standard bearer, you shall be a warning to those whom you have gathered about you in your crime; by your blood, discipline shall be established." And having said this he read out the decree from his tablet: "We command that Thascius Cyprian be executed by the sword." Bishop Cyprian said: "Thank God."

After this sentence the crowd of brethren kept saying: "And we will be beheaded with him." On account of this a commotion arose among the brethren and a great crowd followed him. And thus Cyprian was brought in to the country near Sexti; here he laid aside his red cloak, kneeled on the ground, and prostrated himself before the Lord in prayer. And when he had laid aside his priestly robe and given it to the deacons, he stood in his linen under-garments, and waited for the executioner. Moreover, when the executioner had come, he ordered his followers to give this executioner twenty-five

pieces of gold... Thus the blessed Cyprian died, and his body was placed near at hand on account of the curiosity of the heathen. Hence, being borne away in the night with tapers and torches, it was brought with prayers and great triumph to the courts of the procurator Macrobius Candidianus, which are on the Via Mappaliensis, near the fish ponds. Moreover, after a few days, Galerius Maximus, the proconsul, died.

1195. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Aurelian, 270–275)

SOURCE: Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), p. 26.

Decree of Aurelian.

Passio S. Symphoriani Martyris, ch. 2 (Ruinart, Acta Martyrum Sincera, Amsterdam, 1713, p. 80. Reprinted in Preuschen, Analecta.) Latin.

The Emperor Aurelian to all his administrators and governors. We have learned that the precepts of the laws are violated by those who in our times call themselves Christians. Punish those who are arrested with divers tortures, unless they sacrifice to our gods, until the difficulty mentioned may be righted, and vengeance, satisfied by the extirpation of the crime, may have an end.

1196. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Diocletian, 284–305, and Others), 303–311

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 180, 181. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 180] He [Diocletian], like Decius and Aurelius before him, felt that Christianity was a menace and that the State must either destroy or yield to it, and in consequence instituted the most ruthless persecution which lasted long after his abdication in 305, i.e. from 303 to 311. By his time Christianity was the strongest organized group in the State numbering, perhaps, a tenth of the population and as much as one-half of that in Asia Minor. For, as Harnack has said, it was "a religion of towns and cities." Its numbers, therefore, even if in a minority, exerted a disproportionate influence. The new despot, albeit naturally tolerant and, in addition, married to a Christian wife and having a Christian daughter, was aroused against the Christians by his brutal Caesar Galerius (292–305) who had advanced through the army and was instigated by the Neo-Platonists. He succeeded Diocletian after the latter's abdication. To him Diocletian, unfortunately, left the management of the persecution. It is on his shoulders, therefore, that the chief blame rests.

There is no contemporary history of the persecution and no official text of the three decrees issued in the years 303–304 but we can follow the main events in the summary of

Eusebius written two decades after it began and in the *De mortibus persecutorum* (314–315). The first edict, followed in rapid sequence by the others, was issued on February 23, 303 and ordered all Christian churches and places of assembly closed, the Scriptures and liturgical books publicly burned, Church officials expelled from office and deprived of immunity from torture and all Christians placed outside the law, i.e., without recourse to the courts. For it was decided to crush Christianity at one blow at the annual festival of

the *Terminalia* on that date, a festival believed to have been instituted by Numa. At the time when imperial agents had begun the destruction of the cathedral at Nicomedia two mysterious fires occurred in the palace. These, Lactantius says, were instigated by Galerius while the latter said it was the work of the Christians. A reign of terror ensued. In the words of Eusebius "whole families and in heaps, were in some cases butchered

with the sword; while [p. 181] others were perfected by fire, when it is recorded that men and women leaped upon the pyre with a divine eagerness...." By a second edict issued when it was rumored that the Christians were trying to overthrow the government in the district of Melitene in Armenia Secunda and in Syria it was ordered that bishops, priests, and deacons be imprisoned. As a result the prisons were so crowded that no space was left for ordinary criminals. It was at this time (304) that Diocletian went to Rome to

celebrate his *vicennalia*, an occasion on which it was customary for an emperor to release criminals by general amnesty. Liberty therefore was then promised to those who would sacrifice to the Roman gods, otherwise they would be mutilated. Diocletian became ill in Rome and was so broken in health on his return to Nicomedia that it was rumored he had died. Galerius took the opportunity to issue the third edict in 304 which ordered all to sacrifice on pain of death.

Eusebius grows eloquent in describing the tortures inflicted on Christians in Tyre, Palestine, and especially in the Egyptian Thebaid—where bodies were torn with sharp shards, women completely nude were fastened by one foot and swung aloft with heads downward, and men were tied by their legs to the bent branches of trees in Persian fashion which when released tore them asunder. In Egypt as many as one hundred victims perished in a day and the slaughter was kept up intermittently for years. But it is doubtful if the persecution was carried out on the scale reported by the Church historian for its ruthlessness depended largely on the feelings of the rulers of the tetrarchy, two of whom, Maxentius (306–312) and Constantine in the West, seem to have ordered no deaths. The fact that the populace was somewhat friendly toward the Christians also mitigated its severity even in the East. Diocletian's abdication in 305 was in part the sequel of Galerius' victory.

When the latter became Augustus the Eastern Caesar, his nephew, Maximinus Daia (305–308), subsequently the emperor Galerius Valerius Maximinus (308–313), decreed in 306 that all provincial governors should enforce sacrifice on all and the persecution in the East began anew with greater ferocity. In 309 Daia as co-emperor again promulgated an edict that pagan temples be rebuilt and that all must share in the rites of sacrifice. Finally, the elder Galerius fell ill at Serdica (Sofia) and, whether conscience-stricken at the approach of death as the pious Eusebius thought or because of the persuasions of his colleagues Licinius and Constantine, issued his palinode on April 30, 311—the famous Edict of Toleration. The persecution, apart from sporadic outbreaks kept up in the East by Daia, ceased.

1197. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Diocletian, 284–305, and Others), 303–313

SOURCE: Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 26–28.

[Translator's introductory note; p. 26] This last persecution was the longest and the most severe. It covered approximately a period of ten years, which, however, was interrupted by civil wars, brought on by the establishment of the tetrarchy, and by the edict of toleration, granted by Galerius on his death bed. It

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

was in Syria and Egypt that the persecution took its worst form. In the west the force of the decrees was mitigated, especially in the dominion of Constans.

We have two authorities for the period, Eusebius and Lactantius, both contemporaries and eyewitnesses, the one in Phoenicia and Egypt, and the other in Nicodemia itself. From the two we get many details of the events leading up to the promulgation of the decrees, as well as of the horrors and cruelty attending their execution.

Eusebius says (Book VIII, 10) that the calamities [*sic*] of the times were brought on the Church as a judgment from God, since hypocrisy, rivalry and dissension had grown up in the Church as a result of excessive liberty and great wealth.

Both in the case of the edict of toleration by Galerius and that by Constantine and Licinius, the original Latin text is to be found in Lactantius, and merely a Greek translation in Eusebius, (H. E., Bk. VIII, 17, and X, 5)...

Edicts of Diocletian Against the Christians.

Eusebius, Hist. Ec, Book VIII, ch. 2, ch. 6 at end, and De Mart. Palest. ch. 3, ch. 4, and ch. 9 (ed. Dindorf, Vol. IV, p[p]. 351, 357, 386, 390, 402). Greek.

(Hist. Ecc. viii 2.) This was the nineteenth year of the reign of [p. 27] Diocletian, in Dystrus (which the Romans call March), when the feast of the Saviour's passion was near at hand, and royal edicts were published everywhere, commanding that the churches should be razed to the ground, the Scriptures destroyed by fire, those who held positions of honor degraded, and the household servants, if they persisted in the Christian profession, be deprived of their liberty.

And such was the first decree against us. But issuing other decrees not long after, the Emperor commanded that all the rulers of the churches in every place should be first put in prison and afterwards compelled by every device to offer sacrifice.

(Hist. Ecc. viii 6.) Then as the first decrees were followed by others commanding that those in prison should be set free, if they would offer sacrifice, but that those who refused should be tormented with countless tortures; who could again at that time count the multitude of martyrs throughout each province, and especially throughout Africa and among the race of the Moors, in Thebais and throughout Egypt, from which having already gone into other cities and provinces, they became illustrious in their martyrdoms!

(De Mart. Pal. ch. 3.) During the second year the war against us increased greatly. Urbanus was then governor of the province and imperial edicts were first issued to him, in which it was commanded that all the people throughout the city should sacrifice and pour out libations to the idols......

(De Mart. Pal. ch. 4.)... For in the second attack upon us by Maximinus, in the third year of the persecution against us, edicts of the tyrant were issued for the first time, that all the people should offer sacrifice and that the rulers of the city should see to this diligently and zealously. Heralds went through the whole city of Caesarea, by the orders of the governor, summoning men, women and children to the temples of the idols, and in addition the chiliarchs were calling upon each one by name from a roll.

(De Mart. Pal. ch. 9)..... All at once decrees of Maximinus again got abroad against us everywhere throughout the province. The governors, and in addition the military prefects, incited by edicts, letters and public ordinances the magistrates, together with the generals and the city clerks in all the cities, to fulfill the imperial edicts which [p. 28] commanded that the altars of the idols should be rebuilt with all zeal; and that all the men, together with the women and children, even infants at the breast, should offer sacrifice and pour out libations; and these urged them anxiously, carefully to make the people taste of the sacrifices; and that the viands in the market should be polluted by the libations of the sacrifices; and that watches should be stationed before the baths, so as to defile those who washed in these with the all-abominable sacrifices.....

1198. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (303–313)—Contemporary Account SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* viii. 15. 1; viii. 16. 1–3; translated by J. E. L. Oulton, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 313, 315. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 313] In fact, during the whole period of ten years of persecution there was no respite in their plotting and warfare against each other...

Such was the state of affairs that continued throughout the whole persecution; which came completely to an end, by the grace of God, in the tenth year, though indeed it began to abate after the eighth year... But this was not due to any human agency nor to the pity, as one [p. 315] might say, or humanity of the rulers. Far from it. For from the beginning up to that time they were daily plotting further and severer measures against us; from time to time they were inventing fresh assaults upon us by means of still more varied devices. But it was due to the manifestation of the Divine Providence itself, which, while it became reconciled to the people, attacked the perpetrator of these evils, and was wroth with him as the chief author of the wickedness of the persecution as a whole. For verily, though it was destined that these things should come to pass as a divine judgment, yet the Scripture says, "Woe, through whomsoever the offence cometh." A divinely-sent punishment, I say, executed vengeance upon him, beginning at his very flesh and proceeding to the soul.

1199. Persecution, by Pagan Rome, Ended (311, 313) SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 182, 183. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 182] The edict [of Toleration, 311] was published in the name of Galerius, Licinius, and Constantine, the original Latin text being preserved in Lactantinus' treatise mentioned [translated in No. 1310]...

Two years later another edict signed by Licinius and Constantine is supposed to have been issued at Milan, known as the "Edict of Milan," its purpose being to reemphasize and amplify the earlier one. But it is doubtful if such an "edict" was ever issued since nothing has survived except a letter addressed by Licinius in that year to a governor ordering that it be made known to his province. This may have been written at Milan referring to the Edict already discussed. It should, therefore, be called only a rescript of the former, which was intended for the East. Some historians therefore following the lead of Otto Seeck have denied its existence, except as a repetition of the Edict of 311, while others have argued that the text of the edict found in Lactantius' work, together with a slightly differ- [p. 183] ent Greek translation preserved by Eusebius [see translation in No. 1311], does form an edict because its text is too formal and explicit to admit of doubt. But it seems more probable that Constantine and Licinius on meeting at Milan in 313 agreed on the future policy of toleration for both the West and East and that later Licinius drew up a rescript of instructions for governors, which amounted to the republication of the edict of 311.

1200. Persecution, by Pagan Rome, Over Emperor Worship SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 29–32. 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 29] Such persecution of Christians as there was in the first three centuries resulted in most instances from difficulties over emperor worship. As has been said, the grip of the old Roman gods was slackening throughout the period of the empire. The Romans were normally tolerant in regard to religion, chiefly through indifference. But from Augustus on there rose a cult of homage to the emperor proclaimed a god. Temples were built in all the principal cities of the empire to this living divinity, and in these stood the altars on which the loyal citizen was required to sprinkle incense [p. 30] to the emperor's Genius. To the Roman authorities, this was more an act of patriotism than of religion. Or perhaps it should be called a religious act performed as a proof of patriotism...

On the whole, Roman policy was remarkably tolerant in dealing with the religions encountered as the legions overran that world around the Mediterranean. If the national religions of the conquered countries would add homage to the emperor to their other rites, Rome almost never interfered. On the contrary, it was more likely to find a place for the foreign religion in the swarm of new deities whose cults were brought to Rome. And in one notable instance, Rome even dropped the requirement of emperor worship. The Jews, with their fanatical loyalty to their One True God, and their readiness to turn their land into a blood-soaked waste before they would acknowledge any other deity, were exempted.

If Rome was willing to make an exception in the case of the Jews, why was it not willing likewise to exempt Christians from spilling incense on the altars of the divine emperors? ... The Christians, on the other hand, were ceaseless proselytes. They were avowedly out to make Christians of the entire population of the empire, and the rapidity of their spread showed that this was no idle dream. Not only did they, like the Jews, refuse to worship the emperor as a living god, but they were doing their utmost to [p. 31] induce every subject of the emperor to join them in that same refusal.

The problem for the empire, in other words, was more political than religious. While sacrifice to the Genius of the emperor remained the test of patriotism, could the state authorities afford to wink at the contumacy of these unpatriotic Christians? ...

The Roman proconsuls and local magistrates were not looking for trouble; when their jurisdictions were peaceful they were glad to leave well enough alone. At the same time, the Christians went out of their way to try to prove that they were good citizens. They lived quiet, moral, indeed model lives. The epistles read in their meetings, written by Paul and other leaders, admonished them to render proper obedience to those in civil authority. If they would not pray *to* the emperor by scattering incense on his altars, they never failed to pray *for* him in their meetings. In every respect except that single matter of incense-burning they were exemplary citizens...

[p. 32] Christians were openly recalcitrant when it came to participating in this one prescribed loyalty test. For this reason they were always, legally considered, in contempt of Caesar and therefore liable to punishment. But by the middle of the second century no official who considered persecuting them could be sure how close to his own household the purge might come. So Rome, on the whole, moved cautiously...

Nevertheless, there were martyrs, and their blood, as the familiar saying put it, was the seed of the church... There were enough who sealed their faith with martyrdom to make a deep impression on pagan observers.

1201. Persecution, by Pagan Rome, Reasons for

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 184, 185. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 184] The chief cause of hostility in an Empire which allowed all forms of religion if only their devotees also supported the State-cult and Roman institutions may be laid to the intolerance of the Christians themselves...

Polytheism is naturally tolerant and hospitable to alien faiths and this had grown in the later period of religious syncretism. Rome placed no barriers to any religion which was willing to compromise with that of the State. Its citizens were willing to try any religion or philosophy in seeking salvation. Christianity, on the other hand, increased the intolerance which it inherited from Judaism bringing the same odium on its members as had once been visited on the Jews. It declared its doctrines to be the only righteous ones, remained exclusive, and demanded of every candidate for admission the unconditional surrender of his past. It aroused not only hostility, but, when attacked, fanatical devotion.

The greatest ill-feeling against the Christians was aroused by their refusal to place incense in the incense-burner on the emperor's statute, the symbol of the imperial cult and of loyalty to the emperor—an act no more difficult to observe than the modern custom of saluting a national flag. Like the Jews they refused to share in the official festivals, especially in the triumphs of returning generals and, until Saxa Rubra in 312, to join willingly the Roman armies, a refusal regarded as treasonable since the ultimate duty of citizenship was the defense of the State. Further, they, like the Jews, held aloof from public amusements of circus and arena and refused to illuminate their houses and to hang garlands over their doors on festal occasions. Consequently, they were regarded as a group which refused to bear the full responsibility of citizenship. Their secret meetings were illegal, but the Church had become the largest secret society in the Empire where secret religious assemblies, *hetaeriae*, as Trajan called them in his letter to Pliny (X:43.

1), were banned on political grounds. Pliny said "their worst crime was their meeting at stated times for religious service," merely because such meetings were secret...

[p. 185] One of the worst of Christian crimes was interference with vested economic interests—always dangerous... Pliny said that the temples of Bithynia were deserted and that there were no purchasers of sacrificial animals.

It is, therefore, no wonder that the masses were motivated in their hostility, religiously, socially, economically; and the government, politically. It is, rather, surprising that the Christians did not rouse greater hostility.

1202. Persecution, of Heretics, All Except Trinitarian Catholics, by Catholic Roman Emperors

SOURCE: *Theodosian Code* 16.1.2, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 440. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

Law of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius [I], Feb. 28, 380.

It is Our will that all the peoples who are ruled by the administration of Our Clemency shall practice that religion which the divine Peter the Apostle transmitted to the Romans, as the religion which he introduced makes clear even unto this day. It is evident that this is the religion that is followed by the Pontiff Damasus and by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic sanctity; that is, according to the apostolic discipline and the evangelic doctrine, we shall believe in the single Deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, under the concept of equal majesty and of the Holy Trinity.

I. We command that those persons who follow this rule shall embrace the name of Catholic Christians. The rest, however, whom We adjudge demented and insane, shall sustain the infamy of heretical dogmas, their meeting places shall not receive the name of

churches, and they shall be smitten first by divine vengeance and secondly by the retribution of Our own initiative, which We shall assume in accordance with the divine judgment.

1203. Persecution, of Heretics and Pagans by Christians After Church's Triumph

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), pp. 104, 105. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

[p. 104] Henceforth Christianity won its way partially by [p. 105] persecution and by attempting to exterminate heretics and Pagans. It became easier to be a Christian than to remain a Pagan or a Jew; and safer to be orthodox than to risk being guilty of thinking. Conscientious objectors were henceforth treated as Christians had formerly been treated for their 'sheer obstinacy.' No one could have dreamed that the Christians, who had themselves suffered so much from persecution and protested so vehemently against the injustice and futility of persecution, would so quickly have turned persecutors and surpassed their Pagan predecessors in fanatical savagery and efficiency, utterly oblivious of the Beatitude of the Divine Master (Matt. v. 10, 44, 45). It became ominous for subsequent history that the first General Council of the Church [at Nicaea, 325] was signalized by bitter excommunications and banishments. Christians, having acquired the art of disposing of hostile criticism by searching out and burning the objectionable books of their Pagan adversaries, learned to apply the same method to the works of such groups of Christians as were not in power or in favour for the time; when this method proved unsatisfactory, they found it expedient to burn their bodies.

1204. Persecution, of Heretics (Arians) by Catholics, and Arian Retaliation

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 39, Vol. 4 (London: Methuen & Co., 1898), pp. 196, 197.

[p. 196] The religious toleration which Theodoric had the glory of introducing into the Christian world was painful and offensive to the orthodox zeal of the Italians...

[p. 197] [But the emperor's persecution of Arianism at last] awakened the just resentment of Theodoric, who claimed for his distressed brethren of the East the same indulgence which he had so long granted to the Catholics of his dominions... And a mandate was prepared in Italy, to prohibit, after a stated day, the exercise of the Catholic worship. By the bigotry of his subjects and enemies, the most tolerant of princes was driven to the brink of persecution.

1205. Persecution, of Heretics (Arians) by Justinian

SOURCE: Charles Diehl, "Justinian's Government in the East." chap. 2 in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926), p. 44. Used by permission.

Religious intolerance accompanied the imperial restoration [by Justinian] in the West. In Africa, as in Italy, Arians were spoiled for the benefit of Catholics, their churches were destroyed or ruined, and their lands confiscated.

1206. Persecution, of Heretics, Constitutes a Departure From Early Church Teachings

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 198. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Tertullian in the first years of the third century had said it was "a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his own convictions; it is assuredly no part of religion forcibly to impose religion, to which free

will and not force should lead us." ²² [Note 22: *Ad scapulum* 2...] A century later Lactantius, then tutor of Crispus in Gaul (*ca.* 313), expressed a similar thought: "Religion cannot be imposed by force; if you wish to defend religion by bloodshed and by torture and by guilt, it will no longer be defended, but will be polluted and profaned." ²³ [Note 23: *Divinae institutiones* 1–7; 5, 2...] But this excellent spirit now largely disappeared. St. Chrysostom, who was contemporary with the intolerant Gratian and Theodosius, while approving the denial of the right of assembly to heretics still recommended that Christian love be shown them.²⁴ [Note 24: *Homilies* XXIX, XLVI (latter, *In Matthaeum*).] But, after Theodosius had made Christianity the sole faith of the State, St. Augustine became reconciled to forced conformity with Catholicism though saying it was "better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment," adding, however, that the latter method must not be neglected.²⁵ [Note 25: *Epist.* 185.] Pope Leo the Great (440–461), according to Bishop Creighton, "accepted as a duty the suppression of heresy and raised no objection to legislation which treated heresy as a crime against civil society, and declared it punishable with death."

1207. Persecution, of Heretics, Responsibility of Church for SOURCE: Henry Charles Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, Vol. 1 (New York: Harper, 1888), pp. 214, 215.

[p. 214] If the Church thus still shrank from shedding blood, it had by this time reached the point of using all other means without scruple to enforce conformity. Early in the fifth century we find Chrysostom teaching that heresy must be suppressed, heretics silenced and prevented from ensnaring others, and their conventicles broken up, but that the death-penalty is unlawful. About the same time St. Augustin entreats the Prefect of Africa not to put any Donatists to death because, if he does so, no ecclesiastic can make complaint of them, for they will prefer to suffer death themselves rather than be the cause of it to others. Yet Augustin approved of the imperial laws which banished and fined them and deprived them of their churches and of testamentary power, and he consoled them by telling them that God did not wish them to perish in antagonism to Catholic unity. To constrain any one from evil to good, he argued, was not oppression, but charity; and when the unlucky schismatics urged that no one ought to be coerced in his faith, he freely admitted it as a general principle, but added that sin and infidelity must be punished.

Step by step the inevitable progress was made, and men easily found specious arguments to justify the indulgence of their passions. The fiery Jerome, when his wrath was excited by Vigilantius forbidding the adoration of relics, expressed his wonder that the bishop of the hardy heretic had not destroyed him in the flesh for the benefit of his soul, and argued that piety and zeal for God [p. 215] could not be cruelty; rigor, in fact, he argues in another place, is the most genuine mercy, since temporal punishment may avert eternal perdition. It was only sixty-two years after the slaughter of Priscillian and his followers had excited so much horror, that Leo. I., when the heresy seemed to be reviving, in 447, not only justified the act, but declared that if the followers of heresy so damnable were allowed to live there would be an end of human and divine law. The final step had been taken, and the Church was definitely pledged to the suppression of heresy at whatever cost. It is impossible not to attribute to ecclesiastical influence the successive edicts by which, from the time of Theodosius the Great, persistence in heresy was punished with death.

1208. Persecution, of Pagans by Christian Roman Emperors

SOURCE: Arthur E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (4th ed.), pp. 501, 502. Copyright 1955 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

[p. 501] Constantine I sought to convert all of his subjects to Christianity and to make it the sole official religion of the Empire, although for political reasons he did not place any severe restrictions upon the practice of pagan cults. His sons, Constantius and Constans, however, initiated the Christian persecution of paganism. They prohibited public sacrifices, forbade the adoration of statues of the gods, removed these from temples, closed many of the latter and turned them over to the Christian clergy. Nevertheless, they continued to appoint pagans to high administrative offices. Under Julian the anti-pagan laws were abrogated, restrictions were placed upon Christians, and a vain attempt made to create a pagan state church. But this pagan reaction ended with Julian's death and his successors, Jovian, Valentian I, and Valens, although they reestablished Christianity in its former status, adhered to a policy of toleration of paganism much in the spirit of Constantine I.

With Gratian and Theodosius I the official persecution of paganism was renewed. Theodosius was the first emperor to refuse to accept the title of pontifex maximus at his accession, and he probably influenced his colleague Gratian to abandon his use of it. In 382 A.D. Gratian withdrew all official recognition of pagan worship, deprived the Roman priesthoods of public support, confiscated temple properties, and abolished the privilege of pagan priests. At the same time he removed from the Senate house in Rome the altar and statue of Victory which Julian had replaced after its removal by Constantius. For many of the senators, this altar was the symbol of the life of the state itself, and their spokesman Symmachus made an eloquent plea for its restoration. But under the influence of his Christian advisors, Gratian remained obdurate. Later appeals to Valentinian II and Theodosius were equally in vain. Although the brief reign of Eugenius produced a revival of pagan influence in Rome, the cause of paganism was lost already in the imperial city. After his victory over Arbogast and Eugenius, Theodosius pardoned their supporters in the Roman Senate on [p. 502] condition that they accepted Christianity. In the fifth century, the Senate was thoroughly Christian.

As early as 380 A.D. Theodosius had ordered all his subjects to accept the Christian creed formulated at the Council of Nicaea in 325. In 391, he ordered the destruction of the image and temple of Sarapis in Alexandria, a step which sounded the death knell of paganism in the eastern part of the Empire. The following year he unconditionally forbade pagan worship under the penalties for treason and sacrilege. Theodosius II continued the vigorous persecution of the pagans. Adherence to pagan beliefs was declared criminal, and in the Theodosian code laws against pagans are included among the laws regulating civic life. Under the same emperor, in 415 A.D., the pagan lady Hypatia, a noted philosopher and mathematician, was murdered by a fanatical Christian mob in Alexandria.

Still many prominent persons continued to be secret devotees of pagan beliefs and pagan philosophy was taught in the schools of Athens until they were closed by Justinian. The acceptance of Christianity was more rapid and complete in the cities than throughout the countryside. This gave rise to the use of the term pagan (from the Latin *paganus*, "rural" in the sense of "barbarian") to designate non-Christians; a usage which had become official by 370 A.D. Between the fifth and the ninth centuries, however, paganism virtually disappeared within the boundaries of the Empire [see No. 476].

1209. Persecution, of Pagans by Christian Roman Emperors—Edicts SOURCE: *Theodosian Code* 16.7.1, 16.10.4, trans. by Clyde Pharr, pp. 465, 472. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 465] a. Law of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius [I] (16.7.1), May 2, 381. Those Christians who have become pagans shall be deprived of the power and right to make testaments, and every testament of such decedent, if there is a testament, shall be rescinded by the annulment of its foundation...

b. Law of Constantius and Constans (16.10.4), Dec. 1, 346

[p. 472] It is Our pleasure that the temples shall be immediately closed in all places and in all cities, and access to them forbidden, so as to deny to all abandoned men the opportunity to commit sin. It is also Our will that all men shall abstain from sacrifices. But if perchance any man should perpetrate any such criminality, he shall be struck down with the avenging sword. We also decree that the property of a man thus executed shall be vindicated to the fisc. The governors of the provinces shall be similarly punished if they should neglect to avenge such crimes.

1210. Persecution, of Protestant Dissenters and Catholics by Protestants SOURCE: W. E. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (reprint; New York: Braziller, 1955), Vol. 2, p. 46. [See FRS 93.]

But while the preëminent atrocity of the persecutions of the Church of Rome is fully admitted, nothing can be more grossly disingenuous or untrue than to represent persecution as her peculiar taint. She persecuted to the full extent of the power of her clergy, and that power was very great. The persecution of which every Protestant Church was guilty, was measured by the same rule, but clerical influence in Protestant countries was comparatively weak. The Protestant persecutions were never so sanguinary as those of the Catholics, but the principle was affirmed quite as strongly, was acted on quite as constantly, and was defended quite as pertinaciously by the clergy. In Germany, at the time of the protestation of Spires, when the name of Protestant was assumed, the Lutheran princes absolutely prohibited the celebration of mass within their dominions. In England a similar measure was passed as early as Edward VI... The Presbyterians through a long succession of reigns were imprisoned, branded, mutilated, scourged, and exposed in the pillory. Many Catholics under false pretences were tortured and hung. Anabaptists and Arians were burnt alive.

1211. Persecution, of Protestants by Protestants, Flimsy Excuse for SOURCE: Thomas Shepard (1605–1649), quoted in Charles Francis Adams, *Massachusetts: Its Historians and Its History* (2d ed.; Boston: Houghton, 1894), p. 23.

As for New England, we never banished any for their consciences, but for sinning against conscience, after due means of conviction.

1212. Persecution — Roman Church Has Shed More Blood Than Any Other Institution

SOURCE: W. E. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (reprint; New York: Braziller, 1955), Vol. 2, pp. 40–45. [See FRS 93.]

[p. 40] That the Church of Rome has shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind, will be questioned by no Protestant who has a competent knowledge of history. The memorials, indeed, of many of her persecutions are now so scanty, that it is impossible to form a complete conception of the multitude of her victims, and it is quite certain that no powers of imagination can adequately realise their sufferings. Llorente, who had free access to the archives of the

Spanish Inquisition [see No. 882] assures us that by that tribunal alone more than 31,000 persons were burnt, and more than 290,000 condemned to punishments less severe than death. The number of those who were put to [p. 41] death for their religion in the Netherlands alone, in the reign of Charles V., has been estimated by a very high authority at 50,000, and at least half as many perished under his son. And when to these memorable instances we add the innumerable less conspicuous executions that took place, from the victims of Charlemagne to the free-thinkers of the seventeenth century; when we recollect that after the mission of Dominic the area of the persecution comprised nearly the whole of Christendom, and that its triumph was in many districts so complete as to destroy every memorial of the contest; the most callous nature must recoil with horror from the spectacle. For these atrocities were not perpetrated in the brief paroxysms of a reign of terror, or by the hands of obscure sectaries, but were inflicted by a triumphant Church, with every circumstance of solemnity and deliberation. Nor did the victims perish by a brief and painless death, but by one which was carefully selected as among the most poignant that man can suffer. They were usually burnt alive. They were burnt alive not unfrequently by a slow fire. They [p. 42] were burnt alive after their constancy had been tried by the most excruciating agonies that minds fertile in torture could devise. This was the physical torment inflicted on those [p. 43] who dared to exercise their reason in the pursuit of truth; but what language can describe, and what imagination can conceive, the mental suffering that accompanied it? For in those days the family was divided against itself. The ray of conviction often fell upon a single member. leaving all others untouched. The victims who died for heresy were not, like those who died for witchcraft, solitary and doting women, but were usually men in the midst of active life, and often in the first flush of vouthful enthusiasm, and those who loved them best were firmly convinced that their agonies upon earth were but the prelude of eternal agonies hereafter. This was especially the case with weak women, who feel most acutely the sufferings of others, and around whose minds the clergy had most successfully wound their toils. It is horrible, it is appalling to reflect what the mother, the wife, the sister, the daughter of the heretic must have suffered from this teaching. She saw the body of him who was dearer to her than life, dislocated and writhing and quivering with pain; she watched the slow fire creeping from limb to limb till it had swathed him in a sheet of agony; and when at last the scream of anguish had died away, and the tortured body was at rest, she was told that all this was acceptable to the God she served, and was but a faint image of the sufferings He would inflict through eternity upon the dead. Nothing was wanting to give emphasis to the doctrine. It rang from every pulpit. It was painted over [p. 44] every altar. The Spanish heretic was led to the flames in a dress covered with representations of devils and of frightful tortures, to remind the spectators to the very last of the doom that awaited him.

All this is very horrible, but it is only a small part of the misery which the persecuting spirit of Rome has produced. For, judging by the ordinary measure of human courage, for every man who dared to avow his principles at the stake, there must have been multitudes who believed that by such an avowal alone they could save their souls, but who were nevertheless scared either by the prospect of their own sufferings or of the destitution of their children, who passed [p. 45] their lives in one long series of hypocritical observances and studied falsehoods, and at last, with minds degraded by habitual deception, sank hopeless and terror-stricken into the grave. And besides all these things,

we have to remember that the spirit which was manifested in acts of detailed persecution had often swept over a far wider sphere, and produced sufferings not perhaps so excruciating, but far more extensive. We have to recollect those frightful massacres, perhaps the most fearful the world has ever seen: the massacre of the Albigenses which a pope had instigated, or the massacre of St. Bartholomew for which a pope returned solemn thanks to Heaven... When we consider all these things, it can surely be no exaggeration to say that the Church of Rome has inflicted a greater amount of unmerited suffering than any other religion that has ever existed.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The church inflicted these penalties in the sense of handing over the culprits to the secular power after conviction, observing the technicality of not literally executing the sentence, though the judges were required to carry out the execution. See Nos. 830, 835n.]

1213. Perseverance of the Saints, Council of Trent on SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VI (Jan. 13, 1547), Decree Concerning Justification, chap. 13, trans. in H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, pp. 38, 39. Copyright 1941 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

[p. 38] Similarly with regard to the gift of perseverance, of which it is written: *He that shall persevere to the end, he shall be saved,* which cannot be obtained from anyone except from Him who is able to make him stand who stands, that he may stand perseveringly, and to raise him who falls, let no one promise himself herein something as certain with an absolute certainty, though all ought to place and repose the firmest hope in God's help. For God, unless men themselves fail in His grace, as *he has begun a good work, so will he perfect it, working to will and to accomplish.* Nevertheless, let those who think themselves to stand, take heed lest they fall, and with fear and trembling work out their salvation, in labors, in watchings, in almsdeeds, in prayer, in [p. 39] fastings and chastity. For knowing that they are born again unto the hope of glory, and not as yet unto glory, they ought to fear for the combat that yet remains with the flesh, with the world and with the devil, in which they cannot be victorious unless they be with the grace of God obedient to the Apostle who says: *We are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh, you shall die, but if by the spirit you mortify the deeds of the flesh, you shall live.*

1214. Persia—Early Religion of, Without Temples

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, p. 28. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

Except for the sacred fire [see No. 1815] the Iranians felt no need of temples and altars. Moreover, their minds could conceive the divine beings independent of any symbols such as statues. Sacrifices were offered Ahura on the bare mountain peaks, beautiful only when covered with snow, and thus close to the generally cloudless sky. Crowned with myrtle, the sacrificer led the victim to an open place ritually pure, where he invoked by name the god, cut up the victim, and boiled the flesh. The pieces were piled upon a carpet of tenderest herbs, preferably alfalfa; a Magian then chanted a hymn which related the traditional origin of the gods. Afterward the sacrificer took away the flesh to do with it what he pleased. Such is the account of the contemporary Herodotus.

1215. Persia, Power Such That None "Might Stand Before Him" (Dan. 8:4)

SOURCE: *Xenophon Cyropaedia* i. 1. 5; translated by Walter Miller, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 9. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

He [Cyrus] was able to cover so vast a region with the fear which he inspired, that he struck all men with terror and no one tried to withstand him; and he was able to awaken in all so lively a desire to please him, that they always wished to be guided by his will. Moreover, the tribes that he brought into subjection to himself were so many that it is a difficult matter even to travel to them all, in whatever direction one begin one's journey from the palace, whether toward the east or the west, toward the north or the south.

1216. Persia—Smerdis (Gaumata) and Darius I SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 107, 108. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

[p. 107] In 522, at the age of twenty-eight, Darius was king's spearbearer in Egypt. Before the year was ended, Darius was king.

How so young a man reached so exalted a position while both father and grandfather were still living is explained in the autobiography in the following manner. There was a man of his family, Cambyses by name, son of Cyrus, who was king. Cambyses had a brother, Bardiya by name, of the same father and mother. Afterward Cambyses slew that brother, but it was not known to the people that Bardiya was slain. After Cambyses went to Egypt, the people became rebellious; the Lie was great in the lands. Afterward a Magian (Magush), Gaumata by name, arose and falsely claimed to be that [p. 108] Bardiya. He arose from Pishiyauvada of Mount Arakadrish on March 11, 522. All the people abandoned Cambyses and went over to the pretender. On July 1 he took for himself the kingdom. Afterward Cambyses died by his own hand.

Now that kingdom had belonged from ancient times to the family of Darius. No man, even one of his own family, was able to take the kingdom from that Gaumata. People feared exceedingly lest he slay the many who had known the true Bardiya and so could prove the falsity of Gaumata's claim. No one in fact dared say anything against him until Darius arrived. Since we last hear of him as spearbearer to Cambyses in Egypt, obviously Darius must have left the army in Palestine as soon as the death of the former monarch was known and must have hastened at once to Media to press his claim to the vacant throne.

By the favor of Ahuramazda and with the aid of six other conspirators, Darius slew that Gaumata and his allies at the fort Sikayauvatish in the Median district of Nisaya on September 29, 522. By the favor of Ahuramazda, Darius became king. Later on in the autobiography Darius names the others of the "Seven," the conspirators who took part in the killing: Vindafarna (Intaphrenes), son of Vayaspara; Utana (Otanes), son of Thukhra; Gaubaruva (Gobryas), son of Marduniya (Mardonius); Vidarna (Hydarnes), son of Bagabigna; Bagabukhsha (Megabyzus), son of Datuhya; and Ardumanish, son of Vahauka. "You who shall be king hereafter, preserve well the family of these men."

Darius restored the power taken from his family. He established it on its former foundations. He rebuilt the temples Gaumata had destroyed. To the freemen he restored the pasturelands and to the nobles the cattle herds and peasants which the Magian had seized. He labored until it was as if Gaumata had never taken away the family house. Such was the official version, presented in the autobiography and advertised to the world on the Behistun rock.

1217. Persian Empire — Cyrus to Xerxes

SOURCE: Ira Maurice Price and others, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, pp. 335, 336. Copyright 1958 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 335] Cyrus died in 530 B.C., probably while on some eastern campaign and was succeeded by his son, Cambyses II. This ambitious young man, to make secure his crown, murdered his brother and sister. After eight years of apparent success, he died in 522 B.C. For eight months a usurper, Gaumata [the Magian, pretending to be Smerdis, son of Cyrus], held the throne, but was finally slain, and Darius Hystaspes (522–486 B.C.) seized the crown. It was under the early years of his administration that the Jews at Jerusalem completed and dedicated their Temple (516 B.C.). During these years Darius suppressed revolts and uprisings in all parts of his realm. He then carried his conquests as far as Scythia in Europe [p. 336] (508 B.C.). He fully equipped two great expeditions for invading Greece, but both failed, the second at the famous battle of Marathon (490 B.C.). A third expedition was planned, but a revolt in Egypt (487 B.C.) and his own death (486 B.C.) intervened.

He was the greatest king who ever sat on Persia's throne, both as regards conquests and power of administration. He was succeeded by Xerxes I, supposed to be a remote kin of Cyrus, the conqueror of Babylon.

Xerxes' first great work was the subjugation of Egypt (486 B.C.). After chastising rebels in Babylonia, he turned his attention to the still unconquered state of Greece. He called together his nobles and counselors from all parts of the empire, as a kind of council of war. The conclusion of their deliberations was that the most elaborate preparations should be made, and that Greece should be brought to their feet. Careful and complete provisions were made throughout four years. The army was thoroughly organized, and the commissary department adequately supplied. In 480 B.C. the army started on its long campaign, aided by a large and well-equipped fleet. It crossed the Hellespont on a bridge of double boats and pushed through Macedonia down to Greece. Through Thermopylae it poured over the bodies of the brave 300 Spartans until Athens was captured and burnt. The Persian fleet, disabled by storms, was finally destroyed by the Greeks at the battle of Salamis (September 23, 480 B.C.). The land force retreated to Thessaly, where a picked army remained over winter. In the spring it resumed active offensive operations and recaptured Attica. The Spartans raised a large army, crossed the isthmus, and forced the Persians to retire into Boeotia. On September 25, 479 B.C., the Persian host was completely routed at Plataea, and returned in humiliation to Asia, never again to invade European Greece.

1218. Persian Empire, Extent of

SOURCE: H. G. Wells, *The Outline of History*, pp. 274, 275. Copyright 1920 and 1921 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and by H. G. Wells. Used by permission of Prof. G. p. Wells.

[p. 274] The empire of Darius I was larger than any one of the pre- [p. 275] ceding empires whose growth we have traced. It included all Asia Minor and Syria, that is to say, the ancient Lydian and Hittite empires, all the old Assyrian and Babylonian empires, Egypt, the Caucasus and Caspian regions, Media, Persia, and it extended, perhaps, into India to the Indus. The nomadic Arabians alone of all the peoples of what is nowadays called the Near East, did not pay tribute to the satraps (provincial governors) of Darius. The organization of this great empire seems to have been on a much higher level of efficiency than any of its precursors. Great arterial roads joined province to province, and there was a system of royal posts; at stated intervals post horses stood always ready to carry the government messenger, or the traveller if he had a government permit, on to the next stage of his journey. Apart from this imperial right-of-way and the payment of tribute, the local governments possessed a very considerable amount of local freedom. They were restrained from internecine conflict, which was all to their own good. And at first the Greek cities of the mainland of Asia paid the tribute and shared in this Persian Peace.

1219. Persian Empire — Goal of Xerxes, to "Stir Up All Against the Realm of Grecia"

SOURCE: *Herodotus* vii. 19–21; translated by A. D. Godley, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 333, 335. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 333] 19. Xerxes dealt with the mustering of his army [against Greece], searching out every part of the continent.

[p. 335] 20. For full four years from the conquest of Egypt he was equipping his host and preparing all that was needful therefor; and ere the fifth year was completed he set forth on his march with the might of a great multitude. Of all armaments whereof we have knowledge this was by much the greatest, insomuch that none were aught in comparison of it, neither the armament that Darius led against the Scythians, nor the host of the Scythians when in pursuit of the Cimmerians they brake into Media and subdued and ruled wellnigh all the upper lands of Asia...

21. For what nation did not Xerxes lead from Asia against Hellas? What water did not fall short of the needs of his host, save only the great rivers? Some supplied him with ships, some were enrolled in his infantry, some were charged with the provision of horsemen, others of horse-bearing transports to follow the army, and others again of warships for the bridges, or of food and ships.

[EDITORS' NOTE: On this unsuccessful campaign of Xerxes, see SDACom 3:459, 460.]

1220. Persian Empire—Great Wealth of Xerxes (Dan. 11:2)

SOURCE: *Herodotus* vii. 27; translated by A. D. Godley, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 341, 343. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 341] Pythius thus offering money, Xerxes asked the Persians that were about him who this [p. 343] Pythius was that offered it and how much wealth he possessed: "O king," said they, "this is he who gave your father Darius that gift of a golden plane-tree and vine; and now he is, next to yourself, the richest man of whom we have knowledge."

1221. Persian Empire, Invasion and Conquest of, by Alexander SOURCE: Will Durant, *Our Oriental Heritage* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), pp. 383–385. Copyright 1934 by Will Durant. Used by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc., and George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London.

[p. 383] When the two armies met at Issus Alexander had no more than 30,000 followers; but Darius, with all the stupidity that destiny could require, had chosen a field in which only a small part of his multitude could fight at one time. When the slaughter was over the Macedonians had lost some 450, the Persians 110,000 men, most of these being slain in wild retreat; Alexander, in reckless pursuit, crossed a stream on a bridge of Persian corpses. Darius fled ignominiously...

The young conqueror turned aside now with what seemed foolhardy leisureliness to establish his control over all of western Asia; he did not wish to advance farther without organizing his conquests and building a secure line of communications. The citizens of Babylon, like those of [p. 384] Jerusalem, came out *en masse* to welcome him, offering him their city and their gold; he accepted these graciously, and pleased them by restoring the temples which the unwise Xerxes had destroyed...

Meanwhile Alexander had taken Tyre, and annexed Egypt; now he marched back across the great empire, straight to its distant capitals. In twenty days from Babylon his army reached Susa, and took it without resistance; thence it advanced ... quickly to Persepolis...

Darius had gathered, chiefly from his eastern provinces, a new army of a million men... Alexander, with 7,000 cavalry and 40,000 infantry, met the motley mob at [p. 385] Gaugamela,* [Note *: A town sixty miles from the Arbela which gave the battle its name.] and by superior weapons, generalship and courage destroyed it in a day. Darius again chose the better part of valor, but his generals, disgusted with this second flight, murdered him in his tent. Alexander put to death such of the assassins as he could find, sent the body of Darius in state to Persepolis, and ordered it to be buried in the manner of the Achaemenid kings. The Persian people flocked readily to the standard of the conquerer, charmed by his generosity and his youth. Alexander organized Persia into a province of the Macedonian Empire, left a strong garrison to guard it, and marched on to India.

1222. Persian Empire, Last King of, Defeated at Arbela (Gaugamela) SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, p. 517. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

Gau Gamela [Arbela, 331 B.C.] was truly a decisive battle. By his flight [from Alexander the Great] Darius had surrendered all claim to the Persian throne. To be sure, months would elapse before his death could be announced and his corpse find burial—not in the half-finished tomb he had begun to the south of the Persepolis terrace, but high up the cliff in the graves of his predecessors. Other months must elapse while Bessus the Bactrian satrap fought on to confirm his claim to the title of the fourth Artaxerxes. It would be years before the Iranian Plateau was pacified. But the great war was ended, and Alexander would be accepted as himself a great Persian monarch by the majority of his subjects.

One final scene was needed to round out the crusade. Arbela was the capital of the region in which the decisive battle had been fought; although seventy-five miles distant from the field, it was generally assigned the honor of naming the battle, for Gau Gamela was an unknown known hamlet. The near-by mountain was called Nicatorium, "Mount Victory." From Arbela—named, the Greeks said, from its founder Arbelus, son of Athmoneus—the army turned southward. The Caprus or Lower Zab was crossed, and the naphtha font in the land of Artacene—where today the Mosul oil fields are an object of dispute and where to our own time the fires leap up when the soil is slightly scratched—was visited. Then came the shrine of Anaea or Anahita, Sandracae, where was a palace of the first Darius, Cyparisson, and the crossing of the Gyndes or Diyala on the road to Babylon.

1223. Persian Empire—Passing of Dominion to Alexander

SOURCE: George Rawlinson, *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, [190–]), Vol. 3, pp. 538, 539.

[p. 538] It is needless to pursue further the dissolution of the Empire. The fatal blow was struck at Arbela—all the rest was but the long death-agony. At Arbela the crown of Cyrus passed to the Macedonian; the Fifth Monarchy came to an end. The HE-GOAT, with the notable horn between his eyes, had come [p. 539] from the west to the ram which had two horns, and had run into him with the fury of his power. He had come close to him,

and, moved with choler, had smitten the ram and broken his two horns—there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he had cast him down to the ground.

1224. Peter, and the Rock, Differing Views on

Δ

SOURCE: Peter Richard Kenrick, Speech of, in *An Inside View of the Vatican Council*, ed. by Leonard Woolsey Bacon (New York: American Tract Society, [1872]), pp. 107–109.

[p. 107] The rule of Biblical interpretation imposed upon us is this: that the Scriptures are not to be interpreted contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers. It is doubtful whether any instance of that unanimous consent is to be found. But this failing, the rule seems to lay down for us the law of following, in their interpretation of Scripture, the major number of the fathers, that might seem to approach unanimity. Accepting this rule, we are compelled to abandon the usual modern exposition of the words, "On this rock I build my church."

In a remarkable pamphlet "printed in *fac–simile* of manuscript," and presented to the fathers almost two months ago, we find five different interpretations of the word *rock*, in the place cited; "the first of which declares" (I transcribe the words) "that the church was built on *Peter*; and this interpretation is followed by *seventeen* fathers—among them, by Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo the Great, Augustine.

"The second interpretation understands from [p. 108] these words, 'On this rock I build my church,' that the church was built on *all* the apostles, whom Peter represented by virtue of the primary. And this opinion is followed by *eight* fathers—among them, Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret.

"The third interpretation asserts that the words, 'On this rock,' etc., are to be understood of the *faith* which Peter had professed—that this faith, this profession of faith, by which we believe Christ to be the Son of the living God is the everlasting and immovable foundation of the church. This interpretation is the weightiest of all, since it is followed by *forty-four* fathers and doctors; among them, from the East, are Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Theophylact; from the West, Hilary, Ambrose, Leo the Great; from Africa, Augustine.

"The fourth interpretation declares that the words, 'On this rock,' etc., are to be understood of that rock which Peter had confessed, that is, *Christ*—the church was built upon Christ. This interpretation is followed by *sixteen* fathers and doctors.

"The fifth interpretation of the fathers understands by the name of *the rock,* the *faithful* themselves, who, believing Christ to be the Son of God, are constituted living stones out of which the church is built."

Thus far the author of the pamphlet aforesaid, in which may be read the words of the fathers and doctors whom he cites.

From this it follows, either that no argument at [p. 109] all, or one of the slenderest probability, is to be derived from the words, "On this rock will I build my church," in support of the primacy. Unless it is certain that by *the rock* is to be understood the apostle Peter in and not in his capacity as the chief apostle speaking for them all, the word supplies no argument whatever, I do not say in proof of papal infallibility, but even in

⁴Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

support of the *primacy* of the bishop of Rome. If we are bound to follow the majority of the fathers in this thing, then we are bound to hold for certain that by *the rock* should be understood the faith professed by Peter, not Peter professing the faith.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Archbishop Kenrick, one of the bishops opposed to the declaration of papal infallibility at the Vatican Council, wrote his speech but had no opportunity to deliver it. See No. 870n.]

1225. Peter, Not the Rock

SOURCE: Melvin Grove Kyle, *Mooring-Masts of Revelation*, p. 157. Copyright 1933 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

Here, at the head waters of the Jordan, Christ uttered the words of institution of the Church which should be impregnable even against the gates of hell. There was the great cliff, the foundations of the mountain; here, where the river was born in a moment, were a multitude of stones. Standing amidst those stones He said "Thou art *Petros*" (a stone), as one of these pieces of the great cliff, "and unto this *petra*," (the cliff itself)"I will found my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

1226. Peter, Not the Rock, but Christ (Gregory VII)

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 303. It is remarkable that the reference of the *rock* to *Christ*, which Augustine especially defended with great earnestness, was acknowledged even by the greatest pope of the middle ages, Gregory VII., in the famous inscription he sent with a crown to the emperor Rudolph: "*Petra* [i. e., Christ] *dedit Petro* [i. e., to the apostle], *Petrus* [the pope] *diadema Rudolpho*."

1227. Peter, Not the Rock on Which the Church Is Built (the Venerable Bede)

SOURCE: Bede, the Venerable, *In Matthaei Evangelium Expositio*, iii. 16, comment on Matt. 16:[18], in *MPL*, Vol. 92, cols. 78, 79. Latin.

[col. 78] And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church. Metaphorically it is said to him: Upon this rock, that is the Saviour [col. 79] whom you have confessed, the church is built, [the Saviour] who has given to the faithful confessor a participation in His name... And whatsoever thou shalt bind, etc. This power without doubt is given to all the apostles, to whom by Him after the resurrection it was said generally, *Receive* [ye] the Holy Spirit, etc. (John 20). And in fact to the bishops and priests, and to every church, is committed the same function, although certain of them, not understanding rightly, think that they are able to condemn the innocent and to absolve the guilty, which they are not at all able [to do], but attempting [it], to deprive themselves of the power granted [them].

1228. Peter—Significance of Name (Bede's View)

SOURCE: Bede, the Venerable, *In Marci Evangeluim Expositio*, i. 3, comment on Mark 2, in *MPL*, Vol. 92, col. 160. Latin.

Peter therefore is the same in Greek or Latin as Cephas in Syriac, and in each language the name is derived from "rock"; there is no doubt but that [it is] that [rock] concerning which Paul says: *And that Rock was Christ* (1 Cor. 10). For just as Christ, the true Light, granted to the apostles that they might be called the light of the world, thus also upon Simon, who believed in Christ the Rock [Latin, *petra*], He bestowed the name of Peter [Latin, *petrus*]. On another occasion, alluding to this etymology, He said: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church* (Matt. 16).

1229. Pilate, Pontius, Date

SOURCE: Josephus Antiquities xviii. 4. 2, in *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans. by William Whiston (Cincinnati: H. S. & J. Applegate, 1850), p. 365.

The Samaritan senate sent an embassy to Vitellius, a man that had been consul, and who was now president of Syria, and accused Pilate of the murder of those that were killed, for that they did not go to Tirathaba in order to revolt from the Romans, but to escape the violence of Pilate. So Vitellius sent Marcellus, a friend of his, to take care of the affairs of Judea, and ordered Pilate to go to Rome, to answer before the emperor to the accusations of the Jews. So Pilate, when he had tarried ten years in Judea, made haste to Rome, and this in obedience to the orders of Vitellius, which he durst not contradict; but before he could get to Rome, Tiberius was dead.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Tiberius died in March, A.D. 37; hence Pilate's governorship (Luke 3:1) must be dated c. 26–36. Many apocryphal documents have been attributed to Pilate; none are genuine. Josephus' mention (chap. 3, sec. 3) of Pilate's crucifying Jesus is probably genuine, though his description of Jesus must have been altered by Christians. See *SDACom* 5:95.]

1230. Planets, Names of

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 27.

Now, after the fourth century ... these ancient [descriptive planetary] names ... are gradually ousted from use. The planets become [for the Greeks] the stars of Hermes, Aphrodite, Ares, Zeus, Kronos ... [known to us by their Latin names Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn]. Now this seems due to the fact that in Babylonia these same planets were dedicated respectively to Nebo, Ishtar, Nergal, Marduk, and Ninib... The ideas of Semitic starworship, have come in here, for the ancient mythology of Hellas did not put the stars under the patronage of the Olympians nor establish any connection between them. Thus the names of the planets which we employ to-day, are an English translation of a Latin translation of a Greek translation of a Babylonian nomenclature.

1231. Planets—Venus, Planet of the Goddess Ishtar

 SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, Semitic [Mythology] (Vol. 5 of The Mythology of All Races. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), pp. 24, 25. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York.
 [p. 24] Venus is both morning and evening star, Phosphorus and Hesperus, and

various titles of the Arabian Allat, such as Sa'd 'Uzzā, have dual forms, Sa'dān, 'Uzzā, "the two planets Venus." In Babylonia the morning star is called the "male Venus," and the evening star the "female Venus." But in both aspects Ishtar is always a goddess in Babylonian mythology. She is sometimes described by "Ishtar of Agade" as morning star, and "Ishtar of Erech" as evening star. A long metrical poem describes Ishtar:

"At sunrise she is mistress (*bêlit*), at sunset she is votaress." [p. 25] Mythology set in here at an early period and determined Ishtar, and consequently the western goddesses Astarte, Allat, as a double character. As morning star she is goddess of War (in the West

'Anat), and as evening star patroness of love and harlotry. For this reason the western goddesses of Fate were worshipped on house-tops, where baked cakes were offered to them, an obviously astral cult, and it could be served by women only. So important did the favour of the goddess of this lucky planet seem to the Arabians and Aramaeans that they frequently made human sacrifices to her. Particularly beautiful are the Sumerian and Babylonian hymns addressed to the "Queen of Heaven."

1232. Planets, Worship of—Prayer to Saturn

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 90.

In the astrological system each day [of the week] was sacred to a planet. It is probable that the worshipper prayed prayer to the presiding star of each day in turn. We still possess the text of these prayers addressed to the planets in the East as in the West. We have some in Greek, but of a late date, and the most curious are those of the pagans of Harran near Edessa, which an Arabic writer has transmitted to us in great detail. Thus, for instance, to call upon Saturn it was necessary to await the favourable moment, to don black vestments, to approach the sacred place humbly, like a man sunk in sorrow, to burn a perfume composed of incense and opium mixed with grease and the urine of a goat, then, at the moment when the smoke arose, to raise the eyes to the star and say:

"Lord, whose name is august, whose power is widespread, whose spirit sublime, O Lord Saturn the cold, the dry, the dark, the harmful, ... crafty sire who knowest all wiles, who art deceitful, sage, understanding, who causest prosperity or ruin, happy or unhappy is he whom thou makest such. I adjure thee, O primeval Father, by thy great mercies, and thy noble qualities, to do for me this and that!"

1233. Prayer, Posture in — Kneeling Practiced Less Frequently SOURCE: Thomas Albert Stafford, *Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1942), p. 131, 132. Copyright 1942 by Whitmore & Stone. Used by permission.

[p. 131] In a great many churches of the evangelical denominations, the members of the congregation no [p. 132] longer bow the head for a moment of individual prayer after entering church, nor do they kneel during the offering of prayer. *O tempora*! *O mores*! alas! that these two most excellent customs, so long practiced by our fathers, seem no longer to be in favor.

While we are on the subject of kneeling, let it be said that the lack of sufficient room between pews, as now ordinarily placed, discourages the practice, because seating capacity has been considered first. Perhaps, too, the Puritan aversion to kneeling still exerts a lingering influence that dies hard. Kneeling promotes a pervasive feeling of reverence. God can hear our sincerely uttered prayers in any posture, but the sense of humility symbolized by kneeling is conducive to the best attitude within ourselves.

1234. Predestination, Predestination, Calvin on

SOURCE: John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, bk. 3, chap. 21, trans. by John Allen (4th American ed., rev.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1843), Vol. 2, pp. 140, 141.

[p. 140] The covenant of life not being equally preached to all, and among those to whom it is preached not always finding the same reception, this diversity discovers the wonderful depth of the Divine judgment. Nor is it to be doubted that this variety also follows, subject to the decision of God's eternal election. If it be evidently the result of the Divine will, that salvation is freely offered to some, and others are prevented from attaining it,—this immediately gives rise to important and difficult questions, which are incapable of any other explication, than by the establishment of pious minds in what ought to be received concerning election and predestination—a question, in the opinion of many, full of perplexity; for they consider nothing more unreasonable, than that, of the common mass of mankind, some should be predestinated to salvation, and others to destruction. But how unreasonably they perplex themselves will afterwards appear from the sequel of our discourse. Besides, the very obscurity which excites such dread, not only displays the utility of this doctrine, but shows it to be productive of the most delightful benefit. We shall never be clearly convinced as we ought to be, that our salvation flows from the fountain of God's free mercy, till we are acquainted with his

eternal election, which illustrates the grace of God by this comparison, that he adopts not all promiscuously to the hope of salvation, but gives to some what he refuses to others. Ignorance of this principle evidently detracts from the Divine glory, and dimi- [p. 141] nishes real humility. But according to Paul, what is so necessary to be known, never can be known, unless God, without any regard to works, chooses those whom he has decreed.

1235.Predestination, Council of Trent on

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VI (Jan. 13, 1547), Decree Concerning Justification, chap. 12, trans. in H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 38. Copyright 1941 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

No one, moreover, so long as he lives this mortal life, ought in regard to the sacred mystery of divine predestination, so far presume as to state with absolute certainty that he is among the number of the predestined, as if it were true that the one justified either cannot sin any more, or, if he does sin, that he ought to promise himself an assured repentance. For except by special revelation, it cannot be known whom God has chosen to Himself.

1236. Predestination, Fatalism and Inaction Not Produced by SOURCE: Robert MaAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), p. 83. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

At the time of the Protestant Reformation, for example, the Calvinists were the people who took predestination most seriously. But there were no more active and responsible individuals in that entire period than the Calvinists. Why? Because they were convinced that God had chosen them to do his work, and that therefore nothing, absolutely nothing, could defeat them. Who could stand against the Lord's elect? Consequently they had a vigor that was marvelous (and sometimes terrifying) to behold. A seventeenth century writer put it clearly: "I had rather meet coming against me a whole regiment with drawn swords than one lone Calvinists convinced that he is doing the will of God."

1237. Predestination, Westminster Confession Position on, No Longer Held by Presbyterian Churches

SOURCE: George S. Hendery, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 51–53. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 51] The awesome doctrine of the "double decree," or "double predestination," which has often been regarded as the distinctive feature of the Reformed faith, is no longer held by the Presbyterian Churches in the form in which it is set forth in this chapter. This is one of the points at which several of these Churches have adopted declaratory statements regarding the sense in which they accept the formulation of the doctrine of the Confession. The doctrine still has its defenders among devotees of traditional orthodoxy, but not even among them is it cherished with any degree of enthusiasm. And in the preaching and teaching of the Churches generally it would seem that the recommendation, given in Paragraph 8 [of the Westminster Confession, chapter 3], that the subject be handled with special caution, has been taken to mean that it should be passed over in complete silence...

Four reasons [as to why the doctrine as presented in the Westminster Confession is no longer acceptable] may be given:

(1) The first is rather general, but not without some weight. No reader who compares the statement of the doctrine in the Confession with the Biblical passages on which it is ostensibly founded can fail to notice a profound difference in tone between them. This is especially evident if we take the two passages, Ephesians 1:3–14 and Romans 8:29–30,

which together furnish practically all the terms employed in the formulation of the doctrine (with one significant exception which will be noted later): both breathe an air of exultant joy; both exemplify what has been called "truth that sings." The chapter in the Confession, by contrast, breathes an air of dread and doom, and it ends with the [p. 52] advice to handle the subject with extreme caution. There is no suggestion of caution in Ephesians 1 and Romans 8; there, if ever, the apostle is letting himself go.

- (2) The idea that God has foreordained the reprobate to everlasting death, which is the chief stumbling-stone, leans heavily on the passage in Romans 9:19–23, which speaks of "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction"; but the passage will not bear the interpretation that has been imposed on it...
- [p. 53] (3) If the question be asked, How did the Biblical testimony to the resourcefulness of grace come to be transformed into the theological doctrine of double predestination? the answer would seem to be that those who framed the doctrine were misled by a false model. The clue is to be found in the term which they used to entitle the doctrine and which dominates their interpretation of it, namely, "decree." This term is absent from the New Testament passages which deal with election. "Decree" belongs to the language of the Old Testament, where it is used with reference to God six times; in four places it is used in connection with what are now commonly called laws of nature (Job 28:26; Ps. 148:6; Prov. 8:29; Jer. 5:22), in one place its meaning is uncertain (Zeph. 2:2), and in only one does it refer to election—in that case the election of the Messianic king (Ps. 2:7). The absence of the word from the New Testament is no accident; for it suggests a fixed and unalterable enactment, which is not appropriate to what the men of the New Testament had come to know of the freedom of the grace of God in Jesus Christ. The New Testament term is "purpose."

1238. Presbyterian Bodies—General Statement

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1381, 1382.

[p. 1381] History.—The Presbyterian Reformed churches in existence today throughout the world perpetuate those features, doctrinal and governmental, of the Protestant Reformation of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which were emphasized by John Calvin and his associates, particularly in Switzerland, France, Holland, the Palatinate, England, Scotland, and Ireland. These churches number more than 125 distinct denominations with a total constituency of at least 60,000,000 and represent the largest Protestant church group under the same form of government. The doctrinal and ecclesiastical system developed at Geneva, modified somewhat in Holland and in France and transferred to Scotland, became solidified there largely under the influence of John Knox in 1560 and found a practical and thoroughly logical presentation in the Westminster Assembly, London, England, 1645–49. This was not a distinctively Presbyterian body. Called by act of Parliament to consider the state of the entire country in matters of religion, it represented in its membership all English-speaking Christians, although the Anglicans took no active part in its deliberations. It had no ecclesiastical authority, yet its deliverances on doctrine have furnished the basis both for Presbyterian and many non-Presbyterian bodies; and the form of ecclesiastical government it recommended has gone far beyond the country where it was formulated and has had a marked influence not only on church life, but in civil and national development. In England it fostered the development of the Independents who afterwards became the Congregationalists. In Scotland, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it resulted in

the development of several Presbyterian bodies, each insisting upon some specific administrative phase; and one of its strongholds was the north of Ireland, where so many Scotch found a more congenial home for the time being, until they should cross the Atlantic.

The distinctively Presbyterian churches of the United States trace their origin chiefly to Great Britain. Whatever of English and Welsh Presbyterianism there was in the Colonies, together with the few French Protestant, or Huguenot, churches, combined at an early date with the Scotch and Scotch-Irish elements to form the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, from which the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church in the United States afterwards separated. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church, representing the Calvinistic Methodist of Wales, was united in 1920 with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Five Presbyterian denominations are directly connected with the Secession and Relief movements of the church in Scotland in the eighteenth century: The United Presbyterian Church of North America; known also as the Associate Synod of North America, known also as the Associate Presbyterian Church; the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, formerly the Associate Reformed Synod of the South; the Synod and the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

In close harmony with these distinctively Presbyterian churches are the Reformed churches, traceable to the influence of immigration from the Continent of Europe: The Reformed Church in America (Dutch) and the Christian Reformed Church, both of which originated in Holland; the Reformed Church in the United [p. 1382] States (German) now the Evangelical and Reformed Church, whose beginnings were in Switzerland and Germany; and the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America, representing the State Reformed Church of Hungary. All of these, Presbyterian and Reformed, substantially agree in government, and all maintain similar principles of the Calvinistic system, whether expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Canons of the Synod of Dort, or the Heidelberg Catechism. The Alliance of Reformed Churches throughout the world holding the Presbyterian system, whose special purpose is to secure cooperation by the different denominations in general church work, has grown out of this concord, as has also the Council of the Reformed Churches in the United States, holding the Presbyterian system, organized for the same general purpose.

Doctrine and organization.—Presbyterianism as a doctrinal system has as its fundamental principles the undivided sovereignty of God in His universe, the sovereignty of Christ in salvation, the sovereignty of the Scriptures in faith and conduct, and the sovereignty of the Scriptures of the individual conscience in the interpretation of the Word of God. As a polity, it recognizes Christ as the only head of the church and the source of all power, and the people of Christ as entitled under their Lord to participation in the government and action of the church. As polity and as doctrine, it maintains the right of private judgment in matters of religion, the membership in the Church Universal of all who profess the true religion, the validity of church organization, and the power of each association of organizations to prescribe its own terms of communion. It further holds that ministers are peers one of another, and that church authority is positively vested, not in individuals, such as bishops or presbyters, but in representative courts, including the session, the presbytery, and the synod; and in the case of some bodies, especially the larger ones, the general assembly. This principle of coordinate representative authority, by which the individual member of the church has his own share in the conduct of that church, while at the same time he recognizes not merely the headship of Christ but the fellowship in Christ, has given to the system a peculiar hold wherever there has been representative government and has exerted a strong influence modifying both individualistic and hierarchical tendencies. Its advocates call attention to the resemblance between its polity and the political constitution of the United States, in which country it has had its strongest influence, its courts corresponding closely to the local, State, and national organizations.

Statistics.— ... Certain changes are to be noted. The union between the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, under discussion in 1906, was consummated, but a considerable number of the Cumberland Presbyterian churches refused to adopt the plan and continued the old organization...

The Associate Synod of North America (Associate Presbyterian Church) and Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church are now known as The Synod of the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America and the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, respectively. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, a new body reported for the first time in 1936, was formed by a group which withdrew from the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For later Presbyterian mergers and a proposal of further mergers, with other bodies, see Nos. 664, 665, 1241.]

1239. Presbyterians — Cumberland Presbyterian Church SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1416–1418.

[p. 1416] *History*. The opening years of the nineteenth century witnessed a remarkable religious awakening in various parts of the United States. Revivals were numerous and in certain sections were accompanied by strange "bodily exercises." The leader of the revival in the "Cumberland country" in Kentucky and Tennessee was Rev. James McGready, a Presbyterian minister, and a member of the Synod of Kentucky. He and other ministers conducting the services felt constrained to call the attention of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church to the peculiar manifestations. The assembly, in reply, recognizing that, although the movement had been accompanied by "extraordinary effects on the body," it had accomplished great good, admonished those in charge of the work of the danger of excesses, and expressed the opinion that these effects may be in a considerable degree produced by natural causes. As the revival work progressed, these physical manifestations became so marked as to create an unfavorable reaction, and some Presbyterian ministers set themselves against the entire movement. Others favored it, on the ground that various communities in which it was carried on were indeed transformed. The division in sentiment resulted finally in two distinct parties, revival and antirevival, the one inclined to regard the bodily exercises as a sign of divine approval, the other unable to see any good in the work because of the extravagances.

At the first meeting of the Synod of Kentucky in 1802 the southwestern portion of the Presbytery of Transylvania, including the Cumberland country, was constituted the Presbytery of Cumberland. As the revival, which had started in the Transylvania Presbytery, spread to the various small settlements in this section, the demand for ministers became greater than the supply, and the revival party, which controlled the new presbytery, believed that the emergency, as well as precedent, justified them in introducing into the ministry men who had not had the usual academic and theological training. A few such were inducted into the ministry, and others were set apart as "exhorters." In addition to this, those thus inducted into the ministry were permitted, if they so desired, to adopt the Westminster Confession "as far as they deemed it agreeable to the Word of God," the reservation having special reference to "the idea of fatality, which," as they later expressed it, "seems to be taught under the mysterious doctrine of predestination."

The antirevival party objected both to the admission into the ministry of men who were not up to the usual literary and theological standard and to the permission of this reservation in regard to doctrine; they took the whole matter to the Synod of Kentucky, which in 1805 appointed a commission to confer with the members of the Cumberland Presbytery and adjudicate on their presbyterial proceedings. The commission met in December 1805 assumed full synodical power, against the protest of the revival party, and reached the conclusion, in reference to the men who had been inducted into the ministry by the Presbytery of Cumberland, that the majority of them were "not only illiterate, but erroneous in sentiment"; and solemnly prohibited them "from exhorting, preaching, and administering ordinances in consequence of any authority which they have obtained from the Cumberland Presbytery, until they submit to our jurisdiction, and undergo the requisite examination."

Rev. James McGready, Rev. Samuel McAdow, and three others were also cited to appear at the next meeting of the synod. The synod in 1806 sanctioned the proceedings of the commission, dissolved the Presbytery of Cumberland, attached its members to the Presbytery of Transylvania, and directed that body to deal with "the recusant [nonconforming] members." In May 1809 the General Assembly confirmed the action of the synod.

Meanwhile the revival party formed a council for the special care of the weak churches and preaching centers, over 30 in number, which were in sympathy with them. On receipt of news of the assembly's action, at a meeting of this council in October 1809 the formation of an independent presbytery was strongly urged. This, however, was impracticable, as the elders, who made up the great majority of the council, could not participate in such an organization, and of the ministers only two favored the action. whereas at least three were necessary to [p. 1417] the constitution of a new presbytery. Rev. James McGready, the leader of the revival, and generally looked upon as the father of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, never favored it and never identified himself with the independent body. Others also had withdrawn from the council, and it was finally decided to adjourn to March 20, 1810, after which meeting every member would be free to act as he pleased, unless in the meantime a way should be found to constitute an independent presbytery. This was accomplished, and on February 4, 1810, an independent presbytery was constituted by Rev. Finis Ewing, Rev. Samuel King, and Rev. Samuel McAdow, at the home of the latter in Dickson County, Tenn. The name of the dissolved presbytery, Cumberland, was adopted, a licentiate, Mr. McLean, was ordained, and a compact allowing reservation in creed subscription was entered into.

At the adjourned meeting of the council nearly all the churches in the Cumberland country adhered to the new presbytery, but they were weak, and at most could not have represented more than a few hundred members. While the new movement was launched as an independent presbytery, the wish and hope of those connected with it was not that it should become a separate denomination, but that it might be reunited with the Synod of Kentucky. The organization, however, grew rapidly, and in the course of a few years it became apparent that a new denomination had entered upon its career. At first it was referred to as "the members of the Cumberland Presbytery." As the denominational idea became more apparent, it was called the "Cumberland Presbyterian," the next step being to call it the "Cumberland Presbyterian Church."

In October 1813 the Presbytery of Cumberland, or General Presbytery, was divided into three presbyteries, and a general synod was constituted. This continued to be the supreme judicatory until 1828, when there was a reorganization. In place of the general synod, four synods were constituted and a general assembly, which met in 1829. At this time there were 18 presbyteries, representing the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Illinois, Missouri, and Alabama. By 1853 the church had 20 synods, 79 presbyteries, and 1,250 churches with a membership estimated at 100,000. The first fairly accurate statistics were gathered in 1875, and showed 2,158 churches, 1,232 ministers, 98,242 communicants, and congregational property valued at \$2,069,000.

The fact that the strength of the church was in the border States made it inevitable that the slavery question should become prominent. During the discussions preceding the Civil War, the assembly took the position that the church of God is a spiritual body whose jurisdiction extends only to matters of faith and morals and has no power to legislate upon subjects upon which Christ and His apostles did not legislate. During the war commissioners from the southern presbyteries did not meet with the General Assembly, and that body in 1864 adopted strong resolutions against disunion. After the war the southern members again attended, and, being in the majority, rescinded these resolutions. For a time it seemed as if division was inevitable; it was, however, averted, and the church remained one. Then came the question of the Negro churches, resulting in a mutual agreement for the establishment of the Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church, as affording to the Negroes the opportunities they needed most for church development.

There have been various propositions for union with other churches—the Presbyterian Church in the United States, the Presbyterian Church in United States of America, The Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the Methodist Protestant Church. The chief cause of failure, in the last instance, seems to have been the divergence between the two bodies in regard to the doctrine of the "perseverance of believers," the Cumberland Assembly being unwilling to accept the full Arminian position taken by the Methodist Protestant Church.

When the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America had completed its revision of the Confession of Faith and had taken essentially the position called for by the Cumberland Church in its early history, the question arose again of the union of the two bodies, and in 1903 both General Assemblies appointed committees on fraternity and union. These held a joint meeting and formulated a basis of union which was approved by the General Assemblies in 1904 and was ratified by a majority of the presbyteries of each body in the succeeding year, when the General Assemblies took action for the organic union of the two churches. Meanwhile considerable opposition had arisen in the Cumberland Church, and a protest had been filed against the constitutionality of the assembly's action. [p. 1418] The civil court, to which the matter was referred, held that action to be legal; and when it became evident that it would be carried through, another movement was started by the opposition in the Cumberland Church, "to enjoin the General Assembly * * from taking the final steps to merge or unite, or consolidate the

Cumberland Presbyterian Church with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." The court refused the injunction and the General Assembly, by a vote of 162 to 105, approved the report and "adjourned sine die as a separate assembly, to meet in and as a part of the One Hundred and Nineteenth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America." The opposition then filed a protest, and determined to "continue and perpetuate the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church as same was constituted and organized on May 17, 1906," and declared itself "to be the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, the repository of its established faith, the owners of its property, and the protectors of its trust." It held that all offices had been vacated, appointed men to fill the vacancies in the boards, rescinded "the action and announcements" of the General Assembly, and adjourned to meet in Dickson County, Tenn., the birthplace of the denomination. Suits were brought in a number of courts with regard to church property, with varying results.

Doctrine. In doctrine the Cumberland Presbyterian Church is essentially Calvinistic of the more moderate type: that is, it uniformly protested against the doctrine of reprobation, but recognizes fully the sovereignty of God and the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. The Westminster Confession continued to be the creed of the church until 1814, when a revision was made which was designed to be a popular statement of doctrine emphasizing human responsibility, and this was again revised along much the same lines in 1883.

From various causes many have joined the Cumberland Presbyterian Church who were inclined to Arminian statements of doctrine. The result has been that a party has developed within the church which claims that Cumberland Presbyterianism is really the *via media* between Calvinism and Arminianism. While this has not found expression in definite statements of creed, it has modified very materially the position of many churches and even presbyteries, and a considerable part of the opposition to the union with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America appears to have been occasioned by the presence of this element, which looked upon the revision of the Westminster Confession by that church as less thorough and complete than was claimed for it by its advocates.

So far as church membership is concerned, no subscription to the confession is required. Those who are ordained to the ministry, eldership, and diaconate, however, are required to subscribe to the Confession of Faith.

Organization. In polity the Cumberland Presbyterian Church has always been thoroughly presbyterian, its government being exercised by the various courts—session, presbytery, synod, and general assembly.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 87,263 (YAC, 1961, p. 257).]

1240. Presbyterians—Presbyterian Church in the United States ("Southern")

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1443, 1444.

[p. 1443] *History*. Previous to the Civil War the Presbyterian churches in the United States held widely different positions in regard to slavery. The larger denominations did not take positive ground but left local bodies free to act as they judged best. Some of the smaller and stricter churches, however, were stringent in their rules, and even went so far as to exclude slaveholders from their communion. As early as 1818 the General Assembly expressed itself very strongly in denunciation of slavery, but at the same time

recommended consideration toward those so circumstanced as to be unable to carry out the full recommendation of the church. After the separation between the "Old School" and the "New School," the latter was more aggressive, and the New School Assembly, in 1853, called upon its southern presbyteries to report "the real facts in relation to this subject." The result was that several synods and presbyteries, mostly in the border States, seceded and, in 1858, formed the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church.

When the Civil War broke out, the Old School General Assembly, in session in Philadelphia, through what were known as the "Spring resolutions," pledged its whole constituency to the support of the Federal Government in the contest which was then beginning. The southern churches which were connected with the assembly took the ground that this action violated the constitution of the church, in that it assumed to decide a disputed political question, and would inevitably introduce the strife and rancor of political discussion into the church courts. There was also a deep-seated conviction that the difference of opinion as to the status of slavery was radical and irreconcilable. The great majority of the northern churches, whether or not they gave formal expression to their belief, regarded slavery as sinful. The southern churches refused absolutely to "make slaveholding a sin or nonslaveholding a term (condition) of communion." Accordingly, 47 presbyteries formally withdrew from connection with the Old School General Assembly, and their commissioners met in Augusta, Ga., December 4, 1861, and organized the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.

In 1864 the United Synod and the General Assembly of the Confederate States came together, and in the following year adopted the name "The Presbyterian Church in the United States." This united church was further enlarged by the accession of several bodies which had proclaimed themselves independent of the Northern Assembly, in protest against any political action by an ecclesiastical body. Of these, the largest were the Synod of Kentucky, which joined in 1869, and the Synod of Missouri, which joined in 1874.

As the discussions connected with the Civil War subsided, fraternal relations were established with the northern churches, in 1882, and in 1888 the two General Assemblies held a joint meeting in Philadelphia in celebration of the centenary of the adoption of the constitution of the church. In 1897 they also united in celebrating the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Westminster Assembly, which formulated the Confession of Faith and Catechism of the Church.

Various efforts have been made to bring together these two great sections of the Presbyterian Church. As yet, however, they have not been successful, owing partly to differences in doctrinal emphasis and church conduct, but chiefly to diversity in community and church life. The northern churches make no distinction between white and Negro; the southern churches have adopted a policy of separation, being moved thereto by the conviction that the best development of the Negroes would be secured by the increased responsibility thus laid upon them, and by apprehension that social embarrassment might result from ecclesiastical relations. So far as may be, the Negro members are organized into separate congregations, and these into separate presbyteries, with reference to an ultimate Colored Presbyterian Church. An independent synod was thus set off by the assembly in 1897, but two presbyteries, composed exclusively of Negroes, owing to remoteness, remained as constituent parts of the synods in whose bounds they are located. However, in 1916, the General Assembly constituted these and two [p. 1444] other Negro presbyteries existing within its territory into a synod composed exclusively of Negro ministers and members, yet being a constituent part of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Doctrine and Organization. In doctrinal matters the church is strictly Calvinistic, adheres closely to the standards, and, while allowing liberty of dissent in minor matters, requires strict creed subscription from all its ministers and office bearers. It particularly excludes from its courts all discussion of political questions, holds to the plenary inspiration of the Bible, and has not abated faith in its inerrancy. It claims that the Scriptures forbid women the public expounding of God's Word, or other functions pertaining to an ordained minister, but admits their services in other lines of Christian work.

In polity the principal distinctive feature is the recognition of ruling elders as entitled to deliver the charge in the installation of a pastor and to serve as moderators of any of the higher courts.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 889, 196 (YAC, 1961, p. 257).]

1241. Presbyterians—United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (Formed by the Union of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. ["Northern"] and the United Presbyterian Church of North America) SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1397–1400, 1402, 1434.

[*a*. The Former Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.]

[p. 1397] History. The earliest American Presbyterian churches were established in Virginia, New England, Maryland, and Delaware, and were chiefly of English origin, their pastors being Church of England ministers holding Presbyterian views. In Virginia, in 1611, Rev. Alexander Whitaker was installed as pastor of a church which was governed by himself and a few of the most religious men, and in 1630 Rev. Richard Denton located in Massachusetts, with a church which he had previously served in Yorkshire, England. Between 1642 and 1649 many of the Virginia Puritans were driven out of that colony and found refuge in Maryland and North Carolina; while Denton and his associates found New Amsterdam more friendly than New England. The English Presbyterian element in Maryland and the colonies to the northward was strengthened by the arrival, from 1670 to 1690 of a considerable number of Scotch colonists, the beginnings of a great immigration. There were many Presbyterians among the early settlers of New England, and the church founded at Plymouth in 1620, and other churches in that region, had ruling elders as officers. Several synods were also held, one of which, in 1649, adopted the Westminster Standards for doctrine. English-speaking Presbyterians were first found in New York City in 1643, with Rev. Francis Doughty as their minister, though no church was organized there until 1717. Presbyterian churches of English origin, however, were established earlier [p. 1398] on Long Island [also in New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania]... In 1683 the Presbytery of Laggan, Ireland, in response to a letter from William Stevens, a member of the Council of the Colony of Maryland, sent to this country Rev. Francis Makemie, who became the apostle of American Presbyterianism. He gave himself to the work of ecclesiastical organization and at last succeeded in bringing into organic unity the scattered Presbyterian churches throughout the Colonies.

In 1706 ... 7 ministers, representing about 22 congregations, not including the Presbyterians of New England, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, met and organized a presbytery, the first ecclesiastical gathering of an intercolonial and federal character in the country. With the growth of the country and the development of immigration, particularly of Presbyterians from Scotland and the north of Ireland, the number of churches increased so that in September 1716 the presbytery constituted itself a synod with four presbyteries.

In New England, owing to local conditions, the Presbyterian congregations, of which in 1770 there were fully 85, were not connected ecclesiastically with those of the other colonies, but formed in 1775 the Synod of New England, with 3 presbyteries, Londonderry, Palmer, and Salem. In 1782, however, this synod was dissolved, and, for a century, the Presbyterian Church had comparatively few adherents in the stronghold of the Congregationalists.

The General Synod in 1729 passed what is called the "adopting act," by which it was agreed that all the ministers under its jurisdiction should declare their agreement in and approbation of the Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, "as being, in all essential and necessary articles, good forms of sound words, and systems of Christian doctrine," and also "adopt the said Confession as the confession of their faith." In the same year the synod also denied to the civil magistrate power over the church and power to persecute any for their religion.

The general religious movement which characterized the early part of the eighteenth century, and manifested itself in England in Methodism, in Germany in Pietism, and in New England in the Great Awakening, found its expression in the Presbyterian Church in America through Gilbert Tennent, a pastor in Philadelphia. William Tennent, Sr., who, in 1726, had founded, near Philadelphia, an academy for the training of ministers, had aroused much opposition by his statement that the prevailing grade of ministerial quality was not creditable to the Presbyterian Church. His son, Gilbert Tennent, had become convinced of the necessity of personal conversion, and in 1728, a year before the Wesleys organized the "Holy Club" and 6 years before Jonathan Edwards's famous sermon, began a course of preaching of the most searching type. As others joined him, the movement spread; and when Whitefield came to the country in 1739 he found most congenial fellow workers in Gilbert Tennent, William Tennent, Jr., and their associates. They, however, became so severe in their denunciation of "unconverted ministers" as to arouse bitter opposition; and the result was a division, one party, the "New Side," endorsing the revival and insisting that less stress should be laid on college training, and more on the evidence that the candidate was a regenerate man, and called by the Holy Ghost to the ministry; the other, the "Old Side," largely opposing revivals and disposed to insist that none but graduates of British universities or New England colleges should be accepted as candidates for the ministry. There was also division with regard to the interpretation of the Standards, but in 1758 the bodies reunited upon the basis of the Westminster Standards pure and simple. At that date the church consisted of 98 ministers, about 200 congregations, and some 10,000 communicants.

It was during the period of this division that the "New Side" established, in 1746, the College of New Jersey, later Princeton University, for the purpose of securing an educated ministry. In 1768 the college called John Witherspoon from Scotland and installed him as president and professor of divinity... He was one of the leading persons

in the joint mov[e]ment of Presbyterians and Congregationalists from 1766 to 1775 to secure religious liberty and to resist the establishment of the English Episcopal Church as the state church of the Colonies. He was also a member of the Continental Congress, and the only clerical signer of the Declaration of Independence...

[p. 1399] The opening of the Revolutionary War found the Presbyterian Church on the colonial side. The General Synod called upon the churches to uphold, and by every means within their power to promote, the resolutions of Congress. At the close of the war the synod congratulated the churches on the "general and almost universal attachment of the Presbyterian body to the cause of liberty and the rights of mankind." ...

[The Presbyterian Church] had always been ecclesiastically independent, having no organic connection with European or British churches of like faith; but the independence of the United States had created new conditions for the Christian churches as well as for the American people. All denominations were no longer merely tolerated, but were entitled to full civil and religious rights in all the States. In view of these new conditions, the synod, in May 1788, adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and also a constitution consisting of a form of government, a book of discipline, and a directory for worship. Certain changes were made in the Confession, the Catechisms, and the Directory, along the lines of liberty in worship, of freedom in prayer, and above all, of liberty from control by the state. The form of government was altogether a new document and established the General Assembly as the governing body in the church. The first General Assembly met in 1789 in Philadelphia.

The first important movement in the church after the adoption of the constitution was the formulation of a Plan of Union with the Congregational associations of New England. It began with correspondence in 1792, and reached its consummation in the agreements made from 1801 to 1810 between the General Assembly and the associations of Connecticut and of other States. This plan allowed Congregational ministers to serve Presbyterian churches, and vice versa; and also allowed to churches composed of members of both denominations the right of representation in both presbytery and association. It remained in force until 1837, and was useful to both denominations in securing the results of the great revivals of religion throughout the country, and also in furthering the causes of home and foreign missions; but the operation of the plan was attended with increasing difficulty and dissatisfaction, and it was finally abrogated.

What is known as the Cumberland separation took place during this period. The Presbytery of Cumberland ordained to the ministry persons who, in the judgment of the Synod of Kentucky, were not qualified for the office either by learning or by sound doctrine. The controversies between the two judicatories resulted in the dissolution of the presbytery by the synod in 1806, and finally, in 1810, in arrangements for the organization of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

The membership of the church during this period, 1790 to 1837, increased from 18,000 to 220,557, due mainly to a revival of religion, of which camp meetings were one of the main features in western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky seminary of the church was founded at Princeton, N. J. (1812), and most of the missionary and benevolent boards were established.

About the year 1825 controversies arose respecting the Plan of Union and the establishment of denominational agencies for missionary and evangelistic work... In 1831 the Synod of Pittsburgh founded the Western Foreign Missionary Society as a

distinctively denominational agency. The party favoring these agencies and opposed to united work was known as the "Old School," and that favoring the continuance of the plan as the "New School." Questions of doctrine were also involved in the controversy, though not to so great a degree as those of denominational policy, and led to the trial of Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, for heresy. The Old School majority in the assembly of 1837 brought the matters at issue to a head by abrogating the Plan of Union, passing resolutions against the interdenominational societies, exscinding the synods of Utica, Geneva, Genesee, and the Western Reserve, and establishing the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions… When [p. 1400] [the 1838] assembly met, the New School commissioners … from the four exscinded synods, organized an assembly of their own in the presence of the sitting assembly, and then withdrew.

For nearly 20 years both branches of the church grew slowly but steadily... The New School assembly of 1853 took strong ground in opposition to slavery, with the result that a number of southern presbyteries withdrew and in 1858 organized the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church. In May 1861 the Old School assembly met at Philadelphia with but 13 commissioners present from the Southern States, Dr. Gardiner Spring, of New York, offered resolutions professing loyalty to the Federal Government, which were passed by a decided majority, although a minority, led by Dr. Charles Hodge, while in favor of the Federal Union, declared that an ecclesiastical judicatory had no right to determine questions of civil allegiance. The "Spring resolutions" were the occasion for the organization of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, which met in general assembly at Augusta, Ga., in December 1861, was enlarged by union in 1864 with the United Synod referred to, and upon the cessation of hostilities in 1865 took the name of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Its membership was also increased in 1869 and 1874 by the accession of the synods of Kentucky and Missouri, which had protested by "declaration and testimony" against the action of the Old School assembly, as affecting the Christian character of the ministers and members of the southern Presbyterian churches.

The first step toward the reunion of the Old School and New School was taken in 1862, by the establishment of fraternal correspondence between the two general assemblies. The second step was the organization by the New School, in 1863, of its own home mission work, hitherto carried on in connection with the Congregationalists... [In] 1869, at Pittsburgh, Pa., reunion was consummated on "the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards." ... Since 1870 the church has made steady progress along all lines, and its harmony has been seriously threatened only by the controversy (1891–94) as to the sources of authority in religion and the authority and credibility of the Scriptures, a controversy which, after the trials of Prof. Charles A. Briggs and Henry P. Smith, terminated in the adoption by the General Assembly at Minneapolis, Minn., in 1899, of a unanimous deliverance affirming the loyalty of the church to its historic views on these subjects. In the year 1903 a movement for the revision of the Confession of Faith came to a successful close. This year was also noteworthy for the beginnings of the movement for union with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

This union was brought about in 1906 (although a minority refused to accept it and retained the old name and constitution), and was the third effected on the basis of the Standards, the others being the reunions of 1758 and 1869. In 1906 a Book of Common Worship was prepared and approved by the General Assembly for voluntary use. In 1907

the Council of the Reformed Churches in the United States holding the Presbyterian system was organized, bringing into cooperative relations seven of the churches of the Presbyterian family in the country.

The Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church united with this denomination in 1920. This union brought an accession of 5 synods with 10 presbyteries into the church. In general, these synods preserve their identity by retention of the word "Welsh" as part of their name.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has been identified with every movement for interdenominational fellowship and church union. It was an important factor in 1905 and 1908 in the preliminary arrangements for, and the organization of, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; and has been an active participant in the World Conferences on Faith and Order held at Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1927 and at Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1937; and the World Conferences on Life and Work held at Stockholm, Sweden, in 1925 and at Oxford, England, in 1937. It is now engaged in cooperation with Christian bodies all over the earth in organizing a World Council of Churches...

[p. 1402] The standards of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America are twofold—the standards of doctrine and the standards of government, discipline, and worship. These last are contained in documents known as the "Form of Government," the "Book of Discipline," and the "Directory for Worship," and taken together form the constitution of the church. They were first adopted in 1788, and amendments and additions have been made from time to time, the Book of Discipline being entirely reconstructed in 1884 and extensively revised and rearranged in 1934.

Doctrine. The standards of doctrine of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America are the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. These were first adopted in 1729. In 1788 certain amendments to the Confession and Larger Catechism were approved by the General Synod, giving expression to the American doctrine of the independence of the church and of religious opinion from control by the state. In 1886 the clause forbidding marriage with a deceased wife's sister was stricken out, and in 1903 certain alterations were again made, and there were added two chapters, "Of the Holy Spirit," and "Of the Love of God and Missions." A declaratory statement was also adopted setting forth the universality of the gospel offer of salvation, declaring that sinners are condemned only on the ground of their sin, and affirming that all persons dying in infancy are elect and therefore saved. As a whole these standards are distinctly Calvinistic. They emphasize the sovereignty of God in Christ in the salvation of the individual; affirm that each believer's salvation is a part of the eternal divine plan; that salvation is not a reward for faith, but that both faith and salvation are gifts of God; that man is utterly unable to save himself; that regeneration is an act of God and of God alone; and that God enables those whom He regenerates to attain to their eternal salvation.

Discipline is defined in the Book of Discipline as "The exercise of that authority, and the application of that system of laws, which the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed in His church." In practice it is controlled by a policy of guidance and regulation, rather than one of restriction and punishment. Christian liberty is regarded as consistent with the wise administration of Christian law. The Directory of Worship makes no restriction as to place or form. The church insists upon the supreme importance of the spiritual element, and leaves both ministers and people at full liberty to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences. The sacraments are administered by ministers only, and ordinarily only ministers and licentiates are authorized to teach officially. A book of common worship was approved by the General Assembly in 1906 for optional use by pastors and congregations, and was revised in 1931.

Organization. The ecclesiastical organization of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is set forth in the Form of Government. It has its two principal factors the ministers as representatives of Christ and the ruling elders as representatives of the people; and these two classes constitute the four judicatories which form the administrative system. These are the session, which governs the congregation; the presbytery, which governs a number of congregations within a limited geographic district; the synod, which governs the congregations within a larger geographic district; and the General Assembly, which is the supreme judicatory...

[b. The Former United Presbyterian Church in North America] [p. 1434] *History*. The most successful attempt at union of the different Presbyterian bodies in the United States which represent the Covenanter and Secession movements in Scotland was that accomplished in 1858, when the greater part of the Associate Synod (Secession) and of the Associate Reformed Synod (Secession and Covenanter) were brought together in the United Presbyterian Church of North America, in the city of Pittsburgh. Whatever was distinctive in the views and usages of the two branches of the church, together with their colleges, seminaries, missionary enterprises, traditions, and records, became the inheritance of the United Church.

Doctrine. The United Presbyterian Church accepts the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms as doctrinal standards, amending somewhat the chapters on the power of civil magistrates. In addition, by constitutional action consummated June 2, 1925, it adopted a Confessional Statement made up of 44 articles. This statement contains the substance of the Westminster symbols, together with certain present-day convictions of the United Presbyterian Church. It takes the place of the Judicial Testimony of 1858, and wherever it deviates from the Westminster Standards its declarations prevail. The most noteworthy modifications of the older creedal positions held by the church are the restriction of divorce to marriage unfaithfulness (willful desertion no longer being recognized as a valid cause for divorce), the unequivocal avowal of universal infant salvation, the extension of sacramental privileges to all who have professed their faith in Christ and are leading a Christian life, the withdrawal of any protest against secret oathbound societies, and the abandonment of the exclusive use of the Psalms in worship. The church maintains its insistence on the plenary, verbal inspiration of Scripture as the rule of faith and practice and takes a strongly conservative stand on all the theological issues of the day. Stress is placed on the old pillar doctrines of grace, wherein are affirmed the sufficiency and fullness of the provision God has made for the need of a fallen race, through the atoning work of Jesus Christ, the eternal and only begotten Son, and the renewing and sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. Echoing its associate forefathers in Scotland, the United Presbyterian Church teaches that the Gospel contains a free, unlimited offer of salvation to all sinners alike. With regard to the social order, it is definitely asserted in the Confessional Statement that a primary duty of the church is to

give positive witness that the Christian principles of justice and love should have full expression in all relationships whatsoever—personal, industrial, business, civic, national, and international.

Organization. In organization and government the church is in accord with other Presbyterian bodies, having the same courts—session, presbytery, synod, and general assembly.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. was formed in 1958 by the union of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the United Presbyterian Church of North America. Membership (1959), 3,145,733 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257). For the action taken in 1961 by the General Assembly toward initiating another merger, see Nos. 664, 665.]

1242. Prophecy, Basis of Christian Interpretation of History

SOURCE: Paul Tillich, *The Interpretation of History*, p. 264. Copyright 1936 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

Christian interpretation of history is possible only on the basis of prophecy, implying consequently a sacramental element—Christ, the center of history, *has come*—and a prophetic element—Christ, the end of history, *is coming*. So the Christian interpretation of history stands between "already" and "not yet"; the explanation of this "intermediate situation" is the main problem of Christian theology today.

1243. Prophecy, Fulfilled in New World Discovery, Says Columbus SOURCE: Christopher Columbus, *Libro de las Profecias*, ed. by Cesare de Lollis, pp. 80, 82, in *Scritti*

di Cristoforo Colombo, Vol. 2 (Roma: Auspice il Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, 1894).

[p. 80] Our Lord purposed to make an evident miracle in this voyage to the Indies, in order to comfort me and others in the other matter of the Holy House [his hoped-for expedition to take Jerusalem from the Moslems]...

With all my navigating since the new age, and the conversations that I might have had with so many people, in so many lands, and of so many sects, ... I hold on only to the Holy and Sacred Scripture, and to some prophetic authority of certain holy persons, who through divine revelation said something about this...

[p. 82] I said already that for the execution of the enterprise to the Indies, I profited from neither reason, nor mathematics, nor world maps; simply what Isaiah said was fulfilled.

1244. Prophecy—Fulfillment in History, Including Christian Era SOURCE: Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, secs. 28, 32, 33, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 5, p. 210.

28. The golden head of the image and the lioness denoted the Babylonians; the shoulders and arms of silver, and the bear, represented the Persians and Medes; the belly and thighs of brass, and the leopard, meant the Greeks, who held the sovereignty from Alexander's time; the legs of iron, and the beast dreadful and terrible, expressed the Romans, who hold the sovereignty at present; the toes of the feet which were part clay and part iron, and the ten horns, were emblems of the kingdoms that are to rise; the other little horn that grows up among them meant the Antichrist in their midst; the stone that smites the earth and brings judgment upon the world was Christ...

32. Speak with me, O blessed Daniel. Give me full assurance, I beseech thee. Thou dost prophesy concerning the lioness in Babylon; for thou wast a captive there. Thou hast unfolded the future regarding the bear; for thou wast still in the world, and didst see the things come to pass. Then thou speakest to me of the leopard; and whence canst thou know this, for thou art already gone to thy rest? Who instructed thee to announce these

things, but He who formed thee in (from) thy mother's womb? That is God, thou sayest. Thou hast spoken indeed, and that not falsely. The leopard has arisen; the he-goat is come; he hath smitten the ram; he hath broken his horns in pieces; he hath stamped upon him with his feet. He has been exalted by his fall; (the) four horns have come up from under that one. Rejoice, blessed Daniel thou hast not been in error: all these things have come to pass.

33. After this again thou hast told me of the beast dreadful and terrible. "It had iron teeth and claws of brass: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it." Already the iron rules; already it subdues and breaks all in pieces; already it brings all the unwilling into subjection; already we see these things ourselves. Now we glorify God, being instructed by thee.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This historical view of the four empires of Dan. 2 and 7 is characteristic of the modern historicist view of prophecy (see Nos. 1257, 1258).]

1245. Prophecy, Has Never Ceased Altogether

SOURCE: C. von Orelli, "Prophecy, Prophets," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* (1934 ed.), Vol. 4, p. 2464. Copyright 1939 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. Used by permission.

But this gift ceased more and more, as the Christian church more and more developed on the historical basis of revelation as completed in Christ. Esp. in spiritually aroused eras in the history of the church, prophecy again puts in its appearance. It has never ceased altogether, but on account of its frequent misuse the gift has become discredited. Jesus Himself warned against false prophets, and during the apostolic times it was often found necessary to urge the importance of trying spirits (1 Jn 4 1; 1 Cor 12 10; 14 29).

1246. Prophecy—John Wesley Sees "Considerable" Part as About to Be Fulfilled

SOURCE: John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament* (reprint; London: The Epworth Press, 1952), p. 934, comment on Rev. 1:3.

3. Happy is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy—Some have miserably handled book [of Revelation]. Hence others are afraid to touch it; and, while they desire to know all things else, reject only the knowledge of those which God hath shown. They inquire after anything rather than this; as if it were written, 'Happy is he that doth *not* read this prophecy.' Nay, but *happy is he that readeth, and they that hear, and keep the words thereof*—Especially at this time, when so considerable a part of them is on the point of being fulfilled.

1247. Prophecy, Principles of Interpretation—Conditional and Literal Elements Differentiated

SOURCE: C. von Orelli, "Prophecy and the Prophetic Office," *The New Schaff—Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 9, p. 277. Copyrigth 1911 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

When God lets a prophetic word "fall to the ground" (I Sam. iii. 19), this proves its falsity (Deut. xviii. 21–22). The fulfilment differs, however, according to the character and purpose of the prophecy. Where the emphasis is laid upon the external form and a near term is indicated for a special judgment, whether of an individual or a people, it necessarily follows that the fulfilment must be literal, if the sayings are genuine... But these sayings do not always contain an unalterable judgment of God; indeed, as a rule, the menacing prophecy is intended to produce a change of the people's heart; if this purpose was attained, God's attitude was modified and his sentence was no longer to be executed (as in Jonah's experience with Nineveh, cf. Jonah iv. 2; Jer. xxvi. 18–19).

1248. Prophecy, Principles of Interpretation—Conditional and Unconditional Elements

SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1945), pp. 31, 32. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission.

[p. 31] One of the arguments advanced most insistently in support of the complete intelligibility and literal fulfilment of prophecy is the claim that unconditional promises must be literally fulfilled. In making this claim Dispensationalists have the Abrahamic covenant especially in view. They insist that this covenant was "unconditional"; and they set it as such in sharp contrast and even direct antithesis to the Mosaic law. The covenant was unconditional [p. 32] and must be fulfilled to the letter. The law was conditioned by the words, "if ye will obey my voice" (Ex. xix. 5); this condition was broken immediately and repeatedly; consequently the promise attached to the keeping of this law need not be fulfilled. It is largely on this basis that it is claimed that Israel must return to the land of Canaan and possess the whole of it under the unconditional Abrahamic covenant, which we are told she has never vet done. The superior blessedness of this dispensation of promise, as viewed by Dispensationalists, is indicated by Scofield's words: "The Dispensation of Promise ended when Israel rashly accepted the law (Ex. xix. 8)." The word "rashly" is startlingly significant. It implies either that Israel without due consideration forsook a more favorable for a less favorable status, or that, in accepting the more favorable one, the people did not weigh sufficiently the condition attached to it, did not realize their utter inability to perform it.

This question of the relation of man's obedience to the fulfillment of God's covenant is a matter of great importance...

It is to be observed that a condition may be involved in a command or promise without its being specifically stated. This is illustrated by the career of Jonah. Jonah was commanded to preach judgment, unconditioned, unqualified: "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown." Yet Jonah later declares, in explanation and extenuation of his disgraceful conduct, that he had assumed from the very first that God would spare the city if the people repented (even at the cost of making Jonah appear to be a false prophet); and the outcome proved the surmise to be correct. The unstated condition was presupposed in the very character of God as a God of mercy and compassion (iv. 2). The judgment on Eli's house (1 Sam. ii. 30) is a very striking illustration of this principle, which is carefully stated in Jer. xviii. 1–10.

1249. Prophecy, Principles of Interpretation—Fulfillment Brings Understanding

SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1945), pp. 25–28, 30. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission.

[p. 25] This [insistence on the principle of literal interpretation] raises several questions, most important of which are: the intelligibility of prophecy, the conditional element in prophecy, the relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament, Futurism, and the basic distinction between Israel and the Church.

5

⁵Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

I. The Intelligibility of Prophecy

The claim that prophecy is to be understood literally raises the question of the intelligibility of prophecy, and bears directly on the problem of the relationship of prophecy to history. If prophecy is to be taken literally, *i.e.*, according to the letter, it would be natural to conclude that its literal meaning must be clear and obvious.

- a. The usual view on this subject has been that prophecy is not intended to be fully understood before its fulfillment, that it is only when God "establishes the word of his servant and fulfils the counsel of his messengers," that the meaning and import of their words becomes fully manifest. The reason for this is to be found, as Patrick Fairbairn has so admirably pointed out, in the fact that these disclosures of things to come are made known to men by One who has made man and knows his human frailty and how much knowledge of the future is for his good. Prophecy, in the words of Sir Isaac Newton, is not given to make men prophets, but as a witness to God [p. 26] when it is fulfilled. Prophecy is a wonderful combination of the clear and the obscure. Enough of God's purpose is revealed to act powerfully upon the heart and conscience of those to whom the heavenly message is sent, but not enough to make fatalists of them, to paralyze human effort, or to coerce the human will: enough to prove the message to have been a true word from Him to whom alone the unknown future is fully known, but not enough to enable man to foresee with certainty when and how that purpose is to be realized.
- b. It is the view of Dispensationalists that prophecy is intended to be plain and fully intelligible before its fulfillment. Thus Darby tells us: "I do not admit history to be, in any sense, necessary to the understanding of prophecy." He even went so far as to say, "I do not want history to tell me Nineveh of Babylon is ruined or Jerusalem in the hands of the Gentiles." This is a remarkable statement. The usual way of putting it would be this: "Since the prophets definitely foretell that Nineveh and Babylon will be ruined and Jerusalem fall into the hands of the Gentiles, I know that this is sure to take place. That it has already taken place and when and how it took place, is a matter of historical fact, which history, both sacred and profane, must make clear to me." It is to be noted, therefore, that Darby's statements are the result of the principle of literalism carried to the extreme in the interpretation of prophecy. This view received almost classic expression in the words of Brookes:

"The language in which prophecy is written is as simple and easy to understand as any other part of the Scriptures, and all that is needed in reading it is a submissive disposition, ready to take God at His word without any theory of our own to establish."

This view has been more concisely stated in the words, "Prophecy is pre-written history." If prophecy is written as simply and plainly as history, it should be quite as intelligible as history; and we should have no more difficulty in understanding the prophecies of Isaiah than the history recorded in the Books of the Kings. This view may [p. 27] seem to do great honor to the Bible by insisting that its interpretation is quite independent of the events of history. But it fails to do justice to the fact that God is quite as much the God of history as He is the God of prophecy, and that it is the historical fulfillment of a prophecy which proves that it came from God. This literal view of prophecy also makes its appeal to those who wish to exchange faith for sight, who wish to be able to read the future with clearness and to set up precise prophetical programs regarding things to come, programs which no one can conclusively disprove until the events of history have tested them. The refutation of this conception of the complete intelligibility of prophecy is to be found in the simple and inescapable fact, that it cannot be made to square with the phenomena of

prophecy as they lie before us in Scripture, and in the no less obvious fact that those who insist most emphatically that prophecy is fully intelligible differ among themselves greatly at times as to its meaning. The fallacy in this claim will be clear when due weight is given to the following considerations.

(1) The use of figurative language—symbols, parables, etc.—is far more characteristic of prophecy than of historical narration. Balaam foretold the coming of a star out of Jacob. Daniel spoke of four kings or kingdoms under the figure of an image and also as four wild beasts. Ezekiel has a parable of two great eagles, of a cedar, and of a vine. These are but a few among many examples. Some of these prophecies are interpreted more or less fully in their context, which shows that they are obscure. But some are not interpreted; and those which are explained are often not fully explained...

[p. 28] It is to be remembered that the use of parabolic language serves both to reveal and conceal truth. Nathan's parable of the Ewe Lamb served and was expressly designed to serve the purpose of getting David to condemn himself, without realizing he was doing so. "The man that hath done this shall surely die" was David's verdict. "Thou art the man" was Nathan's utterly unexpected and crushing reply. Jeremiah's vision of the Seething Pot (i. 13) was misinterpreted or deliberately parodied by the leaders of the Jews, and used to support their terrible delusion that Jerusalem was impregnable, an iron pot that could not be broken into (Ezek. xi. 4), which made it necessary for Ezekiel to explain the true meaning of the symbol in words that burn and sear (chap. xxiv). The predictions that Zedekiah should "die in peace" (Jer. xxxiv. 5) and that he should not "see" the land of Babylon (Ezek. xii. 13) require for their proper understanding the brief yet terrible account given in 2 Kgs. xxv. 6f., or they might be completely misunderstood. The interpretation of prophecy is not simple and easy; and it is a mistake to declare that it is.

(2) Not only is the language of prophecy often figurative and parabolic, it also differs from history in its frequent lack of precision and definiteness... "In that day" is one of the most frequently occurring specifications of time in the case of long-range prediction... The phrase is intentionally indefinite...

The same principle applies to prophecies which might be regarded as [p. 30] (3) perfectly simple and plain. Jacob in blessing his sons, declared regarding Simeon and Levi, "I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel." (Gen. xlix. 7.) This is the only one of the blessings which reads like a curse. It is the only one which unites two of Jacob's sons in a common destiny. The reason for this is plain. Jacob expressly alludes to their grievous sin in the matter of Shechem and refers to it as their joint act. How was this prediction fulfilled? In the case of Levi, it was fulfilled in terms of blessing. Because of the obedience of this tribe, when Israel sinned in the matter of the golden calf (Deut. xxxiii. 9, cf. Ex. xxxii. 26f.), Levi was dedicated to the service of the Lord and His sanctuary. Levi received cities in all the tribes and was supported by tithes from all of them. This was a distinction and a glory. Levi was actually divided and scattered. The prophecy was literally fulfilled. But the curse was changed into a blessing, the disgrace became an honor. In the case of Simeon, it was quite different. Simeon decreased greatly in numbers during the forty years of wandering. Simeon, alone of all the tribes, was allotted territory within the bounds of another tribe, Judah. Some members of the tribe seem to have wandered off and joined themselves to the Northern Tribes. Others of them wandered away to the South. Simeon practically disappears from Israel's history. Moses

does not even mention Simeon in his Blessing of the tribes. In Simeon's case the curse remained a curse. Yet who in reading the words of Jacob regarding these two sons could have discovered in its seemingly plain and simple language the vast difference in the import of this prediction for the descendants of these two bloody-handed sons of the patriarch! The prophecy was wonderfully fulfilled; we may even say it was literally fulfilled. But only a study of history enables us to interpret it aright.

1250. Prophecy—Relation to Prophet's Character

SOURCE: C. von Orelli, "Prophecy and the Prophetic Office," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 9, pp. 276, 277. Copyright 1911 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 276] Which side of prophecy should be most prominent depended upon changes in the external aspect of affairs, but also upon the moral level of the people; to a self-righteous people, proud of their good fortune, a judgment must be announced, by means of which God wills to prepare the way for his rule. This phase of prophecy is predominant from Solomon to the exile.: For a chastened and humbled people, however, the consolatory promises of the blessed fruition of God's plans were to be pre- [p. 277] sented. If, therefore, the direction taken by the prophetic sayings depended upon the ethnical needs of each generation, its spiritual height was often conditioned thereby. Even though the prophecies are not a product of the spirit of the age, God's spirit speaks therein first to the community of the present... The personal quality of the individual prophet also influences his prophecy, for his relation to the divine inspirations is not that of a clear mirror from which the divine pictures are reflected. The liveliness and tendency of his imagination, the conceptions with which he was already familiar through his life and calling, appear in his writings.

1251. Prophecy—School of Interpretation Differentiated

SOURCE: Albertus Pieters, *Studies in the Revelation of St. John* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1950), p. 53. Copyright 1943 by Albertus Pieters. Used by permission.

The Preterist says that almost everything in the book of Revelation was fulfilled long ago, the Historicist, that it has been fulfilling all the time, and some of the things foretold are happening in our own day, the Futurist that nothing of that which is prophesied from the beginning of chapter four on has yet taken place, nor can take place until just before the end.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The preterits would be place the fulfillment of practically all, if not all, of Daniel's prophecies in the past, assigning the book most probably to the time of Antiochus IV in the 2d century B.C.]

1252. Prophecy —Schools of Interpretation—Futurism and the Book of Revelation

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 139–141. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 139] The futurist generally believes that all of the visions from Revelation 4:1 to the end of the book are yet to be fulfilled in the period immediately preceding and following the second advent of Christ. The reason for the view is [p. 140] found in the comparison of Revelation 1:1, 19, and 4:1. Revelation 1:1 states that the book as a whole is concerned with "the things which must shortly come to pass," and which are thus identified as belonging to the future as far as the seer is concerned. Revelation 1:19 contains a threefold or perhaps a twofold command:

Write therefore the things which thou sawest, and the things which are, and the things which shall come to pass hereafter;

or, as it is sometimes rendered:

... the things which thou sawest, both the things which are, and the things which shall come to pass hereafter.

In either case, the visions are divided into two general sections: one, the things that fall within the actual lifetime of the seer, the first century, and second, the things which were future to his period.

The introduction to the fourth chapter seemingly identifies the future visions as beginning at that point, for the heavenly voice summoning the seer said:

Come up hither, and I will show thee the things which must come to pass hereafter...

Many futurists hold that the period described by this part of Revelation begins with the removal of the church from the world as described in I Corinthians 15:52–54 and in I Thessalonians 4:13–18. Some, like Seiss, argue that the summons to the seer in Revelation 4:1, 2 is the counterpart to the removal of the church. Newell suggests that the more literal translation, "After these things," would give a clearer understanding of the meaning of the passage, since it would indicate that the events of 4:1 and of the text following came *after* the church age mentioned in 1:9–3:22...

[p. 141] Many if not most futurists interpret Revelation 1:9–3:22 as the historicists do the rest of the book. For the futurists the letters to the churches represent successive periods of church history.

1253. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Futurism, Characteristics of

SOURCE: Albertus Pieters, *Studies in the Revelation of St. John* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1950), pp. 53–57. Copyright 1943 by Albertus Pieters. Used by permission.

[p. 53] The Futurist [says] that nothing of that which is prophesied from the beginning of [Revelation] chapter four on has yet taken place, nor can take place until just before the end.

Futurists tend to be literalists. I do not mean that they do not see any of the symbolic character of the book, but they stick as closely as they can do to the literal meaning. Hence, when they read in the eleventh chapter that the temple is measured, they find here a reason for believing that the actual temple in Jerusalem will be rebuilt; just as some of the Preterists find in the same chapter evidence that when it was written the temple had not yet been destroyed. When the Futurists read in the same chapter of the two witnesses, they do not ask what these symbolize, but who they are, and they come to the conclusion, generally, that these are Enoch and Elijah, who have not yet suffered death. They take the days, also, literally, whence they find that the Beast will have power for three and a half calendar years...

[p. 54] A distinguishing mark of the Futurists is that they all believe in the coming of a personal Antichrist...

Most Futurists are pre-millenarians, or, as I prefer to say, millenarians, that is, they believe that after the Lord Jesus Christ is revealed from heaven, at His Second Advent, the General Judgment will not take place at once, but that there will be a resurrection of the righteous, and after that a blessed reign of Christ on earth [see No. 1073n] for 1,000 years, (or 360,000 years, according to some). Dr. Abraham Kuyper is an outstanding example of a Futurist who is not a millenarian. Historicists are divided on this point. Elliott, Lord, Guinness, and others, are millenarians; Barnes and Carroll are not.

Just as there are two groups of Preterists, a Left Wing and a Right Wing, so there are two sorts of Futurists. The extreme Futurists are the Darbyite dispensationalists, and a slight knowledge of their system is necessary to understand and appreciate their interpretation of the Revelation. This is the system that is set forth in the notes to the "Scofield Bible," and is taught in most of the "Bible Schools" and [p. 55] "Undenominational Churches" of the United States. It originated with a learned and godly man named John N. Darby, the founder of the group known as Plymouth Brethren.

The most important and distinctive doctrine of the dispensationalists is their view of the kingdom of heaven and the Christian church. They believe that Jesus came to establish a visible rule on this earth, and that this is what John the Baptist referred to when he preached that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. The Jews, however, not being willing to accept the kingdom on Christ's terms, the offer was withdrawn and the establishment of the kingdom was postponed until the Second Advent. During the interim, Christ established his church, which is not in any sense a fulfilment of the Old Testament promises, but something new, unknown to the prophets, constituting no part of the continuous development of Israel. It is a "parenthesis in history." It will come to an end in the "Rapture," whereby is meant the sudden, miraculous removal of all true believers to meet Christ in the air. This will be the first stage of the Second Advent. It will be visible to the believers but not to the world at large. The public, visible stage of the Second Advent will be seven years later and is called "The Revelation." This period of seven years, they hold, corresponds to the seventieth week of the prophecy in the ninth chapter of Daniel. The sixty-nine weeks ran out at the first coming of Christ, but with the rejection of Christ by the Jews and the postponement of the kingdom, prophetic time ceased to run. As Dr. Ironside puts it: "The prophetic clock stopped at Calvary. Not one tick has been heard since." ("The Mysteries of God," p. 54.)

[p. 56] During the said seven years the Antichrist will rule. The Jews being then restored to Palestine, he will make a covenant with them for the restoration of their worship, for seven years. The temple will be rebuilt at Jerusalem, the Ten Tribes regathered, and the sacrificial system reinstituted. In the meantime, although all true believers were taken from the earth at the "Rapture," that startling event will result in many real conversions of those left behind. These believers in Christ will eventually be saved, but they form no part of the "church," the body of Christ, properly speaking. They are called, in the literature of this group, the "tribulation saints," because they pass through the tribulation caused by the bad faith of the Antichrist, who will break his covenant with the Jews at the end of three and a half years, and will demand to be worshiped. The refusal of the true Christians and of faithful Jews, although not Christians, will bring upon them this terrible period of persecution. At the end of it, when they are almost overwhelmed, will occur the public manifestation of Christ, the second stage of the Second Advent. He will then destroy the Antichrist and establish his visible earthly kingdom, which will continue for a thousand years...

[p. 57] There are, however, other Futurists, who do not accept dispensationalism, or accept it only with important modifications. Among these is Dr. Henry Frost, who, in his "The Second Coming of Christ," rejects the distinction between the "Rapture" and the "Revelation," believing that the church passes through the tribulation.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Pieters names two other nondispensationalist Futurists, Theodor Zahn (*Die Offenbarung des Johannis* ["The Revelation of John"], 1924), and Abraham Kuyper [*The Revelation*]

of St. John, 1935]. Another who might be mentioned is George Eldon Ladd (*Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, 1952, *The Blessed Hope*, 1956, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, 1959).]

1254. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Futurism, Defined

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 312, 313, 334, 335. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 312] Not one of the supporters of this [Futurist] approach would claim, that all the contents of the book [of Revelation] were future from the standpoint of the writer of the book. Thiessen himself indicates chap. 4:1 as the place where the Futurist designation becomes appropriate. This is, of course, a minor matter to which every one except a Preterist [p. 313] can agree. The question to which we need an answer is, from whose standpoint the events from chap. 4:1 onward must be conceived to lie still in the future. It would be absurd to accuse the holders of the Futurist view of claiming a radical and insuperable futurity for the events which the book pictures. But if this is not done, then the question arises, how long the designation will be usable. It can not be claimed that the events are future from the standpoint of the holders of the view; there must come a time when they come to pass; and from then onward even the holders of the view will find the designation of their approach to the book no longer usable.

What is intended by the designation [Futurism] is, of course, that the bulk of the pictures of the book refers to the endtime of the rapture of the saints, the antichristian setup of world-dominion, the great tribulation, the public appearance of the Son of Man, and the establishment of the millennial reign, together with the events which will form the transition from that reign to eternity. The continental designation of this view as 'endgeschichtich' is far preferable for conveying this meaning...

[p. 334] The modern [Futurist] Premillenarians ... refer the contents of chapter 4 to 19 [of Revelation] to the endtime and skip the period of time which is covered in what we know as the history of the Christian Church. And when the light of John's prophecy begins to disclose for us the momentous events of the endtime, the rapture of the Church is at hand and is an early number on the program, if it has not already occurred. A church historical explanation of the book of Revelation is for these men and women simply out of the question. It happens, that we also find little or no trace of such an understanding of the Apocalypse among the ancient Premillenar- [p. 335] ians; but in their case it was largely due to the fact that their was as yet very little of church history and that they expected the near return of the Lord to leave very little room for its expansion.

1255. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Futurism Different From Early Church Premillennialism

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga. *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 313–315. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 313] It makes no sense ... to claim the early Premillenarians for the Futuristic Approach. They most certainly did not think that the events recorded in the Apocalypse were for the most part some two thousand years away from themselves but were definitely of the conviction, that those events were already in the making in their own days. It is quite plain, that till actual events made it impossible to hold on to the view any longer they saw the antichristian world-power in the Roman imperial government. When that government adopted the Christian religion as the official religion of the Empire, the days of that ancient view were numbered. Lactantius, who gave an exposition of that view to Constantine the Great, did so at the last possible moment. Really he was already a few minutes too late. It is as an antiquated view, that it lives on under the Preterist name.

We should be clear on what this means for the true nature of the view of the ancient Futurists. They were premillenarian, as [p. 314] the modern Futurists are; but their futurism did not involve the interpolation of some long church-period between the first advent of Christ and His return; it was simply due to the fact that in their days so little history had as yet come to pass in fulfilment of the Apocalypse. They simply were adherents of a continuous-historical approach. Their approach was all right; was, in fact, the only approach which would naturally suggest itself to a reader of the Apocalypse; especially if he came, as they did, from a reading of the most closely related other apocalyptic writing in the Bible, the book of Daniel. It is safe to say, that all other explanations of the Apocalypse have arisen from the fact that explanations made on the basis of the continuous-historical approach turned out to be unsuccessful.

In their assumption that the events revealed in the pictures of the Apocalypse were in the making, had begun to come about in their own days, the ancient Premillenarians were perfectly correct. The only serious mistake they made was merely, that they expected the events to come to pass in a relatively short time. This expectation they share with the present-day Futurists. But this superficial similarity gives no present-day Futurist a right to claim those ancient Futurists for his modern views. Forwhat separates them is precisely the intervening lapse of time. Now to hold that the bulk of events foretold in the book will come about in a relatively short time, is a radically different procedure, even when that time is held to be imminent. This procedure is marred by some very serious faults, which can on no account be tolerated. They are the implicit denial of the continuity of historical developments, the extraction of the eschatological quality from the course of Christian history so far, and its concentration into a final period of history which thereby is made quite unintelligible for us who are not yet living in it. Of such a disruptive conception of history those ancient fathers were at all events not guilty.

I view the Futurist view as positively harmful as well as fundamentally unsound. On the surface the old view is as little identical with the new as in its roots. The old view expected the anti- [p. 315] christian development from the pagan Roman Empire, and this is something which the new view can not do. It is therefore forced to substitute a revived pagan Roman Empire [see editors' note], and in this it may very well be essentially correct. But its futurism forbids its recognition of the historical continuity between the two empires, and here lies the danger. It closes the eyes of those whom it teaches and leads for the facts and events which are at present transpiring in the sight of everybody, even while Earnest and Frank are illustrating over the radio the force with which those events are impressing themselves upon those students of the Bible who otherwise play fast and loose with its authority but who scrutinize its eschatological aspects.

The likely effects of the Futurist understanding of the Apocalypse therefore tend to be the very opposite of what its advocates seek. They seek to inculcate in people a sense of the significance and the imminence of Christ's return. But they fail to take proper account of the fact that all the events which intervene between His first and His second coming are preparatory for the latter; that in a sense He is coming all the while in those events, and that His visible appearing is in a sense merely the culmination of the process. Thus their presentation of the matter becomes distorted and tends to confuse their disciples as to the real actual and concrete forms which the precursory signs are assuming. The idea of a secret rapture prior to Christ's public manifestation may be evaluated as being compensatory in as far as it keeps expectancy on tiptoe. But in case its underlying assumption that the believers shall not pass through the great tribulation should prove to be baseless, it merely helps, wherever it is found, to close the eyes of the saints for the very tribulation through which they are passing and to expect instead a future tribulation of such inconceivable dimensions that it can be called eschatological in contrast with the present.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In recent years among futurists there is not the insistence that there was formerly on a literally revived Roman empire.]

1256. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Futurism, Rise of SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 37–40. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 37] Out of this [early 19th-century] revival of interest in prophetic truth came two new interpretations: futurism and "Darbyism." ... Essential to [origin futurism] is the teaching that the Antichrist will be a satanically inspired world-ruler at the end of the age who would inflict severe persecution upon the Church during the Great Tribulation. At the end of the Tribulation, Christ would return to deliver the Church, punish Antichrist, raise the righteous dead, and establish His millennial kingdom. Darbyism modified this outline of truth by teaching a coming of Christ to rapture the Church before the Tribulation and before His coming in glory to establish the millennial kingdom.

The rediscovery of futurism [see editors' note below] is associated with the names of S. R. Maitland, James Todd, and William Burgh. Before we turn to these men, we should note that a futurist interpretation of prophecy had earlier been recovered within the Roman Catholic Church. It will probably come as a shock to many modern futurists to be told that the first scholar in relatively modern times who returned to the patristic futuristic interpretation was a Spanish Jesuit named Ribera. In 1950, Ribera published a commentary on the Revelation as a counter-interpretation to the prevailing view among Protestants which identified the Papacy with the Antichrist. Ribera applied all of Revelation but the earliest chapters to the end time rather than to the history of the Church. Antichrist would be a single evil person who would be received by the Jews and would [p. 38] rebuild Jerusalem, abolish Christianity, deny Christ, persecute the Church and rule the world for three and a half years. On one subject, Ribera was not a futurist: he followed the Augustinian interpretation of the millennium in making the entire period between the cross and Antichrist. He differed from Augustine in making the "first resurrection" to refer to the heavenly life of the martyrs when they would reign in heaven with Christ throughout the millennium, i.e., the church age. A number of Catholic scholars espoused this futuristic interpretation of Antichrist, among them Bellarmine, the most notable of the Jesuit controversialists and the greatest adversary of the Protestant churches.

This futurist interpretation with its personal Antichrist and three and a half year period of tribulation did not take root in the Protestant church until the early nineteenth century...

[p. 39] These early futurists followed a pattern of prophetic events similar to that found in the early fathers, with the necessary exception that Rome was not the final kingdom. In fact they appeal to the fathers against the popular historical interpretation for support of their basic view. A pretribulation rapture is utterly unknown by these men and while Israel is to be restored, the Gospel which Israel will preach in the millennium is the Gospel of grace, and [p. 40] those who are saved are included in the Church. The Tribulation concerns both Israel and the Church; in fact, it will be the time of testing an apostate Christianity.

[EDITORS' NOTE: "Rediscovery" implies too much similarity. For the differences between the futurist view and that of the early church, see No. 1255.]

1257. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Historical (Historicist) Interpretation

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 137, 138. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 137] The historicist view, sometimes called the continuous-historical view, contends that Revelation is a symbolic presentation of the entire course of the history of the church from the close of the first century to the end of time. The argument for the view is founded on the fact that two termini are mentioned: the day in which John the seer lived, and the ultimate day of God's victory and the establishment of the Holy City. No point between them can be identified with certainty as making a break in the sequence; therefore the process must be continuous.

[p. 138] By this interpretation the various series of the churches, the seals, the trumpets, and the bowls are made to particular events in the history of the world that are related to the history of the church...

There have ... been many champions of this theory in the ranks of evangelical Christianity from the Reformation down to modern times. Their interpretation has been sufficiently literal to warrant taking the chronology of Revelation seriously. In the various judgments and woes they have seen the rise and fall of nations and the persecutions and warfare of the church. They have generally identified the beast with Rome, political and ecclesiastical, and the harlot Babylon with the apostate church.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Tenney is writing only of Revelation, but the historicist treats the book of Daniel and other prophecies in the same fashion, and seeks fulfillment throughout history of the predictions without confining them, like the preterist, to the past or, like the futurist, to the last times (see No. 1251).]

1258. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Historical (Historicist) Method of the Protestant Reformers

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 32–34. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 32] The Reformers took over this type of historical interpretation of prophetic truth and found in the Antichrist a prophecy of the Papacy. Luther at first felt that Revelation was defective in everything which could be called apostolic or prophetic and was offended by the visions and symbols of the book; but he came to feel that the prophecy was an outline of the whole course of church history and that the Papacy was predicted both in chapters 11 and 12 and in the second beast of chapter 13. The number 666 period of papal domination.

This "historical" type of interpretation with its application Antichrist to papal Rome so dominated Protestant study of prophetic truth for three centuries that it has frequently been called "the Protestant" interpretation. Some historical interpreters were premillennialists. They found the history of the Church symbolized in the seals, vials, and trumpets, with the second coming of Christ in chapter 19. After the return of Christ, there would be a millennial reign before the final consummation. We would emphasize that there have been many students of the Word who have been thorough-going premillennialists who shared very little of the outline of prophetic truth which today is called premillen[n]ialism. Such were Joseph Mede, Isaac Newton, William Whiston, J. A. Bengel and Henry Alford. These men, and many others, taught the premillennial return of Christ, but they did not believe in a personal Antichrist who would appear at the end of the age to persecute the saints during a three and a half year period of tribulation. Neither did they believe in what we [the futurists] call "the Great Tribulation." They believed that the Tribulation extended throughout the history of the Church, and the three and a half years or twelve hundred and sixty were frequently interpreted to mean twelve hundred and sixty years of church history before the end times could arrive...

[p. 33] Many of the great Christians of Reformation and post-Reformation times shared this view of prophetic truth and identified Antichrist with the Roman Papacy. This is a fact which should be well pondered by modern students who insist that a pretribulation eschatology is *essential* to an orthodox theology. Among adherents of this interpretation were the Waldenses, the Hussites, Wyclif, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Melanchthon, the Baptist theologian John Gill, the martyrs Cranmer, Tyndale, Latimer and Ridley. John Wesley, following Bengel, thought that the papal Antichrist would be overthrown in 1836 and would be succeeded not only by a millennium but by two millenniums, the first on earth and the second in heaven. Jonathan Ed- [p. 34] wards held that the fulfillment of the Revelation in the history of the Church was an unanswerable argument for the inspiration of the Scriptures. He held that the 1260 years of Revelation began in 606 A.D. and that he was therefore living in the last days.

Some of these men were premillennialists, but Edwards adopted the Whitbyan postmillennialism. However, they all shared the historical view; none of them was a futurist, looking for a short tribulation with a personal Antichrist just before the return of Christ. Therefore, the idea of a pretribulation rapture had no place in their interpretation of prophecy.

1259. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Historical (Historicist) the "Standard Protestant" Interpretation

SOURCE: Albertus Pieters, *Studies in the Revelation of St. John* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1950), pp. 43, 45, 46. Copyright 1943 by Albertus Pieters. Used by permission.

[p. 43] The interpretation that looks upon the book of Revelation as a forecast, in symbols, of the history of the Christian church, is sometimes called, not without reason, the standard Protestant interpretation. Alford says that it was the view "held by the precursors and upholders of the Reformation, by Wicliffe and his followers in England, by Luther in Germany, Bullinger in Switzerland, Bishop Bale in Ireland, by Fox the martyrologist by Brighthman, Pareus, and early Protestant expositors generally." ...

[p. 45] Interpreters of this school go into great detail, in comparing the symbols of Revelation with the course of history [see No. 1257]...

[p. 46] A variety of the Historical Interpretation is the "Recapitulationist" view. Those who hold it accept the fundamental "Historicist" principle that the book of Revelation is intended to furnish a panorama of church history, but they do not hold that the story is in continuous chronological order from beginning to end. They think that it is each of which cover[s] the entire period between the first and second advents of Christ.

1260. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Preterism SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, p. 136. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The preterist view of interpretation ... holds that Revelation is simply a sketch of the conditions of the empire in the first century, written by some Hebrew Christian who revolted against pagan tyranny. He saw the empire as a gigantic machine, the opponent of

the gospel in the social, political, and religious realms, and bent on stamping out the Christian movement. In the apocalyptic symbols of this book he voiced his protest against the whole system of evil, and his hope of ultimate victory.

The first systematic presentation of the preterist viewpoint originated in the early seventeenth century with Alcazar, a Jesuit friar, whose work was not free from controversial bias. The Reformers had identified Babylon the Roman church, and had succeeded in making the Revelation a powerful controversial weapon in their favor. In order to offset this interpretation, Alcazar attempted to show that Revelation had no application to the future, but that its prophecy could be divided into two major sections (chs. 1–12, 13–19) which dealt respectively with the church's conflict against Judaism and against paganism. Alcazar thus cleverly nullified the attacks upon the Roman church which the Reformers had made so successfully by using the language of Revelation.

Alcazar's suggestion was followed by some Protestant expositors, but the rise the modern preterist school came with the prevalence of the technique of historical criticism. Since preterism did not necessitate any element of predictive prophecy or even any conception of inspiration, it could treat the Revelation simply as a purely natural historical document, embodying the eschatological concepts of its own time.

1261. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Preterism Related to Historical Approach

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, p. 312. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

What, then, is meant by the preterist approach? As things stand, it looks as if rather vague sense as indicating that the party employing the approach so designated holds, that a rather indefinite but rather large portion of its contents refers to the past relative to the time of the writing of the book. There is nothing precise about such a designation. What makes matters worse, is the fact that also all other approaches seem to hold, that the seven churches to whom John already in existence at the time; and also the fact that at least the two Preterists mentioned by name to all appearance accepted a continuous-historical fulfilment of the visions of the book. I need not add, that all other approaches also see some portions of the Apocalypse as still awaiting fulfilment. The preterist approach is simply a modification of the continuous-historical approach.

1262. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Spiritual or Idealist View of the Revelation

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 143, 144. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 143] A fourth interpretation of the Revelation may be called the idealist or spiritualist view. The latter name has no connection with spiritualism as a cult; it means simply that the whole book is interpreted "spiritually." According to this view, the Revelation represents the eternal conflict of good and evil which persists in every age, although here it may have particular application to the period of the church. The symbols have no immediate historic connection with any definite social or political events...

Many idealists could be classed as preterists, since they hold that the imagery of the Apocalypse is taken from its immediate world, and that the prevailing conditions of Domitian's reign are reflected in the symbolic episodes that fill its pages. They refuse to assign to [p. 144] them any literal historical significance for the future, and they deny all

predictive prophecy except in the most general sense of the ultimate triumph of righteousness.

1263. Prophets, Tests of, Various

SOURCE: W. T. Davison, "Prophecy, Prophets," in James Hastings, ed., *Dictionary of the Bible* (1–vol. ed.; 1924), p. 760. Copyright 1909 by Charles Scribner's New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark Edinburgh.

But certain tests are suggested. Sometimes (*a*) a sign or wonder was wrought in attestation (Dt $13^{1,2}$), but even this was not conclusive, and the true prophets seldom relied upon this evidence. Again, (*b*) in Dt 18^{21f} . fulfilment of prediction is adduced as a test. Clearly that could not be applied at once, and it would rather be useful afterwards to students of the national history than to kings or people about to enter on a battle or an alliance. But (*c*) the people were expected to use their moral and spiritual insight and distinguish the issues set before them, as a man has to judge for himself in questions of conscience... The difficulty of this process of discrimination was often lightened (*d*) by watching the career of the prophets, as to how far their character bore out their professions, what motives actuated them—whether crooked policy, immediate expediency, or high self-denying principle—and thus in the centuries before Christ, as afterwards, one of the best criteria was, 'by their fruits ye shall know them.'

1264. Protestant—Definition and Origin of the Term

SOURCE: John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, pp. 304, 305. Copyright 1954 John Dillenberger & Claude York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. 304] The duality of protest and affirmative witness can be seen in the term *Protestant* itself. The word first had reference to the "Protestation" of the German evangelical estates in the Diet of Speyer (1529)... Here the meaning was partly that of protest, but from the standpoint of affirmed faith. Few churches ever adopted the name "Protestant." The most commonly adopted designations were rather "evangelical" and "re- [p. 305] formed" (these terms continue to be used especially in the European churches and in Latin America). On the other hand, when the word *Protestant* came into currency in England (in Elizabethan times), its accepted signification was not "objection" but "avowal" or "witness" or "confession" (as the Latin *protestari* meant also "to profess"). And for a century the English "Protestant" church was the Church of England, making its profession of the faith in the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. Only later did the word "protest" come to have a primarily negative significance, and the term "Protestant" come to refer to non-Roman churches in general.

1265. Protestant, Origin of the Name

SOURCE: F. Kattenbusch, "Protestantism," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 9, pp. 290, 291. Copyright 1911 by Funk & Wagnall Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 290] The name "Protestant" originated from the "protestation" in which the leading German princes friendly to the Reformation united with fourteen cities of Germany on Apr. 25, 1529, against the decree of the Roman majority of the second Diet of Speyer. It was a designation quite colorless from the religious point of view, and was first used as a political epithet by the opponents of those who signed the [p. 291] protest.

1266. Protestant Episcopal Church

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1486–1492.

[p. 1486] *History*. The interest of the Church of England in America began with the earliest English voyages of discovery. Frobisher (1578) and Drake (1579) had chaplains

with them, interested not merely in the ships' companies, but in the people they found; and the charters of the colonies, started by Sir Humphrey Gilbert (1578 and 1583) and by Sir Walter Raleigh (1584–87) all included, in some form, provision for "public service according to the Church of England." Later enterprises in the first part of the seventeenth century followed the same general policy. Occasional services were conducted at various places, but permanent worship on this side of the Atlantic was begun in 1607, when Rev. Robert [p. 1487] Hunt, underneath a great sail stretched between two old trees, celebrated the Eucharist for the first time at Jamestown, Va. The spirit of the earliest leaders of this colony was one of kindly toleration for all, but with the passing of the colony under the immediate control of the Crown, the harsh tone prevalent in England manifested itself in Virginia, also, in rigid laws in regard to Puritans and Quakers.

The distance from the ecclesiastical authorities, and the growing disposition on the part of the vestries to hire ministers from year to year in order to avoid the sending out of unfit persons by English patrons, brought about an unfortunate condition which the Bishop of London sought to remedy by sending Rev. James Blair as a missionary to the colonies...

In New England isolated attempts at church organization were made, but for many years none proved permanent, since the Puritans applied to the Anglicans the same proscription from which they themselves had fled. With the revocation of the charter of the Massachusetts Colony, a Church of England clergyman was appointed in 1686; and King's Chapel in Boston, the first Episcopal church in New England, was opened in 1689. In 1698 an Episcopal church was established at Newport, R. I., and the same year saw the consecration of Trinity Church in New York City.

In Maryland the Protestant element in the community of St. Mary's erected a chapel and held services according to the rites of the Church of England. The growth of the church was slow, but the arrival in 1700 of Rev. Thomas Bray, the Bishop of London's commissary, gave it new life. His influence was felt also in the other colonies, for it was he who gave the impulse for the organization in England of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which had so large a share in establishing the church in America on a firm foundation.

This society began its work by sending in 1702 a delegation to visit the scattered churches. At that time there does not appear to have been a half dozen clergymen of the Church of England outside of Virginia and Maryland, and the whole number from Maine to Carolina was less than 50. This mission was the beginning of a new era in the history of the Episcopal Church in America. The number of churches was greatly increased, and a far better grade of ministers was secured for them. There were, however, too many of the class who drift to distant sections, and who, removed from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, were more of a hindrance than a help...

A general survey of the situation during the first half of the eighteenth century reveals the causes of the weakness of the church. There was, first, an established church in a few colonies, as, for instance, in Virginia and Maryland, not sufficiently effective to be of positive assistance, but just enough so to arouse the antagonism of the strong dissenting element which feared the introduction of a state church, to avoid which they had left England. There was, secondly, the difficulty of securing competent ministers who were conversant with the needs of the colonies. The impossibility of ordination, except by a tedious and expensive trip to England, deterred many colonial churchmen from application for orders, and as a result the churches were supplied chiefly from abroad, and this often proved a source of weakness rather than of strength. Throughout the whole period repeated urgent appeals for an episcopate were made, but all failed, owing, probably, in part to ignorance in the Church of England as to the real situation, in part to a failure to realize the missionary power and value of the episcopate, and especially to the persistent opposition to an American episcopate shown by English political leaders, who feared that if the colonies were provided with bishops they would be in a better position to claim their independence.

[p. 1488] Notwithstanding these hindrances, the Church of England enjoyed a slow but steady growth in power up to the Revolutionary War. In the southern colonies it was the predominant church, and people were required by law to contribute to its support, though there was frequently a lack of harmony between clergy and people. In New England and the middle colonies, on the other hand, it was largely an alien institution, opposed by a strong majority of dissenters. Usually it was not strong financially, and its support came largely from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; but in Maryland and Virginia the churches were maintained by the local governments and were prosperous.

The close of the war found the Episcopal churches thoroughly disorganized. Many of the clergy were loyal to the Crown and left the country, going either to England or to Canada, and of those who remained few conducted any public services, partly for lack of congregations and partly because of the impossibility of conducting the services in full, including the petition for the royal family. Even the semblance of an establishment was no longer maintained, and few, if any, desired one. There was no episcopacy, and not even any association of churches. Furthermore, so intense was the sentiment of state loyalty that there was little recognition of any relation between the churches of different States. The first move toward an organization was the appearance, in 1782, of a pamphlet entitled "The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered," written by Rev. William White, of Philadelphia, but published anonymously. In this he urged that, without waiting for a bishop, the churches should unite in some form of association and common government. He also outlined a plan which embodied most of the essential characteristics of the diocesan and general conventions as adopted later.

Meanwhile the Maryland Legislature had, in 1779, passed an act committing to certain vestries, as trustees, the property of the parishes, but also prohibiting general assessments, and affirming the right of each taxpayer to designate the denomination to whose support his contribution should be applied. The next year a conference was called, consisting of 3 clergymen and 24 laymen, and a petition was sent to the legislature asking that the vestries be empowered to raise money for parish uses by pew rents and other means. As it was essential to the petition that the organization have a title, the name Protestant Episcopal Church was suggested as appropriate—the term "Protestant" distinguishing it from the Church of Rome, and the term "Episcopal" distinguishing it from the Presbyterian and Congregational bodies. This name was formally approved by a conference at Annapolis in 1783 and appears to have continued in use until definitely adopted by the General Convention of 1789.

With the close of the war and the desire for a full organization, the Maryland churches elected Dr. William Smith bishop and the Connecticut churches, Dr. Samuel Seabury. No steps were taken by Doctor Smith toward consecration, but Doctor Seabury

went to England and applied to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The latter received him cordially but could not see his way clear to accede to his request under the existing political conditions. Doctor Seabury, therefore, applied to the nonjuring Scottish bishops, who, in November 1784, after some hesitation, consecrated him.

As it became evident that the Episcopal churches of the different States were organizing independently, a movement to constitute an Episcopal Church for the whole United States was inaugurated, largely by the initiative of Dr. William White, at an informal meeting at New Brunswick, N. J., in May 1784. New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania were the only States represented, but correspondence with other States resulted in a convention in New York, in October of the same year, with delegates from 8 States. This was also informal, with no recognized authority, and representing very diverse views, but it adopted, with noteworthy unanimity, a recommendation to the churches, embodying ... fundamental principles [and calling for] ... a general convention...

[p. 1489] When the convention next met, in September 1785, at Philadelphia, 16 clergymen and 24 laymen were present, representing only 7 of the 13 States—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. New England was thus not represented at all, and there were numerous protests from many quarters against the proposed plan of organization. The convention adopted, however, with some modifications, the principles already mentioned and then undertook to draw up a constitution and a liturgy, the latter under the general oversight of Dr. William Smith, and the former under that of Dr. William White...

While no serious disposition to question the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration was manifested, yet the desire was general to be connected with the Church of England rather than with that of Scotland. Accordingly an address to the archbishops and bishops of the former church was prepared, and the State conventions were urged to elect bishops. The reply from England was on the whole favorable, and before the next meeting of the convention, in 1786, New York had elected as its bishop Dr. Samuel Provoost; Pennsylvania, Dr. William White; Maryland, Dr. William Smith; and Virginia, Dr. David Griffith. Of these 4, only Doctor White and Doctor Provoost went to England, where they were consecrated on February 4, 1787. The Episcopal Church was thus equipped to perpetuate its own episcopate at the hands of 3 duly consecrated bishops. Subsequently, Dr. James Madison was elected Bishop of Virginia, and was consecrated in England, so that any objection to the Scottish office was obviated.

In 1789 a union of the different forces was effected and Bishop Seabury joined the other bishops. Two houses were constituted in the General Convention, and the constitution and Book of Common Prayer were adopted. Thus the same year that saw the complete organization of the Federal Government witnessed also the full equipment of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The 4 bishops already mentioned united in 1792 in the consecration of Dr. Thomas John Claggett, as Bishop of Maryland, and thus was inaugurated the distinctively American episcopate.

For 20 years and more the church had to combat various hostile influences. It was widely distrusted as being really an English institution. Its compact organization and its formality of worship repelled many, especially in an age that was peculiarly fond of emotionalism and of an untrammeled freedom in religious as well as social and civil life.

The loss of the Methodist element, which hitherto has been identified with the church, though somewhat loosely, deprived it of some strength. Growth was slow...

In the second decade of the nineteenth century came a change... Little by little the church began to take its place in the development of the Nation. An illustration of the progress made is seen in the fact that the four or five active ministers laboring in Virginia when Bishop Moore came to Richmond in 1814 increased to nearly 100 during the 27 years of his service, and the number of churches increased to 170.

[p. 1490] About 1845, Dr. W. A. Muhlenberg, one of the most remarkable men in the history of the church, came into prominence. He founded the system of church schools, organized the first free church of any importance in New York City, introduced the male choir, sisterhoods, and the fresh-air movement; while his church infirmary suggested to his mind the organization of St. Luke's Hospital, the first church hospital of any Christian communion in the country. He hoped to extend the movement in his own parish to the entire church, transforming it from what he considered a liturgical denomination into a real catholic church. As a result a memorial was drawn up... It had much influence in preparing the way for the issuance of the famous Lambeth Quadrilateral on Church Unity, in 1888, and the movement for the first revision of the American prayer book, completed in 1892.

A generation later, further revision of the prayer book seemed desirable. Accordingly, the General Convention of 1913 appointed the Joint Commission on the Book of Common Prayer... Final approval to the revised book was given by the General Convention of 1928.

The progress of the church, so marked everywhere during the second quarter of the nineteenth century, was abruptly halted by the outbreak of the Civil War. Anticipating the dissolution of the Union, the southern dioceses which were constrained to form a separate ecclesiastical organization held a convention at Columbia, S. C., in 1861. Their general disposition to maintain as close contact as possible with the church in the North resulted in the selection of the name "Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States," and in the adoption of a constitution practically identical with the old one. Throughout the period of hostilities a friendly attitude was carefully maintained on both sides...

[After the war] the progress of the reunited church was promptly resumed...

Although there were naturally different schools of opinion within the church, during the nineteenth century there was only one serious rift to mar the steady progress of the church. This grew out of the question of churchmanship, following the inauguration of the Oxford Movement in England during the second quarter of the century. Discussions on ritual and vestments, "Protestant" and "Catholic," with their attendant doctrinal implications, culminated in the withdrawal from the church in 1873 of a small group of evangelicals under the leadership of Rt. Rev. George D. Cummins, Coadjutor Bishop of Kentucky, who organized the Reformed Episcopal Church...

[p. 1491] The opening years of the twentieth century saw an unprecedented growth in the interest and activities of the Episcopal Church...

The General Convention of 1919 must be regarded as one of the great turning points in the life of the Episcopal Church. A new, permanent, central administration known as the National Council was erected...

One outgrowth of the great missionary conference held in Edinburgh, Scotland in 1910, was the appointment by the General Convention of 1913 of a joint commission for

the purpose of considering questions touching on faith and order, in which all Christian communions should be asked to participate. The commission [p. 1492] invited representatives of a considerable number of churches, including the Roman Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox Churches, to join them, and an advisory committee was formed. The first meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order was held in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1920, the second, in August 1927, at Lausanne, Switzerland, and the third, in August 1937, at Edinburgh, Scotland. Out of this last meeting and the World Conference on Life and Work held in July 1937 at Oxford, England, grew the proposal for the World Council of Churches. A preliminary meeting was held in May 1938 in Utrecht, Holland.

Doctrine. The doctrinal symbols of the Protestant Episcopal Church are the Apostles' and Nicene creeds. The Athanasian Creed, one of the symbols of the Church of England, was unanimously rejected by the convention of 1789, chiefly because of its damnatory clauses. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, with the exception of the twenty-first, relating to the authority of the General Council, and with some modifications of the eighth, thirty-fifth, and thirty-sixth articles, were accepted by the convention of 1801 as a general statement of doctrine. Adherence to them as a creed, however, is not required.

The Episcopal Church expects of all its members loyalty to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the one holy Catholic Apostolic Church, in all the essentials, but allows great liberty in non-essentials. There is no inclination to be rigid or to raise difficulties, but the fundamental principles of the church, based upon the Holy Scriptures as the ultimate rule of faith, have been maintained whenever a question has arisen demanding decision.

The clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, instead of signing the Thirty-nine Articles, as is done in the English Church, make the following declaration:

I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation, and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

On this general basis, what is known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral was formulated in England in 1888 for the unity of Christendom:

- (*a*) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.
- (b) The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.
- (c) The two sacraments ordained by Christ himself—baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.
- (d) The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His church. In the baptism of children either immersion or pouring is allowed. The child must be presented by sponsors, who may be the parents, who shall answer for the child, accepting the Apostles' Creed, with the implied promise that the child shall be trained to accept the pledges thus made.

For those who have not been baptized in infancy, reception into the church is by baptism, by whatever form may be preferred, and acceptance of the Apostles' Creed. For those who have been baptized, reception is by confirmation by the bishop, after

instruction in the history, worship, and doctrine of the church. Participation in the sacrament of the Holy Communion is, according to the rules of the church, limited to those who have been confirmed, though the custom is now very general of regarding all baptized persons as virtually members of the church, and as such permitted to partake, if they so desire.

Organization. The system of ecclesiastical government includes the parish or congregation, the diocese, the province, and the General Convention.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1958), 3,126,662 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257). The General Convention voted, Sept. 23, 1961, to participate in the Presbyterian proposal of a multiple merger (see Nos. 664, 665). However, they stipulated that the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (see above) be the basis for talks.]

1267. Protestantism—Early Triumphs SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, p. 134.

Within fifty years from the day on which Luther publicly renounced communion with the Papacy, and burned the bull of Leo before the gates of Wittenberg, Protestantism attained its highest ascendency, an ascendency which it soon lost, and which it has never regained. Hundreds, who could well remember Brother Martin, a devout Catholic, lived to see the revolution of which he was the chief author, victorious in half the states of Europe. In England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, Livonia, Prussia, Saxony, Hesse, Wurtemburg, the Palatinate, in several cantons of Switzerland, in the Northern Netherlands, the Reformation had completely triumphed; and in all the other countries on this side of the Alps and the Pyrenees, it seemed on the point of triumphing.

1268. Protestantism—Post-Reformation Losses SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, pp. 139–141.

[p. 139] The history of the two succeeding generations is the history of the struggle between Protestantism possessed of the North of Europe, and Catholicism possessed of the South, for the doubtful territory which lay between. All the weapons of carnal and of spiritual warfare were employed. Both sides may boast of great talents and of great virtues. Both have to blush for many follies and crimes. At first, the chances seemed to be decidedly in favour of Protestantism; but the victory remained with the Church of Rome. On every point she was successful. If we overleap another half century, we find her victorious and dominant in France, Belgium, Bavaria, Bohemia, Austria, Poland, and Hungary. Nor has Protestantism, in the course of two hundred years been able to reconquer any portion of what was then lost.

It is, moreover, not to be dissembled that this triumph of the Papacy is to be chiefly attributed, not to the force of arms, but to a great reflux in public opinion...

The war between Luther and Leo was a war between firm faith [p. 140] and unbelief, between zeal and apathy, between energy and indolence, between seriousness and frivolity, between a pure morality and vice. Very different was the war which degenerate Protestantism had to wage against regenerate Catholicism. To the debauchees, the poisoners, the atheists, who had worn the tiara during the generation which preceded the Reformation, had succeeded Popes who, in religious fervour and severe sanctity of manners, might bear a comparison with Cyprian or Ambrose. The order of Jesuits alone could show many men not inferior in sincerity, constancy, courage, and austerity of life, to the apostles of the Reformation. But while danger had thus called forth in the bosom of the Church of Rome many of the highest qualities of the Reformers, the Reformers had contracted some of the corruptions which had been justly censured in the Church of Rome. They had become lukewarm and worldly. Their great old leaders had been borne to the grave, and had left no successors. Among the Protestant princes there was little or no hearty Protestant feeling...

The whole zeal of the Catholics was directed against the Protestants, while almost the whole zeal of the Protestants was directed against each other. Within the Catholic Church there were no serious disputes on points of doctrine. The decisions of the Council of Trent were received; and the Jansenian controversy had not yet arisen. The whole force of Rome was, therefore, effective for the purpose of carrying on the war against the Reformation. On the other hand, the force which ought to have fought the battle of the Reformation was exhausted in civil conflict. While Jesuit preachers, Jesuit confessors, Jesuit teachers of youth, overspread Europe, eager to expend every faculty of their minds and every drop of their blood in the cause of their Church, Protestant doctors were confuting, and Protestant rulers were punishing, sectaries who were just as good Protestants as themselves...

[p. 141] As the Catholics in zeal and in union had a great advantage over the Protestants, so had they also an infinitely superior organization. In truth, Protestantism, for aggressive purposes, had no organization at all. The Reformed Churches were mere national Churches. The Church of England existed for England alone... The Church of Scotland, in the same manner, existed for Scotland alone. The operations of the Catholic Church, on the other hand, took in the whole world... Our island, the head of the Protestant interest, did not send out a single missionary or a single instructor of youth to the scene of the great spiritual war... The spiritual force of Protestantism was a mere local militia, which might be useful in case of an invasion, but could not be sent abroad, and could therefore make no conquests.

1269. Protestantism, Present Trends

SOURCE: "The New Protestantism," *Time*, 75 (May 30, 1960), 43, 44. Copyright 1960 by Time, Inc., New York; courtesy *Time*.

[p. 43] On certain thin-aired uplands where theologians graze it is growing increasingly difficult to tell a Protestant from a Roman Catholic. To a degree that would have been unthinkable 50 years ago, they [p. 44] read each other's works and build upon each other's researches—though each retains his own faith. In Europe much personal discussion goes on between Roman Catholic and Protestant scholars; Calvinist Theologian Oscar Cullman is welcome at the Vatican, and some of the best studies of Karl Barth have been written by Catholic scholars. In the U.S. there is a growing movement, sparked by Jesuit Father Walter Abbott of the weekly *America*, for the preparation of a common translation of the Bible.

The changes in Protestant thought that lie behind this trend were neatly analyzed last week in the Catholic weekly *Commonweal* by the Rev. Gregory Baum of St. Basil's Seminary in Toronto, Ont.

New Difficulty. In North America, during the 19th century and almost up to the present generation, he wrote, there were basically two kinds of Protestants: liberals and fundamentalists. The liberals viewed the New Testament as an amalgam of history and legend in which their scholars searched for "the historical Jesus." ...

Today, Father Baum perceives "a renaissance of Protestant thought." Instead of looking upon the Scriptures as historical material, Protestant thinkers now take them essentially as "the proclamation of the faith of the early Church... What is important, first

of all, is not whether Jesus really said this or that, or really did this or that; what counts is that through the biblical witness the early Church proclaimed its faith in the saving power of Christ..."

This view means that church and tradition have become far more important in Protestant thought, as they have always been in Catholicism. And with this shift, the old-style Catholic arguments against Protestantism "have become somewhat irrelevant, rather empty and even somewhat rationalistic." ...

The new line "alters the character and flavor of Catholic theological literature. It removes the slightly rationalistic trend of the older approach which created the impression that a man could argue himself into faith, and it imbues the whole of the Catholic teaching with an authentic biblical atmosphere."

Catholic theologians are looking upon Protestant theologians with a new friendliness and respect. "The change reflects much more than an increase of tolerance; it is rather a consequence of the change that has taken place within Protestantism, change which, on the one hand, leads Protestant theology closer to the tradition of the Church and, on the other, offers, by its profundity, a true challenge to Catholic theology."

1270. Purgatory, and Alleged Power of Good Works

SOURCE: Joseph Husslein, *The Souls in Purgatory*, p. 32. Copyright 1924 by The America Press, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 126.]

Other good works, too, may be performed for the Poor Souls. Especially approved throughout all the history of the Church has been the offering of alms for their sake. We are told that as water extinguishes fire, so alms destroy sins. Without any doubt, says St. Augustine, "will the departed souls obtain relief when the Sacrifice of the Mediator (*i. e.*,

the Holy Mass) is offered for them, or alms are spent in the Church." (*Enchiridion*, c. 110.) Such alms may of course be given anywhere. "We are too forgetful of our dear departed," St. Francis de Sales often said.

1271. Purgatory, Duration of Purification in, Held Unknown

SOURCE: Joseph Husslein, *The Souls in Purgatory*, p. 21. Copyright 1924 by The America Press, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 126.]

While Purgatory itself is limited by the last judgment, we cannot speak with equal certainty of the length of time during which individual souls may have to undergo their purification, that they be rendered fit to enter into the sight of the All-Holy God. The duration of Purgatory may extend for some over many years. Of this we are practically certain, since it is the custom of the Church herself to offer up anniversary Masses for individual souls during hundreds of years.

1272. Purgatory, Trent Decree Concerning

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXV (Dec. 3 and 4, 1563), Decree Concerning Purgatory, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 165. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the Sacred Writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred councils, and very recently in this oecumenical synod that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the holy synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavour that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, transmitted by the holy Fathers and sacred councils, be believed, maintained, taught and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ.

6

⁶Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1273. Reformation, Advance Preparation for

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, "Reformation," An Religious Encyclopaedia, ed. by Philip Schaff and others, Vol. 3 (3d ed., rev.; New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1891), p. 2004.

It [the Reformation] was not an abrupt revolution, but had its roots in the middle ages. There were many "reformers before the Reformation," and almost every doctrine of Luther and Calvin had its advocates long before them. The whole struggling of mediaeval Catholicism toward reform and liberty; the long conflict between the German emperors and the popes; the reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel; the Waldenses and Albigenses in France and Northern Italy; Wiclif and the Lollards in England; Hus and the Hussites in Bohemia; Arnold of Brescia, and Savonarola, in Italy; the spiritualistic piety and theology of the mystics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the theological writings of Wesel, Woch, and Wessel, in Germany and the Netherlands; the rise of the national languages and letters in connection with the feeling of national independence; the invention of the printing-press; the revival of letters and classical learning under the direction of Agricola, Reuchlin, and Erasmus,-all these, and similar movements, were preparations for the Reformation. The evangelical churches claim a share in the inheritance of all preceding history, and own their indebtedness to the missionaries, schoolmen, fathers, confessors, and martyrs of former ages, but acknowledge no higher authority than Christ and his inspired organs.

1274. Reformation, Importance in History

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, pp. 204, 205.

[p. 204] The Reformation of the sixteenth century is, next to the introduction of Christianity, the greatest event in history. It was no sudden revolution; for what has no roots in the past can have no permanent effect upon the future. It was prepared by the deeper tendencies and aspirations of previous centuries, and, when finally matured, it burst forth almost simultaneously in all parts of Western Christendom. It was not a superficial amendment, not a mere restoration, but a regeneration; not a return to the Augustinian, or Nicene, or ante-Nicene age, but a vast progress beyond any previous age or condition of the Church since the death of St. John. It went, through the intervening ages of ecclesiasticism, back to the fountain-head of Christianity itself, as it came from the lips of the Son of God and his inspired Apostles... It brought out from this fountain a new phase and type of Christianity, which had never as yet been fully understood and appreciated in the Church at large. It was, in fact, a new proclamation of the free Gospel of St. Paul, as laid down in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. It was grand act of emancipation from the bondage of the mediaeval hierarchy, and an assertion of that freedom wherewith Christ has made us free. It inaugurated the era of manhood and the general priesthood of believers. It taught the direct communion of the believing soul with Christ. It removed the obstructions of legalism, sacerdotalism, and ceremonialism, which, [p. 205] like the traditions of the Pharisees of old, had obscured the genuine Gospel and made void the Word of God.

1275. Reformation—Luther and the Holy Staircase at Rome SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 6 (New York: Scribner, 1901), pp. 128, 129.

[p. 128] When Luther came in sight of the eternal city, he fell upon the earth, raised his hands and exclaimed, "Hail to thee, holy Rome! Thrice holy for the blood of martyrs shed here." He passed the colossal ruins of heathen Rome and the gorgeous palaces of Christian Rome. But he ran, "like a crazy saint," through all the churches and crypts and

catacombs with an [p. 129] unquestioning faith in the legendary traditions about the relics and miracles of martyrs. He wished that his parents were dead that he might help them out of purgatory by reading mass in the most holy place, according to the saying: "Blessed is the mother whose son celebrates mass on Saturday in St. John of the Lateran." He [Luther] ascended on bended knees the twenty-eight steps of the famous Scala Santa (said to have been transported from the Judgment Hall of Pontius Pilate in Jerusalem), that he might secure the indulgence attached to this ascetic performance since the days of Pope Leo IV. in 850, but at every step the word of the Scripture sounded as a significant protest in his ear: "The just shall live by faith" (Rom 1:17).² [Note 2: This interesting incident rests on the authority of his son Paul, who heard it from the lips of his father in 1544. Modern Popes, Pius VII. and Pius IX., have granted additional indulgences to those who climb up the Scala Santa.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: Scholars differ as to what Luther said or thought as he climbed these stairs on his knees. See two quotations in *SDACom*, Vol. 7, p. 50.]

1276. Reformation—Luther's Ninety five Theses

SOURCE: Louis L. Snyder, ed., *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 63–66. Copyright © 1958 by Rutgers, The State University. Used by permission.

[p. 63] Extracts from Luther's Ninety-Five Theses, October 31, 1517. Disputation of Dr. Martin Luther Concerning Indulgences

In the desire and with the purpose of elucidating the truth, a disputation will be held on the underwritten propositions at Wittenberg, under the presidency of the Reverend Father Martin Luther, monk of the order of St. Augustine, Master of Arts and Sacred Theology, and ordinary lecturer in the same at that place. He therefore asks those who cannot be present and discuss the subject with us orally to do so by letter in their absence. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

1. Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ in saying "Repent ye" [poenitentiam agite], etc.,

intended that the whole life of believers should be penitence [*poenitentia*]. [Brackets in Snyder.]

- 2. This word cannot be understood as sacramental penance, that is, the confession and satisfaction which are performed under the ministry of priests.
- 3. It does not, on the other hand, refer solely to inward penitence; nay, such inward penitence is naught, unless it outwardly produces various mortifications of the flesh.
- 4. The penalty [for sin] must thus continue as long as the hatred of self—that is, true inward penitence; namely, till our entrance into the kingdom of heaven.
- 5. The Pope has neither the will nor the power to remit any penalties except those which he has imposed by his own authority, or by that of the canons.
- 6. The Pope has no power to remit any guilt, except by declaring and warranting it to have been remitted by God; or at most by remitting cases reserved for himself; in which cases, if his power were despised, guilt would certainly remain.
- 7. Certainly God remits no man's guilt without at the same time subjecting him, humbled in all things, to the authority of his representative, the priest...
- 20. Therefore the Pope, when he speaks of the plenary remission of all penalties, does not mean really of all, but only of those imposed by himself.
- 21. Thus those preachers of indulgences are in error who say that [p. 64] by the indulgences of the Pope a man is freed and saved from all punishment.

- 22. For in fact he remits to souls in purgatory no penalty which they would have had to pay in this life according to the canons.
- 23. If any entire remission of all penalties can be granted to anyone, it is certain that it is granted to none but the most perfect, that is, to very few.
- 24. Hence the greater part of the people must needs be deceived by this indiscriminate and high-sounding promise of release from penalties...
- 27. They preach mad, who say that the soul flies out of purgatory as soon as the money thrown into the chest rattles.
- 28. It is certain that when the money rattles in the chest, avarice and gain may be increased, but the suffrage of the Church depends on the will of God alone...
- 32. Those who believe that, through letters of pardon, they are made sure of their own salvation, will be eternally damned along with their teachers.
- 33. We must especially beware of those who say that these pardons from the Pope are that inestimable gift of God by which man is reconciled to God.
- 34. For the grace conveyed by these pardons has respect only to the penalties of sacramental satisfaction, which are of human appointment.
- 35. They preach no Christian doctrine, who teach that contrition is not necessary for those who buy souls out of purgatory or buy confessional licenses.
- 36. Every Christian who feels true compunction has of right plenary remission of pain and guilt, even without letters of pardon.
- 37. Every true Christian, whether living or dead, has a share in all the benefits of Christ and of the Church ... even without letters of pardon...
- 39. It is a very difficult thing, even for the most learned theologians, to exalt at the same time, in the eyes of the people, the ample effect of pardons and the necessity of true contrition...
- 42. Christians should be taught that it is not the mind of the Pope that the buying of pardons is to be in any way compared to works of mercy.
- 43. Christians should be taught that he who gives to a poor man, or lends to a needy man, does better than if he bought pardons...
- 50. Christians should be taught that if the Pope were acquainted [p. 65] with the exactions of the preachers of pardons, he would prefer that the basilica of St. Peter should be burnt to ashes, than that it should be built up with the skin, flesh, and bones of his sheep...
- 52. Vain is the hope of salvation through letters of pardon, even if a commissary—nay, the Pope himself—were to pledge his own soul for them...
- 56. The treasures of the Church, whence the Pope grants indulgences, are neither sufficiently named nor known among the people of Christ.
- 57. It is clear that they are at least not temporal treasures, for these are not so readily lavished, but only accumulated, by many of the preachers.
- 58. Nor are they the merits of Christ and of the saints, for these, independently of the Pope, are always working grace to the inner man, and the cross, death, and hell to the outer man...
- 62. The true treasure of the Church is the Holy Gospel of the glory and grace of God...
- 63. This treasure, however, is naturally most hateful, because it makes the first to be last;
- 64. While the treasure of indulgences is naturally most acceptable, because it makes the last to be first.

- 65. Hence the treasures of the Gospel are nets, wherewith of old they fished for the men of riches.
- 66. The treasures of indulgences are nets, wherewith they now fish for of the riches of men...
- 75. To think that Papal pardons have such power that they could absolve a man even if by an impossibility—he had violated the Mother of God, is madness.
- 76. We affirm on the contrary that papal pardons cannot take away even the least of venial sins, as regards its guilt...
- 81. This license in the preaching of pardons makes it no easy thing, even for learned men, to protect the reverence due to the Pope against the calumnies, or, at all events, the keen questionings of the laity.
- 82. As, for instance: Why does not the Pope empty purgatory for the sake of his most holy charity and of the supreme necessity of souls—this being the most just of all reasons—if he redeems an infinite number of souls for the sake of that most fatal thing, money, to be spent on building a basilica—this being a very slight reason?
- 83. Again: Why do funeral masses and anniversary masses for the deceased continue, and why does not the Pope return, or permit [p. 66] the withdrawal of, the funds bequeathed for this purpose, since it is a wrong to pray for those who are already redeemed? ...
- 86. Again: Why does not the Pope, whose riches are at this day more ample than those of Croesus, build the basilica of St. Peter with his own money rather than with that of poor believers? ...
- 88. Again: What greater good could the Church receive than if the Pope were to bestow these remissions and participations a hundred times a day, instead of once, as he does now, on any one of the faithful? ...
- 90. To repress these scruples and arguments of the laity by force alone, and not to solve them by giving reasons, is to expose the Church and the Pope to the ridicule of their enemies, and to make christian men unhappy.
- 91. If, then, pardons were preached according to the spirit and wish of the Pope, all these questions would be solved with ease; nay, would not exist.
- 92. Away then with all those prophets who say to the people of Christ: "Peace, peace," and there is no peace.
- 93. Blessed be all those prophets who say to the people of Christ: "The cross, the cross," and there is no cross.
- 94. Christians should be exhorted to strive to follow Christ their head through pains, deaths, and hells.
- 95. And thus trust to enter heaven through many tribulations, rather than in the security of peace.

1277. Reformation—Luther's Reply Before the Diet at Worms on April 18, 1521

SOURCE: Henry Bettenson, ed., *Documents of the Christian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 282–285. Used by permission.

[p. 282] The Diet of Worms, 1521

Luther's Final Answer, 18 April

[Introductory note:] Leo's excommunication of Luther, in the Bull *Exsurge Domine*, was published in Saxony in the autumn of 1520. But the Elector refused to carry it out. Luther finally repudiated the Pope and [p. 283] burned the Bull publicly. In January 1521 the Pope issued another and stronger Bull, and called upon the Emperor to put it into effect. Charles V wished to secure himself against Francis I by using

the threat of Luther to bring the Pope to heel, and at the same time to assert his independence of the Pope, and to grant Luther a show of justice sufficient to satisfy the anti-papal sentiment in Germany. A diet was summoned, the papal case was stated, and Luther was given his chance to recant. After this final answer of Luther, Charles announced his intention of suppressing heresy and secured his alliance with Leo. The Edict of Worms put Luther under the Imperial ban, and forbade the printing of his works or the proclamation or defense of his opinions.

... [Eck, Official of the Archbishop of Trier, asked Luther.] Do you wish to defend the books which are recognized as your work? Or to retract anything contained in them?

. . .

... [Luther replied.] Most Serene Lord Emperor, Most Illustrious Princes, Most Gracious Lords ... I beseech you to grant a gracious hearing to my plea, which, I trust, will be a plea of justice and truth; and if through my inexperience I neglect to give to any their proper titles or in any way offend against the etiquette of the court in my manners or behavior, be kind enough to forgive me, I beg, since I am a man who has spent his life not in courts but in the cells of a monastery; a man who can say of himself only this, that to this day I have thought and written in simplicity of heart, solely with a view to the glory of God and the pure instruction of Christ's faithful people...

... Your Imperial Majesty and Your Lordships: I ask you to observe that my books are not all of the same kind.

There are some in which I have dealt with piety in faith and morals with such simplicity and so agreeably with the Gospels that my adversaries themselves are compelled to admit them useful, harmless, and clearly worth reading by Christian. Even the Bull, harsh and cruel though it is, makes some of my books harmless, although it condemns them also, by a judgment downright monstrous. If I should begin to recant here, what, I beseech you, should I be doing [p. 284] but condemning, alone among mortals, that truth which is admitted by friends and foes alike, in an unaided struggle against universal consent?

The second kind consists in those writings leveled against the papacy and the doctrine of the papists, as against those who by their wicked doctrines and precedents have laid waste Christendom by doing harm to the souls and the bodies of men. No one can either deny or conceal this, for universal experience and world-wide grievances are witnesses to the fact that through the Pope's laws and through man-made teachings the consciences of the faithful have been most pitifully ensnared, troubled, and racked in torment, and also that their goods and possessions have been devoured (especially amongst this famous German nation) by unbelievable tyranny, and are to this day being devoured without end in shameful fashion; and that though they themselves by their own laws take care to provide that the Pope's laws and doctrines which are contrary to the Gospel or the teachings of the Fathers are to be considered erroneous and reprobate. If then I recant these, the only effect will be to add strength to such tyranny, to open not the windows but the main doors to such blasphemy, which will thereupon stalk farther and more widely than it has hitherto dared...

The third kind consists of those books which I have written against private individuals, so-called; against those, that is, who have exerted themselves in defense of the Roman tyranny and to the overthrow of that piety which I have taught. I confess that I have been more harsh against them than befits my religious vows and my profession. For I do not make myself out to be any kind of saint, nor am I now contending about my conduct but about Christian doctrine. But it is not in my power to recant them, because that recantation would give that tyranny and blasphemy an occasion to lord it over those whom I defend and to rage against God's people more violently than ever.

However, since I am a man and not God, I cannot provide my writings with any other defense than that which my [p. 285] Lord Jesus Christ provided for his teaching. When he had been interrogated concerning his teaching before Annas and had received a buffet from a servant, he said: 'If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil.' If the Lord himself, who knew that he could not err, did not refuse to listen to witness against his teaching, even from a worthless slave, how much more ought I, scum that I am, capable of naught but error, to seek and to wait for any who may wish to bear witness against my teaching.

And so, through the mercy of God, I ask Your Imperial Majesty, and Your Illustrious Lordships, or anyone of any degree, to bear witness, to overthrow my errors, to defeat them by writings of the Prophets or by the Gospel; for I shall be most ready, if I be better instructed, to recant any error, and I shall be the first in casting my writings into the fire...

Thereupon the Orator of the Empire, in a tone of upbraiding, said that his answer was not to the point, and that there should be no calling into question of matters on which condemnations and decisions had before been passed by Councils. He was being asked for a plain reply, without subtlety or sophistry, to this question: Was he prepared to recant, or no?

Luther then replied: Your Imperial Majesty and Your Lordships demand a simple answer. Here it is, plain and unvarnished. Unless I am convicted of error by the testimony of Scripture or (since I put no trust in the unsupported authority of Pope or of councils, since it is plain that they have often erred and often contradicted themselves) by manifest reasoning I stand convicted by the Scriptures to which I have appealed, and my conscience is taken captive by God's word, I cannot and will not recant anything, for to act against our conscience is neither safe for us, nor open to us.

On this I take my stand. I can do no other. God help me. Amen.³ [Note 3: The last words are given in German: Hier stehe ich. Ich kann nicht anders. Gott helff mir. Amen.] (*Op. Lat.* vi. 8. Kidd, No. 42.)

[EDITORS' NOTE: Brackets in text on p. 283 are Bettenson's.]

1278. Reformation, Milton on

SOURCE: John Milton, "Of Reformation in England," *The Prose Works of John Milton*, Vol. 2 (London: George Bell and Sons, 1888), pp. 366–368.

[p. 366] When I recall to mind at last, after so many dark ages, wherein the huge overshadowing train of error had almost swept all the stars out of the firmament of the church; how the bright and blissful Reformation (by divine power) struck through [p. 367] the black and settled night of ignorance and antichristian tyranny, methinks a sovereign and reviving joy must needs rush into the bosom of him that reads or hears; and the sweet odour of the returning gospel imbathe his soul with the fragrancy of heaven. Then was the sacred Bible sought out of the dusty corners where profane falsehood and neglect had thrown it, the schools opened, divine and human learning raked out of the embers of forgotten tongues, the princes and cities trooping apace to the new erected banner of salvation; [p. 368] the martyrs, with the unresistable might of weakness, shaking the powers of darkness, and scorning the fiery rage of the old red dragon.

1279. Reformation, Produced Counter Reformation in Catholicism

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, pp. 135–139.

[p. 135] It is not, therefore, strange that the effect of the great outbreak of Protestantism in one part of Christendom should have been to produce an equally violent outbreak of Catholic zeal in another. Two reformations were pushed on at once with equal energy and effect, a reformation of doctrine in the North, a reformation of manners and discipline in the South. In the course of a single generation, the whole spirit of the Church of Rome underwent a change... All the institutions anciently devised for the propagation and defence of the faith were furbished up and made efficient. Fresh engines of still more formidable power were constructed. Every where old religious communities were remodelled and new religious communities called into existence...

[p. 136] With what vehemence, with what policy, with what exact discipline, with what dauntless courage, with what self-denial, with what forgetfulness of the dearest private ties, with what intense and stubborn devotion to a single end, with what unscrupulous laxity and versatility in the choice of means, the Jesuits fought the battle of their church, is written in every page of the annals of Europe during several generations. In the [p. 137] order of Jesus was concentrated the quintessence of the Catholic spirit; and the history of the order of Jesus is the history of the great Catholic reaction. That order possessed itself at once of all the strongholds which command the public mind, of the pulpit, of the press, of the confessional, of the academies... Nor was it less their office to plot against the thrones and lives of apostate kings, to spread evil rumours, to raise tumults, to inflame civil wars, to arm the hand of the assassin. Inflexible in nothing but in their fidelity to the Church, they were equally ready to appeal in her cause to the spirit of loyalty and ... freedom...

The spirit which appeared so eminently in this order animated the whole Catholic world. The Court of Rome itself was purified. During the generation which preceded the Reformation, that court [the papal court] had been a scandal to the Christian name. Its annals are black with treason, murder, and incest. Even its more respectable members were utterly unfit to be ministers of religion... [p. 138] But when the great stirring of the mind of Europe began, when doctrine after doctrine was assailed, when nation after nation withdrew from communion with the successor of St. Peter, it was felt that the Church could not be safely confided to chiefs whose highest praise was that they were good judges of Latin compositions, of paintings, and of statues, whose severest studies had a pagan character, and who were suspected of laughing in secret at the sacraments which they administered... Men of a very different class now rose to the direction of ecclesiastical affairs, men whose spirit resembled that of Dunstan and of Becket. The Roman Pontiffs exhibited in their own persons all the austerity of the early anchorites of Syria... As was the head, such were the members. The change in the spirit of the Catholic world may be traced in every walk of literature and of art...

But it was not on moral influence alone that the Catholic Church relied. The civil sword in Spain and Italy was unsparingly employed in her support. The Inquisition was armed with new powers and inspired with a new energy. If Protestantism, or the semblance of Protestantism, showed itself in any quarter, it was instantly met, not by petty, teasing persecution, but by persecution of that sort which bows down and crushes all but a very few select spirits...

[p. 139] Thus, while the Protestant reformation proceeded rapidly at one extremity of Europe, the Catholic revival went on as rapidly at the other.

1280. Reformation—Resulting Divisions of Protestantism

SOURCE: Alexander Campbell, Christian Baptism (Bethany, Va.: Alexander Campbell, 1853), p. 15.

It [the Reformation] ended in a Protestant hierarchy, and swarms of dissenters. Protestantism has been reformed into Presbyterianism,—that into Congregationalism, and that into Baptism &c. &c. Methodism has attempted to reform all, but has reformed itself into many forms of Wesleyism... All of them retain in their bosom, in their ecclesiastic organizations, worship, doctrines, and observances, various relics of Popery. They are, at best, but a reformation of Popery, and only reformations in part. The doctrines and traditions of men yet impair the power and progress of the gospel in their hands.

1281. Reformation, Zurich Articles

SOURCE: William A. Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith* (New York: Scribner, 1912), pp. 195, 196. Used by permission of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[p. 195] *The Sixty-seven Articles of Zürich* were prepared for, and maintained at, the great public disputation held in that city in 1523, which virtually decided the repudiation of Rome. They thus correspond to Luther's Theses of six years before. Though not enforced as a standard, they were an epoch-making theological manifesto, and exercised a certain local normative function... The Reformation produced no more impressive or thought-provoking document. Their scope, purport, and form may best be gathered from a few examples in their own words.

1. All who say that the Gospel is nothing without the approval of the Church err and cast reproach upon God.

- 2. The sum of the Gospel is that our Lord Jesus Christ, the true Son of God, has made known to us the will of His heavenly Father, and redeemed us by His innocence from eternal death and reconciled us to God.
- 3. Therefore Christ is the only way to salvation for all who were, who are, who shall be.
- 7, 8. Christ is the Head of all believers. All who live in this Head are His members, and children of God. And this is the true Catholic Church, the Communion of saints.
- 17. Christ is the one eternal High Priest. Therefore those who give themselves out as high priests are opposed to the glory and power of Christ and reject Christ.
- 18. Christ, who offered Himself once on the Cross, is the sufficient [p. 196] and perpetual sacrifice for the sins of all believers. Therefore the Mass is no sacrifice, but a commemoration of the one sacrifice of the Cross and a seal of the redemption through Christ.
- 22. Christ is our righteousness. Hence it follows that our works are good so far as they are Christ's, but not good so far as they are our own.
- 27. All Christians are brethren of Christ, and brethren one with another: therefore they ought not to call any one "father" upon earth. This does away with orders, sects, factions, etc.
- 34. The so-called spiritual power has no ground for its display in the teaching of Christ.
- 49. Greater scandal I know not than that priests should be forbidden lawful wedlock but allowed for money to have concubines. Shame on it!
- 50. God alone forgives sins, and that through Christ Jesus, our Lord, alone.
- 52. Confession therefore to priest or neighbour ought not to be for remission of sins but for consultation.
- 57. Holy Scripture knows of no purgatory after this life.
- 58. The judgment of the deceased is known to God alone.

- 59. The less that God reveals to us concerning these matters, the less ought they to be searched into by us.
- 60. If any one in anxiety for the dead beseeches or prays for favour to them from God, I do not condemn him; but to appoint a time concerning it,—a seven-year for a mortal sin,—and to lie for profit, is not human but devilish.
- 62. Scripture knows no other presbyters or priests than those who proclaim God's word. **1282. Reformed Bodies,** General Statement Concerning

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1496, 1497.

[p. 1496] *General Statement*. The churches, aside from the Lutheran, that were the direct outcome of the Protestant reformation, trace their ecclesiastical origin to republican Switzerland, and those leaders in the cause of representative government, Zwingli, Calvin, and Melanchthon. Of these the Swiss, Dutch, and some German churches came to be known as "Reformed," the Scotch and English as Presbyterian, and the French as Huguenot, while those in Bohemia and Hungary preserved their national names.

In the early colonization of America, Dutch and Germans, as well as Scotch and English, were prominent, and as a result there are four Reformed churches, two tracing their origin to Holland, one to the German Palatinate, and one to Hungary. The first church in New Amsterdam was organized by the Dutch in 1628, and for a considerable time the Hollanders were practically limited to that neighborhood. Somewhat later a German colony, driven from the Palatinate by the ruthless persecution of Louis XIV. settled in upper New York and Pennsylvania, and, as it grew, spread westward. Another Dutch immigration, which established its headquarters in Michigan, identified itself with the New York branch, but afterwards a minor part formed its own ecclesiastical organization. The New York branch, known at first as the Reformed Dutch Church, later adopted the title "Reformed Church in America"; similarly, the German Reformed Church became the Reformed Church in the United States. The third body is known as the Christian Reformed Church; while a fourth is styled the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America. This denomination was organized in 1924 by certain congregations which refused to accept the "Tiffin agreement," under whose terms the majority of the churches constituting the former Hungarian Reformed Church in America were formally transferred to the jurisdiction of the Reformed Church in the United States. There are also a small number of congregations called Netherlands Dutch, and Protestant Reformed Churches, and some Hungarian churches, which have no general ecclesiastical organization and are included under the head of Independent churches.

In its earlier history each body clung to its ancestral language, a practice which not infrequently checked a natural growth, although it had the advantage of giving to the newcomers a congenial church life, to which is largely due the fact that these community have grown up loyal to the best interests both of their mother church and of their new country. As conditions changed, the use of English was accepted, and the older churches blended with the general interests of the community.

In their doctrine, polity, and general public life, the Reformed churches remain conservative. New ideas, simply because novel, have not had ready acceptance; yet new forms of organization, such as the various societies for young people and similar enterprises, have found a cordial welcome. In interdenominational relations they have always been friendly, are members of the Alliance of Reformed Churches, and early inaugurated foreign mission work. They have stood for high standards in education and scholarship and have furnished many men prominent in public life.

In doctrine they are generally Calvinistic. Their Heidelberg catechism emphasizes the general comfort of redemption in Christ, while the Westminster catechism teaches the same and emphasizes the sovereignty of God. The polity is presbyterian, differing from that of the Presbyterian churches only in the names of church offices and some minor details...

In 1926 it was noted that the Hungarian Reformed Church in America had been transferred to the jurisdiction of the [p. 1497] Reformed Church in the United States, with the exception of a few churches which did not approve the merger and organized in 1924 as the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America. Prior to 1936 the Reformed Church in the United States merged with the Evangelical Synod of North America under the name "Evangelical and Reformed Church," [which in turn became a part of the United Church of Christ in 1957].

1283. Reformed Bodies—Christian Reformed Church SOURCE: *CRB*, *1936*, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1515, 1516.

[p. 1515] *History*. In 1846–47 a colony from Holland settled in Michigan and gave the names of their old provinces to their new homes, such as Zeeland, Vriesland, Holland, etc. Those in Iowa chose the significant name of "Pella" for their place of refuge. Practically all joined the Dutch Reformed Church [now the Reformed Church in America] in 1849, but when this union was formed they made an express condition that "they would be most perfectly free at any time they found an ecclesiastical connection opposed to their religious prosperity and enjoyment to bid (the Reformed Church) a fraternal adieu and be by themselves."

After some years a number of the members and two of the ministers of the Michigan congregations considered that various things in the doctrines and discipline of the church they had joined were opposed to their prosperity and enjoyment, and after considerable friction they withdrew April 8, 1857. Delegates from six churches met in Holland, Mich., in May 1857 and effected a separate organization. Two years later the name of "Holland Reformed Church" was adopted as the denominational title, but in 1861 it was changed to "True Dutch Reformed." In 1880 the name "Holland Christian Reformed Church in America" was chosen, but in 1890 the word "Holland" was dropped, and in 1904 the words "in America" were eliminated, so that the official title today is "Christian Reformed Church."

At first the growth was slow. Two of the congregations disappeared from the roll the year after organization, and one of the clergymen returned to the Reformed Church, leaving as sole pastor of the denomination Rev. K. Van den Bosch. Owing to different opinions in regard to ecclesiastical customs, considerable agitation arose among the members. In 1864 Rev. D. J. Van der Werp, an earnest preacher and a talented writer, came from the Netherlands to settle as pastor of the church at Graafschap, Allegan County, Mich. Coming into relations with recent immigrants from the Netherlands and from Germany (Bentheim and East Friesland), and finding many who were dissatisfied with the conditions in the Reformed Church, he succeeded within a few years in [p. 1516] organizing a number of congregations in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois, as well as in Michigan. He also began to train young men for the ministry, thus laying the foundation of the present theological school and Calvin College, which were formally opened in

1876 in Grand Rapids, Mich. In 1868 he began the publication of a biweekly paper, De Wachter (The Watchman), and through this medium was able to extend the influence of the movement in many directions.

In 1880 the first home missionary was ordained for the organization of churches among the Reformed Hollanders and East Frisians scattered in different parts of the United States. This home mission work, aided by increasing immigration and a constantly growing number of graduates from the theological school, has been the chief instrument in causing the comparatively rapid growth of the church in recent years.

The denomination was strengthened considerably in 1882 by the accession of half a dozen churches which, with their pastors, had left the Reformed Church because of the refusal of its General Synod to condemn freemasonry and to discipline communicant members who were members of that organization. A further considerable increase came in 1890 when the Classis of Hackensack united with the denomination. This classis was the remnant of the True Reformed Dutch Church, which in 1822 had withdrawn from the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America (then called the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church) because of its alleged departure from Calvinistic teaching and preaching and from the exercise of church discipline.

In their early history the language of the churches was almost exclusively Dutch, but what became known as the "Americanization movement" in Michigan was strengthened by the formation of an English-speaking congregation in Grand Rapids, Mich., and the addition of the Hackensack Classis, which had been using English from the beginning. In the city congregations in all instances the use of English has increased very fast since the World War, so that nearly all conduct their services each Sunday in the English language. All of the Sunday-school work and catechism teaching is, likewise, carried on in English. In Iowa and Minnesota about half a dozen rural churches still make very limited use of the German language...

Doctrine. The creeds of the Christian Reformed Church are those of the Reformed Churches which trace their origin to Holland, namely, the Belgic Confession of Faith, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of Dort.

In the Dutch services, the Psalms are sung exclusively, except that a few "Spiritual Songs" are used as a supplement to the Psalter, and in all congregations a Psalter-Hymnal, published in 1934, and besides the 150 Psalms including 141 hymns, has taken the place of the Psalter version published, in 1912, by a committee of the United Presbyterian Church, based on the labors of a joint committee of nine American and Canadian denominations.

Organization. The church adopted as its constitution the 86 articles of church government (the Church Order) approved by the National Synod of Dort in 1619, insofar as they were suited to American civil conditions. These articles provide for a strictly presbyterian order of polity, including the parity of the ministry and the joint rule of the elders of the different congregations.

The first organization of all the congregations was called a "classis" (presbytery). From 1865 to 1879 general assemblies were held annually. In 1880 the name "synod" was adopted for the annual meeting of all the churches as one body.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 236,145 (YAC, 1961, p. 257.)]

1284. Reformed Bodies—Reformed Church in America (Dutch Reformed Church)

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, pp. 1504-1506.

[p. 1504] *History*. The Reformed Church in America traces its origin to the Reformed Church in Holland. After the Reformation had triumphed in the northern provinces of the Netherlands, Holland became a stronghold of the Protestant faith and a refuge from persecution in other countries. The congregations worshiped at first as "The Churches of the Netherlands under the Cross," but before 1560 a united organization had been formed, and 1566 and 1568 important synods were in session. The presbyterian form of government, as set forth by Calvin, was adopted; ministers, elders, and deacons were the constituted officers, and, in the local church, formed the consistory. The Belgic Confession of Faith and the Heidelberg Catechism were adopted as the standards of doctrine. A liturgy drawn from early sources and from liturgies in use elsewhere at the time was introduced in the churches. In 1618–19 the canons of the Synod of Dort were also made a doctrinal standard.

The Reformed religion came to New Netherland with the earliest Dutch settlers. "Comforters of the Sick" were commissioned to minister to the spiritual needs of the colonists. They conducted informal religious services until the arrival of the first minister of the New Amsterdam Church, Rev. Jonas Michaelius, on April 7, 1628. In that same year the church, now known as the "Collegiate Church," the oldest church in the Middle States, was formally organized.

At first the work in America was in charge of the Synod of Holland, or more directly, the Classis of Amsterdam. The ministers, who were few in number, came from Holland. Toward the middle of the eighteenth century the exercise of authority here became the occasion of sharp and protracted controversy, and two parties arose, the Coetus and Conferentie, the issue in the latter part of the century being the entire independence of the American church.

[p. 1505] The education and ordination of ministers were the chief points of controversy. Not enough ministers were coming from Holland. It was a long, difficult, and expensive thing to send young men to Holland for education or for ordination if educated here. Foremost in advocating education and ordination in this country were Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen, who came in 1719–20 to serve the churches in the Raritan Valley, in New Jersey, and his sons, John and Theodorus. Following their efforts and under the immediate leadership of Jacob Rutsen Hardenbergh, then minister of the Raritan Valley churches, and Hendrick Fisher the elder, a college was founded. It was one of the nine colonial colleges and received its first charter in 1766 and its second in 1770 from George III of England. It was located at New Brunswick, N. J., was called Queen's College; in 1825 its name was changed to Rutgers College. John Henry Livingston was appointed professor of theology in 1784. This was the beginning of the first theological seminary to be established in this country. The founding of the college and the seminary practically coincided with the emerging of the church into its independent American organization.

John Henry Livingston, returning in 1770 from theological study at Utrecht to take charge of the New York church, brought with him a plan of union which formally united the church and made virtually complete the independent authority which had been growing for 20 years. A General Body and five Particular Bodies were created. In 1792 a more formal constitution was adopted, and in 1794 the General Synod was organized. The presbyterian form of government was retained and the three doctrinal standards brought from the Netherlands continued to be the accepted standards of the church. The liturgy was adopted in 1771, although some changes have been made in it from time to time. The constitution also has been revised at different times, the last extensive revision having been made in 1916. Two names were in use at the time of the adoption of the constitution in 1792—namely, "The Dutch Reformed Church in North America" and "The Reformed Dutch Church in the United States of America." In 1819 the church was incorporated as "The Reformed Protestant Dutch Church." In 1867 the name was changed to "The Reformed Church in America."

The church spread and grew strong in New York and New Jersey. In the middle of the nineteenth century it received an increment of great importance and promise in the large Dutch immigration. This immigration was made up of whole congregations which, with their ministers, sought relief from religious troubles in the homeland. In 1850 the first of these congregations became formally a part of the Reformed Church in America. These people settled in the North and Middle West, beginning in Michigan and Iowa. The coming of such colonists continued, their descendants multiplied, and they spread through these and neighboring States. New congregations were and are still constantly being formed. Thus, in the West, as well as in the East, the strength of the church has increased. An outgrowth of the Dutch settlement and religious life in the West was the founding of Hope College at Holland, Mich., in 1866, and of the Western Theological Seminary. Central College, at Pella, Iowa, became a Reformed Church institution in 1916. The Northwestern Classical Academy, at Orange City, Iowa, added a junior college in 1928.

The earliest efforts of the church toward general extension in domestic mission lines were begun in 1786 when the church at Saratoga petitioned the synod for a minister, and a committee was appointed to devise some plan of preaching the Gospel in destitute localities. This was followed by similar applications from Dutch families in Pennsylvania and Kentucky, while a number of churches in Canada were also cared for. For many years the Classis of Albany acted as agent of the synod in looking after such localities in the North. The Canadian churches were subsequently transferred to the Presbyterians. In 1806 the General Synod assumed the management of all missionary operations, and it continued to send out itinerants, though not a few of the churches planted failed to develop on account of lack of frequent ministrations.

In 1822 several private individuals formed the Missionary Society of the Reformed Dutch Church, which was soon adopted by the synod. A similar organization was started at Albany in 1828, and in 1831 the Board of Domestic Missions was organized. From that time the movement became more aggressive. In 1837 a church was organized in Illinois, followed in a few years by churches in Michigan and Wisconsin. With the development of Dutch immigration in the West, the demand for missionary labor increased, and the board was reorganized in 1849. Five years later the plan of a church building fund to aid needy churches was proposed.

[p. 1506] The foreign missionary interests of the church were of early origin, some of the earliest Dutch ministers engaging also in work for the Indians. In 1796 the New York Missionary Society was formed by members of the Presbyterian, Reformed Dutch, and Baptist churches. This was succeeded in 1816 by the United Missionary Society, which in 1826 was merged in the American Board; but in 1832 a plan was adopted by which the Reformed Church in America, retaining its general connection with that board, conducted its own missions, developing work in India, China, Japan, and later in Arabia.

The necessity for an adequate and adequately trained ministry led very early in the history of the church to the formation of "Cent Societies" and "Education Societies" in individual churches and classes, the purpose of these being in each instance the financial aid of students for the ministry. On May 7, 1828, a group of ministers and elders of the Collegiate Church of New York met and organized "The Education Society of the Reformed Dutch Church" and raised funds for the aid of such students. In 1831 this society was adopted by the General Synod and renamed "The Board of Education of the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church," and it has functioned in this field since that time. The board was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York in 1869. Its functions have been enlarged from time to time. Its activities at present are outlined in the section on "Work."

Doctrine. The doctrinal standards of the Reformed Church in America are the Belgic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of the Synod of Dort. The church is thus a distinctively Calvinistic body. It has a liturgy for optional use in public worship, with forms of prayer. Some parts of the liturgy, as those for the administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper and for the ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons, are obligatory; the forms of prayer, the marriage service, etc., are not obligatory. Children are "baptized as heirs of the Kingdom of God and of His Covenant"; adults are baptized (by sprinkling or immersion, as preferred) on profession of repentance for sin and faith in Christ. All baptized persons are considered members of the church, are under its care, and are subject to its government and discipline. No subscription to a specific form of words being required, admission to communion and full membership is on confession of faith before the elders and minister.

Ministers on being ordained are required to subscribe to the standards and polity of the church.

Organization. The polity of the Reformed Church is presbyterian. The government of the local church is under the control of a consistory which is composed of the minister, elders, and deacons...

The classis, which has immediate supervision of the churches and the ministry, consists of all the ministers within a certain district, and an elder from each consistory within that district... The classes of a certain district are combined in a particular synod... The highest court of the church is the General Synod.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 219,770 (YAC, 1961, p. 257).]

1285. Religion—American Statistics

SOURCE: Will Herberg, *Protestant—Catholic—Jew*, pp. 235–237. Copyright © 1955 by Will Herberg. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York.

[p. 235] Thus, in a recent quite extensive public opinion poll, some 87 per cent of the American people affirmed their belief in God as "absolutely certain" (10 per cent more were "fairly sure"); the proportion of Catholics "absolutely certain" was 92 per cent, but of Jews, only 70 per cent ("fairly sure," 7 and 18 per cent respectively). The Protestant figures were identical with the national average.

[p. 236] Again, while 18 per cent of those who identified themselves as Catholics stated that they had not attended church in the three previous months, some 56 per cent of the Jews made this confession. Of Protestants, 32 per cent said they had not been to church in that period, the same proportion as in the national sample. At the other extreme, 62 per cent of the Catholics said that they went to church at least once a week, as against

12 per cent of the Jews, 25 per cent of the Protestants, and 32 per cent of the nation as a whole.

Of Americans as a whole, 75 per cent have stated they regarded religion as "very important"; 83 per cent of the Catholics had this conviction, but only 47 per cent of the Jews. Protestants registered 76 per cent. On the other hand, 37 per cent of the Jews said they regarded religion as "fairly important," as against 14 per cent of the Catholics, 20 per cent of the Protestants, and 20 per cent of the national sample. The remainder—3 per cent of the Catholics, 4 per cent of the Protestants, 5 per cent of the national sample, but 15 per cent of the Jews—held religion to be "not very important" or not important at all.

About 83 per cent of Americans held the Bible to be the revealed word of God in some sense, and 10 per cent regarded it as merely a "work of literature." The breakdown shows that the Bible as revelation was affirmed by 88 per cent of the Catholics and 85 per cent of the Protestants, but by only 45 per cent of the Jews—an equal 45 per cent holding it to be merely a great literary work. Even those included in the category of "Others"—those who refused to identify themselves as Protestants, Catholics, or Jews—took a higher view of the Bible; some 52 per cent of them said they regarded it as revelation.

Though 83 per cent of Americans affirmed the Bible to be the revealed word of God, 40 per cent confessed that they read it never or hardly ever; 56 per cent of the Catholics admitted as much, 32 per cent of the Protestants, and 65 per cent of the Jews.

In all of these respects, the pattern is very much the same: [p. 237] Catholics come closest to the religious norm, to what is usually regarded as the beliefs and attitudes proper to religious people; Protestants come next, hewing close to the national average; Jews are most remote. The one exception so far, that Catholics read the Bible considerably less and Protestants considerably more than the national sample, may easily be accounted for by the special traditions of these groups.

1286. Religion, Distribution of, in the U.S., March, 1957 SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States; March 1957" (its *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 79, February 2, 1958), pp. 1, 2.

[p. 1] Two out of every three persons 14 years old and over in the United States regarded themselves as Protestant and one out of every four as Roman Catholic, according to the results of a sample survey of the civilian population taken by the Bureau of the Census in March 1957. In the survey, the answers to the question "What is your religion?" were obtained on a *voluntary* basis... In replying to the question as asked, many persons, in addition to those who maintain formal affiliation with a religious organization, associated themselves with such a group and reported its name.

Of all persons 14 years old and over in the survey, 96 percent reported a religion, 3 percent stated that they had no religion, and 1 percent made no report on religion. On the basis of the survey returns, it is estimated that in the civilian population 14 years old and over in March 1957 about 79.0 million persons regarded themselves as Protestant, 30.7 million as Roman Catholic, 3.9 million as Jewish, 1.5 million as having some other religion, and 3.2 million as having no religion.

It is further estimated that among those persons 14 years old and over 23.5 million regarded themselves as Baptist, 16.7 million as Methodist, 8.4 million as Lutheran, and 6.7 million as Presbyterian... The remaining 23.7 million Protestants 14 years old and over were distributed among many smaller denominations which are not shown separately in this report.

The figures in this report are subject to sampling variability, which may be relatively large in the case of the smaller figures and small differences between figures...

Color and sex.—More women than men were reported for the major religious groups... This reflects both the larger number of women than men in the total population and the exclusion from the survey [p. 2] of about 2 million members of the Armed Forces... About three times as many men (2.4 million) as women (0.8 million) were reported as having no religion. Whether or not these differences are related to the fact that women generally gave information for the household members is unknown.

About 64 percent of the white population and 88 percent of the nonwhite population were reported as Protestant. About three-fourths of the nonwhites were reported as Baptists or Methodist (61 percent and 17 percent, respectively). About 31 percent of the persons reported as Baptist and 12 percent of those reported as Methodist were nonwhite. Thus, a larger proportion of the nonwhite population than of the white population is concentrated in a few religious groups.

Region of residence.—About 83 percent of the civilian population 14 years old and over in the South in March 1957 was reported as Protestant, compared with about 42 percent of the population in the Northeast and 69 percent in the North Central Region and in the West... In the Northeast, the persons who said they were Roman Catholic comprised about 45 percent of the population of that region and constituted the largest religious group. The population in the Northeast included about 26 percent of the Nation's civilians 14 years old and over as compared with 17 percent of all persons reported as Protestant, 46 percent of the persons reported as Roman Catholic, 69 percent of those reported as Jewish, 42 percent of the persons reporting some other religion, and 11 percent of the persons reporting no religion. The Northeast had the largest proportion of population reporting a religion, 98 percent.

Urban and rural residence.—There are marked differences in the urban and rural distributions of the religious groups... Although 64 percent of the population 14 years old and over in 1957 lived in urban areas, 96 percent of the persons reported as Jewish, 79 percent of those reported as Roman Catholic, 57 percent of those reported as Protestant, and 54 percent of those reporting no religion lived in urban areas. In urban areas, 59 percent of the population was reported as Protestant, 32 percent as Roman Catholic, 5 percent as Jewish, 2 percent as having some other religion, and 2 percent as having no religion.

Age.—Among persons 14 years old and over, the median age was about 38.7 years for persons reported as Roman Catholic, 40.8 years for those reported as Protestant, 42.0 years for persons reporting no religion, and 44.5 years for persons reported as Jewish... These figures imply that the religious groups with relatively low median ages include above average proportions of young adults and below average proportions of persons in the older ages. The differences in the age distribution of persons in the several religious groups reflect, among other things, differences in the period of immigration of persons (or of their ancestors) and in their birth and death rates over long periods of time. A relatively large proportion of immigrants between 1880 and 1921 came from countries that were predominantly Roman Catholic. Moreover, the nonwhite population has had higher birth and death rates than the white population. The differences also reflect the effect of any shifting of persons from one religion to another during the course of their

lives. The present data show that only a small percentage of the population at each age regard themselves as having no religion.

Religion reported by married couples.—Among all married couples in which one partner was reported as Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Jewish, in 94 percent of the cases the other partner was reported in the same major group. ... If marriages occurred at random in respect to religion, this proportion would have been 56 percent. Under these circumstances, 44 percent of all couples would have reported the husband and wife in different major religious groups, but the survey found only 6 percent so reported. Although these figures suggest a major role of religious affiliation or preference in the selection of marriage partners, it is not possible to distinguish those cases in which one of the partners changed his religion to conform to that of the spouse. Moreover, the enumerators were instructed not to assume that all members of a family have the same religion, but it is possible that this instruction may have been overlooked in some cases.

Among married couples in which the husband, or the wife, were reported as Roman Catholic, 22 percent of the husbands or wives reported that they were Protestant or Jewish. For couples in which one spouse was reported as Protestant, 9 percent of the husbands or wives were reported as Roman Catholic or Jewish. For couples in which one spouse was reported as Jewish, 7 percent of the husbands or wives were reported as Protestant or Roman Catholic.

1287. Religion, Modern

SOURCE: J. B. Philips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 58, 59. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Philips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 58] Many modern Christians are inclined to put God back into the past. How many times in visiting various churches does one hear of what used to happen in the old days! And, since Christians derive a great deal of their inspiration from reading the Bible, they can all too easily envisage God as thoroughly at home in the sacred pages but somehow no part of the modern picture at all... Many Christians today cannot readily conceive of God operating in a world of television, washing machines, atomic fission, automation, psychiatry, electronic brains, glossy magazines, modern music, and jet propulsion. The complication and speed of present-day living make it extremely difficult for the mind to imagine the Biblical God interpenetrating such a system and operating [p. 59] within its pressures. The very word "God" seems out of key and even bizarre in our modern context.

1288. Religion, Modern Attitude Toward Ten Commandments Illustrated SOURCE: Russell L. Jaberg, "The Modern Ten," *Christianity Today*, 4 (May 9, 1960), 20. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

Sentimentalism and a lack of appreciation for the authority of the Word of God have wrought some changes in modern attitudes toward principles for living covered by the Ten Commandments. The commandments come out something as follows in our day:

I. *Thou shalt have no other gods before me*. "Religion is all right, but you can't be fanatical about it." II. *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image*. "Every man has his own religion; it is all right just so long as he is sincere about it." III. *Thou shalt not*

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. "I'm sure the Lord knows how vexed I was, for it was enough to make anyone say something." IV. *Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.* "You ought to go to Church when you can, but I need rest and relaxation and this is the only day I can get them." V. *Honor thy father and thy mother.* "Parents shouldn't force their children to do something; they may warp their children's personalities for life." VI. *Thou shalt not kill.* "It's a big world that runs fast and hard; so, someone's bound to get hurt." VII. *Thou shalt not commit adultery.* "Love will triumph in the end." VIII. *Thou shalt not steal.* "Everyone else is getting his. You have to make it for yourself any way you can; just be sure you don't get caught." IX. *Thou shalt not bear false witness.* "We were all just sitting around and talking. You know how one word brings on another. No one meant anything by what he said." X. *Thou shalt not covet.* "As soon as we can trade for a new hardtop and move into that new ranch house, then people will have to look up to us too."

1289. Religion, Modern—Need for Emphasis on Law SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, "Biblical, Liberal, Catholic," *The Christian Century*, 77 (Nov. 9, 1960), 1306. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

(5) Directly contrary to the trend of recent Protestant theology, in Christian ethics I have moved to a higher appreciation of law and even of a reasonable casuistry. Three kinds of experience are affecting me in this matter. One is a more thorough and sympathetic study of Judaism than I had previously undertaken. Another is life in the first-generation Christian church of Rhodesia, where it is absolutely necessary to have rules of church discipline in order to define the very meaning of the Christian life in the sea of paganism and superstition which surrounds it. The limitations of legalism also are painfully evident there and Galatians is a tract for the times. Yet Galatians 5 with its new law is as necessary as the message of forgiveness, grace and Christian freedom. Finally, having returned to America I find myself asking frequently whether we are so much better situated here where wealth is king and salvation is thought to be by psychological technique or earthly power. The church blends so easily into a culture which is, to say the least, ambiguous that certain eternal laws and the basic principles of Christian ethics need again to be taught with unmistakable clarity and vigor. The need is made the more urgent by the antinomian trend which is so prominent in current theology and by the prevailing moral confusion further confounded by the subtleties and paradoxes of "Christian realism."

1290. Religion, Modern Return to, and Conformity

SOURCE: Will Herberg, *Protestant—Catholic—Jew*, pp. 54, 69–73. Copyright © 1955 by Will Herberg. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York.

[p. 54] How does it come about that Americans today are, in one way, more religious than they have been for a long time and are becoming increasingly so, and yet, in other ways, are more remote from the centrality of Jewish-Christian faith than perhaps they have ever been? On one level at least, the answer would seem to be that the religious revival under way in this country today—the notable increase in religious identification, affiliation, and membership—is a reflection of the social necessity of "belonging." ...

[p. 69] People tend more and more to identify and locate themselves socially in terms of three great sub-communities—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish—defined in religious terms. To find a place in American society increasingly means to place oneself in one or another of these [p. 70] religious communities. And although this process of self-

identification and social location is not in itself intrinsically religious, the mere fact that in order to be "something" one must be either a Protestant, a Catholic, or a Jew means that one begins to think of oneself as religiously identified and affiliated...

Another factor of prime sociological importance has worked toward the same end, and that is the basic change in character structure that seems to be under way among certain sections of the American people. The reference here is to the shift from inner-direction to other-direction... [p. 71] The inner-directed man is work-conscious, intent upon achievement, not afraid to stand on his own feet and if necessary against the crowd, interested in "results" not in "personalities." It is the inner-directed man who has been characteristic of American life and achievement so far.

Lately, however, for reasons that are still obscure though we are beginning to get some inkling of them, there has been emerging on certain levels another character type, described as other-directed. Instead of possessing a built-in gyroscope to keep him true to his course, the other-directed man operates with a kind of built-in radar apparatus which is ceaselessly at work receiving signals from the person's "peer group" and adjusting him to the situation indicated by these signals... Whereas the inner-directed man, as we have seen, is always ready to stand up against his environment and indeed seems to get a kind of grim satisfaction out of doing so. The "morality" of the inner-directed type becomes "morale" for the other-directed; "character" becomes [p. 72] "personality"; moral indignation and intolerance give way to a kind of all-embracing tolerance—tolerance of everything and everybody except the "unadjusted" and the "anti-social." ...

It is not difficult to see the current turn to religion and the church as, in part at least, a reflection of the growing other-directedness of our middle-class culture... Being religious and joining a church is, under contemporary American conditions, a fundamental way of "adjusting" and "belonging"; through the built-in radar apparatus of other-direction it becomes almost automatic as an obvious social requirement, like entertaining or culture. The vogue of Van Gogh and Renoir reproductions in the suburban home and the rising church affiliation of the suburban community may not be totally unconnected; both may, without disparagement, be interpreted, in part at least, as the consequence of the craving for adjustment and conformity involved in other-direction...

[p. 73] These more obviously sociological factors ought not, however, to obscure other, perhaps less definable, forces operating at other levels of human life. The contemporary crisis of Western civilization, which has brought a sense of total insecurity to men everywhere, is surely one of the most significant of these...

In this situation of pervasive crisis and danger, religion appeals to many as "synonymous with peace," indeed as offering the "best hope of peace in the world today"—"peace of mind" for the individual amid the anxieties and confusions of contemporary existence.

1291. Religion, Modern Revival in, and Increased Crime

SOURCE: William Hard, "How Law-abiding Are We—Really?" *Reader's Digest*, 74 (May, 1959), 39, 40. Copyright 1959 by The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 39] We come to a woeful paradox.

One. There is no doubt that in America we now have a revival of religion. The National Council of the Churches of Christ has reported that our church membership, in proportion to population, was 36 percent in 1900, 49 percent in 1940 and 61 percent in 1957. What a growth in, at any rate, religiosity!

Two. Simultaneously we have the growth of dishonesty and of violence... This growth has included since January 1, 1957, more than 100 bombings or attempted bombings having racial or religious aspects.

Clearly we have achieved a split personality. We are having both a religious revival and a moral decline...

[p. 40] We have churches uttering religion. We need more people *living* religion.

I think it clear that we have not succeeded adequately in fusing "worship" and "the world." We have not succeeded adequately in fusing ritual and righteousness.

The ancient Hebrew prophets, whose sacred texts have the reverence of both Jews and Christians, found many ways of saying to the children of Israel: Ye have multiplied your ceremonies. But ye do not keep my commandments.

1292. Religion, Modern Revival of, in Secularist Framework SOURCE: Will Herberg, *Protestant—Catholic—Jew*, p. 13. Copyright © 1955 by Will Herberg. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York.

The religious situation in the United States today confronts us with a perplexing problem. "The fact of a religious revival in America cannot be gainsaid," Barbara Ward noted in her recent "Report to Europe on America." … Whether we judge by religious identification, church membership, or church attendance, whether we go by the best-seller lists, the mass media, or the writings of intellectuals, the conclusion is the same: there is every sign of a notable "turn to religion" among the American people today.

And yet, writing not much before Miss Ward's visit, a perceptive historian of America noted that at the mid-twentieth century, "the trend toward secularism in ideas was not reversed." ... The secularism dominating the American consciousness is not an overt philosophy; it is an underlying, often unconscious, orientation of life and thought, ... pervasive and omnipresent.

1293. Religion, Modern—Secularism Forgets Christ

SOURCE: Will Herberg, *Protestant—Catholic—Jew*, pp. 13–15. Copyright © 1955 by Will Herberg. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York.

[p. 13] When Ignazio Silone, the Italian writer and Socialist, was asked what he felt to be the "most important date in universal history," he replied unhesitatingly: "The twenty-fifth of December in the year zero." But when nearly thirty outstanding Americans were asked not long ago to rate the hundred most significant events in history, first place was given to Columbus' discovery of America, while Christ, His birth or [p. 14] crucifixion, came fourteenth, tied with the discovery of X rays and the Wright brothers' first plane flight. Silone is no orthodox Christian, yet it is evident that he takes his Christianity seriously in a way that the eminent American historians, educators, and journalists, who forgot all about Christ in listing significant events in history, obviously do not. The secularism that pervades the American consciousness is essentially of this kind: it is thinking and living in terms of a framework of reality and value remote from the religious beliefs simultaneously professed...

This is at least part of the picture presented by religion in contemporary America: Christians flocking to church, yet forgetting all about Christ when it comes to naming the most significant events in history; men and women valuing the Bible as revelation, purchasing and distributing it by the millions, yet apparently seldom reading it themselves. Every aspect of contemporary religious life reflects this paradox—pervasive secularism amid mounting religiosity, "the strengthening of the religious structure in spite of increasing secularization." The influx of members into the churches and the increased readiness of Americans to identify themselves in religious terms certainly appear to stand in contrast to the way Americans seem to think and feel about matters central to the faiths they profess.

[p. 15] The paradox is there, and it would be misleading to try to get rid of it by suppressing one or the other side of the apparent contradiction. It will not do to brush aside the evidences of religious revival by writing off the new religiousness as little more than shallow emotionalism, "escapism," or mere pretense. The people who join the churches, take part in church activities, send their children to church schools, and gladly identify themselves in religious terms are not fools or hypocrites. They are honest, intelligent people who take their religion quite seriously. Of that there cannot be much doubt.

Nor, on the other hand, can there be much doubt that, by and large, the religion which actually prevails among Americans today has lost much of its authentic Christian (or Jewish) content. Even when they are thinking, feeling, or acting religiously, their thinking, feeling, and acting do not bear an unequivocal relation to the faiths they profess. Americans think, feel, and act in terms quite obviously secularist at the very time that they exhibit every sign of a widespread religious revival. It is this secularism of a religious people, this religiousness in a secularist framework, that constitutes the problem posed by the contemporary religious situation in America.

1294. Religion, Popular, of No Practical Importance

SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *Beyond Personality* (1948), pp. 3, 4. Copyright 1945 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 3] Isn't the popular idea of Christianity just this? That Jesus Christ was a great moral teacher and that if only we took his advice we might be able to establish a better social order and avoid another war? Now, mind you, that is quite true. But it tells you very *little* about Christianity and it has no *practical* importance at all.

It's quite true that if we took Christ's advice we should soon be living in a happier world. You needn't even go as far as Christ. If we did all that Plato or Aristotle or Confucius told us, we'd get on a great deal better than we do. And so what? We never have followed the advice of the great teachers. Why are we likely to begin now? Why are we more likely to follow Christ than any of the others? Because He's the best moral teacher? But that makes it even less likely that we shall follow Him. If we can't take the elementary lessons, is it likely we're going to take the most advanced one? If Christianity only means one more bit of good advice, then Christianity is of no importance. There's been no lack [p. 4] of good advice for the last four thousand years. A bit more makes no difference.

1295. Religion—Predictions Concerning Its Supposed Imminent

Disappearance

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 1. Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

Religion would soon disappear among civilized people. This prediction was freely made from the middle to the end of the nineteenth century and later.

"God is dead," announced Nietzsche's Zarathustra.

"Religion is the opium of the masses," declared Karl Marx. He assured his readers that all belief in God would disappear when the Communist revolution had done away with the suffering of the poor under capitalist exploitation. Belief in God was only the rationalization of hidden emotional drives, explained Sigmund Freud. As for Christianity, one could now write its epitaph under the title, *The Future of an Illusion*.

1296. Religion—Trends in American Protestantism

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of Christianity, 1st ed., pp. 1423, 1424. Copyright 1953 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1423] In spite of dissent and tensions among Protestants there was a growing [p. 1424] unity. This was seen not only in organic unions and co"peration but also in other ways. Forms of worship spread from one denomination to another. Among several of the churches which had been opposed to liturgy traditional features of dignified worship began to be taken over from the Catholic (but not necessarily the Roman Catholic) heritage. "Divided chancels" which accorded a central place to the altar or communion table were substituted for the arrangement which focused attention on the pulpit. Ministers and choirs donned vestments. Books of praver for use in the public services became common, most of them with forms for the communion which were adaptations of the historic liturgies. More and more hymnals, even of the least co"perative denominations, drew from authors who ranged all the way from Unitarians to Roman Catholics. The observance of Lent, Holy Week, Good Friday, and Whitsunday which a generation earlier would have been shunned as "Popery" spread among churches on the extreme wing of Protestantism. Methods of reaching children, young people, and the laity, including summer assemblies, tended to be the same, regardless of the denomination. From time to time, chiefly on the initiative of Protestants, limited coöperation among Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews was achieved on special projects.

1297. Religion—Vanishing Faith in Future Life

SOURCE: Joseph Fletcher, "The Patient's Right to Die," *Harper's*, 221 (October 1960), 140. Copyright 1960 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

At the level of sheer logic, one of the most curious features of the "theological era" of the past is that most people feared and sought to avoid death at any and every cost, except sometimes for honor's sake. Even though they professed to have faith in personal survival after death, it was their Worst Enemy. Nowadays, when faith is waning not only in the prospect of hell but even of heaven, there is a trend toward accepting death as a part of reality, just as "natural" as life. Churchmen, even clergymen, are dropping the traditional faith in personal survival after death, just as many unbelievers do. Curiously, it is the skeptics about immortality who appear to face death more calmly. They seem somehow less inclined to hang on desperately to life at the cost of indescribable and uncreative suffering for themselves and others.

1298. Religions, False, of the Present Day

SOURCE: Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial*, pp. 236, 237. Copyright 1948 by Oxford University Press, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 236] In our Western world of today, the worship of Leviathan—the self-worship of the tribe—is a religion to which all of us pay some measure of allegiance; and this tribal religion is, of course, sheer idolatry. Communism, which is another of our latter-day religions, is, I think, a leaf taken from the book of Christianity—a leaf torn out and misread. Democracy is another leaf from the book of Christianity, which has also, I fear, been torn out and, while perhaps not misread, has certainly [p. 237] been half emptied of meaning by being divorced from its Christian context and secularized; and we have

obviously, for a number of generations past, been living on spiritual capital, I mean clinging to Christian practice without possessing the Christian belief—and practice unsupported by belief is a wasting asset, as we have suddenly discovered.

1299. Religious Customs, Pagan and Christian

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 197–200, 204–212, 214–217.

[p. 197] I. HOLY WATER

The lustral use of water was familiar to the Romans at an early date...

[p. 198] In some of the Oriental cults established in Rome and elsewhere in Italy holy water had a still more important part. It was for example a feature of the cult of Isis...Further, we know from Apuleius that baptism by the priest was a prerequisite for initiation into the mysteries of Isis, its purpose being purification and remission of sins...[p. 199] And the followers of the Mithras cult also practiced baptism...

The ancient Roman custom of touching a baby's forehead and lips with spittle on the day on which it received its name is mentioned by Persius with caustic comment. The purpose of the act apparently was to avert the machinations of witch or demon. A similar use of spittle survives in the baptism service of the Roman Church today, in which the [p. 200] priest touches the ears and nostrils of the candidate for baptism with spittle, using among other phrases the words: *tu autem effugare*, *diabole*...

i pilases me words. ui dutem ejjugure, didbole...

[p. 204] 3. Bells, Gongs, Rattles

The use of bells in religious services was common in India and China long before it was adopted in Europe. We have, however, some fairly early examples in Greece and Etruria. For we are told that at the sanctuary of Zeus at Dodona bells were rung or gongs sounded; and the tomb of the Etruscan prince Porsenna, near Clusium, was equipped with a number of little bells that vibrated in the wind. On Roman soil we hear of a gong at the second temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, dedicated by Catulus in 69 B.C. Its purpose, like that of the bells at Dodona and on Porsenna's tomb, was probably to frighten away malicious spirits.

Bells were used in some of the foreign cults introduced into Italy... [p. 205] In the cult of Isis the rattle (*sistrum*) was in constant use both in processions and in services at the temple. In these cases also the most probable explanation of the practice is the belief that the sound warded off evil demons...

[p. 206] Of special interest ... is a bell found at Tarragona in Spain. It belonged to one Felix, a slave in a temple of the city, who used it in the rites of the cult of the Emperor (*sacris Augustis*). He may have rung it to indicate the moment of sacrifice or some other important point in the ritual...

And it is likely that in the use of the bell found at Tarragona to which reference has just been made we have the origin of the custom of ringing a small bell (the *sanctus*) at the celebration of the mass. Apparently an analogous use was made of the *sistrum* by the priests of Isis. In the fresco from Herculaneum de- [p. 207] picting the adoration of the holy water the priest and priestess on either side of the officiant are represented as shaking a *sistrum*...

[p. 208] 4. LIGHTS

Lighted lamps and torches appear in various cults and ceremonies of ancient Rome... [p. 209] The polemical writings of Tertullian (about A.D. 200) and Lactantius (about A.D. 300) make it plain that the placing of lights before the images of gods and on votive objects was a common pagan practice.

At first the Christians scrupulously refrained from a ritual use of lights. In their eyes apparently the practice had the taint of paganism. But from the end of the third century their attitude seems to have changed and after the recognition of Christianity by Constantine the symbolical use of lights established itself firmly in many kinds of ceremonies. Candles were burned before images of the Madonna or Christ or the Saints, and were a conspicuous part of numerous ceremonial processions and sacred [p. 210] ceremonies such as baptisms, marriages, and funerals. While some of the Christian writers continued to protest against this pagan element in the Church, others defended it. Lights became and still are an inevitable concomitant of many forms of religious service. Their reintroduction into cult after the primitive simplicity of the first few centuries of Christianity had passed away, was only one phase of that externalism that came to be a notable characteristic of Christianity after and partly as a result of the imperial favor which it attained.

5. *INCENSE* ...

[p. 211] In the days of religious conflict the practice of burning incense distinguished pagans from Christians. Prudentius calls the pagan idolaters "the incense-bearing crowd" (*turifera grex*), and one of the tests imposed on persons suspected of being Christians was the offering of a few grains of incense on the altar of some Roman god...

Perhaps it was the bitter associations of the Christians with incense that inhibited its use by them during the first four centuries of the Church. At any rate there is no evidence of its being employed ritually till nearly the end of the fourth century... [p. 212] Only gradually was its use extended in the west to the celebration of the mass and other solemn services of the Catholic church. This had, however, become the practice by the fourteenth century and now obtains. In the Anglican church the use of incense, which was abolished at the Reformation, was resumed about the middle of the nineteenth century and at present is increasing...

[p. 214] 7. GARLANDS ...

In the early days of the Church the garland was a symbol of paganism, as is clear from Tertullian's story of the soldier whose adherence to Christianity was detected through his refusal to wear one... [p. 215] But little by little the attitude of the Christians changed...

The same spirit that in Horace's ode "crowned the little images of the gods with rosemary and myrtle" still finds expression in the images of the Madonna decked with garlands that [p. 216] may be seen along the roads in southern Italy.

8. TONSURE

The shaven head was one of the characteristics of the priests of Isis... Tonsure was known to other Oriental religions...

[p. 217] The oft-quoted saying of St. Jerome that Christian priests should not appear with shorn head lest they be confounded with priests of Isis and Serapis or other heathen deities suggests the possibility that Christian clerics had sometimes done so. One gets the same impression from the action of the Council of Carthage (398), which prohibited the cutting of the beard and hair. It is a mistake to say that the tonsure was not practiced in the fourth century. All that can be safely said is that it was not authorized.

In heathen and Christian rites the significance of the tonsure was the same. It indicated the separation of the devotee from the world and his ascription to divine service.

1300. Religious Liberty, American Founders on

a. George Washington

SOURCE: To the General Committee, Representing the United Baptist Churches in Virginia. May, 1789, in *The Writings of George Washington*, edited by Jared Sparks, Part 5, Vol. 12, p. 155.

Every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.

b. Thomas Jefferson

SOURCE: An Act for establishing Religious Freedom, passed in the Assembly of Virginia in the beginning of the year 1786, in *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by H. A. Washington, Vol. 8, p. 454, Appendix, No. III.

Almighty God hath created the mind free; ... all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy Author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do.

c. Benjamin Franklin

SOURCE: Letter to Richard Price, Oct. 9, 1780, in *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, edited by Albert Henry Smyth, Vol. 8, p. 154.

When a Religion is good, I conceive that it will support itself; and, when it cannot support itself, and God does not take care to support, so that its Professors are oblig'd to call for the help of the Civil Power, it is a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one.

d. James Madison

SOURCE: Letter to Edward Everett, March 19, 1823, in *Letters and Other Writings of James Madison*, Vol. 3, p. 307.

Religion is essentially distinct from civil Government, and exempt from its cognizance; ... a connexion between them is injurious to both.

1301. Religious Liberty—Canadian Bill of Rights

SOURCE: Statutes of Canada, 8–9 Elizabeth II (1960), chap. 44, pp. 519–521. [p. 519] CHAP. 44

An Act for the Recognition and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

[Assented to 10th August, 1960.]

The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions;

Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law;

And being desirous of enshrining these principles and the human rights and fundamental freedoms derived from them, in a Bill of Rights which shall reflect the respect of Parliament for its constitutional authority and which shall ensure the protection of these rights and freedoms in Canada: THEREFORE Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

PARTI

BILL OF RIGHTS.

- It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely,(a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law; [p. 520] (b) the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law; (c) freedom of religion; (d) freedom of speech; (e) freedom of assembly and association; and (f) freedom of the press.
- Every law of Canada shall, unless it is expressly declared by an Act of the Parliament 2. of Canada that it shall operate notwithstanding the Canadian Bill of Rights, be so construed and applied as not to abrogate, abridge or infringe or to authorize the abrogation, abridgment or infringement of any of the rights or freedoms herein recognized and declared, and in particular, no law of Canada shall be construed or authorize or effect the arbitrary detention, imprisonment or exile of applied so as to(a)impose or authorize the imposition of cruel and unusual treatment or any person;(b) deprive a person who has been arrested or detained(i) punishment;(c) of the right to be informed promptly of the reason for his arrest or detention.(ii) of the right to retain and instruct counsel without delay, or(iii) of the remedy by way of *habeas corpus* for the determination of the validity of his detention and for his release if the detention is not authorize a court, tribunal, commission, board or other authority to compel a lawful:(*d*) person to give evidence if he is denied counsel, protection against self crimination or deprive a person of the right to a fair hearing in other constitutional safeguards;(*e*) accordance with the principles of fundamental justice for the determination of his rights and obligations;(f) deprive a person charged with a criminal offence of the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, or of the right to reasonable bail without just cause; deprive a person of the right to the assistance of an interpreter in any proceedings or(g)in which he is involved or in which he is a party or a witness, before a court, commission, board or other tribunal, if he does not understand or speak the language in which such proceedings are conducted.
- 3. The Minister of Justice shall, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council, examine every proposed regulation submitted in draft form [p. 521] to the Clerk of the Privy Council pursuant to the *Regulations Act* and every Bill introduced in or presented to the House of Commons, in order to ascertain whether any of the provisions thereof are inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of this Part and he shall report any such inconsistency to the House of Commons at the first convenient opportunity.
- 4. The provisions of this Part shall be known as the *Canadian Bill of Rights*.

PART II

5. (1) Nothing in Part I shall be construed to abrogate or abridge any human right or fundamental freedom not enumerated therein that may have existed in Canada at the commencement of this Act.

1302. Religious Liberty—Catholic Hopes for Tolerance, Reason for SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 51. Used by permission.

But there is also another and still worse totalitarianism [than clericalism], that of the anti-religious totalitarian countries. And in face of this danger, Roman Catholic thinkers ask all Christians to unite their forces in mutual tolerance for the defence of Christendom.

1303. Religious Liberty, Catholic Liberal View on SOURCE: Max Pribilla, "Dogmatische Intoleranz und bürgerliche Toleranz" ("Dogmatic Intolerance and Civil Tolerance"), *Stimmen der Zeit*, 144 (April, 1949), 39. Used by permission of *Stimmen der*

Zeit.

Christianity as a whole is today facing a violent attack which threatens to extinguish all rights of God and of man. At this vital stage it is the compelling duty of all Christians to act together and to unite their forces for the defence of their highest and holiest possession. This presupposes *that the Christian churches and communions should renounce the application of force and outward pressure (in any form)* in their mutual competition and settle spiritual issues with spiritual weapons. But this means that *they should not only retain liberty of religious practice for themselves, but grant it to others as well*.

1304. Religious Liberty, Catholic Liberal Views on, Not Official SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), Preface. Used by permission.

This present study tries to investigate only one Roman Catholic tendency concerning religious liberty: *that which considers freedom of religion as essentially linked with the Christian and evangelical spirit.* As we point out in Chapter III, we do not forget that many Roman Catholics are still resolutely against this doctrinal position, but we think it necessary to stress the momentous importance, within the Roman Catholic Church, of the every day increasing stream in favour of religious liberty. If such an attitude should prevail in Roman Catholic thinking and practice, there is no doubt that new ways would open towards an ecumenical understanding with our Catholic brethren.

1305. Religious Liberty, Catholic Limitation of—Question of a "Right Conscience"

SOURCE: James Cardinal Gibbons, *The Faith of Our Fathers* (92d ed., rev.; Baltimore: John Murphy Company, [192–]), p. 226.

A man enjoys *religious* liberty when he possesses the free right of worshiping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God.

1306. Religious Liberty, Catholic Opinion Divided on

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 37. Used by permission.

The right to live in accordance with God's will means practically the right to live in accordance with one's own conscience. And that right is called "freedom of conscience."

This right is directed particularly against the authorities in society. Even the authority of the Church is bound up with freedom of conscience. "If the Pope himself were to order me to do something that is against my conscience, I should refuse," said Cardinal

Buoncompagni, who later became Gregory XIII, in 1565 to Philip II of Spain.³ [Note 3: *Cf.* LUDWIG VON PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, vol. IX, p. 16.]

For many Roman Catholic theologians, the deep implications of this right to freedom of conscience spring from the fact that such freedom is the social aspect of the metaphysical link between the personality and its transcendental destiny...

Nevertheless, there are still some Roman Catholic theologians who believe that this right to freedom of conscience should not be accorded to the "erring conscience" for the well-known reason that "error has no rights."

1307. Religious Liberty—Catholic Traditional Intolerance

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), pp. 57, 58. Used by permission.

[p. 57] We have spoken of a new Roman Catholic theory and we added that its defenders do not like the word "new." As a matter of fact the Catholic defenders of religious liberty, wishing to remain within the traditional orthodoxy of their church, are very much concerned to prove that their doctrine is not *new* at all but, on the contrary, that it has in its favour the most ancient currents of Catholic thought...

What disturbs [these Catholic] defenders of religious freedom is precisely that their adversaries frequently pretend ... that the Roman Catholic Church has already taken its final decision *against* religious liberty...

The arguments brought up to prove that the *real* Roman Catholic tradition and doctrine are against religious freedom are strong enough and not to be refuted easily. They are of two kinds:

(a) First of all, the Roman Catholic Church seems to have always acted, in practice, against the principles of religious liberty. The Inquisition, the historical fact of "Sacral Christendom," the bloody persecution of heresy, the confabulation of Church and state to oppress [p. 58] non-Catholic citizens, all seem to point toward *an intolerant attitude* which should necessarily correspond to *an intolerant doctrine*.

(b) Secondly, which is worse, there are many *statements of doctrine* by which the Popes seem to have condemned, clearly and without ambiguity, religious liberty.

1308. Religious Liberty, Early Church View of (3d Century) SOURCE: Tertullian, *To Scapula*, chap. 2, trans. by S. Thelwall in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 105.

It is a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his own convictions... It is assuredly no part of to compell religion—to which free-will and not force should lead us.

1309. Religious Liberty, Early Church View of (4th Century)

SOURCE: Hilary of Poitiers, *Liber contra Auxentium* ("Book Against Auxentius"), cap. iv, quoted in E. Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, trans. by Bertrand L. Conway (New York: Longmans, 1908), p. 6. Copyright 1907 by Bertrand L. Conway. Used by permission.

I ask you Bishops to tell me, whose favor did the Apostles seek in preaching the Gospel, and on whose power did they rely to preach Jesus Christ? Today, alas! while the power of the State enforces divine faith, men say that Christ is powerless. The Church threatens exile and imprisonment; she in whom men formerly believed while in exile and prison, now wishes to make men believe her by force... What a striking contrast between the Church of the past and the Church of to-day.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Hilary wrote when Arian bishops used the power of the state against Catholics, A.D. 363. Vacandard remarks (on p. 7): "To sum up: As late as the middle of the fourth century and even later,

all the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers who discuss the question of toleration are opposed to the use of force."]

1310. Religious Liberty, for Christians, Granted by Roman Emperor Galerius (311)

SOURCE: Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press [189–]), pp. 28, 29.

[p. 28] Lactantius, De Mort. Pers. ch. 34, 35. Opera, ed. O. F. Fritzsche, II, p. 273. (Bibl. Patr. Ecc. Lat. XI, Leipzig, 1844.)

(Ch. 34.) Among other arrangements which we are always accustomed to make for the prosperity and welfare of the republic, we had desired formerly to bring all things into harmony with the ancient laws and public order of the Romans, and to provide that even the Christians who had left the religion of their fathers should come back to reason; since, indeed, the Christians themselves, for some reason, had followed such a caprice and had fallen into such a folly that they would not obey the institutes of antiquity, which perchance their own ancestors had first established; but at their own will and pleasure, they would thus make laws unto themselves which they should observe and would collect various peoples in divers places in congregations. Finally, when our law had been promulgated to the effect that they should conform to the institutes of antiquity, many were subdued by the fear of danger, many even suffered death. And yet since most of them persevered in their determination, and we saw that they neither paid the reverence and awe due to the gods nor worshipped the God of the Christians, in view of our most mild clemency and the constant habit by which we are accustomed to grant indulgence to all, we thought that we ought to grant our most prompt indulgence also to these, so that they may again be Christians and may hold their conventicles, provided they do nothing contrary to good order. But we shall tell the magistrates in another letter what they ought to do.

Wherefore, for this our indulgence, they ought to pray to their God for our safety, for that of the republic, and for their own, that the republic may continue uninjured on every side, and that they may be able to live securely in their homes.

[p. 29] (ch. 35). This edict is published at Nicomedia on the day before the Kalends of May, in our eighth consulship and the second [consulship] of Maximinus.

1311. Religious Liberty, for Pagans and Christians, Granted by Constantine (313)

SOURCE: Constantine and Licinius, quoted in Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* x. 5. 1–14; translated by J. E. L. Oulton, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 445, 447, 449, 451, 453. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 445] *Copy of Imperial Ordinances translated from the Latin tongue.*¹ [Note 1: ...It is probable that at Milan, in 313 (ix. 11. 9), Constantine and Licinius drew up a norm of instructions to governors which might be copied, with perhaps some variations in detail, and sent to the various provinces. One redaction of that norm was translated by Eusebius, another was transcribed by Lactantius (*De Mortibus Persecutorum* 48).]

In our watchfulness in days gone by that freedom of worship should not be denied, but that each one according to his mind and purpose should have authority given him to care for divine things in the [p. 447] way that pleased him best, we had given orders that both to the Christians [and to all others liberty should be allowed] to keep to the faith of their own sect and worship. But inasmuch as many and various conditions seemed clearly to have been added in that rescript, in which such rights were conceded to the same persons, it may be that perchance some of them were shortly afterwards repelled from such observance. [Bracketed note in Eusebius.]

When I Constantine Augustus and I Licinius Augustus had come under happy auspices to Milan, and discussed all matters that concerned the public advantage and good, among the other things that seemed to be of benefit to the many,—or rather, first and foremost—we resolved to make such decrees as should secure respect and reverence for the Deity: namely, to grant both to the Christians and to all the free choice of following whatever form of worship they pleased, to the intent that all the divine and heavenly powers that be might be favourable to us and all those living under our authority. Therefore with sound and most upright reasoning we resolved on this counsel: that authority be refused to no one whomsoever to follow and choose the observance or form of worship that Christians use, and that authority be granted to each one to give his mind to that form of worship which he deems suitable to himself, to the intent that the Divinity ... may in all things afford us his wonted care and generosity. It was fitting to send a rescript that this is our pleasure, in order that when those conditions had altogether been [p. 449] removed, which were contained in our former letters sent to thy Devotedness, concerning the Christians, those things also which seemed to be wholly unfortunate and foreign to our clemency might be removed, and that now each one of those who were possessed of the same purpose-namely, to observe the Christians' form of worship—should observe this very thing, freely and simply, without any hindrance. Which things we have resolved, to signify in the fullest manner to thy Carefulness, to the intent that thou mayest know that we have granted to these same Christians free and unrestricted authority to observe their own form of worship. And when thou perceivest that this has been granted unrestrictedly to them by us, thy Devotedness will understand that authority has been given to others also, who wish to follow their own observance and form of worship—a thing clearly suited to the peacefulness of our times—so that each one may have authority to choose and observe whatever form he pleases. This has been done by us, to the intent that we should not seem to have detracted in any way from any rite or form of worship.

And this, moreover, with special regard to the Christians, we resolve: That their places, at which it was their former wont to assemble, concerning which also in the former letter dispatched to thy Devotedness a definite ordinance had been formerly laid down, if any should appear to have bought them either from our treasury or from any other source—that these they should restore to these same Christians without payment or any demand for com- [p. 451] pensation, setting aside all negligence and doubtfulness; and if any chance to have received them by gift, that they should restore them with all speed to these same Christians: provided that if either those who have purchased these same places or those who have received them by gift request aught of our generosity, let them approach the prefect of the district, to the intent that through our kindness thought may be taken for them also. All which things must be handed over to the corporation of the Christians by thy zealous care immediately and without delay.

And inasmuch as these same Christians had not only those places at which it was their wont to assemble, but also are known to have had others, belonging not to individuals among them, but to the lawful property of their corporation, that is, of the Christians, all these, under the provisions of the law set forth above, thou wilt give orders to be restored without any question whatsoever to these same Christians, that is, to their corporation and assembly; provided always, of course, as aforesaid, that those persons who restore the same without compensation, as we have mentioned above, may look for indemnification, as far as they are concerned, from our generosity.

In all these things thou shouldest use all the diligence in thy power for the abovementioned corporation of the Christians, that this our command may be fulfilled with all speed, so that in this also, through our kindness, thought may be taken for the common and public peace. For by this method, as we have also said before, the divine [p. 453] care for us which we have already experienced in many matters, will remain stedfast ... continually. And that the form which this our enactment and generosity takes may be brought to the knowledge of all, it is fitting that this which we have written be set forth by thy order and published everywhere, and brought to the knowledge of all, to the intent that the enactment which embodies this our generosity may escape the notice of no one.

1312. Religious Liberty, for Pagans and Christians Under Constantine (313)

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 71, 72. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The Edict of Toleration

[p. 71] The second, and much more serious, mistake about Constantine is the idea that he established Christianity as the empire's official religion and banned pagan worship. What he did was immensely important, but it was not that. What he really did was to proclaim complete religious liberty for both pagans and Christians. Personally he favored Christianity, as has been said earlier, but he decreed that everyone in the empire should be free to worship whatever God or gods he pleased [see Nos. 1310, 1311]. This was exactly what such Christians as Tertullian and Lactantius had been arguing for... Constantine granted their request...

This was a very radical program. One may well question whether Constantine realized how radical it was. It would be centuries before the development of any doctrine of human rights or any principle of religious liberty to support such complete freedom of individual choice in matters of religion. John Locke stated it theoretically in 1689. The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States enacted it into law in 1791. The edict was indeed a landmark in the fortunes of the church, [p. 72] for it ended the age of Christian martyrs and brought the church out of the catacombs. It would have been a turning point in the history of civilization and political theory if its generous provisions had been maintained. In the light of what followed we can now see that it marked only the moment of transition when the moving finger paused briefly at the zero point while shifting from one side to the other on the dial of persecution—from the persecution of orthodox Christians in alliance with the state.

1313. Religious Liberty, in Early Anabaptist Church Articles SOURCE: David Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, Vol. 3 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1873), p. 101.

There was, however, *one* body or band of Separatists in James's reign who had pushed farther ahead, and grasped the idea of Liberty of Conscience at its very utmost... They were the poor and despised Anglo-Dutch Anabaptists who called John Smyth ... their leader. In a Confession, or Declaration of Faith, put forth in 1611 by the English Baptists in Amsterdam, just after the death of Smyth, this article occurs: "The magistrate is not to meddle with religion, or matters of conscience, nor compel men to this or that form of religion; because Christ is the King and Lawgiver of the Church and Conscience." It is believed that this is the first expression of the absolute principle of Liberty of Conscience in the public articles of any body of Christians.

1314. Religious Liberty, in the United States, Taken for Granted SOURCE: Paul Blanshard, *God and Man in Washington* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960), p. 58 Copyright 1960 by Paul Blanshard. Used by permission.

With only a few technical restrictions, any American can organize a church, teach or preach religion, conduct a religious school, found a religious hospital and publish and distribute literature about his faith without being molested. All these religious freedoms must be extended impartially to all churches or religious schools without discrimination.

Those freedoms seem commonplace enough to most Americans; we tend to take them for granted. Yet they represent one of history's greatest cultural achievements. They distinguish the American way of life in matters of religion from that of many other nations which consider themselves democratic.

1315. Religious Liberty, John Wesley on

SOURCE: John Wesley, "Advice to the People Called Methodists," in his *Works* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, [reprint of 1872 ed.]), Vol. 8, p. 357.

Condemn no man for not thinking as you think: Let every one enjoy the full and free liberty of thinking for himself: Let every man use his own judgment, since every man must give an account of himself to God. Abhor every approach, in any kind or degree, to the spirit of persecution. If you cannot reason or persuade a man into the truth, never attempt to force him into it. If love will not compel him to come in, leave him to God, the Judge of all.

1316. Religious Liberty, Roger Williams the Pioneer of, in the New World

SOURCE: Roger Williams, *The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution* (London: The Hanserd Knollys Society, 1848), p. 370, note 1.

[It is] a monstrous paradox, that God's children should persecute God's children, and that they that hope to live eternally together with Christ Jesus in the heavens, should not suffer each other to live in this common air together, &c. I am informed it was the speech of an honourable knight of the parliament: "What! Christ persecute Christ in New England?"

1317. Religious Liberty—U.S. First Amendment in Its Historical Setting SOURCE: Justice [Felix] Frankfurter, Separate (concurring) opinion in *McGowan* v. *Maryland* and three other cases, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 420, at pp. 463–467.

[p. 463] Within the discriminating phraseology of the First Amendment, distinction has been drawn between cases raising "establishment" and "free exercise" questions. Any attempt to formulate a bright-line distinction is bound to founder. In view of the competition among religious creeds, whatever "establishes" one sect disadvantages another, and vice versa. But it is possible historically, and therefore helpful analytically—no less for problems arising under the Fourteenth Amendment, illuminated as that Amendment is by our national experience, than for problems arising under the First—to isolate in general terms the two largely overlapping areas of concern reflected in the two constitutional phrases, "establishment" and "free exercise," and which emerge more [p. 464] or less clearly from the background of events and impulses which gave those phrases birth.

In assuring the free exercise of religion, the Framers of the First Amendment were sensitive to the then recent history of those persecutions and impositions of civil disability with which sectarian majorities in virtually all of the Colonies had visited deviation in the matter of conscience. This protection of unpopular creeds, however, was not to be the full extent of the Amendment's guarantee of freedom from governmental intrusion in matters of faith. The battle in Virginia, hardly four years won, where James Madison had led the forces of disestablishment in successful opposition to Patrick Henry's proposed Assessment Bill levying a general tax for the support of Christian teachers, was a vital and compelling [p. 465] memory in 1789. The lesson of that battle, in the words of Jefferson's Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, whose passage was its verbal embodiment, was "that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor, whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness, and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporal rewards, which proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labours for the instruction of mankind..." ⁵ [Note 5: 12 Hening, Statutes of Virginia (1823), 84, 85.] What Virginia had long practiced, and what Madison, Jefferson and others fought to end, was the extension of civil government's support to religion in a manner which made the two in some degree interdependent, and thus threatened the freedom of each. The purpose of the Establishment Clause was to assure that the national legislature would not exert its power in the service of any purely religious end; that it would not, as Virginia and virtually all of the Colonies had done, make of religion, as religion, an object of legislation.

Of course, the immediate object of the First Amendment's prohibition was the established church as it had been known in England and in most of the Colonies. But with foresight those who drafted and adopted the words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," did not limit the constitutional proscription to any particular, dated form of state-supported theological venture. The Establishment Clause withdrew from [p. 466] the sphere of legitimate legislative concern and competence a specific, but comprehensive, area of human conduct: man's belief or disbelief in the verity of some transcendental idea and man's expression in action of that belief or disbelief. Congress may not make these matters, as such, the subject of legislation, nor, now, may any legislature in this country. Neither the National Government nor, under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, a State, may, by any device, support belief or the expression of belief for its own sake, whether from conviction of the truth of that belief, or from conviction that by the propagation of that belief the civil welfare of the state is served, or because a majority of its citizens, holding that belief, are offended when all do not hold it.

With regulations which have other objectives the Establishment Clause, and the fundamental separationist concept which it expresses, are not concerned. These regulations may fall afoul of the constitutional guarantee against infringement of the free exercise or observance of religion. Where they do, they must be set aside at the instance of those whose faith they prejudice. But once it is determined that a challenged statute is

supportable as implementing other substantial interests than the promotion of belief, the guarantee prohibiting religious "establishment" is satisfied.

To ask what interest, what objective, legislation serves, of course, is not to psychoanalyze its legislators, but to examine the necessary effects of what they have enacted. If the primary end achieved by a form of regulation is the affirmation or promotion of religious doctrine—primary, in the sense that all secular ends which it purportedly serves are derivative from, not wholly independent of, the advancement of religion—the regulation is beyond the power of the state. This was the case in *McCollum*. Or if a statute furthers both secular and religious ends [p. 467] by means unnecessary to the effectuation of the secular ends alone—where the same secular ends could equally be attained by means which do not have consequences for promotion of religion—the statute cannot stand.

1318. Religious Liberty—U.S. First Amendment Interpreted Broadly SOURCE: U.S. Supreme Court opinion delivered by Mr. Chief Justice [Earl] Warren, in *McGowan* v. *Maryland*, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 420, at pp. 441–443.

[p. 441] An early commentator opined that the "real object of the [first] amendment was ... to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, which should give to an hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government." 3 Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, 728. But, the First Amendment, in its final form, [p. 442] did not simply bar a congressional enactment *establishing a church;* it forbade all laws *respecting an establishment of religion*. Thus, this Court has given the Amendment a "broad interpretation ... in the light of its history and the evils it was designed forever to suppress..." *Everson* v. *Board of Education, supra* [330 U.S. 1], at pp. 14–15. It has found that the First and Fourteenth Amendments afford protection against religious establishment far more extensive than merely to forbid a national or state church. Thus, in *McCollum* v. *Board of Education,* 333 U. S. 203, the Court held that the action of a board of education, permitting religious instruction during school hours in public school buildings and requiring those children who chose not to attend to remain in their classrooms, to be contrary to the "Establishment" Clause...

Thus, these broad principles have been set forth by this Court. Those cases dealing with the specific problems arising under the "Establishment" Clause which have reached this Court are few in number. The most extensive discussion of the "Establishment" Clause's latitude [p. 443] is to be found in *Everson* v. *Board of Education, supra,* at pp. 15–16 [Court decision]:

"The 'establishment of religion' clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor [p. 22] the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organization or groups and *vice versa*. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and State.""

1319. Religious Toleration, Catholic Definition of

SOURCE: Editorial, "On Religious Toleration," *America, National Catholic Weekly Review* (920 Broadway, New York 10, N.Y.), 103 (Sept. 24, 1960), 690–693. Used by permission.

[p. 690] Toleration in general is the forbearance we show to something we regard as evil or inadequate, but which we are unable or unwilling to do away with. Religious toleration is that magnanimity we show toward those of another faith, determining to leave it and its believers untroubled even though we are convinced they profess what is false...

We must carefully note the difference between *theoretical dogmatic tolerance* and *practical civic tolerance* (whether this latter is exercised by the individual or the organized community).

The Catholic position on theoretical dogmatic tolerance is simple: no man, be he doctor, lawyer or Indian chief, can defend this sort of tolerance if he has any regard for truth. Theoretical dogmatic tolerance is nothing else than the affirmation that truth and error are of equal value in a universe where truth, religious or otherwise, either does not exist or is unattainable. If God is eternal Truth, and if He has endowed the mind with a natural inclination to attain His Truth insofar as it is mirrored in creation, then adherence to truth is a universal ethical duty. In this sense, indeed, "error has no right to exist," nor can man's psychological freedom to err be construed as a God-given right to be in the wrong. No sound concept of human liberty [p. 691] can confound this precious prerogative with the license to pursue falsity, either intellectual or moral. The perfection of man's development cannot lie along a road that deviates from eternal Truth and Law; it must be sought in conformity with them.

With logical consistency, therefore, the Catholic Church is unqualifiedly intolerant toward what it believes to be erroneous in faith and morals. For here, above all, is the field where error can jeopardize the salvation of the human soul. Moreover, this is the field in which the Church holds itself uniquely qualified to instruct humanity. For the Catholic Church, religious truth is one, not multiple; the Church alone possesses the full deposit of that truth by divine revelation, together with a divine commission to teach it to all men. It follows as a consequence that in order to be faithful to its essential constitution, the Catholic Church cannot concede that other faiths are theoretically justifiable; hence dogmatic intolerance in matters of religious truth is not merely a right but a sacred duty. Non-Catholics may find the thesis unpalatable, but the Catholic Church cannot reject it except at the cost of itself turning Protestant...

It may be entirely proper to refute error, wherever it appears. But it may be entirely wrong to assault the mind and heart in which error resides, whether or not the error is held in good faith. For when we confront human persons, we are never at liberty to disregard the principles of justice and charity: the inviolability of personality gives a new dimension to the dialogue on toleration.

Even more, when we consider human beings as grouped into the social entities called states, the application of the principles of toleration demands careful estimation of the claims of the common welfare...

As for the nature of practical public toleration, which is our chief concern here, it may be described as that exercise of political wisdom whereby the civil community, in seeking the social good of peace, not only recognizes the right of every citizen to make a sincere interior commitment of faith, but also leaves everyone free to give that faith a suitable external profession and cultus, subject to the essential requirements of public order and morality... If we confine our attention to this broad ground of principle, it cannot be argued that the Catholic Church is opposed to practical public toleration, above all in the religiously pluralistic and constitutionally structured civil societies which are the emerging political pattern of modern times...

The repression of error, even in matters of religion, is not [p. 692] a good to be sought or achieved at all costs. In a definite historical context, the good of unity in faith may inevitably take second place to the common good of all the members of the commonwealth, simply because the benefits of religious unity cannot be attained without disastrously fracturing the bond of social fellowship...

So much then for the general principles that cover the abstract and practical aspects of religious toleration. All will grant that their application is difficult, and, to confine our attention to Catholicism, we will grant that in the long course of history they have been applied to real-life situations with limited consistency and wisdom. There have been Popes who were politically ambitious, theologians who were narrowly partisan, canonists who were too much influenced by the force of ancient customs. And since, after the Reformation, many Protestants have been on the "receiving end" of what impresses them, often justly, as Catholic bigotry, it is no wonder that they view with suspicion the actual attitudes of the Church toward religious toleration. They sometimes feel that the honeyed words about principles are given the lie by the record of the past and the thrust toward the future.

We will not advance the peaceful dialogue on toleration, it is to be feared, by airing ancient ills whose very recital evokes the uneasy ghosts of mistrust and prejudice. The grosser aspects of the Inquisition are no longer with us, but some of the odor remains, and so it is with many another difficulty that is cast up before us. If our non-Catholic brethren are to entertain any sympathetic appreciation of the new winds that are blowing through the fields of Catholic thinking on the pragmatic aspects of religious toleration, we must endeavor to make a fresh start toward the communication of understanding...

It is possible to cut the Gordian knot in this fashion and thus offer a less controversial basis for discussion of the divisive issue of toleration? We believe that such an approach is possible and that it will appeal to men of good will everywhere. The new basis is to be found in an important address of Pope Pius XII (*Pope Pius XII on the World Community*, The America Press, 25c.)

The late Pontiff was much preoccupied with the need of establishing a truly juridic world community among the society of nations...

While granting the difficulties and complexities that mankind would face in setting up such an organization, Pius XII did not hesitate to advance a *theoretical principle of harmonization* (Italics here and below are ours, not those of the Pope). He expounded it in the document named above, which was addressed to the Fifth National Convention of the Union of Italian Jurists on December 6, 1953:

Within the limits of the possible and lawful, to promote everything that facilitates union and makes it more effective; to remove everything that disturbs it; to tolerate at times that which it is impossible to correct but which, on the other hand, must not be permitted to make shipwreck of the community from which a higher good is hoped for.

Following this, the Pope proceeded to discuss the specific problem of protecting religion and morality in a world community whose member-states ran through the spectrum of belief from Christianity to professed atheism. In this matter, of which a partial aspect is the "practical coexistence of Catholic with non-Catholic states," Pius XII

proposed a *positive law of religious toleration* which was to be given world-wide validity and force:

Within its own territory and for its own citizens, each state will regulate religious and moral affairs by its own laws. *Nevertheless, throughout the whole territory of the international community of states, the citizens of every member-state will be allowed the exercise of their own beliefs and ethical and religious practices,* insofar as these do not contravene the penal laws of the state in which they are residing...

In justifying this sweeping concession to the claims of religious pluralism in a world community of states, Pius XII reviewed the traditional principles of religious toleration that we outlined in the earlier part of this editorial and raised the *crucial question*:

Could it be that in certain circumstances He (God) would not give men any mandate, would not impose any duty, and *would not even communicate the right* to impede or to repress what is erroneous and false?

To this question the Pope gave an affirmative answer: "Such a command is unknown to the common convictions of mankind, to Christian conscience, to the sources of revelation and to the practice of the Church."

The reason why the late Pontiff could commit himself so strongly to this position is to be found in what we emphasized in an earlier part of this essay: the duty of repressing religious and moral errors is not valid absolutely and unconditionally, even though the Church has a divine mandate to "draw to herself and [p. 693] bind together in religious unity the men of all races and of all times." Therefore, without prejudice to the duty of theoretical dogmatic intolerance, the Pope recognized the necessity of the *norm of the common good* for the resolution of questions of fact in the existential order of pluralistic communities:

The duty of repressing moral and religious error cannot therefore be an ultimate norm of action. It must be subordinated to *higher and more general* norms, which *in some circumstances* permit, and even perhaps seem to indicate as the better policy, toleration of error in order to promote *a greater good*. (In this quotation the italics are those of Pius XII.)

The greater good under discussion, of course, is that tremendous complex of spiritual and temporal goods which on the one hand embraces the welfare of the Church and State in every individual commonwealth, and on the other, the well-being of the universal Church and of the nascent world community internationally organized along juridic lines...

Pope Pius XII offered for juridic exploration and implementation a Magna Carta of Religious Liberty that is surely deserving of sympathy. And in proposing his plan, which he insisted was in accord with traditional principles, he did not hesitate to add that "no other norms are valid for the Church except the norms we have just indicated for the Catholic jurist and statesman."

Surely these forthright statements of a recent and most respected Pope should comfort those who are troubled with an obsessive fear that the Church entertains gross political designs upon the nations or upon the American political system in particular. In fact, it is quotations such as the above, together with others that might be drawn from the modern Popes beginning with Leo XIII, that will form the nucleus of a practical theology of toleration and of freedom of conscience that is applicable to the changing conditions of our time.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract is a forthright statement. It does not offer religious liberty, but what it advocates is, by definition in the first sentence correctly called toleration—"the forbearance" of "something we regard as evil or inadequate"; not an inalienable right inherent in the individual, but a sufferance that is granted (or withheld) at the discretion of the church or state for the benefit of "the common good," not for the protection of the minority. Religious repression is here not defined as an evil, but as "not a good to be sought or achieved at all costs." Private faith is to be given a "suitable" external profession and worship.

And the best that can be quoted from a papal pronouncement as a "sweeping concession to the claims of religious pluralism" is merely a concession of toleration, at times, of what is impossible to correct, with citizens of various states allowed their own beliefs and practices under the regulation of penal laws. This forthright statement will bear careful study, and should be taken exactly at face value.]

1320. Rewards, Final, of the Righteous and the Wicked (Moslem View)

SOURCE: Koran, Sūra lvi, 1–56, in *The Holy Qur–an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 2, pp. 1484–1490. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 1484] In the name of God, Most Gracious, Most Merciful.

- 1. When the Event Inevitable Cometh to pass,
- 2. Then will no (soul) Entertain falsehood Concerning its coming.
- 3. (Many) will it bring low; (Many) will it exalt;
- 4. When the earth shall be Shaken to its depths,
- 5. And the mountains shall Be crumbled to atoms,
- 6. Becoming dust scattered abroad,
- 7. And ye shall be sorted out Into three classes.

8. Then (there will be) The Companions of The Right Hand;—What will be The Companions of The Right Hand?

[p. 1485] 9. And the Companions of The Left Hand,—What will be The Companions of The Left Hand?

- 10. And those Foremost (In Faith) will be Foremost (in the Hereafter).
- 11. These will be Those Nearest to God:
- 12. In Gardens of Bliss:
- 13. A number of people From those of old,
- 14. And a few from those Of later times.
- 15. (They will be) on Thrones Encrusted (with gold And precious stones),
- 16. Reclining on them, Facing each other.
- [p. 1486] 17. Round about them will (serve) Youths of perpetual (freshness),

18. With goblets, (shining) beakers, And cups (filled) out of Clear-flowing fountains:

- 19. No after-ache will they Receive therefrom, nor will they Suffer intoxication:
- 20. And with fruits, Any that they may select;
- 21. And the flesh of fowls, Any that they may desire.
- 22. And (there will be) Companions With beautiful, big, And lustrous eyes,-
- 23. Like unto Pearls Well-guarded.
- 24. A Reward for the Deeds Of their past (Life).
- 25. No frivolity will they Hear therein, nor any Taint of ill,-
- [p. 1487] 26. Only the saying, "Peace! Peace".

27. The Companions of The Right Hand,—What will be The Companions of The Right Hand?

- 28. (They will be) among Lote-trees without thorns,
- 29. Among Talh trees With flowers (or fruits) Piled one above another,-
- 30. In shade long-extended,
- 31. By water flowing constantly,
- 32. And fruit in abundance.
- 33. Whose season is not limited, Nor (supply) forbidden,
- 34. And on Thrones (of Dignity), Raised high.

35. We have created (their Companions) Of special creation.

- [p. 1488] 36. And made them Virgin-pure (and undefiled),—
- 37. Beloved (by nature), Equal in age,—
- 38. For the Companions Of the Right Hand.

SECTION 2.

- 39. A (goodly) number From those of old,
- 40. And a (goodly) number From those of later times.
- 41. The Companions of The Left Hand,—What will be The Companions of The

Left Hand?

- 42. (They will be) in the midst Of a fierce Blast of Fire And in Boiling Water,
- 43. And in the shades of Black Smoke:
- 44. Nothing (will there be) To refresh, nor to please:
- 45. For that they were wont To be indulged, before that,

[p. 1489] In wealth (and luxury),

46. And persisted obstinately In wickedness supreme!

47. And they used to say, "What! when we die And become dust and bones, Shall we then indeed Be raised up again?—

- 48. "(We) and our fathers of old?"
- 49. Say: "Yea, those of old And those of later times,

50. "All will certainly be Gathered together for the meeting Appointed for a Day Well-known.

- 51. "Then will ye truly,—O ye that go wrong, And treat (Truth) as Falsehood!—
- 52. "Ye will surely taste Of the Tree of Zaqqūm.
- 53. "Then will ye fill Your insides therewith,
- 54. "And drink Boiling Water On top of it:
- [p. 1490] 55. "Indeed ye shall drink Like diseased camels Raging with thirst!"
- 56. Such will be their entertainment On the Day of Requital!

1321. Ring, Engagement, in Ancient Rome

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), p. 29.

Among the Romans ... there was a ceremony of bethrothal, which sometimes took place long before the wedding. On this occasion the prospective bridegroom gave his fiancée a ring which she wore on the third finger of her left hand. Sometimes guests were invited, and the bride-to-be received presents.

1322. Ring, Wedding, in Ancient Rome

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), p. 32.

In regard to the giving of a [wedding] ring it seems probable, in spite of Tertullian's comment on the pagan character of the custom, that it was usual among most of the Christians even in his time (about A.D. 200), and it is quite clear that it was a universal practice from the fourth century.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This is what Tertullian says: "Touching the ceremonies, however, of private and social solemnities—as those of the white toga [the garment assumed at manhood by the Roman citizen], of espousals, of nuptials, of name-giving—I should think no danger need be guarded against from the breath of the idolatry which is mixed up with them. For the causes are to be considered to which the ceremony is due. Those above-named I take to be clean in themselves, because neither manly garb, nor the marital ring or union, descends from honours done to any idol" (On Idolatry, chap. 16, trans. in ANF, Vol. 3, p. 71).]

1323. Ritualism, in the Early Church

SOURCE: H. G. Wells, *The Outline of History*, pp. 514, 515. Copyright 1920 and 1921 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and by H. G. Wells. Used by permission of Prof. G. P. Wells.

[p. 514] Jesus had called men and women to a giant undertaking, to the renunciation of self, to the new birth into the kingdom of love. The line of least resistance for the flagging convert was to intellectualize himself away from this plain doctrine, this stark proposition, into complicated theories and ceremonies—that would leave his essential self alone. How much easier is it to sprinkle oneself with blood than to purge oneself from malice and competition; to eat bread and drink wine and pretend one had absorbed divinity, to give candles rather than the heart, to shave the head and retain the scheming privacy of the brain inside it! The world was full of such evasive philosophy and theological stuff in the opening centuries of the Christian era...

By the fourth century of the Christian era we find all the Christian communities so agitated and exasperated by tortuous and elusive arguments [p. 515] about the nature of God as to be largely negligent of the simpler teachings of charity, service, and brotherhood that Jesus had inculcated.

1324. Robes, Ascension, Himes on

SOURCE: Joshua V. Himes, Letter to the editors, *The Outlook*, 50 (Nov. 24, 1894), 875. *TO THE EDITORS OF THE OUTLOOK:*

I have been much interested in the articles lately appearing in The Outlook upon the question of ascension robes. I am glad that public interest has been again aroused upon this topic, for it is time it should be settled, and settled right; and nothing is truly settled until it is settled right.

I wish to say that I was intimately associated with William Miller for eleven years, beginning in 1839; that with him I attended hundreds of meetings, laboring with him in public and private, and was with him at his home in the State of New York on the night of the tenth day of the seventh month, when we expected the Lord to come; and, having had a perfect knowledge of everything connected with that work, I *know* the whole story of ascension robes to be a concoction of the enemies of the Adventists, begotten of religious prejudices, and that there is not a scintilla of truth in it. No wonder the writer in The Outlook of October 27 did not give his name and address. The statement that "to be prepared, dressed in their ascension robes, was the instruction given by their leaders to the rank and file of the Millerites," is almost too silly to be noticed. The writer originated, and with others singed, the call for the first Adventist conference, which was held with the church over which he was pastor in Boston, Mass., in 1840.

During those eventful days, from 1840 to 1844, and for several years after, I had charge of all their publishing work, and no man, living or dead, knew better what was taught and done by Adventists than did I. There were some excesses, such as always attend great religious upheavals, but they were not committed by the instruction of their leaders, and the putting on of ascension robes was not one of these excesses.

When these stories first started, and while I was publishing in the interests of the Adventist cause, I kept a standing offer, in the paper of which I was editor, of a large reward for one well-authenticated case where an ascension robe was worn by those looking for the Lord's return. No such proof has ever been forthcoming. It was always rumor, and nothing more. Absolute evidence never has been furnished. It has always been one of those delightful falsehoods which many people have wanted to believe, and hence its popularity and perpetuity until this present day. I have refuted the story hundreds of times, in both the "Advent Herald"in Boston, Mass., and in the "Midnight Cry" in New York, which had a circulation of tens of thousands of copies; and no accusers ever made

an attempt to defend themselves, although I held my columns open to them to do so. And now, at the age of ninety years, with a full personal experience of those times, before God, who is my Judge, and before whose tribunal I must soon appear, I declare again that the ascension-robe story is a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end, and I am glad of the opportunity to deny it once more before I die.

The preparation urged upon the "rank and file" of those looking for the coming of the Lord was a preparation of heart of and life by a confession of Christ, a forsaking of their sins and living a godly life; and the only robes they were exhorted to put on were the robes of righteousness, obtained by faith in Jesus Christ—garments made white in the blood of the Lamb. Nothing of an outward appearance was ever thought of or mentioned. JOSHUA V. HIMES, Rector St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Elk Point, South Dakota

October 29, 1894.

1325. Rome, After Defeat of Carthage, Expands

SOURCE: George Stephen Goodspeed, *A History of the Ancient World* (rev. ed., New York: Scribner, 1912), p. 365.

Hardly had the conflict with Carthage been won, when a war broke out with Macedonia. Thus Rome was involved directly with the politics of the east and could not call a halt until the kingdoms of Macedonia, Syria and Egypt, with the lesser powers of Greece and Asia Minor, became either subjects or allies of Rome. Thus was created an empire around the Mediterranean sea, from the Atlantic to the Euphrates river.

1326. Rome, as Dominant Power in the East by 168 B.C. SOURCE: Arthur E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (4th ed.), pp. 131, 132. Copyright 1955 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

[p. 131] Finally, in 168, the Romans ... won a complete victory over Perseus in the battle of Pydna. Perseus took refuge in flight but soon was obliged to give himself up. He was taken to Rome, where he was treated with ignominy and died in captivity. The Macedonian kingdom was at an end: its territory was divided into four autonomous

republics, which were forbidden mutual privileges of *commercium* and *conubium*; a yearly tribute of 100 talents was imposed upon [p. 132] them; the royal mines and domains became the property of the Roman state, and for a time the gold and silver mines were shut down...

Having disposed of Macedonia, the Romans turned their attention to the other Greek states with the intention of rewarding their friends and punishing their enemies.

1327. Rome, Rome, as Real Sovereign in Eastern Mediterranean

SOURCE: Arthur E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (4th ed.), p. 132. Copyright 1955 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

It was clear [after Pydna] that Rome was the real sovereign in the eastern Mediterranean and that her friends and allies enjoyed only local autonomy, while they were expected to be obedient to the orders of Rome. This is well illustrated by the anecdote of the circle of Popilius. During the Third Macedonian War, Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, King of Syria, had invaded Egypt. After the battle of Pydna a Roman ambassador, Gaius Popilius by name, was sent to make him withdraw. Popilius met Antiochus before Alexandria and delivered the Senate's message. The king asked for time for consideration; but the Roman, drawing a circle around him in the sand, bade him answer before he left the spot. Antiochus yielded and evacuated Egypt.

1328. Rome, as Successor to Greece by Conquest of Macedonia (Dan. 8:9)

SOURCE: Theodor Mommsen, *The History of Rome*, bk. 3, chap. 10 (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, [1957]), Vol. 2, pp. 508, 518, 519. Used by permission.

[p. 508] Thus [by victory over Perseus, king of Macedonia, battle of Pydna, June 22, 168 B.C.] perished the empire of Alexander the Great, which had subdued and Hellenized the east, 144 [actually 155] years after its founder's death...

[p. 518] All the Hellenistic states had thus been completely subjected to the protectorate of Rome, and the whole empire of Alexander the Great had fallen to the Roman commonwealth just as if the city had inherited it from his heirs. From all sides kings and ambassadors flocked to Rome to congratulate her; and they showed that fawning is never more abject than when kings are in the antechamber...

[p. 519] The moment was at least well chosen for such acts of homage. Polybius dates from the battle of Pydna the full establishment of the universal empire of Rome. It was in fact the last battle in which a civilized state confronted Rome in the field on a footing of equality with her as a great power; all subsequent struggles were rebellions or wars with peoples beyond the pale of the Romano-Greek civilization—with barbarians, as they were called. The whole civilized world thenceforth recognized in the Roman senate the supreme tribunal, whose commission decided in the last resort between kings and nations; and to acquire its language and manners foreign princes and youths of quality resided in Rome.

[EDITORS' NOTE: On the number of years the great historian suffered a slip of the pen: the battle of Pydna occurred in the year 144 of the Seleucid Era, which was not counted from Alexander's death (323 B.C.) but from the year when Seleucus I took over Babylon (312/11 B.C.).]

1329. Rome, Called the "Iron Monarchy"

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 38, general observations at end of chapter, par. 1, Vol. 4 (London: Methuen & Co., 1898), p. 161.

The arms of the republic, sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the Ocean; and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations and their kings, were successively broken by the *iron* monarchy of Rome.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Although Gibbon uses the phrase "iron monarchy," reminiscent of the iron kingdom of Daniel's image, he was aware, as the first sentence shows that Rome was not a monarchy when she expanded her holdings as described. While yet a republic Rome had reached the Atlantic, the Euphrates, and the Rhine, though the legions arrived at the Danube in the reign of Augustus (see *SDADic*, map XIX). It was the Roman *republic* that took over the territories of Alexander's empire; in fact, Augustus became the first emperor at his conquest of Egypt in 31 B.C. Nevertheless the farthest limits of expansion were reached under the subsequent empire period, and thus we can look back and speak of the Roman Empire as the successor of the Greco-Macedonian.]

1330. Rome—Civilizing Influence of Greece

SOURCE: A. E. R. Boak an others, *The Growth of European Civilization* (3d ed., 1946), p. 84. Copyright 1938, 1941, 1943, by F. S. Crofts & Co., Inc., New York. Used by permission of Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

From the opening of the historic period the development of Roman civilization was profoundly affected by foreign influences, in particular by Etruscan and Greek. But whereas the influence of the Etruscans virtually ceased with the expulsion of their kings from Rome, that of the Greek continued with increasing strength throughout the whole of the period of the republic. This Greek influence first made itself felt in Rome indirectly through Etruscan channels; there followed direct contact with Cumae, the most northerly outpost of Greek colonization in Italy; then with the Greek cities of southern Italy, particularly Tarentum; still later with Syracuse in Sicily; and finally with the Aegean and Asiatic Greeks through the incorporation of European Greece and a large part of the Hellenistic East into the Roman Empire. In addition to the Romans and Italians, who as soldiers, administrators, tax collectors, and business men came to know Greek culture in its native environment, Rome itself from the second century B.C. was thronged with Greek teachers, traders, architects, artists, doctors, and above all, with household slaves, all of whom acted as conscious or unconscious agents in the spread of Hellenism. In these circumstances it was inevitable that the older and more advanced Hellenic civilization should leave an indelible imprint upon the younger and less highly developed culture of Rome. And, in fact, there is hardly a single important aspect of Roman civilization that does not reveal unmistakable traces of imitating or borrowing ideas that originated among the Greeks. With obvious truth the Roman poet Horace could say: "Captive Greece has captured her rude conqueror."

1331. Rome, Divinities of Greece Adopted by

SOURCE: A. E. R. Boak and others, *The Growth of European Civilization* (3d ed., 1946), p. 93. Copyright 1938, 1941, 1943, by F. S. Crofts & Co., Inc., New York. Used by permission of Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Contact with the Greeks led to the introduction of Greek divinities and, of much greater importance, to the identification of the native Italian gods with those of the Greek pantheon, with the result that Greek mythology and forms of artistic representation were taken over wholesale by the Romans.

1332. Rome—Emperor Augustus and the City's Grandeur

SOURCE: Suetonius *Lives of the Caesars* ii. 28; translated by J. C. Rolfe, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 167. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Since the city was not adorned as the dignity of the empire demanded, and was exposed to flood and fire, he [Augustus] so beautified it that he could justly boast that he had found it built of brick and left it in marble.

1333. Rome—Emperor Tiberius Accepts Sovereignty

SOURCE: Dio Cassius *Roman History* lvii. 7; trans. by Earnest Cary, Vol. 7 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), pp. 127, 129. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 127] Now when no further news of any rebellious [p. 129] moves came [after Augustus' death] and the whole Roman world had acquiesced securely in his leadership, Tiberius accepted the rule without further dissimulation.

1334. Rome—Emperor Tiberius Ruler at Time of Christ's Death SOURCE: Tacitus *Histories* xv. 44; translated by Clifford H. Moore, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 283, 285. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 283] Christus, the founder of the name [Christians], had undergone the death penalty in the reign of Tiberius, by sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilatus, and the pernicious superstition was checked for a moment, only to break out once more, not merely in Judaea, the home of the disease, but in the capital itself, where all things horrible or shameful in the world collect and find a vogue. First, then, the confessed members of the sect were arrested; next, on their disclosures, vast [p. 285] numbers were convicted, not so much on the count of arson as for hatred of the human race.

1335. Rome, Golden-Age Expectations in

SOURCE: Cicero, [Marcus Tullius], *The Republic* iii. 22, translated by Clinton Walker Keyes (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943), p. 211. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

There will not be different laws at Rome and at Athens, or different laws now and in the future, but one eternal and unchangeable law will be valid for all nations and all times, and there will be one master and ruler, that is, God, over us all, for he is the author of this law, its promulgator, and its enforcing judge.

1336. Rome—"Head of the Wold" an Early Goal

SOURCE: *Livy* v. 51.3; 54.5–7; translated by B. O. Foster, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940), pp. 171, 185. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 171] And although, while the Gauls were victorious and in possession of the entire City [of Rome, 390 B.C.] the Capitol nevertheless and the Citadel were held by the gods and men of Rome, shall we now, when the Romans are victorious and the City is regained, desert even Citadel and Capitol? ...

[p. 185] It is now, Quirites, in its three hundred and sixty-fifth year... Granting that your valour may go elsewhere, yet surely the fortune of this place could not be taken along Here is the Capitol, where men were told, when of old they discovered there a human head, that in that place should be the head of the world and the seat of empire.

1337. Rome, "Nearly the Whole World" Ruled by SOURCE: Polybius *The Histories* i. 1. 5, 6; 2.7; translated by W. R. Paton, Vol. I (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 3, 5, 7. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 3] For who is so worthless or indolent as not to wish to know by what means and under what system of polity the Romans in [p. 5] less than fifty-three years (220–168 B.C.) have succeeded in subjecting nearly the whole inhabited world to their sole government—a thing unique in history? Or who again is there so passionately devoted to other spectacles or studies as to regard anything as of greater moment than the acquisition of this knowledge? ...

[p. 7] But the Romans have subjected to their rule not portions, but nearly the whole of the world [and possess an empire which is not only immeasurably greater than any which preceded it, but need not fear rivalry in the future].

[EDITORS' NOTE: The brackets in the last sentence appear in the translation.]

1338. Rome, Policy of, as Plutarch Viewed It

SOURCE: Plutarch *Moralia*, "On the Fortune of the Romans," 11; translated by Frank Cole Babbitt, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), pp. 363, 365. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 363] The smooth flow of events and the impelling swiftness of Rome's progress to so high a pinnacle of power and expansion demonstrates to all who reason aright that the progress of Rome's sovereignty was not brought about by the handiwork and urging of human beings, but was speeded on its way by divine escort and the fair wind of Fortune. Trophy upon trophy arises, triumph meets triumph, and the first blood, while still warm on their arms, is overtaken and washed away by a second flood. They count [p. 365] their victories, not by the multitude of corpses and spoils, but by captive kingdoms, by nations enslaved, by islands and continents added to their mighty realm.

1339. Rome, Policy of, Combination of Clemency and Harshness SOURCE: *Diodorus of Sicily* xxxii. 4; translated by Francis R. Walton, Vol. 11 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 415, 417. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [p. 415] In more recent times the Romans, when they went in pursuit of world empire, brought it into being by the valour of their arms, then extended its influence far and wide by the kindest possible treatment of the vanquished. So far, indeed, did they abstain from cruelty and revenge on those subjected to them that they appeared to treat them not as enemies, but as if they were benefactors and friends. Whereas the conquered, as former foes, expected to be visited with fearful reprisals, the conquerors left no room for anyone to surpass them in clemency. Some they enrolled as fellow citizens, to some they granted rights of intermarriage, to others they restored their independence, and in no case did they nurse a resentment that was unduly severe. Because of their surpassing humanity, therefore, kings, cities, and whole nations went over to the Roman standard. But once they held sway over virtually the whole inhabited world, they confirmed their power by terrorism and by the destruction of the most eminent cities. Corinth they razed to the ground, the Macedonians (Perseus for example) they rooted out, they razed [p. 417] Carthage and the Celtiberian city of Numantia, and there were many whom they cowed by terror.

1340. Rome—Preparation for the Spread of Christianity

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 185, 186. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 185] The Mediterranean, for centuries the highway [p. 186] of civilization and the clearing-house of ideas, was free from pirates; the great military roads radiating in trunklines from the *miliarium aureum* in the Forum to the uttermost parts of the Empire with branch-networks in every province made communication easy and safe. It has been said that private travel in the Antonine Age was not equaled for safety, rapidity and comfort down to the advent of railways and steamships. There were only two principal languages, Latin and Greek, understood by the educated and mercantile classes everywhere. Rome had rid herself of local prejudices, political, social, and especially religious, and the union of many peoples with common sentiments laid the sure basis for a progressive religion. As Ernest Renan wrote:

Think of the apostles in the face of an Asia Minor, a Greece, and Italy divided into a hundred little republics; of a Gaul, a Spain, an Africa, in possession of old national institutions—and it is no longer possible to conceive of their success, or even to understand how their project would have had its birth. The unity of the Empire was the condition precedent to any great religious proselytism which should set itself above nationalities.⁸³ [Note 83: *Lectures on the Influence of the Institutions, Thought, and Culture of Rome on Christianity*, tr. by Charles Beard (4th ed.; London, 1898), pp. 18–19.]

1341. Rome, Prophecies Applied to—"Eternal City," and Woman of Revelation 17

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 303. It is worthy of notice, that the post-Nicene, as well as the ante-Nicene fathers, with all

their reverence for the Roman see, regarded the heathenish title of Rome, *urbs aeterna*, as blasphemous, with reference to the passage of the woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, Rev. xvii. 3. The prevailing opinion seems to have been, that Rome and the Roman empire would fall before the advent of Antichrist and the second coming of the Lord.

1342. Rome, Prophecies Applied to—4th Beast (Contemporary View) SOURCE: Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, secs. 32, 33, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 5, p. 210.

Rejoice, blessed Daniel thou hast not been in error: all these things have come to pass.

33. After this again thou hast told me of the beast dreadful and terrible. "It had iron teeth and claws of brass: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it." Already the iron rules; already it subdues and breaks all in pieces already it brings all the unwilling into subjection; already we see these things ourselves. Now we glorify God, being instructed by thee.

1343. Rome, Religion of—Astrology and Eastern Cults During the Empire Period

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 50–53.

[p. 50] Towards the commencement of our era, when the peace and unity of the ancient world was assured by the foundation of the Empire, began the development of this great religious movement which little by little was to orientalise Roman paganism. The gods of the nations of the Levant imposed themselves, one after another, on the West. Cybele and Attis were transported [p. 51] from Phrygia, Isis and Serapis travelled thither from Alexandria. Merchants, soldiers, and slaves brought the Baals of Syria and Mithra, an immigrant from the heart of Persia... All of them, no matter what their origin, were influenced in different degrees by astrology and star-worship... Attis, the Anatolian deity of vegetation, ended by becoming a solar god, just like Serapis, the Baals, and Mithra. In very early times, even in Mesopotamia, star-worship was imposed upon Persian Mazdaism... The mysteries of Mithra imported into Europe this composite theology, offspring of the intercourse between Magi and Chaldeans; and the signs of the zodiac, the symbols of the planets, the emblems of the elements, appear time after time on the bas-reliefs, mosaics, and paintings of their subterranean temples... [p. 52] Towards the age of the Severi [astrology] acquired an almost undisputed supremacy even in the Latin world.

Here it no longer presents itself as a learned theory taught by mathematicians, but as a sacred doctrine revealed to the adepts of exotic cults, which have all assumed the form of mysteries...

[p. 53] The triumph of Oriental religions was simultaneously the triumph of astral religion, but to secure recognition by all pagan peoples, it needed an official sanction. The influence which it had acquired among the populace, was finally assured when the emperors lent it an interested support.

1344. Rome, Religion of—Babylonian Sun Cult Made Official by Emperor Aurelian

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 55, 56.

[p. 55] In 274, Aurelian ... created a new cult of the "Invincible Sun." Worshipped in a splendid temple, served by pontiffs who were raised to the level of the ancient pontiffs

of Rome, celebrated every fourth year by magnificent games, *Sol Invictus* was definitely promoted to the highest rank in the divine hierarchy and became the official protector of the Sovereigns and of the Empire... He [Aurelian] placed in his new sanctuary the

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

images of Bel [god of Babylon; see No. 154] and Helios, which he captured at Palmyra. In establishing this new State cult, Aurelian in reality proclaimed the dethronement of the old Roman idolatry and the accession of Semitic Sun-worship...

[p. 56] This sidereal theology, founded on ancient beliefs of Chaldean astrologers, transformed in the Hellenistic age under the twofold influence of astronomic discoveries and Stoic thought, [was] promoted, after becoming a pantheistic Sun-worship, to the rank of official religion of the Roman Empire.

1345. Rome, Religion of—Emperor Worship—Roman Emperors Become Personification of Sun-god

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 53, 54.

[p. 53] In proportion as Caesarism became more and more transformed into absolute monarchy, it tended more and more to lean for support on the Oriental clergy. These priests, loyal to the traditions of the Achaemenids and the Pharaohs, preached doctrines which tended to elevate sovereigns above mankind, and they supplied the emperors with a dogmatic justification of their despotism. For the old [p. 54] principle of the sovereignty of the people, the original form of Caesarism, was substituted a reasoned belief in supernatural influences. The emperor is the image of the Sun on earth, like him invincible

and eternal (*invictus, aeternus*), as his official title declares. Already in the eyes of the Babylonians the Sun was the royal planet, and it is he that in Rome continues to give to his chosen ones the virtues of sovereignty, and destines them for the throne from the time of their appearance on earth.

1346. Rome.—Seat of Empire Moved to Constantinople by Constantine SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), pp. 11, 12.

[p. 11] From the hour when Constantine ... translated the seat of empire to Constantinople, from that moment there never reigned [p. 12] in Rome a temporal prince to whom the Bishops of Rome owed a permanent allegiance [see No. 1119].

1347. Rome, So-called "Christianizing" of

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 93. But the elevation of Christianity as the religion of the state presents also an opposite

aspect to our contemplation. It involved great risk of degeneracy to the church. The Roman state, with its laws, institutions, and usages, was still deeply rooted in heathenism, and could not be transformed by a magical stroke. The christianizing of the state amounted therefore in great measure to a paganizing and secularizing of the church. The world overcame the church, as much as the church overcame the world, and the temporal gain of Christianity was in many respects cancelled by spiritual loss. The mass of the Roman empire was baptized only with water, not with the Spirit and fire of the gospel, and it smuggled heathen manners and practices into the sanctuary under a new name. The very combination of the cross with the military ensign by Constantine was a most doubtful omen, portending an unhappy mixture of the temporal and the spiritual powers.

1348. Rome—Theodosius I Makes Christianity the State Religion SOURCE: Charles Norris Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), pp. 328–332. Used by permission.

[p. 328] By the manifesto of Constantine and Licinius there had been substituted for the classical idea of the commonwealth the notion of two more or less distinct orders, the one political, the other ecclesiastical. With that of Theodosius [I], the relationship between these orders was finally determined by the complete subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power...

The recognition in Catholicism of a principle of universal validity and application suggested the possibility of its adoption as the basis for a new social order, in which the state should find justification for its existence in 'defending the peace of the Church'. In this idea may be seen the spirit and purpose of Theodosianism, and it found expression in a thoroughgoing effort to realize, within the framework of the Roman system, the forms of a Catholic state...

[p. 329] The formal liquidation of paganism under Theodosius and his successors has been characterized as 'perhaps the only example of the total extirpation of any ancient and popular superstition' and thus deserving of consideration as 'a singular event in the history of the human mind'...

Legislative activity against paganism began with the edict of 381, branding it as sacrilegious to participate in forbidden rites either by day or night with the object of divination, or to use for such purpose any existing shrine or altar. The year following witnessed the nationalization of the temples and of their treasures (including the statues of the gods) which were thrown open to the public as monuments of art, access to the altars alone being prohibited. In 385 the campaign against divination was extended to

include the prohibition of *auspicia* even by native rites. These and similar measures were followed in 392 by what has been called a final and comprehensive enactment against paganism:

'No one of whatever rank, position or dignity, high or low, rich or poor, in any place whatsoever in any city, shall sacrifice an innocent victim to senseless images; nor, in the more intimate efforts of pro- [p. 330]

pitiation, shall he worship the *lar* with fire, the *genius* with wine, the *penates* with savour, by lighting flames, laying on incense or suspending garlands...

'Individuals presuming to sacrifice victims or to consult their entrails shall be assimilated to the position of those charged with treason, all persons being authorized to lay an accusation against them and, upon conviction, they shall suffer the penalties provided by law, even though they have made no inquiries contrary or relative to the safety of the prince. It is enough to convict them that they should have desired to break the laws of nature itself, by prying into and unfolding forbidden mysteries...

'Any one who worships an image constructed by human hands and thus foolishly reveals his fears of that which he has himself made, who decorates trees with fillets or erects altars of cut turf, shall be punished by the confiscation of the property upon which he is shown to have indulged in such superstition.'Any one who attempts, either in public temples or shrines or on private properties other than his own, to perform any act of pagan sacrifice ... shall be liable to a fine of twenty pounds, gold.'

The prohibition of pagan worship was followed, in 396, by a final cancellation of privileges and immunities accorded by ancient law to the priests and ministers of pagan cults, whose profession was now officially outlawed...

[p. 331] These measures will serve to illustrate the methods employed by Theodosius in stamping out the vestiges of paganism. They reveal the official Graeco-Roman religion as a victim of weapons which it had itself invoked against Christianity in the days of its ascendancy. In legislating the gods out of existence, the role of the state was purely formal and, formally, the victory appears to have been pathetically easy and swift. Opposition developed chiefly among the nobility of the ancient capital. [p. 332] ... Otherwise the administration encountered serious resistance only among the volatile masses of great Eastern cities such as Alexandria, where the conflict between pagan and Christian was bitter and prolonged.

1349. Rome, to Be Displaced by New Barbarian Nations

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 128.

The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theatre going, intemperance, lewdness, in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous barbarians. When the Christians were awakened by the crashings of the falling empire, and anxiously asked why God permitted it, Salvian, the Jeremiah of his time, answered: "Think of your vileness and your crimes, and see whether you are worthy of the divine protection." Nothing but the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian, but essentially heathen world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society. There must be new, fresh nations, if the Christian civilization prepared in the old Roman empire was to take firm root and bear ripe fruit.

1350. Rome—Western Empire—Barbarian Invasions as Viewed by a Contemporary

SOURCE: Ammianus Marcellinus *History* xxvi. 4. 5; translated by John C. Rolfe, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 587, 589. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 587] At this time [c. A.D. 365], as if trumpets were sounding the war-note throughout the whole Roman world, the most savage peoples roused themselves and poured across [p. 589] the nearest frontiers. At the same time the Alamanni were devastating Gaul and Raetia, the Sarmatae and Quadi Pannonia, while the Picts, Saxons, Scots, and Attacotti were harassing the Britons with constant disasters. The Austoriani and other Moorish tribes raided Africa more fiercely than ever and predatory bands of Goths were plundering Thrace and Pannonia.

1351. Rome—Western Empire, Breakup of, Gradual SOURCE: F. J. Foakes-Jackson, "The New West and Gregory the Great," in the composite work *An Outline* of *Christianity* (New York: Bethlehem Publishers, 1926), Vol. 2, pp. 149–152.

[p. 149] While ecclesiastical dogma was being hardened into a definite creed the Roman world was slowly dissolving. The battle of Hadrianople, where the Emperor Valens and his army were annihilated in 378, was in a sense the beginning of the end. The victorious Goths then reached the suburbs of Constantinople but advanced no further. During the reign of Theodosius the Great, the barbarians, on the whole, respected the frontiers of the empire. The crisis came about 410, when the Visigothic King Alaric captured Rome. The Roman legions were withdrawn from Britain, and the island was left to intestine discord and foreign invasion. The Goths, a Teutonic people, set up kingdoms in Gaul and Spain. Then came the terrible Vandal invasion of Africa and the establishment of the pirate kingdom of Carthage. In 455 Genseric the Vandal took Rome. But before this a more terrible enemy had appeared, in Attila and the Huns, wild Mongolian horsemen, whose vast hordes from a world unknown to the Romans carried ruin and desolation far and wide. Under the feeble rule of Theodosius II Attila's progress was unchecked, but when his sister Pulcheria raised her husband Marcian to the purple manlier counsels prevailed, and the Huns were defeated by the Roman general, Aetius, and the Visigothic king, Theodoric, at the great battle of Châlons in the year 451.

[p. 150] In the West the empire was in the throes of dissolution—Africa, Spain, and Britain were lost. In Italy barbarian generals set up puppet emperors only to dethrone them. At last in 479 [i.e., 476] Odoacer, a barbarian chief, the real master of Italy,

deprived Romulus Augustulus of the imperial dignity, sending the insignia of the empire to the Eastern emperor, Zeno, with a message that one ruler of the Roman world was sufficient. From this time a barbarian king ruled with an authority nominally delegated to him by the emperor at Constantinople. Odoacer was supplanted by Theodoric the Ostrogoth, under whom civilization was for a time fostered and preserved in Italy, but whose glorious reign was succeeded by a period of uninterrupted misery and disaster.

From 476 to 521 the world was almost entirely under the sway of Arians. All the barbarians, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and Vandals professed Arianism. Not that they could appreciate the intricate subtleties of the Greek language or the technical terms which separated those who held the Creed of Nicaea from the followers of Arius, but because they had received their Christianity from Arian missionaries, and perhaps because they disdained to worship with the despised Roman provincials. In Africa the orthodox were subjected to a cruel persecution by their Vandal overlords. Roman orthodoxy was isolated from the Christianity professed in the East as well as from that of the barbarians, till it received the support of an uncivilized race hitherto almost unknown.

On the northern frontier of Gaul the Franks were ruled by a ferocious and very able king named Clovis, who accepted baptism (496) at the hands of an orthodox bishop, St. Remigius, Bishop of Rheims, and was admitted by him to the Church with the words: "Bow thine head, Sicambrian, adore what thou hast burned, and burn what thou hast adored."

Clovis embraced the faith with ardor. When he heard the story of the Passion and Crucifixion, he exclaimed: "Had I and my Franks been there, it never would have happened" He resolved to become the champion of the true faith...

[p. 151] In recalling the empire's misfortunes in the West, it must not be forgotten that in the East it retained its inherent vitality for centuries, and when all seemed lost it was capable of suddenly asserting its strength. The genius of Diocletian, and after him of Constantine, was displayed in their recognizing that the heart of the empire was no longer in Italy but in Asia Minor, and when Constantine made Byzantium impregnable as Constantinople, he thereby saved civilization for centuries. Under a vigorous administration Constantinople was capable of dominating the Mediterranean seaboard; this was proved by the long reign of Justinian, the builder of the Church of St. Sophia and the man who has left an imperishable memorial in the consolidation of Roman law familiarly known as the Code of Justinian. Under Justinian the Persians were confined to the frontier, Africa was recovered from the Vandals, and Italy from the Ostrogoths, and his reign was made glorious by the exploits of Belisarius, one of the greatest of Roman generals. For though much has been written of the degeneracy of the Roman armies, then and for generations to come, when properly led, they were more than a match for any barbarian force however numerous.

The war between the Romans of Constantinople and the Ostrogoths proved the ruin of Rome and of Italy. Rome was taken and retaken by Belisarius and the barbarian kings; the aqueducts were destroyed, and Rome was at one time left without a single inhabitant. The city remained with its splendid edifices deserted even though not demolished. Italy, except for the cities in the south and on the Adriatic coast, had become almost desolate; nor were matters improved when it was restored to the empire, and what the barbarian had spared became the [p. 152] prey of the imperial tax-gatherer. It was left open to

another barbarian incursion—that of the Lombards, who like the Franks became a powerful influence on the destinies of Europe.

1352. Rome—Western Empire, "Fall" of, Not Sudden

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 92, 93. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 92] For several centuries after the fall of Rome, the political and social structure of Europe was such a mass of confusion that it defies representation in any simple pattern...

[p. 93] When and how did Rome fall? The first term in the title of Gibbon's famous work was more appropriate than the second. After the division of the empire and the removal of the seat of its western part from the city of Rome, there was a long decline an evaporation of authority, a sinking of its vitality, the gradual fading and ultimate disappearance of its apparatus of government. Though moribund, it still drew a labored breath after the raid on Rome by Alaric the Goth (410). The invasion of Italy by Attila the Hun (455) left the Western empire virtually unconscious. It died in a coma a few years later, though already it had practically ceased to exist. When the insignificant Romulus Augustulus was deposed (476), there was no longer even a titular emperor. The ghost of the Western empire—feeble even for a ghost—was the shadowy claim of the Eastern emperor at Constantinople to the allegiance of the barbarian chiefs who exercised independent military control in Italy, Gaul, Spain, and North Africa. The only part of that claim that ever had any historical reality was the Eastern emperor's exarchate at Ravenna.

1353. Rome—Western Empire—Last Emperor Dethroned by Odoacer SOURCE: Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), pp. 42, 43. Copyright 1950 by Will Durant. Used by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc.

[p. 42] A new conglomeration of barbarians swept down into Italy—Heruli, Sciri, Rugii, and other tribes that had once acknowledged the rule of Attila. At the same time a Pannonian general, Orestes, deposed Nepos, and established his son Romulus (nicknamed Augustulus) on the throne (475). The new invaders demanded from Orestes a third of Italy; when he refused they slew him, and replaced Romulus with their general Odoacer (476). This son of Attila's minister Edecon was not without ability; he convened the cowed Senate, and through it he offered to Zeno, the new Emperor of the [p. 43] East, sovereignty over all the Empire, provided that Odoacer might as his *patricius* govern Italy. Zeno consented, and the line of Western emperors came to an end...

Actually, however, Odoacer ruled Italy as a king, with small regard for Zeno. In effect the Germans had conquered Italy as Gaiseric had conquered Africa, as the Visigoths had conquered Spain, as the Angles and Saxons were conquering Britain, as the Franks were conquering Gaul. In the West the great Empire was no more.

1354. Rome—Western Empire—Last Emperor Replaced by Odoacer, Who Became Undeclared Ruler in the West

SOURCE: Ernest Barker, "Italy and the West, 410–476," chap. 14 in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), pp. 430, 431. Used by permission.

[p. 430] Odovacar [or Odoacer] ... had served under Ricimer in 472 against Anthemius; and by 476 he had evidently distinguished himself sufficiently to be readily chosen as their king by the congeries of Germanic tribes which were cantoned in Italy. His action was prompt and decisive. He became king on 23 August: by the 28th Orestes had been captured and beheaded at Piacenza, and on 4 September Paulus, the brother of Orestes, was killed in attempting to defend Ravenna. The Emperor Romulus Augustulus became the captive of the new king, who, however, spared the life of the handsome boy, and sent him to live on a pension in a Campanian villa. While Odovacar was annexing Italy, Euric was spreading his conquests in Gaul; and when he occupied Marseilles, Gaul, like Italy, was lost.

[p. 431] The success of Odovacar did not, however, mean the erection of an absolutely independent Teutonic kingdom in Italy, or the total extinction of the Roman Empire in the West; and it does not therefore indicate the beginning of a new era, in anything like the same sense as the coronation of Charlemagne in 800. It is indeed a new and important fact, that after 476 there was no Western Emperor until the year 800, and it must be admitted that the absence of any separate Emperor of the West vitally affected both the history of the Teutonic tribes and the development of the Papacy, during those three centuries.

1355. Rome—Western Empire, Replaced by New European States SOURCE: Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), p. 43. Copyright 1950 by Will Durant. Used by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc.

The results of the barbarian conquest were endless. Economically it meant reruralization... Ethnically the migrations brought a new mingling of racial elements—a substantial infusion of Germanic blood into Italy, Gaul, and Spain, and of Asiatic blood into Russia, the Balkans, and Hungary... Politically the conquest replaced a higher with a lower form of monarchy; it augmented the authority of persons, and reduced the power and protection of laws; individualism and violence increased. Historically, the conquest destroyed the outward form of what had already inwardly decayed; it cleared away with regrettable brutality and thoroughness a system of life which, with all its gifts of order, culture, and law, had worn itself into senile debility, and had lost the powers of regeneration and growth. A new beginning was now possible: the Empire in the West faded, but the states of modern Europe were born.

1356. Rome, Witiges' Repulse From, by Belisarius (A.D. 538), a Turning Point

SOURCE: George Finlay, *Greece Under the Romans* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1844), p. 295.

With the conquest of Rome by Belisarius, the history of the ancient city may be considered as terminating; and with his defence against Witiges commences the history of the middle ages.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The period known as the Middle Ages is, roughly speaking, the age of the Papacy.] **1357. Rome, Church of**—Early Growth

SOURCE: Jérôme Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, pp. 136, 137. Copyright 1940 by Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

[p. 136] Although Statius and Martial and Juvenal may perhaps not have suspected the fact; and though Pliny the Younger—who in Bithynia had himself been up against the Christians of his province—lets fall no hint of its existence in his *Letters;* though Tacitus and Suetonius speak of it only from hearsay, the former in abusive language which excludes his having had any first-hand knowledge, the second with confusions which prove both the lacunae in his information and his own lack of insight—it is nevertheless beyond all doubt that "Christianity" in Rome goes back to the reign of Claudius (41–54), and that under Nero it had become so widespread that the emperor was able to throw the blame for the great fire of 64 onto the Christians. Using this as a pretext, he inflicted on them atrocious refinements of torture, the first of the persecutions which assailed without

destroying the Church of Christ. It is evident that its subterranean growth had progressed with astounding rapidity. This was perhaps due less to the importance of the Urbs in the world than to the existence in Rome of the Jewish colony which the goodwill of Julius Caesar had acclimatised there. From the beginning of the empire members of the Jewish colony had proved so troublesome that in 19 A.D. Tiberius thought itnecessary to take severe measures against them, and so numerous that he was able to ship off 4,000 Jews at one swoop to Sardinia. It was through the Jewish colony that the first Christians coming from Jerusalem penetrated into Rome, breaking up the unity of the colony and ranging against each other the upholders of the ancient Mosaic law and the adherents of the new faith.

The Jewish religion had cast its spell over a number of Romans, attracted by its monotheism and the beauty of the Decalogue. The religion of the Christians which dispensed the same light but offered in addition a splendid message of redemption and brotherhood, was not behind in substituting its own proselyting. Seen from the outside and from a little distance, the two religions were at first easily confused with each other, and it is possible, for instance, that the invectives which Juvenal hurls at the Jews were really directed at the Christians whom he had not at this date learned to distinguish from them. They also were obedient to the commandments of their God, and might [p. 137] well pass in the eyes of a superficial observer for being simply "attached to Jewish customs." But after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., and under the early Antonines, "the Church" inevitably began to be distinguished from "the Synagogue"; and the Church's teaching, which made no distinction of race, soon began to supplant that of the Jews.

We have, naturally, no means of estimating the number of conversions which Christianity effected in those days in Rome, but it would be wrong to suppose that they were confined to the lower strata of the population. The Epistles of Saint Paul, saluting

those of the brethren who are of the household of Caesar (*in domo Caesaris*), prove directly that the apostle had recruited some of his followers from among the retainers of the emperor, among those slaves and freedmen who, under a specious appearance of humility, included the most powerful servants of the empire.

1358. Rome, Papal, Continuation of Pagan Roman Empire SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 148, 149. Used by permission.

[p. 148] The mighty Catholic Church was little more than the Roman Empire baptised. Rome was transformed as well as converted. The very capital of the old Empire became the capital of the Christian [p. 149] Empire. The office of Pontifex Maximus was continued in that of Pope... Even the Roman language has remained the official language of the Roman Catholic Church down through the ages. Christianity could not grow up through Roman civilisation and paganism, however, without in turn being coloured and influenced by the rites, festivities, and ceremonies of old polytheism. Christianity not only conquered Rome, but Rome conquered Christianity. It is not a matter of great surprise, therefore, to find that from the first to the fourth century the Church had undergone many changes.

1359. Rome, Papal, Continuation of Roman Empire

SOURCE: Adolf Harnack, *What Is Christianity*? trans. by Thomas Bailey Saunders (2d ed., rev.; New York: Putnam, 1901), pp. 269, 270. [Ernest Benn Ltd., London, has recently published a new edition of this book.]

[p. 269] Whatever Roman elements the barbarians and Arians left ... [came] under the protection of the Bishop of Rome, who was the chief person there after the Emperor's disappearance... [p. 270] *The Roman Church in this way privily pushed itself into the place of the Roman World-Empire, of which it is the actual continuation;* the empire has not perished, but has only undergone a transformation... That is no mere "clever remark," but the recognition of the true state of the matter historically, and the most appropriate and fruitful way of describing the character of this Church. It still governs the nations... It is a political creation, and as imposing as a World-Empire, because the continuation of the Roman Empire. The Pope, who calls himself "King" and "Pontifex Maximus," is Caesar's successor.

1360. Rome, Papal, Successor to Pagan Rome

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 6, 7. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 6] As Rome's role in pagan history came to an end, she was destined to play another, a sacred one, in Christian history very like that of Jerusalem in Judaism... Rome's part in ecclesiastical history had begun...

Thus a Christian Rome, destined, like its pagan predecessor on the Palatine, to conquer a large part of the earth, gradually arose on Vatican Hill... [p. 7] While today the Palatine [the hill of the Roman emperors' palaces] is in ruins, St. Peter's still draws worshipers from all parts of the world. Of the Christian conversion of Rome in the fourth century the historian Freeman said: "That Christianity should become the religion of the Roman Empire is the miracle of history; but that it did so is the leading fact of all history from that day onwards." But while the Empire became Christian, the Church became in part pagan. For it gradually assumed the Empire's monarchical form, and later the imperial gradations of rank and geographical divisions. By the eighth century the Bishop of Rome had become a temporal prince, so that the philosopher Hobbes could truthfully say of the Papacy that it was "the ghost of the Roman Empire, crowned and seated on the grave thereof." Still later, in our time, the Pope, having lost his temporal power, has gone further and has become, since 1870, virtually an absolute monarch over the spiritual lives of Roman Catholics.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For the pope's status since 1929, see No. 1169.]

1361. Rome, Papal, Survives the Roman Empire

SOURCE: [Joseph Turmel], *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages*, by André Lagarde [pseudonym] (New York: Scribner, 1915), p. vi. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

No, the Church will not descend into the tomb. It will survive the Empire... At length a second empire will arise, and of this empire the Pope will be the master—more than this, he will be the master of Europe. He will dictate his orders to kings who will obey them.

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1362. Sabbath—as Defined by Karlstadt

SOURCE: Andres Carolstat [Andreas Rudolf Karlstadt], *Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen* ("Concerning the Sabbath and Commanded Holidays") (1524), chap. 1, unpaged. (This is also reprinted in Karlstadt's *Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25*, Part I, compiled and published by Erich Hertzsch, pp. 21–47, No. 325 of Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke d. 16. u. 17. Jahrhunderts, founded by W. Braune. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1956.) German.

Sabbath is a Hebrew or Jewish word and signifies to stop working or to rest ... and means nothing else than a rest day in which created things are to rest. Behold how God created and worked in six days and rested on the seventh. Likewise man is to work six days and rest and be idle on the seventh. From this it follows that we are not allowed to celebrate created spirits, such as angels and saints. For the holiday is a rest day of God, our majesty. The Lord only is our God and Master and no angel or saint is our Lord or God.

1363. Sabbath—Catholic Catechism on "Third" Commandment SOURCE: *This We Believe* (rev. ed. of the *Baltimore Catechism No. 3*), pp. 189–193. Copyright 1957 by Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington. Used by permission.

[p. 189] 234. What is the third commandment of God?

The third commandment of God is: Remember thou keep holy the Lord's day.

(a) The obligation to worship God is imposed on all men by the natural law. Man is obliged to adore and to thank God for His continuous blessings. Since the nature of man makes it impossible for him actually to express his adoration and his thanks continuously, reason dictates that certain times be specified for this purpose. God defined more exactly how man is to fulfill this obligation by His divine precept given in the Old Testament.

Scripture

"On the sixth day God finished the work he had been doing. And he rested on the seventh day from all work he had done. God blessed the seventh day and made it holy because on it he rested from all his work of creation" (Genesis 2:2-3).

"Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day. Six days you may labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the LORD, your God. No work may be done then either by you, or your son or your daughter, or your male or female slave, or your beast, or by the alien who lives with you. In six days the LORD made the heavens and the earth, the sea and all that is them; but on the seventh day he rested. That is why the LORD has blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy" (Exodus 20:8–11).

"Take care to keep holy the Sabbath day as the LORD, your God, commanded you. Six days you may labor and do all your work; but the seventh [p. 190] day is the Sabbath of the LORD, your God" (Deuteronomy 5:12–14).

235. Why does the Church command us to keep Sunday as the Lord's day?

The Church commands us to keep Sunday as the Lord's day, because on Sunday Christ rose from the dead, and on Sunday the Holy Ghost descended upon the apostles.

(a) The early Church changed the day of worship from Saturday to Sunday on the authority given to it by Christ. The New Testament makes no explicit mention that the apostles changed the day of worship, but we know it from Tradition.

236. What are we commanded by the third commandment?

By the third commandment we are commanded to worship God in a special manner on Sunday, the Lord's day.

Scripture

"Therefore, you must keep the Sabbath as something sacred. Whoever desecrates it shall be put to death. If anyone does work on that day, he must be rooted out of his people. Six days there are for doing work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of complete rest, sacred to the LORD" (Exodus 31:14–15).

237. How does the Church command us to worship God on Sunday?

The Church commands us to worship God on Sunday by assisting at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

- [p. 191] (a) Catholics who have reached the age of seven years and have sufficient use of reason are bound under pain of mortal sin to hear Mass on Sunday.
- (b) To satisfy the obligation to assist at Mass on Sunday a person must actually be present at the place where Mass is celebrated. If he cannot enter the church because it is overcrowded, he can still hear Mass provided he is part of the assembly assisting at the Holy Sacrifice. A person who is a notable distance from the worshipers certainly is not bodily present at Mass.
- (c) A person should be present for the entire Mass, from the beginning to the last Gospel. It is a venial sin to miss even slight part of a Mass of obligation deliberately and a mortal sin to miss a notable part. The obligation to assist at Mass is not fulfilled if the Consecration or the Communion is missed. The obligation can be fulfilled by hearing parts of two or more Masses in succession, provided one is present for both the Consecration and the Communion of the same Mass.
- (d) To fulfill the obligation to assist at Mass a person must have at least an implicit intention of hearing Mass and must [p. 192] advert, at least in a vague way, to the celebration of the Mass. It would be a mortal sin if he paid no attention at all to the principal parts of the Mass at which he assisted on Sunday. A person is obliged under pain of venial sin to avoid deliberate distractions during Mass and to take ordinary care to assist attentively and in a becoming manner.
- (e) The Mass offers us an opportunity to gain great spiritual benefits, and the more frequently and more devoutly we hear Mass, the more grace we can obtain. Ordinarily the best way to hear Mass is to unite with the priest and follow him in reciting the prayers of the Mass.
- (f) A grave inconvenience to oneself or to another excuses one from the obligation to hear Mass on Sundays and holy-days.

238. What is forbidden by the third commandment of God? By the third commandment of God all unnecessary servile work on Sunday is forbidden.

239. What is servile work?

Servile work is that which requires labor of body rather than of mind.

- (a) Farming, mechanical and industrial labor, and business transactions are forbidden even though one does them for [p. 193] pleasure and without any gain. Reading, writing, typewriting, studying, drawing, painting, embroidering, playing music, traveling, hunting, fishing, and the like are not servile works even though they may require considerable bodily exertion.
- (b) The obligation to avoid servile work on Sunday is grave, and therefore, its violation is a mortal sin if one works for a notable time.

240. When is servile work allowed in Sunday?

Servile work is allowed on Sunday when the honor of God, our own need, or that of our neighbor requires it.

(a) It is permissible on Sunday to do work directly concerned with divine worship; to perform necessary household duties which cannot conveniently be anticipated or deferred; to take personal care of the sick; and to do work required for the common good or necessary for one's own livelihood.

1364. Sabbath, Catholic Dedication of, to Mary

SOURCE: Dom Louis Gougaud, *Devotional and Ascetic Practices in the Middle Ages* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., [1927]), p. 69. Used by permission. [FRS No. 132.]

St Peter Damian, one of those who aided most the spread of Mariology in the eleventh century, expresses the same thought in the following manner: "Sabbath signifies rest, for one reads that God himself rested on that day. It is not then fitting that the same day should be dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, in whom the divine Wisdom chose its abode, and rested as on a couch of holiness?"

[EDITORS' NOTE: The "Divine Office" of the Virgin Mary in the Roman breviary is performed on every Saturday except at certain times during the yeaar when other ritual for specific observances supersedes it. See *A Catholic Dictionary* (3d ed.), ed. by Donald Attwater, p. 310.]

1365. Sabbath—Catholic View on Time Element in Sabbath Command SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 397–399. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 397] The point of difference is evident. The other Commandments of the Decalogue are precepts of the natural law, obligatory at all times and unalterable. Hence, after the abrogation of the Law of Moses, all the Commandments contained in the two tables are observed by Christians, not indeed because their observance is commanded by Moses, but because they are in conformity with nature which dictates obedience to them.

This Commandment about the observance of the Sabbath, on the other hand, considered as to the time appointed for its fulfillment, is not fixed and unalterable, but susceptible of change, and belongs not to the moral, but the ceremonial law. Neither is it a principle of the natural law; we are not instructed by nature to [p. 398] give external worship to God on that day, rather than on any other. And in fact the Sabbath was kept holy only from the time of the liberation of the people of Israel from the bondage of Pharaoh. The observance of the Sabbath was to be abrogated at the same time as the other Hebrew rites and ceremonies, that is, at the death of Christ. Having been, as it were, images which foreshadowed the light and the truth, these ceremonies were to disappear at the coming of that light and truth, which is Jesus Christ...

The Apostles therefore resolved to consecrate the first day of the week to the divine worship, and called it *the Lord's day*. [p. 399] St. John in the Apocalypse makes mention of *the Lord's day*; and the Apostle commands collections to be made *on the first day of the week*, that is, according to the interpretation of St. Chrysostom, on the Lord's day. From all this we learn that even then the Lord's day was kept holy in the Church.

1366. Sabbath, Christ and

SOURCE: W. D. Killen, *The Ancient Church* (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 1883), pp. 188, 189.

[p. 188] It has often been asserted that, during His own ministry, our Saviour encouraged His disciples to violate the Sabbath, and thus prepared the way for its abolition. But this theory is as destitute of foundation as it is dangerous to morality. Even the ceremonial law continued binding till Jesus expired upon the cross; and He felt it to be His duty to attend to every jot and tittle of its appointments. Thus it became Him "to fulfil all righteousness." He is at pains to show that the acts of which the Pharisees complained as breaches of the Sabbath could be vindicated by Old Testament authority; and that these formalists "condemned *the guiltless*," when they denounced the disciples as doing that which was unlawful. Jesus never transgressed either the letter or the spirit of any commandment pertaining to the holy rest; but superstition had added to the written law a multitude of minute observances; and every Israelite was at perfect liberty to neglect any or all of these frivolous regulations.

The Great Teacher never intimated that the Sabbath was a ceremonial ordinance to cease with the Mosaic ritual. It was instituted when our first parents were in Paradise; and the precept enjoining its remembrance, being a portion of the Decalogue, is of perpetual obligation. Hence, instead of regarding it as a merely Jewish institution, Christ declares that it "was made for MAN," or, in other words, that it was designed for the benefit of the whole human family. Instead of anticipating its extinction along with the ceremonial law, He speaks of its existence after the downfall of Jerusalem. When He announces the calamities connected with the ruin of the holy city, He instructs His followers to pray that the urgency of the catastrophe may not deprive them of the comfort of the ordinances of the sacred rest. "Pray ye," said he, "that your [p. 189] flight be not in the winter, *neither on the Sabbath-day*."

1367. Sabbath, Christ's Attitude Toward

SOURCE: G. Campbell Morgan, The Ten Commandments (New York: Revell, 1901), p. 50.

Much has been made of the attitude of Christ in speech and deed toward the Sabbath. Some have imagined that by words He uttered and by deeds He did He relaxed the binding nature of the old command. This view, however, is to absolutely misunderstand and misinterpret the doing and the teaching of Jesus.

1368. Sabbath, Christ's Custom of Observing

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, p. 25. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

Jesus observed the Sabbath Day of his own people. It was his "custom" to worship in the synagogues on the Sabbath Day. After he entered upon his own ministry, he and his followers continued to recognize and use the Sabbath Day, but according to his own individual and spiritual insight and interpretation. Even when Sabbath observance was made one of the chief grounds of bitter antagonism to him by the Pharisees he continued his recognition of the Sabbath and uttered no word that can properly be construed as lacking in deep reverence. Apparently, he expected that his followers would continue to hold and inculcate the spirit of the historic Sabbath.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This quotation should not be interpreted as indicating on the part of Dr. Carver any lack of commitment to the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian's LORD's Day.]

1369. Sabbath, Jewish Observance of—Custom Widely Spread in Josephus' Dav

SOURCE: Josephus *Against Apion* ii. 39; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 405, 407. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [FRS No. 96.]

[p. 405] And there is not [p. 407] one city, Greek or barbarian, nor a single nation, to which our custom of abstaining from work on the seventh day has not spread, and where the fasts and the lighting of lamps and many of our prohibitions in the matter of food are not observed.

1370. Sabbath, Jewish Observance of, Evening to Evening, Announced by Priest's Trumpet

SOURCE: Josephus *War* iv. 9. 12; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 171, 173. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 171] The last was erected above the roof of the priests' chambers, at the point where it was the custom for [p. 173] one of the priests to stand and to give notice, by sound of trumpet, in the afternoon of the approach, and on the following evening of the close, of every seventh day, announcing to the people the respective hours for ceasing work and for resuming their labours.

1371. Sabbath, Jewish Observance of, From Evening to Evening SOURCE: Agatharchides, quoted in Josephus *Against Apion* i. 22; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 247, 249. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 247] The people known as Jews, who inhabit the most strongly fortified of cities, called by the natives Jerusalem, have a custom of abstaining from work every seventh day; on those occasions [p. 249] they neither bear arms nor take any agricultural operations in hand, or engage in any other form of public service, but pray with outstretched hands in the temples until the evening.

1372. Sabbath, Jewish Observance of—Study of the Law SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* xvi. 2. 3, in *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans. by William Whiston (Cincinnati: H. S. & J. Applegate, 1850), p. 325.

The seventh day we set apart from labor; it is dedicated to the learning of our customs and laws, we thinking it proper to reflect on them, as well as on any [good] thing else, in order to our avoiding of sin [brackets in translation].

1373. Sabbath, Jewish Traditions Concerning

SOURCE: Mishnah (tractates and sections as indicated), trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), folios and pages as indicated. Used by permission.

a. Shabbath 1.1, in Talmud 2*a*, pp. 1, 2

[p. 1] The carryings out of the Sabbath are two which are four within, and two which are four without. How so? The poor man stands without and the master of the house within: [i] if the poor man stretches his hand within and places [an article] into the hand of the master of the house, or [ii] if he takes [an article] from it and carries it out, the poor man is liable, and the master of the house is exempt. [Again,] [i] if the master of the house stretch- [p. 2] es his hand without and places [an object] in the poor man's hand, or [ii] takes [an object] therefrom and carries it in, the master is liable, while the poor man is exempt. [iii] If the poor man stretches his hand within and the master takes [an object] from it, or places [an object] therein and he carries it out, both are exempt. [an object] from it, or places [an article] therein and he carries it inside, both are exempt.

b. Shabbath 1.5, 6, 7, 8, in Talmud 17*b*, p. 73

Beth Shammai rule: Ink, dyes and alkaline plants may not be steeped unless they can be dissolved while it is yet day,³ [Note 3: These materials had to be steeped in water before they were fit for their purpose, and Beth Shammai rule that this may not be done on Friday unless there is time for the process to be completed before the Sabbath.] but Beth Hillel permit it. Beth Shammai rule: Bundles of wet flax may not be placed in an oven unless they can begin to steam while it is yet day, nor wool in the dyer's kettle unless it can assume the colour [of the dye]; but Beth Hillel permit it. Beth Shammai rule: One must not sell to a Gentile, or help him to load [an ass], or lift up [an article] upon him unless he can reach a near place; but Beth Hillel permit it. Beth Shammai maintain: Hides must not be given to a tanner, nor garments to a Gentile fuller, unless they can be done while it is yet day; but in all these [cases] Beth Hillel permit [them] before sunset.

c. Shabbath 2.5, in Talmud 29b, p. 131

If one extinguishes the lamp because he is afraid of Gentiles, robbers, or an evil spirit, or for the sake of an invalid, that he should sleep, he is not culpable. If [because] he would spare the lamp, the oil, or the wick, he is culpable. R. Jose exempts him in all cases, except in respect of the wick, because he makes charcoal.

d. Shabbath 3.6, in Talmud 42b, p. 196

One may not place a vessel under a lamp to catch the oil.⁵ [Note 5: On the Sabbath.] But if it is placed there before sunset, it is permitted. Yet one may not benefit from it,⁷ [Note 7: I.e., use the oil which drops therein.] because it is not mukan.

e. Shabbath 5.2, in Talmud 52b, p. 240

An ass may go out with its cushion if it is tied to it. Rams may go out coupled

[lebubin]. Ewes may go out [with their posteriors] exposed [shehuzoth], tied [kebuloth],

and covered [*kebunoth*]; goats may go out [with their udders] tied up. R. Jose forbids in all these cases, save ewes that are covered. R. Judah said: Goats may go out [with their udders] tied in order to dry up, but not to save their milk.

f. Shabbath 5.3, in Talmud 54*a*, p. 248

And wherewith may it not go out? A camel may not go out with a pad [tied to its tail] ...; and similarly other animals. One must not tie camels together and pull [one of them], but he may take the cords in his hand and pull [them], providing he does not twine them together.

g. Shabbath 5.4, in Talmud 54b, p. 250

An ass may not go out with a cushion, when it is not tied to it, or with a bell, even if it is plugged, or with a ladder [-shaped yoke] around its neck, or with a thong around its foot. Fowls may not go out with ribbons, or with a strap on their legs; rams may not go out with a waggonette under their tails,⁴ [Note 4: This refers to a species of ram whose tail was very fat, to preserve which it was yoked to a waggonette.] ewes may not go out

protected [*hanunoth*], or a calf with a *gimon*, or a cow with the skin of a hedgehog,⁷ [Note 7: Tied round its udder.] or with the strap between its horns. R. Eleazar b.

'Azariah's cow used to go out with a thong between its horns, [but] not with the consent of the rabbis.

h. Shabbath 6.1, in Talmud 57*a*, p. 266

Wherewith may a woman go out, and wherewith may she not go out?¹ [Note 1: On the Sabbath. The general rule is that a woman may wear superfluous garments which are ornamental, save some which the Rabbis prohibited for fear that she might remove them for a friend's inspection and admiration, carrying them meanwhile in the street. Those which are not considered ornamental constitute a burden, and are always forbidden.] A woman may not go out with ribbons of wool, linen ribbons, or fillets round her head; nor

may she perform ritual immersion whilst wearing them, unless she loosens them. [She may not go out] with frontlets, garlands [*sarbițin*], if they are not sewn, or with a hair-net [*kabul*] into the street, or with a golden city,⁷ [Note 7: An ornament which contained a picture of Jerusalem.] or with a necklace [*kațla*], or with ear-rings, or with a finger-ring which has no signet, or with a needle which is unpierced. Yet if she goes out [with these], she is not liable to a sin-offering.

i. Shabbath 6.2, in Talmud 60a, p. 280

A man may not go out with a nail-studded sandal, nor with a single [sandal], if he has no wound on his foot; ⁴ [Note 4: Either because he may be suspected of carrying the other sandal under his garments (T.J.), or because he may evoke ridicule, which will cause him to remove and carry it. But when one foot is wounded, there is no fear of this. V. Rashi.] nor with *Tefillin*, nor with an amulet, if it is not from an expert, nor with a coat of mail [*shiryon*], nor with a casque [*kasda*], nor with greaves [*megafayyim*]. Yet if he goes out, he does not incur a sin-offering.

j. Shabbath 6.3, in Talmud 62*a*, p. 289

A woman may not go out with a needle that is pierced, nor with a ring bearing a signet, nor with a *kokliar*, nor with a *kobeleth*, nor with a balsam phial; and if she does go out, she is liable to a sin-offering; this is R. Meir's view. But the sages rule that she is not culpable in the case of a *kobeleth* and a balsam phial.

k. Shabbath 6.4, in Talmud 63*a*, p. 295

A man must not go out with a sword, bow, shield, lance [*allah*], or spear; and if he does go out, he incurs a sin-offering. R. Eliezer said: They are ornaments for him. But the Sages maintain, they are merely shameful, for it is said, *And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.* A knee-band [*berith*] is clean, and

one may go out with it on the Sabbath; ankle-chains [*kebalim*] are unclean, and one may not go out with them on the Sabbath.

l. Shabbath 6.5, in Talmud 64b, p. 306

A woman may go out with ribbons made of hair, whether they are of her own [hair] or of her companions, or of an animal, and with frontlets and with *sarbitin* that are

fastened to her. [She may go out] with a hair-net [*kabul*] and with a wig into a courtyard; with wadding in her ear, with wadding in her sandals, and with the cloth prepared for her menstruation; with a peppercorn, with a globule of salt and anything that is placed in her mouth,⁷ [Note 7: Before the commencement of the Sabbath.] providing that she does not put it in her mouth in the first place on the Sabbath, and if it falls out, she may not put it back. As for an artificial tooth, [or] a gold tooth,—Rabbi permits but the Sages forbid it.

m. Shabbath 7.2, in Talmud 73a, pp. 348, 349

[p. 348] The primary labours are forty less one, [viz.:] sowing, ploughing, reaping, binding [p. 349] sheaves, threshing, winnowing, selecting, grinding, sifting, kneading,

baking, shearing wool, bleaching, hackling, dyeing, spinning, stretching the threads, the making of two meshes, weaving two threads, dividing two threads, tying [knotting] and untying, sewing two stitches, tearing in order to sew two stitches, capturing a deer, slaughtering, or flaying, or salting it, curing its hide, scraping it [of its hair], cutting it up, writing two letters, erasing in order to write two letters [over the erasure], building, pulling down, extinguishing, kindling, striking with a hammer, [and] carrying out from one domain to another: these are the forty primary labours less one.

n. Shabbath 7.4, in Talmud 76*a*, p. 360

He who carries out a cow's mouthful of straw, a camel's mouthful of peastalks

[*'eẓah*], a lamb's mouthful of ears of corn, a goat's mouthful of herbs, moist garlic or onion leaves to the size of a dried fig, [or] a goat's mouthful of dry [leaves], [is culpable]. And they do not combine with each other, because they are not alike in their standards.

o. Shabbath 8.1, in Talmud 76b, p. 363

[76b] He who carries out [raw] wine, [the standard is that it be] enough for the mixing of a cup; milk, as much as is quaffed at a time; honey, sufficient to place on a scab; oil, as much as is required to rub in a small limb; water, enough for rubbing collyrium; and all

other liquids, [the standard is] a *rebi'ith;* and all waste water, a *rebi'ith*. R. Simeon said:

[The standard for] all these is a *rebi⁻ith*, all these measures having been stated only in respect of those who put them away.

p. Shabbath 8.2, 3, 4, in Talmud 78a, 78b, pp. 371, 372

[p. 371] He who carries out cord, [the standard is] as much as is required for making a handle for a basket; a reed cord, as much as is required for making a hanger for a sieve or a basketsieve. R. Judah said: As much as is required for taking the measure of a child's shoe. Paper, large enough to write a tax-collector's receipt on it. (And he who carries out a tax-collector's receipt is liable.) Erased paper, as much as is required to wrap round a small phial of spikenard oil; skin, for making an amulet; parchment, for writing thereon

the shortest passage of the Tefillin, which is 'Hear O Israel,': ink, for writing two letters;

stibium, for painting one eye; paste, for putting on the top of a lime board [*shafshaf*]; pitch and sulphur, for making a perforation [therein]; wax for putting over a small hole; clay, for making a hole in a gold refiner's pot. R. Judah said: For making a [tripod's] peg. Bran, for putting on the mouth of a gold refiner's pot; [p. 372] lime, for smearing the smallest of girls. R. Judah said: Enough to produce a hair-crown [*k'alk'al*]. R. Nehemiah

said: Enough for making side-curls [ondafe].

q. Shabbath 10.2, in Talmud 91b, p. 436

If one carries out food and places it on the threshold, whether he [himself] subsequently carries it out [into the street] or another does so, he is not culpable, because the [whole] act was not performed at once. [If one carries out] a basket which is full of produce and places it on the outer threshold, though most of the produce is without, he is not culpable unless he carries out the whole basket.

r. Shabbath 10.3, in Talmud 92a, pp. 439, 440

[p. 439] If one carries out [an article], whether with his right or with his left [hand], in his lap or on his shoulder, he is culpable, because thus was the carrying of the children of Kohath. In a backhanded manner, [e.g.,] with his foot, in his mouth, with his elbow, in his ear, in his hair, in his belt with [p. 440] its opening downwards, between his belt and his shirt, in the hem of his shirt, in his shoes or sandals, he is not culpable, because he has not carried [it] out as people [generally] carry out.

s. Shabbath 10.5, in Talmud 92b, p. 444

If one carries out a loaf into the street, he is culpable; if two carry it out, they are not culpable. If one could not carry it out and two carry it out, they are culpable; but R. Simeon exempts [them].

t. Shabbath 10.6, in Talmud 94b, p. 452

If one pares his nails with each other or with his teeth, likewise [if one plucks] his hair, likewise his moustache, likewise his beard; and likewise if [a woman] plaits [her hair], likewise if she paints [her eyelids], likewise if she rouges [her face],—R. Eliezer declares [them] culpable, while the Rabbis forbid [these actions] as a *shebuth*.

u. Shabbath 11.1, 2, in Talmud 96*a*, p. 460

If one throws [an article] from private into public ground [or] from public into private ground, he is culpable. From one private domain to another, and public ground lies between, R. Akiba holds him liable, but the Sages declare him exempt. How so? If there are two balconies facing each other in the street, he who reaches over or throws [an article] from one to the other is not culpable. If both are on the same storey, he who reaches over is culpable, while he who throws is not, for thus was the service of the Levites: two waggons [stood] behind each other in public ground, [and] they reached over the boards from one to another, but did not throw.

v. Shabbath 11.3, in Talmud 100a, pp. 478, 479

[p. 478] If one throws [an article] four cubits on to a wall above ten handbreadths, it is as though he throws it into the air; if below, it is as though he throws it on to the ground. And he who throws [an article] four cubits along the ground is culpable. [p. 479] If one throws [an object] within four cubits but it rolls beyond four cubits, he is not culpable; beyond four cubits but it rolls within four cubits, he is culpable.

w. Shabbath 11.4, in Talmud 100b, p. 480

If one throws [an object over a distance of] four cubits in the sea, he is not liable. If there is a water pool and a public road traverses it, and one throws [an object] four cubits therein, he is liable. And what depth constitutes a pool? Less than ten handbreadths. If there is a pool of water and a public road traverses it, and one throws [an object] four cubits therein, he is liable.

x. Shabbath 11.6, in Talmud 102*a*, pp. 486, 487

[p. 486] If one throws [an article] and recalls [that it is the Sabbath] after it leaves his hand, and another catches it, or a dog catches it, or it is burnt, he is not liable. If one throws [an article] in order to inflict a wound, whether in man or in beast, and he recalls [that it is the Sabbath] before the wound is inflicted, he is not liable. This is the general principle: All who are liable to sin-offerings [p. 487] are liable only if the beginning and the end [of the forbidden action] are unwitting. If their beginning is unwitting while their

end is wilful, if their beginning is wilful while their end is unwitting, they are not liable, unless their beginning and end are unwitting.

y. Shabbath 12.1, in Talmud 102b, p. 490

If one builds, how much must he build to be culpable? He who builds however little, and he who chisels, and he who strikes with a hammer or with an adze, and he who bores [a hole], however little, is culpable. This is the general principle: Whoever does work on the Sabbath and his work endures, is culpable. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: He too is culpable who beats with the sledge hammer on the anvil at the time of his work, because he is as one who improves his work.

z. Shabbath12.2, in Talmud 103a, p. 493

He who ploughs, however little, he who weeds and he who trims [trees], and he who cuts off young shoots, however little, is culpable. He who gathers timber: If in order to effect an improvement, [the standard of culpability is] however little; if for fuel, as much as is required for boiling a light egg. If one collects grass, if to effect an improvement, [the standard of culpability is] however little; if for an animal['s fodder], a kid's mouthful.

aa. Shabbath 12.3, in Talmud 103*a*, p. 494

He who writes two letters, whether with his right or with his left hand, of the same designation or of two designations, or in two pigments, in any language, is culpable.

bb. Shabbath 12.4, 5, in Talmud 104b, pp. 502, 503

[p. 502] If one writes two letters in one state of unawareness, he is culpable. If one writes with ink, chemicals, *sikra*,⁶ [Note 6: A kind of red paint.] *k'umos*,⁷ [Note 7: Ink

prepared with gum.] *k'ankantum*,⁸ [Note 8: Vitriol used as an ingredient of ink.] or with anything that leaves a mark on the angle of two walls or on the two leaves [tables] of a ledger, and they [the two letters] are read together, he is culpable. If one writes on his flesh, he is culpable: he who scratches a mark on his [p. 503] flesh, R. Eliezer declares him liable to a sin-offering; but the Sages exempt him. If one writes with a fluid, with fruit juice, with road dust, or with writer's powder, or with anything that cannot endure, he is not culpable. [If one writes] with the back of his hand, with his foot, with his mouth, or with his elbow; if one writes one letter near [other] writing, or if one writes upon writing; if one intends writing a *h'eth* but writes two *zayyinin*; one [letter] on the ground another on a beam: if one writes on two walls of the house or on two leaves of a

and another on a beam; if one writes on two walls of the house, or on two leaves of a ledger which are not to be read together, he is not culpable. If one writes one letter as an abbreviation, R. Joshua b. Bathyra holds him liable, whilst the Sages exempt him.

cc. Shabbath 13.6, in Talmud 106b, p. 515

If a deer enters a house and one person shuts [the door] before it, he is culpable; if two shut it, they are exempt. If one could not shut it, and both shut it, they are culpable. R. Simeon declares [them] exempt.

dd. Shabbath 13.7, in Talmud 106b, p. 515

If one sits down in the doorway but does not fill it, and a second sits down and fills it,² [Note 2: Thereby effectively trapping an animal that has entered the house.] the second is culpable. If the first sits down in the doorway and fills it, and a second comes and sits down at his side, even if the first [then] rises and departs, the first is culpable

while the second is exempt. What does this resemble? One who shuts his house to guard it, and a deer is [thereby] found to be guarded therein.

ee. Shabbath 14.3, in Talmud 109b, p. 532

We may not eat Greek hyssop on the Sabbath, because it is not the food of healthy people; ² [Note 2: But obviously a medicine.] but we may eat *yo'ezer* ³ [Note 3: A certain plant.] and drink *abub ro'eh*.⁴ [Note 4: Lit., 'shepherd's flute'—name of a plant (Eupatorium) used for medicinal purposes (Jast.).] A man may eat any kind of food as a remedy, and drink any liquid,⁵ [Note 5: Provided that they are eaten and drunk without healing intentions too.] except water of palm trees and a potion of roots, because they are [a remedy] for jaundice; but one may drink water of palm trees for his thirst and rub himself with oil of roots without medical purpose.

ff. Shabbath 14.4, in Talmud 111a, pp. 539, 540

[p. 539] If one's teeth pain him, he must not sip vinegar through them,¹⁷ [Note 17: This is healing, which is forbidden on the Sabbath.] but may dip [his bread in vinegar] in the usual manner, and if he is cured, he is cured. If one's loins pain him, he must not rub them [p. 540] with wine or vinegar, but he may anoint them with oil, yet not rose oil. Royal children may anoint their wounds with rose oil, since it is their practice to anoint themselves thus on weekdays. R. Simeon said: All Israel are royal children.

gg. Shabbath 15.3, in Talmud 113a, pp. 551, 552

[p. 551] One may fold up garments even four or [p. 552] five times, and spread the sheets on the beds on the night of the Sabbath for [use on] the Sabbath, but not on the Sabbath for [use on] the conclusion of the Sabbath.

hh. Shabbath 16.2, in Talmud 117b, p. 576

Food for three meals may be saved, that which is fit for man, for man, that which is fit for animals, for animals. How so? If a fire breaks out Sabbath night, food for three meals may be saved; [if] in the morning, food for two meals may be saved; at [the time of] *minḥah*, food for one meal. R. Jose said: At all times we may save food for three meals.

ii. Shabbath 16.6, in Talmud 121a, p. 599

If a Gentile comes to extinguish, we do not say to him, 'extinguish it' or 'do not extinguish,' because his resting is not our obligation. But if a minor comes to extinguish, we must not permit him, because his resting is our obligation.

jj. Shabbath 16.7, in Talmud 121a, p. 600

A dish may be inverted over a lamp, that the beams should not catch [fire], and over an infant's excrement, and over a scorpion, that it should not bite. R. Judah said: An incident came before R. Joḥanan b. Zakkai in Arab, and he said, I fear on his account [that he may be liable to] a sin-offering.

kk. Shabbath 16.8, in Talmud 122a, p. 604

If a Gentile lights a lamp, an Israelite may make use of its light; but if [he does it] for the sake of the Israelite, it is forbidden. If he draws water to give his own animal to drink, an Israelite may water [his] after him; but if [he draws it] for the Israelite's sake, it is forbidden. If a Gentile makes a stairway to descend by it, an Israelite may descend after him; but if on the Israelite's account, it is forbidden. It once happened that R. Gamaliel and the Elders were travelling in a ship, when a Gentile made a stairway for going down, and R. Gamaliel and the Elders descended by it.

ll. Shabbath 18.3, in Talmud 128b, pp. 640, 641

[p. 640] One may not deliver an animal [in giving birth] on a festival, but one may assist it. We may deliver a woman on the Sabbath, summon a midwife for her from place to place, desecrate the Sabbath on her account, and tie up the navel-string. R. Jose [p. 641] said: One may cut [it] too. And all the requirements of circumcision may be done on the Sabbath.

mm. Shabbath 19.1, in Talmud 130a, p. 649

R. Eliezer said: If one did not bring an instrument on the eve of the Sabbath,¹ [Note 1: A knife for circumcision.] he must bring it on the Sabbath uncovered; but in [times of] danger he hides it on the testimony of witnesses. R. Eliezer said further: One may cut timber to make charcoal for manufacturing iron. R. Akiba stated a general principle: Any [manner of] work which could be performed on Sabbath eve does not supersede the Sabbath; but that which could not be performed on Sabbath eve does supersede the Sabbath.

nn. Shabbath 19.2, in Talmud 133a, pp. 668, 669

[p. 668] We perform all the requirements of [p. 669] circumcision on the Sabbath. We circumcise, uncover [the corona], suck [the wound], and place a compress and cummin upon it. If one did not crush [the cummin] on the eve of the Sabbath, he must chew [it] with his teeth and apply [it to the wound]; if he did not beat up wine and oil on the eve of

the Sabbath, each must be applied separately. We may not make a *haluk* ⁶ [Note 6: A kind of shirt-shaped bandage placed over the membrum and tied at the corona, to prevent the flesh from growing back and recovering the membrum.] for it in the first place, but must wrap a rag about it. If this was not prepared from the eve of the Sabbath, one winds it about his finger ⁷ [Note 7: As though it were a garment, so that it shall not be carried just like on weekdays.] not and brings it, and even through another courtyard.

oo. Shabbath 19.3, in Talmud 134b, pp. 675, 676

[p. 675] We may bathe the infant both before and after the circumcision, and sprinkle [warm water] over him by hand but not with a vessel. R. Eleazar b. 'Azariah said: We may bathe an infant on the third day [of circumcision] which falls on the Sabbath, because it is said, and it came to pass on [p. 676] the third day, when they were sore. As for one who is doubtful, and an hermaphrodite, we may not desecrate the Sabbath on their account; but R. Judah permits [it] in the case of an hermaphrodite.

pp. Shabbath 20.1, in Talmud 137b, p. 694

R. Eliezer said: One may suspend a strainer on festivals, and pour [wine] through a suspended [strainer] on the Sabbath. But the Sages rule: One may not suspend a strainer on festivals, nor pour [wine] through a suspended [strainer] on the Sabbath, but we may pour [it] through a suspended [strainer] on festivals.

qq. Shabbath 21.2, in Talmud 142b, p. 721

If a stone is on the mouth of a cask [of wine], one tilts it on a side and it falls off. If it [the cask] is [standing] among [other] casks, he lifts it out, tilts it on a side, and it falls

off. If money is lying on a cushion, one shakes the cushion, and it falls off. If dirt is upon it, one wipes it off with a rag; ⁴ [Note 4: But not with water, which is forbidden as washing.] if it is of leather,⁵ [Note 5: Which is not such as is washed with water.] water is poured over it until it disappears.

rr. Shabbath 21.3, in Talmud 143*a*, pp. 723, 724

[p. 723] Beth Shammai say: One may remove bones and [nuts]shells from the table; but Beth Hillel rule: One must take away the whole board and shake it. One may remove from the table crumbs less than the size of an olive and the panicles of beans and lentils, because they are food for animals. As for [p. 724] a sponge, if it has a leathern handle, one may wipe [the board] with it; if not, one may not wipe [the board] with it. [The Sages maintain]: In either case it may be handled on the Sabbath and is not susceptible to defilement.

ss. Shabbath 22.1, in Talmud 143b, p. 726

If a cask [of wine] is broken,¹ [Note 1: On the Sabbath.] one may save thereof the requirements for three meals, and he [the owner] can say to others, 'come and save for yourselves', provided that he does not sponge it up.³ [Note 3: I.e., he must not absorb the spilt wine in a sponge, lest he wring it out (into a vessel), which is forbidden.] Fruit may not be squeezed in order to express their juices: If they exude of their own accord they are prohibited. R. Judah said: If [they stand] as eatables, that which exudes from them is permitted; but if for liquids, that which exudes from them is prohibited. If honeycombs are crushed on the eve of the Sabbath and it [the honey] exudes spontaneously, it is forbidden; but R. Eleazar permits it.

tt. Shabbath 23.5 in Talmud 151a, 151b, p. 771

All the requirements of the dead may be done; he may be anointed with oil and washed, provided that no limb of his is moved. The pillow may be removed from under him, and he may be placed on sand, in order that he may be able to keep. The jaw may be tied up, not in order that it should close but that it should not go further [open]. And likewise, if a beam is broken, it may be supported by a bench or bed staves, not in order that it [the break] should close up, but that it should go no further.

uu. Shabbath 23.5, in Talmud 151b, p. 772

One may not close [the eyes of] a corpse on the Sabbath, nor on weekdays when he is about to die, and he who closes the eyes [of a dying person] at the point of death is a murderer.

vv. Shabbath 24.1, in Talmud 153a, p. 783

If darkness falls upon a person on a road,¹ [Note 1: The Sabbath commences.] he entrusts his purse to a Gentile; but if there is no Gentile with him, he places it on the ass. When he reaches the outermost courtyard he removes the objects which may be handled on the Sabbath, whilst as for those which may not be handled on the Sabbath, he unties the cords and the sacks fall off automatically.

ww. 'Erubin 4.1, in Talmud 41*b*, p. 286

He whom Gentiles, or an evil spirit, have taken out [beyond the permitted Sabbath limit] has no more than four cubits [in which to move]. If he was brought back [he is regarded] as if he had never gone out. If he was taken to another town, or if he was put in a cattle-pen or in a cattle-fold, he may, ruled R. Gamaliel and R. Eleazar b. Azariah,

move through the whole of its area; but R. Joshua and R. Akiba ruled: He has only four cubits [in which to move].

It once happened that they were coming from Brindisi and while their ship was sailing on the sea, R. Gamaliel and R. Eleazar. b. Azariah walked about throughout its area, but R. Joshua and R. Akiba did not move beyond four cubits.

xx. 'Erubin 4.4, in Talmud 45a, pp. 312, 313

[p. 312] If a man sat down by the way and when he rose up he observed that he was near a town he may not enter it, since it had not been [p. 313] his intention to do so; so R. Meir. R. Judah ruled: He may enter it. Said R. Judah, it once actually happened that R. Tarfon entered a town though this was not his intention.

yy. 'Erubin 4.5, 6, in Talmud 45*a*, 45*b*, pp. 313–315

[p. 313] If a man slept by the way and was unaware that night had fallen, he is entitled to move within two thousand cubits in any direction; so R. Johanan b. Nuri. The Sages, however, ruled: He has only four cubits within which to move. R. Eliezer ruled: And the man is deemed to be in their centre. [p. 314] R. Judah ruled: He may move in any direction he desires. R. Judah, however, agrees that if he has once chosen his direction he may not go back on it.

If there were two men and a part of the prescribed number of cubits of the one overlapped with that of the other, they may bring their meals and eat them in the middle, provided the one does not carry out anything from his limit into that of the other. If there were three men and the prescribed limit of the middle one overlapped with the respective limits of the others, he is permitted to eat with either of them and either of them is permitted to eat with him, but the two outer persons are forbidden to eat with one another. R. Simeon remarked: To what may this case be compared? To three courtyards that open one into the other and also into a public domain, where, if the two outer ones made an *'erub* with the middle one, it is permitted [p. 315] to have access to them and they are permitted access to it, but the two outer ones are forbidden access to one another.

zz. 'Erubin 5.8, in Talmud 61*a*, pp. 428, 429

[p. 428] The people of a large town may walk through the whole of a small town, and the people of a small town may walk through the whole of a large town. How is this [to be understood]? If a man stayed in a large town and deposited his *'erub* in a small town

or if he stayed in a small town and deposited his *'erub* in a large town, he may walk through all the town and two thousand cubits beyond it. R. Akiba ruled: He is allowed to walk no [p. 429] further than two thousand cubits from the place of his *'erub*.

aaa. 'Erubin 4.7, 8, in Talmud 49b, pp. 343, 344

[p. 343] If a man who was on a journey [home- [p. 344] ward] was overtaken by dusk, and he knew of a tree or a wall and said, 'Let my Sabbath base be under it', his statement is of no avail. If, however, he said, 'Let my Sabbath base be at its root', he may walk from the place where he stands to its root a distance of two thousand cubits, and from its root to his house another two thousand cubits. Thus he can walk four thousand cubits after dusk.

If he does not know of any tree or wall, or if he is not familiar with the *halachah*, and said, 'Let my present position be my Sabbath base', his position acquires for him the

right of movement within a radius of two thousand cubits in any direction; so R. Hanina b. Antigonus. The Sages, however, ruled: The distances are to be squared in the shape of a square tablet, so that he may gain the area of the corners.

bbb. 'Erubin 10.3, in Talmud 97b, p. 674

If a man was reading in a scroll on a threshold and the scroll rolled out of his hand, he may roll it back to himself. If he was reading it on the top of a roof and the scroll rolled out of his hand, he may, before it reached ten hand-breadths from from the ground, roll it back to himself.

ccc. Yoma 8.6, in Talmud 83a, p. 407

If one is seized by a ravenous hunger, he may be given to eat even unclean things until his eyes are enlightened. If one was bit by a mad dog, he may not give him to eat the lobe of its liver. But R. Matthia b. Heresh permits it. Furthermore did R. Matthia b. Heresh say: If one has pain in his throat, he may pour medicine into his mouth on the Sabbath, because it is a possibility of danger to human life and every danger to human life suspends the [laws of the] Sabbath.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Brackets, except for page numbers and for inserted footnotes, are in the translation.] 1374. Sabbath, Karlstadt on

SOURCE: Andres Carolstat [Andreas Rudolf Karlstadt], *Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen* ("Concerning the Sabbath and Commanded Holidays") (1524), chap. 4, unpaged. (This is also reprinted in

Karlstadt's *Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25*, Part I, compiled and published by Erich Hertzsch, pp. 41, 42. No. 325 of Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke d. 16. u. 17. Jahrhunderts, founded by W. Braune. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1956.) German.

[p. 23] When servants have worked six days, they should have the seventh day free. God says without distinction, "Remember that you observe the seventh day." He does not say whether we should keep Sunday or Saturday for the seventh day. Concerning Sunday it is known that men have instituted it. Concerning Saturday, it is still under [p. 24] dispute. It is clear however, that you should celebrate the seventh day and allow your servants to do so as often as they have worked six days. Should, however, a master name and select his seventh day for each individual servant, it would tend to bring disorder into the household, especially if he has many servants. Should each household in a city select a different Sabbath the order of the city and the work of the preacher would be thrown into confusion.

But if God's word or the sermons are not set aside, or if God's word were read or preached every day, every master of a house would have the power to choose for himself and his servants a seventh day which would be most convenient and most advantageous for his work.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Page numbers have been supplied by count.]

1375. Sabbath, Karlstadt's View of, Rejected by Luther

SOURCE: Martin Luther, "Wider die himmlischen Propheten," in his *Sämmtliche Schriften*, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, Vol. 20 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), col. 148. German.

Thanks be unto the pious Paul and Isaiah, that they so long ago freed us from these factious spirits; otherwise we would have to sit on the Sabbath with our head in our hands, and wait for a heavenly voice, as they pretend. Indeed if Karlstadt were to write further about the Sabbath, Sunday would have to give way, and the Sabbath, i.e., Saturday, must be kept holy.

1376. Sabbath, Luther on-Remained After Man's Fall

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Commentary on Genesis*, ed. by J. N. Lenker, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis, Minn.: Lutherans in All Lands Co., 1904), Comment on Gen. 2:3, pp. 138–140.

[p. 138] God blessed the Sabbath and sanctified it to himself. It is moreover to be remarked that God did this to no other creature. God did not sanctify to himself the heaven nor the earth nor any other creature. But God did sanctify to himself the seventh day. This was especially designed of God, to cause us to understand that the "seventh [p. 139] day" is to be especially devoted to divine worship...

It follows therefore from this passage, that if Adam had stood in his innocence and had not fallen he would yet have observed the "seventh day" as sanctified, holy and sacred... Nay, even after the fall he held the "seventh day" sacred; that is, he taught on that day his own family. This is testified by the offerings made by his two sons, Cain and Abel. The Sabbath therefore has, from the beginning of the world, been set apart for the worship of God... For all these things are implied and signified in the expression "sanctified." ...

[p. 140] Although therefore man lost the knowledge of God by sin, yet God willed that his command concerning the sanctifying of the Sabbath should remain. He willed that on the seventh day both the Word should be preached, and also those other parts of his worship performed, which he himself instituted.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Luther is here speaking of the fact that God willed that the Sabbath should remain after the Fall. This passage does not indicate Luther's opinion on how long it should remain, but he states elsewhere that the seventh day, as a "ceremony" and a temporary part of the fourth commandment, was abolished along with the Mosaic system although the Decalogue, or moral law, remains forever (see Nos. 1377, 1378).]

1377. Sabbath, Luther on—"Repealed"; Otherwise Saturday Must Be Kept Holy

SOURCE: Martin Luther, "Wider die himmlischen Propheten," in his *Sämmtliche Schriften*, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, Vol. 20 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), cols. 146–149. German.

[col. 146] 44. ... I am speaking now as a Christian and for the Christians. For Moses was given only to the Jewish people and does not concern us Gentiles and Christians. We have our gospel and the New Testament; [col. 147] if they shall prove from it that the images are to be put away, we will readily follow them. But if through Moses they want to make Jews of us, we will not stand for it.

45. ... One can see that these rabble spirits understand nothing in the Scripture, neither Moses nor Christ, and do not seek nor find anything in it but their own dreams. And we are here laying the ground from St. Paul, 1 Tim. 1:9 ("To the righteous no law is given" [Luther's trans.]), and Peter, in Acts 15:10, "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" With this text (just as Paul with his) St. Peter cancels all of Moses, with all his laws, for the Christian...

46. Yes, you say, that would be true of the ceremonies and judicial matters, that is, what Moses teaches as to outward divine service and outward government, but the decalogue, that is, the ten commandments, in which there is nothing of the ceremonies and judicialia, are not canceled there. I reply: I know quite well of this general, old difference given but without reason, for out of the ten commandments come [literally; "pour out"], and with it hand all the other commandments and all of Moses...

48. Therefore it is not true that there are no ceremonies in the ten commandments, or no judicial matters; there are, and they hang therein and belong therein. That God had designated. He himself put in two ceremonies, speaking about [col. 148] images and the Sabbath, wanting to prove that these two items are ceremonies and that in their manner they are repealed in the New Testament, that one may see how Dr. Karlstadt in his book,

On the Sabbath, handled this as cunningly as on the images. For St. Paul clearly and plainly says in Col. 2:16, 17, 'Let no one therefore judge you in meat or drink, or in respect to a holy day or new moons or Sabbath days which are a shadow of things to come.' Here Paul abolished the Sabbath by name and called it a bygone shadow because the body, which is Christ himself, has come.

49. ... Isa. 66:23, "One Sabbath will be at the other, and one new moon at the other," i.e., daily will be Sabbath in the NT, no differentiation in the time.

50. ... For it is the truth, and no one can deny it: Whoever observes a law of Moses as Moses' law, must observe them all as St. Paul concludes in Gal. 5:3, "He who allows himself to be circumcised must keep all the law." Also whoever destroys images or keeps the Sabbath (that is, he who teaches it necessary to observe these commandments) must be circumcised and keep the whole law of Moses; which certain- [col. 149] ly, (if you give room to these spirits), eventually would compel them to do, to teach, and to observe.

1378. Sabbath, Luther on—Temporary Seventh Day and Permanent Commandment

SOURCE: Martin Luther, "Wider die Sabbather," in his *Sämmtliche Schriften*, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch. Vol. 20 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), col. 1855. German.

66. Now what Moses calls the seventh day, and how God created the world in six days, because of which they are not to do any work, that is the temporary adornment with which Moses clothes this commandment especially for his people at this time; for earlier one does not find it written, neither by Abraham nor in the time of the ancient fathers, but it is a temporary addition and adornment, set up only for this people that was led out of Egypt. Nor was it to remain forever, any more than the whole law of Moses. But keeping it holy, that is, teaching and preaching the word of God is the right, clear, and only meaning of this commandment. It has been from the beginning and remains for ever and ever in all the world. Therefore the seventh day does not concern us Gentiles at all, nor does it concern the Jews themselves any longer than until the Messiah, although nature and need compel that on the day on which God's word is preached, one must, as stated, be quiet, cease from work, or keep Sabbath, for God's word cannot be heard or taught where one at the same time thinks of something else or is not quiet.

1379. Sabbath, Lutheran Confession on the Sabbath—Changing of the Law

SOURCE: The Augsburg Confession, part 2, art. 7, "Of Ecclesiastical Power," trans., in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 69–71.

[p. 69] There are certain marvelous disputations touching the changing of the law, and the ceremonies of the new law, and the change of the Sab- [p. 70] bath: which all arose from the false persuasion, that there should be a [*sic*] service in the Church, like to the Levitical; and that Christ committed to the Apostles and Bishops the devising new ceremonies, which should be necessary to salvation. These errors crept into the Church, when the righteousness of faith was not plainly enough taught. Some dispute that the

observation of the Lord's day is not indeed of the law of God, but *as it were* of the law of God; and touching holidays, they prescribe how far it is lawful to work in them. What else are such disputations but snares for men's consciences? For though they seek to moderate traditions, yet the equity of them can never be perceived so long as the opinion of necessity remaineth; which must needs remain, where the righteousness of faith and Christian liberty are not known.

The Apostles commanded 'to abstain from blood' (Acts xv. 20). Who observeth that nowadays? And yet they do not sin that observe it not. For the Apostles themselves would not burden men's consciences with such a servitude; but they forbade it for a time, because of scandal. For in the decree, the will of the Gospel is always to be considered. [p. 71] Scarcely any Canons are precisely kept; and many grow out of use daily...

The Bishops might easily retain lawful obedience, if they would not urge men to observe such traditions as can not be kept with a good conscience.

1380. Sabbath, Made for the Human Race

SOURCE: Tayler Lewis, translator's note on Gen. 2:3 in John Peter Lange, *A Commentary: ... Genesis* (New York: Scribner, 1868), p. 197.

If we had no other passage than this of Gen. ii. 3, there would be no difficulty in deducing from it a precept for the universal observance of a sabbath, or seventh day, to be devoted to God, as holy time, by all of that race for whom the earth and its nature were specially prepared. The first men must have known it. The words "He hallowed it," can have no meaning otherwise. They would be a blank unless in reference to some who were required to keep it holy.

1381. Sabbath, Manner of Observing, Karlstadt on

SOURCE: Andres Carolstat [Andreas Rudolf Karlstadt], *Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen* ("Concerning the Sabbath and Commanded Holidays") (1524), chap. 4, unpaged. (This is also reprinted in Karlstadt's *Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25*, Part I, compiled and published by Erich Hertzsch, pp. 21–47. No. 325 of Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke d. 16. u. 17. Jahrhunderts, founded by W. Braune. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1956.) German.

[p. 26] What man on the Sabbath is to do or to leave undone and how he has to behave toward God and his brethren is easy to say, for the Scripture is clear. But it is more difficult to perceive and to examine than to understand because it is beyond all natural abilities. Man must be at rest and at peace with God and must ask of God and await all sanctification... Moses also speaks (Ex. 35:2) of a Sabbath of rest to the Lord. This rest consists in this, that man knows he cannot attain any sanctification except through Christ and yet is to be as holy as God is holy, which, however, he is unable to do. Therefore [p. 27] man becomes irritable and full of unrest, toil, and drudgery, and can find neither peace nor rest nor leisure until he surrenders irrevocably to God—until he knows that God sanctifies only through Christ and without merit and work. When he knows this and understands it correctly, namely that God sanctifies gratuitously, then he is satisfied with God and arrives at the rest in God.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Page numbers have been supplied by count.]

1382. Sabbath, Obligation of, Ever Since Eden

SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, Weighed and Wanting (Chicago: Revell, 1898), pp. 46, 47.

[p. 46] I honestly believe that this commandment is just is just as binding to-day as it ever was. I have talked with men who have said that it has been abrogated, but they have never been able to point to any place in the Bible where God repealed it. When Christ was on earth, He did nothing to set it aside; He freed it from the traces under which the scribes and Pharisees had put [p. 47] it, and gave it its true place. "The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath." It is just as practicable and as necessary for men today as it ever was—in fact, more than ever, because we live in such an intense age.

The sabbath was binding in Eden, and it has been in force ever since. This fourth commandment begins with the word "remember," showing that the sabbath already existed when God wrote this law on the tables of stone at Sinai. How can men claim that this one commandment has been done away with when they will admit that the other nine are still binding?

1383. Sabbath, Obligation of, Perpetual

SOURCE: Adam Clarke, *The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, [n.d.]), Vol. 2, p. 524, comment on Col. 2:16.

There is no intimation here that the *Sabbath* was done away, or that its moral use was superseded, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that, *Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy,* is a command of *perpetual obligation,* and can never be superseded but by the final termination of time. As it is a *type* of that rest which remains for the people of God, of an eternity of bliss, it must continue in full force till that eternity arrives; for no *type* ever ceases till the *antitype* be come. Besides, it is not clear that the

apostle refers at all to the *Sabbath* in this place, whether Jewish or Christian; his $\zeta \alpha \delta \delta \alpha \tau \omega v$ of *Sabbaths* or *weeks*, most probably refers to their *feasts of weeks*, of which much has been said in the notes on the Pentateuch.

1384. Sabbath, Obligatory if We Follow the Bible Alone SOURCE: F. G. Lentz, *The Question Box* (New York: Christian Press Association, 1900), p. 98. [FRS No. 54.]

If you follow the Bible alone there can be no question that you are obliged to keep Saturday holy, since that is the day especially prescribed by Almighty God to be kept holy to the Lord.

1385. Sabbath—Origin and Nature of the Institution

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, pp. 40, 41. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

[p. 40] The Sabbath comes to us out of its original beginnings as primarily religious, ethical, and moral. It is never, with the sanction of revelation, reckoned as a mere ceremonial...

Its faithful observance is strictly and urgently enjoined. It is required, negatively, that men abstain from all the ordinary functions of work for obtaining livelihood. On the Sabbath Day men must rest from business, from toil, from physical indulgence. On the positive side men must reverence the day as holy; and use it to cultivate their relationship to God, recognizing their dependence upon him and expressing their response to him. Just how this shall be done is left to spiritual discernment and voluntary device. In a way not equally applicable to any other institution of religion, Jesus could affirm that the Sabbath is made for man, not man for the Sabbath. As no other expression of religion it is independent of any necessary forms, free from the powerful tendencies to ceremonialism, and is universally observable under all conditions of human life...

[p. 41] As presented to us in the Scriptures the Sabbath was not the invention of any religious founder. It was not at first part of any system of religion, but an entirely independent institution. Very definitely it is presented in Genesis as the very first institution, inaugurated by the Creator himself. It was purely religious, wholly moral,

wholly spiritual. It had no prescribed ceremonies, no sacramentarian significance. It required no priest, no liturgy. It was for man as God's creature, steward and friend.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This quotation should not be interpreted as indicating on the part of Dr. Carver, any lack of commitment to the observance of the first day of the week as the Christian's Lord's Day.]

1386. Sabbath, Origin of—Antedates Sinai

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 15, 16. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 15] There are evidences that the [Sabbath] day was observed in some manner by the Jewish people before this command was given to Moses. The day is first mentioned in the Old Testament in connection with the fall of manna, and even there it is men- [p. 16] tioned as something with which the Israelites were familiar. The Sinaitic legislation as writers mention, simply gave force of law to an already existing custom.

1387. Sabbath, Origin of—From Creation

SOURCE: Alexander Campbell, in *Debate on the Evidences of Christianity ... Between Robert Owen ... and Alexander Campbell* (London: R. Groombridge, 1839), p. 291.

The seventh day was observed from Abraham's time; nay, from the creation. The Jews identified their own history with the institution of the sabbath day. They loved and venerated it as a patriarchal usage.

1388. Sabbath, Origin of, Jewish Historian on

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* i. 1. 1; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 17. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Thus, so Moses tells us, the world and everything in it was made in six days in all; and on the seventh God rested and had respite from His labours, for which reason we also pass this day in repose from toil and call it the sabbath, a word which in the Hebrew language means "rest."

1389. Sabbath, Origin of—Not New Truth at Sinai

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 20–24. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 20] Through all the history of the race from [p. 21] Adam to Moses, extending over a period of more than two thousand years, there is no distinct reference to a Sabbath day, though there are many references to Sabbath engagements, such as altars, and sacrifices, and communion with God. Jesus says: "The Sabbath was made for man;" and the necessary inference is that from the beginning man knew the primary uses of the day, and received the benefits which it was designed to impart...

[p. 22] Before the giving of the law from Sinai the obligation of the Sabbath was understood. When some of the people went out to get manna on that day, God said unto Moses: "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? The Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he hath given you on the sixth day bread enough for two days."

Indeed, it may be questioned if the law given through Moses on tables of stone disclosed any new truth...

[p. 23] The law simply gathered up the truth, and set it among the things of God, that can not be [p. 24] moved. "The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the word of the Lord abideth forever."

The fourth commandment does not institute a Sabbath, nor does it sanctify a day; it simply writes the Sabbath among the immutable things of God. Nehemiah bears this forceful testimony: "Thou camest down also upon Sinai, and spakest with thy people

from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments, and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath."

1390. Sabbath, Purpose of

SOURCE: Andres Carolstat [Andreas Rudolf Karlstadt], *Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen* ("Concerning the Sabbath and Commanded Holidavs") (1524), chap. 2, unpaged. (This is also reprinted in

Karlstadt's *Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–25*, Part I, compiled and published by Erich Hertzsch, pp. 21–47. No. 325 of Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke d. 16. u. 17. Jahrhunderts, founded by W. Braune. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1956.) German.

God has given to mankind all commandments and prohibitions that man may become aware of His image within, and that he may understand how God created him in His image, and that he may become as God is, that is, holy, serene, good, righteous, wise, strong, truthful, kind, merciful, etc... as it is written: Ye shall become holy and be holy, for I, your God and Lord, am holy, says God; keep my commandments and do them... Hence the Sabbath is instituted by God so that we may desire to become holy as God is holy, and rest as He did and cease from work...

That is the spiritual reason for the Sabbath which is commanded in the honor of God, to our benefit... Just as God looks after our benefit and holiness, so we too should have in mind and seek God's glory and honor, and the good of our neighbor, and not our own.

Whoever turns his eyes upon his own advantage, he sullies himself, makes himself unholy, and neglects the reason for the Sabbath. All this was understood and explained by Isaiah, when he says, I cannot bear nor endure your Sabbath and feastday. Your actions are unclean and wicked; put away from your eyes your evil thoughts and cease to do evil...

If a soul does not become aware of its clearness and inwardness and does not let go of darkness, uncleanness, wickedness and unholiness, it is far from and foreign to the purpose of the instituted Sabbath and God hates their Sabbath and rejects their feastdays. For in all commandments it is the purpose and the spirit which must be kept in mind and nothing else; that is, that only the God who commands must be taken to heart and His will must be sought and recognized. Whoever thinks differently, misses the commandment and deceives himself.

The above-stated purpose is eternal and unchangeable. No man may disturb it; even the least creature cannot without harm frustrate God's honor and revile God. This purpose is spiritual, invisible and eternal. Nor is man in this way lord of the Sabbath; he is rather a servant of God or a servant of this Sabbath. Therefore man cannot without noticeable loss depart from the purpose of the Sabbath even the width of his hair. The faith and the love of God look to this purpose and just as man may not without his destruction shorten faith or transgress against God's love, so he may not transgress God's Sabbath without damnation.

1391. Sabbath—Spiritual Nature of Fourth Commandment SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 32–34. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 32] As a code for the Jewish theoracy the law has its temporal aspects, but in all its ordinances it is primarily and essentially spiritual. It is the means by which guilt is disclosed, and the need of salvation impressed on the mind...

[p. 33] The Sabbath is a day of rest, but its physical aspects are only secondary and incidental...

[p. 34] Like other statutes of the law, the fourth commandment is spiritual. Preeminently and especially it provides a season of rest for the soul. In the old Testament, whether in the Patriarchal or the Mosaic dispensation, the Sabbath is the supreme provision for knowing God and finding rest in him. "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you."

1392. Sabbath, Time of Beginning—Sunset in Arctic Summer as Late as Midnight

SOURCE: Paul B. Du Chaillu, The Land of the Midnight Sun (New York: Harper, 1882), Vol. 1, pp. 61, 64.

[p. 61] We crossed the arctic circle at 66° 32' N., or 1408 geographical miles south from the pole, where the sun shines for an entire day on the 22d of June, and the observer will see it above the horizon at midnight, and due north...

The sun at midnight is always north of the observer, on account of the position of the earth. It seems to travel around a circle, requiring twenty-four hours for its completion, it being noon when it reaches the greatest elevation, and midnight at the lowest. Its ascent and descent are so imperceptible at the pole, and the variations so slight, that it sinks south very slowly, and its disappearance below the horizon [sunset] is almost immediately followed by its reappearance [sunrise]...

[p. 64] Its motion is very slow, and for quite awhile it apparently follows the line of the horizon, during which there seems to be a pause... This is midnight. For a few minutes the glow of sunset mingles with that of sunrise, and one cannot tell which prevails; but soon the light becomes slowly and gradually more brilliant, announcing the birth of another day.

1393. Sabbath, Time of Beginning—Sunset in Arctic Winter as Early as Noon

SOURCE: Paul B. Du Chaillu, *The Land of the Long Night* (New York: Scribner, 1899), pp. 73, 75, 109–111. [p. 73] The day I left Pajala [in early winter] I saw the sun at noon; it was hardly above the horizon; it had barely risen and shown itself when it was sunset and it

disappeared under the horizon.

Then came a long snowstorm, and for a wonder one without a gale. After the snowstorm the sky suddenly cleared, and at noon I saw the sun's lower rim touching the horizon. It was of a fiery red. Then after a while it disappeared.

The next day only the upper half of the sun was above the horizon at noon, and just as the rim was ready to sink I fancied I heard the sun say to me: "Tomorrow you will not see me; then you will have entered 'The Land of the Long Night.""...

[p. 75] The sun had disappeared below the horizon, but in clear days its glow could be seen... In fine weather the glow over the horizon told me when it was about noon. It was indeed a strange land; but the Lapps could tell from the stars whether it was night or day, for they were accustomed to gauge time by them...

[p. 109] I watched the horizon [several months later] every day towards noon, hoping to see the sun, for the light was getting brighter and brighter. The glow of the hidden sun was so great at noon that it looked as if sunrise were going to take place...

One day I saw a golden thread above the snowy horizon. It was the upper rim of the sun. I watched, hoping to see the whole sun. But it was at its meridian, and in a very short time the golden thread had disappeared and the sun was on its downward course...

[p. 110] The following day the glow above the horizon became more brilliant, and towards noon the sun rose slowly above the snow; but only about half of its body made its appearance. It was of a fiery red. Then it gradually sank. The third day the whole [p. 111] of the sun appeared above the horizon [sunrise], then in a short time sank below [sunset].

1394. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church as Festivals in Eastern Churches

SOURCE: Joseph Bingham, *The Antiquities of the Christian Church* (London: Bohn, 1870), bk. 13, chap. 9, sec. 3, Vol. 1, pp. 656, 657.

[p. 656] We also find in ancient writers frequent mention made of religious assemblies on the Saturday, or seventh day of the week, which was the Jewish sabbath. It is not easy to tell either the original of this practice, or the reasons of it, because the writers of the first ages are altogether silent about it. In the Latin churches (excepting Milan) it was kept as a fast; but in all the Greek churches as a festival: I consider it here only as a day of public Divine service, on which, as the authors who mention it assure us, all the same offices were performed as were used to be on the Lord's day. For [Pseudo] Athanasius,⁸ [Note 8: Homil. de Semente, t. 1. p. 1060.] who is one of the first that mentions it, says, They met on the sabbath, not that they were infected with Judaism, but to worship Jesus, the Lord of the sabbath. And Timotheus [I, archbishop] ... of Alexandria, says, The communion ⁹ [Note 9: Timoth, Ep. Canon, can. 13, ap. Bevereg. Pandect. t. 2.] was administered on this day, as on the Lord's day. Which were the only days in the week that the communion was received by the Christians of his time at Alexandria. Socrates ¹⁰ [Note 10: Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 22.] is a little more particular about the service: for he says. In their assemblies on this day they celebrated the communion; only the churches of Egypt and Thebais differed in this from the rest of the world, and even from their neighbours at Alexandria, that they had the communion at evening service. In another place, speaking of the churches of Constantinople in the time of Chrysostom, he reckons Saturday¹¹ [Note 11: Ibid. lib. 6. cap. 8.] and Lord's day the two great weekly festivals, on which they always held church assemblies. And Cassian¹² [Note 12: Cassian. Institut. lib. 2. cap. 6. In die vero sabbati vel Dominico utrasque lectiones de Novo recitant Testamento, id est, unam de Apostolo vel Actibus Apostolorum, et aliam de Evangeliis.] takes notice of the Egyptian churches, that among them the service of the Lord's day and the sabbath was always the same; for they had the lessons then read out of the New Testament only, one out of the Gospels, and the other out of the Epistles or the Acts of the Apostles; whereas, on other days they had them partly out of the Old Testament and partly out of the New. In another place he observes,¹³ [Note 13: Cassian. lib. 3. cap. 2.] That in the monasteries of Egypt and Thebais, they had no public assemblies on other days, besides morning and evening, except upon Saturday and the Lord's day, when they met at three o'clock, that is, nine in the morning, to celebrate the communion. In the council of Laodicea there are three canons to the same purpose. One ¹⁴ [Note 14: Conc. Laodic. can. 16.] appoints the Gospels, with the other Scriptures, to be read upon this day. Another,¹⁵ [Note 15: Ibid. can. 49.] That the oblation of the bread in the eucharist shall not be made all the time of Lent, except on the sabbath and the Lord's day. Which implies that those were communion days, and kept as festivals, even in Lent itself. And for the same reason a third canon ¹⁶ [Note 16: Can. 51.] orders. That no festivals of martyrs should be kept in Lent, but only commemorations of

the martyrs be made on the sabbath and the Lord's day. The only difference that was then made between the sabbath and the Lord's day, was, that Christians were not obliged to rest from bodily ¹⁷ [Note 17: Can. 29.] labour on the sabbath, but might work on that day. (so far as Divine service would permit.) giving preference in this respect to the Lord's day, whereon they were to rest as Christians. And if any transgressed these rules about working on the sabbath, they were to be [p. 657] deemed Judaizers, and are ordered to be anathematized by another canon of the same council. By which it appears that Saturday was kept weekly as a day of public worship, but not as a Jewish sabbath. Epiphanius¹⁸ [Note 18: Epiphan. Epitom. t. 1. p. 1107.] mentions it likewise as a day of public assemblies in some places, but not in all. St. Basil¹⁹ [Note 19: Basil. Ep. 289. ad Caesaream Patriciam. So Austin, Ep. 118.] says it was one of the four days in the week, on which in his time they received the communion. By all which we may perceive that the author of the Constitutions had a plain regard to the practice of the Eastern church, when he prescribed, that on every sabbath save one, (that is, the Saturday before Easter day,) and on every Lord's day ²⁰ [Note 20: Constit. lib. 5. cap. 20. It. lib. 8. cap. 23.] they should hold religious assemblies, and keep them as the weekly festivals; that is, not only with psalmody, and reading the Scriptures, and common prayers, which was the ordinary service of the morning and evening of every day; but with sermons also, or preaching the gospel, and the offering of the oblation, and reception of the holy food; as he describes the service of the sabbath and Lord's day in another place.²¹ [Note 21: Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 59. p. 268.]

1395. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Both Celebrated for a Time

SOURCE: *The Sunday Problem* (Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1923), p. 36. Copyright 1923 by The Board of Publication of the United Lutheran Church in America. Used by permission of the Muhlenberg Press.

We have seen how gradually the impression of the Jewish sabbath faded from the mind of the Christian Church, and how completely the newer thought underlying the observance of the first day took possession of the church. We have seen that the Christians of the first three centuries never confused one with the other, but for a time celebrated both.

1396. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Both Festivals, but Preference for Sunday

SOURCE: Joseph Bingham, *The Antiquities of the Christian Church* (London: Bohn, 1870), bk. 20, chap. 3, secs. 1, 2, Vol. 2, pp. 1137, 1138. [See FRS No. 74.]

[p. 1137] Next to the Lord's day, the ancient Christians were very careful in the observation [observance] of Saturday, or the seventh day, which was the ancient Jewish sabbath. Some observed it as a fast, others as a festival; but all unanimously agreed in keeping it as a more solemn day of religious worship and adoration. In the Eastern church it was ever observed as a festival, one only sabbath excepted, which was called the Great Sabbath, between Good Friday and Easter-day, when our Saviour lay buried in the grave, upon which account it was kept as a fast throughout the whole church. But setting aside that one sabbath, all the rest were kept as festivals in the Oriental church...

[p. 1138] So far as concerns public worship, they make it in all things conformable to that of the Lord's day; which is a further evidence of its being a festival. They tell us, They had not only the Scriptures read, as on the Lord's day, and sermons preached, but the communion administered also...

The council of Laodicea ... particularly forbids the offering of the eucharistical oblation, or solemnizing any memorials of martyrs, on any other days in Lent, beside the sabbath and the Lord's day, because all other days were days of fasting, but these, even in Lent, were kept as festivals and days of relaxation...

Only here we are to observe, that though the substance of the service for the sabbath and the Lord's day was the same, yet in rites and ceremonies a difference was made, and in some other respects the preference was given to the Lord's day above the sabbath. For, first, we find no ecclesiastical laws obliging men to pray standing on the sabbath; for that was a ceremony peculiar to the Lord's day, in memory of our Saviour's resurrection. Nor, ... any laws obliging men to abstain wholly from bodily labour. But, on the contrary, the council of Laodicea has a canon forbidding Christians to Judaize, or rest on the sabbath, any further than was necessary for public worship; but they were to honour the Lord's day, and rest on it as Christians... The Jews abstained wholly from working on the sabbath; the Christians only so far as was necessary for their attendance upon Divine service in the church.

1397. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Difference Between East and West in 4th Century

SOURCE: George Park Fisher, *History of the Christian Church* (New York: Scribner, 1900), p. 118. [FRS No. 99.]

In many of the Oriental churches the Sabbath (Saturday) was still observed like Sunday, while in the West a large number, by way of opposition to Jewish institutions, held a fast on that day.

1398. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church, Distinction Between Maintained

SOURCE: James C. Robertson, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 2 (London: John Murray, 1901), pp. 54, 55. [FRS No. 106.]

[p. 54] (8.) The Lord's day was observed with greater strictness than before, although the distinction between it and the Sabbath, as to origin, authority, and manner of observance, was still carefully maintained. Constantine, as [p. 55] we have seen, ordered that no legal proceedings and no military exercises should take place on it; yet he allowed agricultural labour to be carried on, lest the benefit of favourable weather should be lost. The council of Laodicea, while it condemned all Judaizing in the observance of the day, directed that labour should be avoided on it as much as possible. Theodosius in 379, and again in 386, enacted that no civil business should then be done, and abolished the spectacles in which the heathen had found their consolation when the day was set apart from other secular uses by Constantine.

The custom of observing the Sabbath in a similar manner to the Lord's day was now declining. The Laodicean canon, which has just been quoted, denounced a cessation from work on it as Judaical.

1399. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church, Marked by Public Worship in the East

SOURCE: Augustus Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, trans. by Joseph Torrey (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1851), pp. 421–423. [FRS No. 98.]

[p. 421] The custom, derived from the Jews, of paying a certain respect to the Sabbath still continued to be handed down in the *Oriental* communities. In several of the Eastern churches the Sabbath was celebrated nearly after the same manner as Sunday. Church

assemblies were held, sermons delivered, and the communion celebrated on this day. The [p. 422] direction given by the council of Laodicea deserves to be noticed, viz.: that on the Sabbath, the gospels should be read along with the other parts of the holy scriptures. It may be that the new arrangement which this council designed to introduce by the above-cited canon was simply that the scriptures generally should be read in church on the Sabbath in the same manner as on Sunday; and in this case we must suppose the council wished to restore the custom, formerly observed, of assembling for worship on the Sabbath as well as on Sunday, which had now become obsolete in many of the Eastern churches. Or this ordinance may be understood as simply indicating the design of the council, that in the meetings for divine worship on the Sabbath the gospels should be read, together with other parts of the holy scriptures; whence we might infer that, as the celebration of the Sabbath had been taken from the Jews, it had been the custom also to make use of the *Old Testament only* on this day in the church lessons. [See editors' note.] In many districts a punctual Jewish observance of the Sabbath must doubtless have become common, hence the council of Laodicea considered it necessary to ordain that Christians should not celebrate this day after the Jewish manner, nor consider themselves bound to abstain from labour. It was a general rule in the Eastern church that there should be no fasting on the Sabbath, hence the Sabbath also, as well as Sunday, was excepted from the period of fasting before Easter. But in many of the Western churches, particularly in the Roman and the Spanish, opposition to the Jews and Judaists had led to the [p. 423] custom of observing the Sabbath rather as a day of fasting.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In a footnote here Neander remarks that the latter interpretation would have called for a slightly different Greek construction, while the former is out of harmony with the fact that "the customary celebration of the Sabbath is everywhere presupposed by the council, and they considered themselves bound rather to moderate" this "Judaizing tendency." Hefele, in his note on canon 16 of the Council of Laodicea, refers to Neander's note and remarks that it is unlikely that there were Judaizing congregations that read only the Old Testament on the Sabbath. He adds that "about the middle, or at least in the last half of the fourth century, Judaizing no longer flourished, and probably no single Christian congregation held such Ebionite, un-Evangelical views."]

1400. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church, Observed by Full Liturgy Even During Lent—Council of Laodicea

SOURCE: Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, Vol. 2, trans. and ed. by H. N. Oxenham (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), p. 320.

CAN. 49. "During Lent, the bread shall not be offered, except on Saturday and Sunday."

This canon, which was repeated by the Trullan Synod in its fifty-second canon, orders that on ordinary week days during Lent, only a *Missa Praesanctificatorum* [Mass of the Presanctified (elements), a eucharistic service using the bread and wine that had been consecrated in an earlier mass and reserved for later use] should take place, as is still the custom with the Greeks on all days of penitence and mourning, when it appears to them unsuitable to have the full liturgy, and as Leo Allatius says, for this reason, that the consecration is a joyful act. A comparison of the above sixteenth canon, however, shows that Saturday was a special exception...

CAN. 51. "During Lent, no feasts of the martyrs shall be celebrated, but the holy martyrs shall be celebrated, but the holy martyrs shall be commemorated on the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent."

For the obvious reason that on these days there was full and solemn service.

1401. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Rest on Sabbath; Worship on Sunday

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 15. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

It was not easy for the early Jewish converts to forget completely the sacred practices connected with the observance of the Sabbath, particularly the rest from servile work. It happened then, that although they did perform the acts of Christian worship on the Sunday, many of them still continued to observe the bodily rest on the Sabbath. A history of the problem shows that in some places, it was really only after some centuries that the Sabbath rest really was entirely abolished, and by that time the practice of observing a bodily rest on the Sunday had taken its place.

1402. Sabbath and Sunday, in Early Church—Voluntary Observance SOURCE: Jeremy Taylor, *The Rule of Conscience* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1851), pp. 456–458. [FRS No. 71.]

[p. 456] § 49. ... The primitive Christians did keep the sabbath of the Jews; not only for their compliance with the Jews till the distinction were confessed and notorious, but because the moral religion which was served by that day was not brought into the religion of the Lord's day as yet...

[p. 457] § 50. At first they kept both days, with this only difference, that though they kept the sabbath, yet it was after the christian, that is, after the spiritual manner: in these exuberancies and floods of religion which overflowed their channels, one day of solemnity was not enough; but besides that they by their sabbath meetings had entercourse with the Jews in order to their conversion, and the Jewish Christians in order to the establishment of their religion, they were glad of all occasions to glorify God; but they did it without any opinion of essential obligation, and without the Jewish rest, and upon the account of christian reasons...

[p. 458] § 51. The effect of which consideration is this; that the Lord's day did not succeed in the place of the sabbath, but the sabbath was wholly abrogated, and the Lord's day was merely of ecclesiastical institution. It was not introduced by virtue of the fourth commandment, because they for almost three hundred years together kept that day which was in that commandment; but they did it also without any opinion of prime obligation, and therefore they did not suppose it moral.

1403. Sabbath and Sunday, in 1st-Century Literature—Clement of Rome (*c*. 97) on "Fixed Times" for Christian Services

SOURCE: First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians xl. 1, 2; in *Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 77, 79. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 77] 1. Since then these things are manifest to us, and we have looked into the depths of the divine knowledge, we ought to do in order all things which the Master commanded us to perform at appointed times. 2. He commanded us to celebrate sacrifices and services, and that it should not be thoughtlessly or disorderly, but at fixed times and hours... 4. So then those who offer their oblations at the appointed seasons are acceptable and blessed, for [p. 79] they follow the laws of the Master and do no sin.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract is included here because it is one of those often quoted in favor of Sunday. It is obvious that the "fixed times" and "appointed seasons" for Christian worship do not specify Sunday or any particular day. They could just as well mean the Sabbath as Sunday, hence prove nothing. For a similarly unnamed day of Christian worship mentioned by the Roman governor Pliny the Younger, see No. 1185a.] **1404.** Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—Ignatius of Antioch (fl. *c*. 107) on Sabbath Contrasted With Lord's (Day?)

SOURCE: Ignatius, [Epistle] To the Magnesians ix. 1; in *Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 205, 207. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [FRS No. 115.]

[p. 205] If then they who walked in ancient customs came to a new hope, no longer living for the Sabbath, but for the Lord's Day, on which also our life sprang up through him and his death,—though some deny him,—and by this mystery we received faith, and for this reason also we suffer, that we may be found disciples of Jesus Christ our only teacher; 2. if these things be so, how then shall we be able to live without him of whom even the prophets were disciples in the Spirit and to whom they looked [p. 207] forward as their teacher? And for this reason he whom they waited for in righteousness, when he came raised them from the dead.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Greek text from which this passage is translated (see Loeb. ed., p. 204) here reads $\chi \alpha \tau \alpha \chi \nu \rho \iota \alpha \chi \eta \nu \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \zeta$. The Greek text in *MPG*, Vol. 5, col. 669, reads $\chi \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} K \nu \rho \iota \alpha \chi \eta \nu \zeta \hat{\omega} \eta \nu \zeta \hat{\omega} \eta \nu \zeta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon \zeta$. For a discussion of the translation problems of this passage, see No. 1614; see also No. 769. For a longer recension of Magnesians 9 in a later interpolated form of Ignatius' epistles, see No. 1411.]

1405. Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—Pseudo Barnabas (c. 130 or 150?) on the "Eight Day" Celebrated in Honor of the Resurrection SOURCE: The [False] Epistle of Barnabas xv. 1–9; in *Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 393, 395, 397. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [See FRS No. 94.]

[p. 393] 1. Furthermore it was written concerning the Sabbath in the ten words which he spake on Mount Sinai face to face to Moses. 'Sanctify also the Sabbath of the Lord with pure hands and a pure heart.' 2. And in another place he says, 'If my [p. 395] sons keep the Sabbath then will I bestow my mercy upon them.' 3. He speaks of the Sabbath at the beginning of the Creation, 'And God made in six days the works of his hands and on the seventh day he made an end, and rested in it and sanctified it.' 4. Notice, children, what is the meaning of 'He made an end in six days'? He means this: that the Lord will make an end of everything in six thousand years, for a day with him means a thousand years. And he himself is my witness when he says, 'Lo, the day of the Lord shall be as a thousand years.' So then, children, in six days, that is in six thousand years, everything will be completed. 5. 'And he rested on the seventh day.' This means, when his Son comes he will destroy the time of the wicked one, and will judge the godless, and will change the sun and the moon and the stars, and then he will truly rest on the seventh day. 6. Furthermore he says, 'Thou shalt sanctify it with clean hands and a pure heart.' If, then, anyone has at present the power to keep holy the day which God made holy, by being pure in heart, we are altogether deceived. 7. See that we shall indeed keep it holy at that time, when we enjoy true rest, when we shall be able to do so because we have been made righteous ourselves and have received the promise, when there is no more sin, but all things have been made new by the Lord: then we shall be able to keep it holy because we ourselves have first been made holy. 8. Furthermore he says to them, 'Your new moons and the sabbaths I cannot away with.' Do you see what he means? The present sabbaths are not acceptable to me, but that which I have made, in which I will give rest to all things and make the beginning of an [p. 397] eighth day, that is the beginning of another world. 9. Wherefore we also celebrate with gladness the eighth day in which Jesus also rose from the dead, and was made manifest, and ascended into Heaven.

1406. Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—The Didache on the Eucharist on "The Lord's (Day?) of the Lord"

SOURCE: The Didache xiv. 1–3; in *Apostolic Fathers*, translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 331. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [FRS No. 113.]

1. On the Lord's Day of the Lord come together, break bread and hold Eucharist, after confessing your transgressions that your offering may be pure; 2. but let none who has a quarrel with his fellow join in your meeting until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice be not defiled. 3. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord, "In every place and time offer me a pure sacrifice, for I am a great king," saith the Lord, "and my name is wonderful among the heathen."

[EDITORS' NOTE: The following explanation has been given of the first sentence: The Greek, which does not contain the word *day*, seems to be garbled, for it reads, literally: "According to the Lord's [?] of the Lord, coming together break bread and hold the Eucharist." The word to be supplied after *Lord's* could be *day*, but it could also be some other word, such as *commandment*. Therefore, in order to cite this document as proof for the Lord's day, the thing to be proved must be assumed, and thus this quotation becomes of no value as proof. It must be interpreted in the light of other information. In later times, certainly, the adjective

kuraikē, "Lord's," came to be used alone as a name for Lord's day, but this document is not proof of that use.]

1407. Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—Justin Martyr (*c.* 155)

a. First Record of Weekly Sunday Observance

SOURCE: Justin Martyr, First Apology, chap. 67, trans. in ANF, Vol. 1, pp. 185, 186.

[p. 185] And we afterwards continually remind each other of these things. And the wealthy among us help the needy; and we always keep together; and for all things wherewith we are supplied, we bless the Maker of all through His Son [p. 186] Jesus Christ, and through the Holy Ghost. And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our praver is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saving Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons. And they who are well to do, and willing, give what each thinks fit; and what is collected is deposited with the president, who succours the orphans and widows, and those who, through sickness or any other cause, are in want, and those who are in bonds, and the strangers sojourning among us, and in a word takes care of all who are in need. But Sunday is the day on which we all hold our common assembly, because it is the first day on which God, having wrought a change in the darkness and matter, made the world; and Jesus Christ our Saviour on the same day rose from the dead. For He was crucified on the day before that of Saturn

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

(Saturday); and on the day after that of Saturn, which is the day of the Sun (Sunday), having appeared to His apostles and disciples, He taught them these things, which we have submitted to you also for your consideration.

b. Law and Sabbath Held Ended in Christ

SOURCE: Justin Martyr, *Dialogue With Trypho, a Jew*, chaps. 11, 12, 43, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 1, pp. 199, 200, 216.

[p. 199, chap. 11] There will be no other God, O Trypho, nor was there from eternity any other existing ... but He who made and disposed all this universe. Nor do we think that there is one God for us, another for you, but that He alone is God who led your fathers out from Egypt with a strong hand and a high arm. Nor have we trusted in any other (for there is no other), but in Him in whom you also have trusted, the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob. But we do not trust through Moses or through the law: for then we would do the same as yourselves. But now—(for I have read that there shall be a final law, and a covenant, the chiefest [p. 200] of all, which it is now incumbent on all men to observe, as many as are seeking after the inheritance of God. For the law promulgated on Horeb is now old, and belongs to yourselves alone; but *this* is for all universally. Now, law placed against law has abrogated that which is before it, and a covenant which comes after in like manner has put an end to the previous one; and an eternal and final law-namely, Christ-has been given to us, and the covenant is trustworthy, after which there shall be no law, no commandment, no ordinance. Have you not read this which Isaiah says: "Hearken unto Me, my people; and, ye kings, give ear unto Me: for a law shall go forth from Me, and My judgment shall be for a light to the nations. My righteousness approaches swiftly, and My salvation shall go forth, and nations shall trust in Mine arm?" And by Jeremiah, concerning this same new covenant, He thus speaks: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt"). If, therefore, God proclaimed a new covenant which was to be instituted, and this for a light of the nations, we see and are persuaded that men approach God, leaving their idols and other unrighteousness, through the name of Him who was crucified. Jesus Christ, and abide by their confession even unto death, and maintain piety. Moreover, by the works and by the attendant miracles, it is possible for all to understand that He is the new law, and the new covenant, and the expectation of those who out of every people wait for the good things of God. For the true spiritual Israel, and descendants of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (who in uncircumcision was approved of and blessed by God on account of his faith, and called the father of many nations), are we who have been led to God through this crucified Christ, as shall be demonstrated while we proceed...

[chap. 12] The new law requires you to keep perpetual sabbath, and you, because you are idle for one day, suppose you are pious, not discerning why this has been commanded you: and if you eat unleavened bread, you say the will of God has been fulfilled. The Lord our God does not take pleasure in such observances: if there is any perjured person or a thief among you, let him cease to be so; if any adulterer, let him repent; then he has kept [sabbatized] the sweet and true sabbaths of God...

[p. 216, chap. 43] As, then, circumcision began with Abraham, and the Sabbath and sacrifices and offerings and feasts with Moses, and it has been proved they were enjoined on account of the hardness of your people's heart, so it was necessary, in accordance with

the Father's will, that they should have an end in Him who was born of a virgin, of the family of Abraham and tribe of Judah, and of David; in Christ the Son of God, who was proclaimed as about to come to all the world, to be the everlasting law and the everlasting covenant, even as the forementioned prophecies show.

c. Sabbath Observers Regarded as "Weakminded" Brethren

SOURCE: Justin Martyr, Dialogue With Trypho, a Jew, chap. 47, trans. in ANF, Vol. 1, p. 218.

If some, through weak-mindedness, wish to observe such institutions as were given by Moses, ... along with their hope in this Christ, and [wish to perform] the eternal and natural acts of righteousness and piety, yet choose to live with the Christians and the faithful, as I said before, not inducing them either to be circumcised like themselves, or to keep the Sabbath, or to observe any other such ceremonies, then I hold that we ought to join ourselves to such, and associate with them in all things as kinsmen and brethren.

1408. Sabbath and Sunday, in 2d-Century Literature—Irenaeus (*c*. 130–*c*. 202) on Abraham as Righteous "Without Observance of Sabbaths" SOURCE: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, bk. 4, chap. 16, pars. 2, 3, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 1, p. 481.

2. And that man was not justified by these things, but that they were given as a sign to the people, this fact shows,—that Abraham himself, without circumcision and without observance of Sabbaths, "believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God." ... Moreover, all the rest of the multitude of those righteous men who lived before Abraham, and of those patriarchs who preceded Moses, were justified independently of the things above mentioned, and without the law of Moses. As also Moses himself says to the people in Deuteronomy: "The LORD thy God formed a covenant in Horeb. The Lord formed not this covenant with your fathers, but for you."

3. Why, then, did the Lord not form the covenant for the fathers? Because "the law was not established for righteous men." But the righteous fathers had the meaning of the Decalogue written in their hearts and souls, that is, they loved the God who made them, and did no injury to their neighbour. There was therefore no occasion that they should be

cautioned by prohibitory mandates (*correptoriis literis*), because they had the righteousness of the law in themselves. But when this righteousness and love to God had passed into oblivion, and became extinct in Egypt, God did necessarily, because of His great goodwill to men, reveal Himself by a voice, and led the people with power out of Egypt, in order that man might again become the disciple and follower of God; and He afflicted those who were disobedient, that they should not contemn their Creator; and He

fed them with manna, that they might receive food for their souls (uti rationalem

acciperent escam); as also Moses says in Deuteronomy: "And fed thee with manna, which thy fathers did not know, that thou mightest know that man doth not live by bread alone; but by every word of God proceeding out of His mouth doth man live." And it enjoined love to God, and taught just dealing towards our neighbour, that we should neither be unjust nor unworthy of God, who prepares man for His friendship through the medium of the Decalogue, and likewise for agreement with his neighbour,—matters which did certainly profit man himself; God, however, standing in no need of anything from man.

1409. Sabbath and Sunday, in 3d-Century Literature—Tertullian of North Africa (160?–230?)

a. Holy Days a Point of Difference Between Jews and Christians

SOURCE: Tertullian, Apology, chap. 21, trans. in ANF, Vol. III, p. 34.

We neither accord with the Jews in their peculiarities in regard to food, nor in their sacred days, nor even in their well-known bodily sign, nor in the possession of a common name.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Tertullian does not directly name the Sabbath. This extract is presented because it is one of those cited by those who use the Church Fathers as evidence for Sunday.]

b. Sabbaths "Strange" but Every "Eighth Day" Kept

SOURCE: Tertullian, On Idolatry, chap. 14, trans. in ANF, Vol. 3, p. 70.

By us, to whom Sabbaths are strange, and the new moons and festivals formerly beloved by God, the Saturnalia and New-year's and Midwinter's festivals and Matronalia are frequented... To the *heathens* each festive day occurs but once annually: *you* have a festive day every eighth day.

c. Sabbath Not Observed by Patriarchs, Says Tertullian

SOURCE: Tertullian, An Answer to the Jews, chap. 2, trans. in ANF, Vol. 3, p. 153.

Let him who contends that the Sabbath is still to be observed as a balm of salvation, and circumcision on the eighth day because of the threat of death, teach us that, for the time past, righteous men kept the Sabbath, or practised circumcision, and were thus rendered "friends of God." For if circumcision purges a man since God made Adam uncircumcised, why did He not circumcise him, even after his sinning, if circumcision purges? At all events, in settling him in paradise, He appointed one uncircumcised as colonist of paradise. Therefore, since God originated Adam uncircumcised, and inobservant of the Sabbath, consequently his offspring also, Abel, offering Him sacrifices, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, was by Him commended; while He accepted what he was offering in simplicity of heart, and reprobated the sacrifice of his brother Cain, who was not rightly dividing what he was offering. Noah also, uncircumcised—yes, and inobservant of the Sabbath—God freed from the deluge. For Enoch, too, most righteous man, uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, He translated from this world; who did not first taste death, in order that, being a candidate for eternal life, he might by this time show us that we also may, without the burden of the law of Moses, please God. Melchizedek also, "the priest of the most high God," uncircumcised and inobservant of the Sabbath, was chosen to the priesthood of God. Lot, withal, the brother of Abraham, proves that it was for the merits of righteousness, without observance of the law, that he was freed from the conflagration of the Sodomites.

d. Weekly Sabbath Temporary, Argues Tertullian

SOURCE: Tertullian, An Answer to the Jews, chap. 4, in ANF, Vol. 3, pp. 155, 156.

[p. 155] It follows, accordingly, that, in so far as the abolition of carnal circumcision and of the old law is demonstrated as having been consummated at its specific times, so also the observance of the Sabbath is demonstrated to have been temporary.

For the Jews say, that from the beginning God sanctified the seventh day, by resting on it from all His works which He made; and that thence it was, likewise, that Moses said to the People: "REMEMBER the day of the sabbaths, to sanctify it: every servile work ye shall not do therein, except what pertaineth unto life." Whence we (Christians) understand that *we* still more ought to observe a sabbath from all "servile work" always, and not only every seventh day, but through all time. And through this arises the question for us, *what* sabbath God willed us to keep? For the Scriptures point to a sabbath eternal and a sabbath temporal. For Isaiah the prophet says, "*Your* sabbaths my soul hateth;" and in another place he says, "My sabbaths ye have profaned." Whence we discern that the temporal sabbath is human, and the eternal sabbath is accounted divine; concerning which He predicts through Isaiah: "And there shall be," He says, "month after month, and day after day, and sabbath after sabbath; and all flesh shall come to adore in Jerusalem, saith the Lord;" which we understand to have been fulfilled in the times of Christ, when "all flesh"-that is, every nation-"came to adore in Jerusalem" God the Father, through Jesus Christ His Son, as was predicted through the prophet: "Behold, proselvtes through me shall go unto Thee." Thus, therefore, before this temporal sabbath, there was withal an eternal sabbath foreshown and foretold; just as before the carnal circumcision there was withal a spiritual circumcision foreshown. In short, let them teach us, as we have already premised, that Adam observed the sabbath; or that Abel, when offering to God a holy victim, pleased Him by a religious reverence for the sabbath; or that Enoch, when translated, had been a keeper of the sabbath; or that Noah the ark-builder observed, on account of the deluge, an immense sabbath; or that Abraham, in observance of the sabbath, offered Isaac his son; or that Melchizedek in his priesthood received the law of the sabbath.

But the Jews are sure to say, that ever since this precept was given through Moses, the observance has been binding. Manifest accordingly it is, that the precept was not eternal nor spiritual, but temporary, which would one day cease. In short, so true is it that it is not in the exemption from work of the sabbath—that is, of the seventh day—that the celebration of this solemnity is to consist, that Joshua the son of Nun, at the time that he was reducing the city Jericho by war, stated that he had received from God a precept to order the People that priests should carry the ark of the testament of God seven days, making the circuit of the city; and thus, when the seventh day's circuit had been performed, the walls of the city would spontaneously fall. Which was so done; and when the space of the seventh day was finished, just as was predicted, down fell the walls of the city. Whence it is manifestly shown, that in the number of the seven days there intervened a sabbath-day. For seven days, whencesoever they may have commenced, must necessarily include within them a sabbath-day; on which day not only must the priests have worked, but the city must have been made a prev by the edge of the sword by all the people of Israel. Nor is it doubtful that they "wrought servile work," [p. 156] when, in obedience to God's precept, they drave the preys of war. For in the times of the Maccabees, too, they did bravely in fighting on the sabbaths, and routed their foreign foes, and recalled the law of their fathers to the primitive style of life by fighting on the sabbaths. Nor should I think it was any other law which they thus vindicated, than the one in which they remembered the existence of the prescript touching "the day of the sabbaths."

Whence it is manifest that the force of such precepts was temporary, and respected the necessity of present circumstances; and that it was not with a view to its observance in perpetuity that God formerly gave them such a law.

e. Pagan and Christian Worship on Sunday

SOURCE: Tertullian, Ad Nationes, bk. 1, chap. 13, trans. in ANF, Vol. 3, p. 123.

Others, with greater regard to good manners, it must be confessed, suppose that the sun is the god of the Christians [see No. 1567], because it is a well-known fact that we pray towards the east, or because we make Sunday a day of festivity. What then? Do you do less than this? Do not many among you, with an affectation of sometimes worshipping

the heavenly bodies likewise, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise? It is you, at all events, who have even admitted the sun into the calendar of the week; and you have selected its day, in preference to the preceding day as the most suitable in the week for either an entire abstinence from the bath, or for its postponement until the evening, or for taking rest and for banqueting. By resorting to these customs, you deliberately deviate from your own religious rites to those of strangers. For the Jewish feasts are the Sabbath and "the Purification," and Jewish also are the ceremonies of the lamps, and the fasts of unleavened bread, and the "littoral prayers," all which institutions and practices are of course foreign from your gods. Wherefore, that I may return from this digression, you who reproach us with the sun and Sunday should consider your proximity to us. We are not far off from your Saturn and your days of rest.

f. Christ Observed the Sabbath

SOURCE: Tertullian, Against Marcion, bk. 4, chap. 12, trans. in ANF, Vol. 3, pp. 363, 364.

[p. 363] He was called "Lord of the Sabbath," because He maintained the Sabbath as His own institution. Now, even if He had annulled the Sabbath, He would have had he right to do so, as being its Lord, (and) still more as He who instituted it. But He did not utterly destroy it, although its Lord, in order that it might henceforth be plain that the Sabbath was not broken by the Creator... Thus Christ did not at all rescind the Sabbath: He kept the law thereof... [p. 364] "I came not to destroy, the law, but to fulfil it." ... He exhibits in a clear light the different kinds of work, while doing what the law excepts from the sacredness of the Sabbath *and* while imparting to the Sabbath-day itself, which from the beginning had been consecrated by the benediction of the Father, an additional sanctity by His own beneficent action.

g. Kneeling in Worship on the Sabbath and Sunday

SOURCE: Tertullian, On Prayer, chap. 23, trans. in ANF, Vol. 3, p. 689.

Some few ... abstain from kneeling [in church] on the Sabbath... We, however (just as we have received), only on the day of the Lord's Resurrection ought to guard not only against kneeling, but every posture and office of solicitude.

[EDITORS' NOTE: To pray standing in public worship on Sunday was considered an expression of the joy belonging to the resurrection day (see No. 1415). Some Christians therefore reasoned that the Sabbath, as a festival commemorating Creation, should be honored in the same way.]

h. No Fasting on the Sabbath

SOURCE: Tertullian, On Fasting, chap. 14, trans. in ANF, Vol. 4, pp. 111, 112.

[p. 111] Being, therefore, observers of "seasons" for these things, and of "days, and months, and years," we *Galaticize*. Plainly we do, if we are [p. 112] observers of *Jewish* ceremonies, of *legal* solemnities: for *those* the apostle unteaches, suppressing the continuance of the Old Testament which has been buried in Christ, and establishing that of the New. But if there is a new creation in Christ, our solemnities too will be bound to be new: else, if the apostle has erased *all* devotion absolutely "of seasons, and days, and months, and years," why do we celebrate the passover by an *annual* rotation in the *first month*? Why in the *fifty* ensuing *days* do we [the Montanists] spend our time in all exultation? Why do we devote to Stations the *fourth* and *sixth days* of the week, and to fasts the "preparation-day?" Anyhow, you [the "carnal Christians"] sometimes continue your Station even over the Sabbath,—a day never to be kept as a fast except at the passover season [see No. 1396] according to a reason elsewhere given. With us, at all events, *every* day likewise is celebrated by an ordinary consecration. And it will not, then, be, in the eyes of the apostle, the *differentiating principle*—distinguishing (as he is doing)

"things new and old"—which will be ridiculous; but (in this case too) it will be your own unfairness, while you taunt us with the *form of antiquity* all the while you are laying against us the *charge* of *novelty*.

1410. Sabbath and Sunday, in 3d-Century Literature—Origen of Alexandria (185?–254?) on Ceasing From Worldly Works on Sabbath (Heb. 4:9)

SOURCE: Origen, *Homily 23 on Numbers*, chap. 4, in *MPG*, Vol. 12, cols. 749, 750. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank H. Yost.

[col. 749] After the festival of the unceasing sacrifice [daily sacrifice] is put the second festival of the Sabbath, and it is fitting for whoever is righteous among the saints to keep also the festival of the Sabbath. Which is, indeed, the festival of the Sabbath, except that concerning which the Apostle said, "There remaineth therefore a sabbatismus, that is, a keeping of the Sabbath, to the people of God [Hebrews 4:9]"? Forsaking therefore the Judaic observance of the Sabbath, let us see what sort of observance of the Sabbath is expected of the Christian. On the day of the Sabbath nothing of worldly acts ought to be performed. If therefore you cease from all worldly works, and do nothing mundane, but are free for spiritual works, you come to the church, offer the ear for divine readings and discussions and thoughts of heavenly things, give attention to the future life, keep before your eyes the coming judgment, [col. 750] do not regard present and visible things but the invisible and the future: this is the observance of the Christian Sabbath.

[EDITORS' NOTE: It is clear that Origen is referring to the seventh day of the week. However it is not equally clear that he is saying that one should not work on the Sabbath. It is not certain that the sentence "On the day of the Sabbath nothing of worldly acts ought to be performed" is his own expressed opinion. This sentence is just as likely to be the ancient Biblical command for which he is giving a figurative Christian interpretation in the next sentence; for in his continuation, beyond the extract included here, he alternately cites the Sabbath law and interprets spiritually. For example: The prohibition of bearing a burden refers to the burden of sin. If this is true, he may mean no more than that the Christian equivalent of Jewish Sabbathkeeping is to substitute spiritual for worldly occupation and to go to church. The wording of the text does not make the meaning clear.]

1411. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Interpolated Ignatius (*c*. 300)—Sabbath Observed Spiritually, the Lord's Day as a Festival

SOURCE: Ignatius, *Epistle to the Magnesians* (longer recension dated *c*. A.D. 300), chap. 9, in *MPG*, Vol. 5, cols. 768, 769. Greek. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank Yost. [See FRS No. 116.]

Let us no longer sabbatize in a Jewish manner, (and) rejoicing in holidays, ... but let each one of you sabbatize spiritually, rejoicing in meditation on the law, not in rest of body, admiring the artisanship of God, not eating stale things and drinking lukewarm things and walking measured distances and enjoying dancing and plaudits which do not have sense. And after the sabbatizing, let every friend of Christ keep as a festival the Lord's (day), the resurrection-day, the queen, the chief of all the days.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For the shorter, genuine form of this epistle, see No. 1404. See also No. 769.] 1412. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Pope Miltiades

(311–314) Forbids Fasting on Sunday

SOURCE: *The Book of the Popes* (*Liber Pontificalis*), trans. by Louise R. Loomis, p. 40. Copyright 1916 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

He decreed that no one of the faithful should in any wise keep fast upon the Lord's day or upon the fifth day of the week, because the pagans celebrate those days as a sacred fast.

1413. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Eusebius (*c.* 260–*c.* 340)

a. Change of the Sabbath

SOURCE: Eusebius, Commentary on the Psalms, on Ps. 91 (92): 2, 3, in MPG, Vol. 23, col. 1172. Greek.

All things whatsoever that it was duty to do on the Sabbath, these we [the church] have transferred to the Lord's day, as being more authoritative and more highly regarded and first in rank, and more honorable than the Jewish Sabbath.

b. Sabbath and Sunday Observed by Ebionites

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* iii. 27; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 263. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

They [the Ebionites] used to observe the sabbath and the rest of the Jewish ceremonial, but on Sundays celebrated rites like ours in commemoration of the Saviour's resurrection.

c. Religious Worship on Sunday Enforced in Constantine's Army

SOURCE: Eusebius, *The Life of Constantine*, bk. 4, chaps. 18–20, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 1, pp. 544, 545.

[p. 544] And since his desire was to teach his whole army zealously to honor the Saviour's day (which derives its name from light, and from the sun), he freely granted to those [p. 545] among them who were partakers of the divine faith, leisure for attendance on the services of the Church of God, in order that they might be able, without impediment, to perform their religious worship. ...

With regard to those who were as yet ignorant of divine truth, he provided by a second statute that they should appear on each Lord's day on an open plain near the city, and there, at a given signal, offer to God with one accord a prayer which they had previously learnt... The emperor himself prescribed the prayer to be used by all his troops, commanding them to pronounce the following words in the Latin tongue: ...

"We acknowledge thee the only God: we own thee as our King, and implore thy succor. By thy favor have we gotten the victory: through thee are we mightier than our enemies. We render thanks for thy past benefits, and trust thee for future blessings. Together we pray to thee, and beseech thee long to preserve to us, safe and triumphant, our emperor Constantine and his pious sons."

1414. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Constitutions of the Holy Apostles (pseudonymous work, *c*. 375)

a. Both Days of Public Worship in the East

SOURCE: Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, bk. 2, sec. 7, chap. 59, trans. in ANF, Vol. 7, p. 423.

Assemble yourselves together every day, morning and evening, singing psalms and praying in the Lord's house: in the morning saying the sixty-second Psalm, and in the evening the hundred and fortieth, but principally on the Sabbath-day. And on the day of our Lord's resurrection, which is the Lord's day, meet more diligently, sending praise to God that made the universe by Jesus, and sent Him to us, and condescended to let Him suffer, and raised Him from the dead. Otherwise what apology will he make to God who does not assemble on that day to hear the saving word concerning the resurrection, on which we pray thrice standing in memory of Him who arose [see No. 1415] in three days,

in which is performed the reading of the prophets, the preaching of the Gospel, the oblation of the sacrifice, the gift of the holy food?

b. Sabbath and Sunday Days of Joy; Fasting Forbidden (Except the Sabbath Preceding Easter)

SOURCE: Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, bk. 5, sec. 3, chap. 20; bk. 7, sec. 2, chap. 23, trans. in ANF, Vol. 7, pp. 449, 469.

[p. 449] We enjoin you to fast every fourth day of the week, and every day of the preparation, and the surplusage of your fast bestow upon the needy; every Sabbath-day excepting one, and every Lord's day, hold your solemn assemblies, and rejoice: for he will be guilty of sin who fasts on the Lord's day, being the day of the resurrection, or during the time of Pentecost, or, in general, who is sad on a festival day to the Lord. For on them we ought to rejoice, and not to mourn...

[p. 469] But keep the Sabbath, and the Lord's day festival; because the former is the memorial of the creation, and the latter of the resurrection. But there is one only Sabbath to be observed [as a fast] by you in the whole year, which is that of our Lord's burial, on which men ought to keep a fast, but not a festival. For inasmuch as the Creator was then under the earth, the sorrow for Him is more forcible than the joy for the creation; for the Creator is more honourable by nature and dignity than His own creatures.

c. Five-Day Week for Slaves

SOURCE: Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, bk. 8, sec. 4, chap. 33, trans. in ANF, Vol. 7, p. 495.

I Peter and Paul do make the following constitutions. Let the slaves work five days; but on the Sabbath-day and the Lord's day let them have leisure to go to church for instruction in piety. We have said that the Sabbath is on account of the creation, and the Lord's day of the resurrection.

1415. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Basil of Caesarea (*c*. 329–378)

SOURCE: Basil, On the Spirit, chap. 27, sec. 66, trans. in NPNF, 2d series, Vol. 8, p. 42.

We pray standing, on the first day of the week, but we do not all know the reason. On the day of the resurrection (or "standing again" Gr. $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\alpha}\zeta\tau\alpha\zeta\iota\zeta$) we remind ourselves of the grace given to us by standing at prayer, not only because we rose with Christ, and are bound to "seek those things which are above," but because the day seems to us to be in some sense an image of the age which we expect...

The church teaches her own foster children to offer their prayers on that day standing, to the end that through continual reminder of the endless life we may not neglect to make provision for our removal thither... On this day the rules of the church have educated us to prefer the upright attitude of prayer, for by their plain reminder they, as it were, make our mind to dwell no longer in the present but in the future.

1416. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Council of Laodicea (Date Unknown, Between 343 and 381) on Sabbath and Sunday SOURCE: Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils*, Vol. 2, trans. and ed. by H. N. Oxenham (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), pp. 310, 316, 320. [FRS No. 41.]

[p. 310] CAN. 16. "On Saturday [Greek *sabbaton*, "the Sabbath"] the Gospels and other portions of the Scripture shall be read aloud." ...

[p. 316] CAN. 29. "Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday, but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honour, and, as being

Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out [Greek *anathema*] from Christ." ...

[p. 320] CAN. 49. "During Lent, the bread shall not be offered, except on Saturday and Sunday." ...

CAN. 51. "During Lent, no feast of the martyrs shall be celebrated, but the holy martyrs shall be commemorated on the Saturdays and Sundays of Lent." [EDITORS' NOTE: For the significance of canon 29, see Nos. 1399, 1638.]

1417. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Epiphanius of Constantia (315?–403) on Sabbath Worship

SOURCE: Epiphanius, *Expositio Fidei* ("Exposition of the Faith"), *MPG*, Vol. 42, col. 832. Greek. In certain places also on the Sabbath they hold assemblies.

1418. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Gregory of Nyssa (331?–396?) on Sabbath and Sunday as Sisters

SOURCE: Gregory of Nyssa, De Castigatione ("On Reproof"), in MPG, Vol. 46, col. 309. Greek.

With what kind of eyes do you see the Lord's Day [Sunday], you who dishonor the Sabbath? Do you not know that these days are sisters?

1419. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—John Chrysostom (*c.* 347–407) on Sabbath Observance in His Day

SOURCE: Chrysostum, *Commentary on Galatians,* on chap. 1:7, trans. in *NPNF*, 1st series, Vol. 13, p. 8. There are many among us now, who fast on the same day as the Jews, and keep the

sabbaths in the same manner; and we endure it nobly or rather ignobly and basely.

1420. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Pope Siricius (384–399) on Sunday as a Day for Sacraments

SOURCE: Siricius, Epistle, chap. 2, in MPL, Vol. 13, cols. 1134, 1135. Latin.

[col. 1134] The Lord's Day, especially Easter with its Pentecost, guards for itself the privilege [the mystery of baptism], both among us [at Rome] and among all the churches; on these days of the sun through [col. 1135] the year, it is convenient that the general sacraments of baptism be given to the multitudes flocking to the faith.

1421. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—John Cassian (*c*. 395) on Sabbath and Sunday Church Services Among Monks in Egypt SOURCE: John Cassian, *The Twelve Books on the Institutes of the Coenobia*, bk. 3, chap. 2; bk. 5, chap. 26, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 11, pp. 213, 243.

[p. 213] Wherefore, except Vespers and Nocturns, there are no public services among them [monks in Egypt] in the day except on Saturday and Sunday, when they meet together at the third hour for the purpose of Holy Communion...

[p. 243] We have seen another who lived alone, who declared that he had never enjoyed food by himself alone, but that even if for five days running none of the brethren came to his cell he constantly put off taking food until on Saturday or Sunday he went to church for service and found some stranger whom he brought home at once to his cell, and together with him partook of refreshment for the body not so much by reason of his own needs, as for the sake of kindness.

1422. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—(Pseudo?) Athanasius on Sabbath Worship

SOURCE: Athanasius, Homilia de Semente, sec. 1, in MPG, Vol. 28, col. 144. Greek.

On the Sabbath day we gathered together, not being infected with Judaism, for we do not lay hold of false Sabbaths, but we come on the Sabbath to worship Jesus, the Lord of the Sabbath. For of old there was among the ancients the honorable Sabbath, but the Lord changed the day of the Sabbath to the Lord's day, and not we alone despise the Sabbath, but the prophet is the one who cast it aside and said, "Your new moons and Sabbaths my should hates."

1423. Sabbath and Sunday, in 4th-Century Literature—Jerome (*c.* 340–420) on Sabbath as a Ceasing From Sin

SOURCE: Jerome, Comment on Isaiah 56:2 and 58:13, in MPL, Vol. 24, cols. 539, 573. Latin.

[col. 539] What sort of Sabbath is it that He commands to be kept, the following line shows: *Keeping his hands that he might not do any evil.* ...

[col. 573] From one command, therefore [not to go out of one place on the Sabbath], which is impossible according to the letter, we are obliged to understand spiritually the others also: that we must not do servile work and lose the liberty of the soul, for whoever sins is a servant of sin; that we should not carry a burden on the Sabbath, such as he carried who said, "My iniquities ... weigh increasingly upon me like a heavy burden" [Ps. 38:4].

1424. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Asterius of Amasea (*c*. 400) on Sabbath and Sunday as a Beautiful "Team" SOURCE: Asterius of Amasea, Homily 5, on Matt. 19:3, in *MPG*, Vol. 40, col. 225, Greek.

It is beautiful to Christians and to the industrious that the team of these two days comes together; I speak of the Sabbath and the Lord's day, which time in its course brings around weekly. For as mothers and nurses of the church they gather the people, set over them priests as instructors, and lead both disciples and teachers to have a care for souls.

1425. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Augustine, Bishop of Hippo (354–430), on Fasting on the Sabbath in Rome, Not in Milan

SOURCE: Augustine, Letter 54, to Januarius, chap. 2, in MPL, Vol. 33, cols. 200, 201. Latin.

[col. 200] In some places no day is omitted, on which the communion is not offered; in some [it is offered] only on the Sabbath and the Lord's day [Sunday]; in some only on the Lord's Day...

[col. 201] He [Ambrose, Bishop of Milan] said to me, "When I come to Rome, I fast on the Sabbath; when I am here, I do not fast. Thus even you, to whatever church you happen to come, observe its custom if you do not wish to be a stumblingblock to anyone, nor anyone to you."

1426. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Pope Innocent I (402–417) Enjoins Sabbath Fasting

SOURCE: Innocent I, Epistle 25, chap. 4, in *MPL*, Vol. 20, col. 555. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank H. Yost.

That the Sabbath is for fasting the clearest argument demonstrates. For if we not only celebrate the Lord's day on account of the revered [Latin *venerabilis*] resurrection of our

Lord Jesus Christ at Easter [Latin *pascha*, "passover"], but also throughout each recurring cycle of the weeks, we repeat the image of this very day, and fast on the sixth day because of the passion of the Lord, and we ought not then to omit [for fasting] the

Sabbath, which is seen closed in between the sadness and joy of this time. In it is certainly known that the apostles were in sadness both these days, and had shut themselves in for fear of the Jews.

1427. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Theodoret of Cyrrhus (390?–457?) on Sabbath and Sunday Observance by Ebionites SOURCE: Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *De Fabulis Haereticorum* ("On the Fables of the Heretics"), bk. ii, chap. 1, in *MPG*, Vol. 83, col. 389. Greek.

They [the Ebionites] observe the Sabbath according to Jewish law, and sanctify the Lord's day in keeping with our custom.

1428. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Socrates Scholasticus (fl. *c*. 440)

a. Sabbath and Easter

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, pp. 130, 131.

[p. 130] In Asia Minor most people kept the fourteenth day of the moon, disregarding the Sabbath: yet they never separated from those who did otherwise, until Victor, bishop of Rome, influenced by too ardent a zeal, fulminated a sentence of excommunication against the Quartodecimans in Asia... [p. 131] Others in the East kept that feast on the sabbath indeed, but differed as regards the month.

The feast of Easter came to be observed in each place according to the individual peculiarities of the peoples...

The fasts before Easter will be found to be differently observed among different people. Those at Rome fast three successive weeks before Easter, excepting Saturdays and Sundays.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Some in the East observed Easter on the Sabbath; whether always on a Sabbath, or only when the 14th fell on that day, is not made clear in the original. However, it is obvious that the author refers to Saturday, not Sunday, as shown by the word $\Sigma \dot{\alpha} \beta \beta \alpha \tau \sigma \nu$ and also by its mention along with Sunday.]

b. Rome and Alexandria Drop Sabbath Communion

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 132. [FRS No. 118.]

Although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries on the sabbath ²² [Note 22: i.e. Saturday] of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this.

c. Sabbath and Sunday Designated "the Festal Days"

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 6, chap. 8, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 144.

As often therefore as the festal days occurred—I mean Saturday and Lord's day—in each week, on which assemblies are usually held in the churches, they [the Arians] congregated within the city gates about the public squares, and sang responsive verses adapted to the Arian heresy.

1429. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Sozomen (*c*. 400–*c*. 447) on Rome as Leader in Setting Aside Recognition of Sabbath SOURCE: Sozomen, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 7, chap. 19, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 390. [FRS No. 119.]

The people of Constantinople, and almost everywhere, assemble together on the Sabbath, as well as on the first day of the week, which custom is never observed at Rome or at Alexandria.

1430. Sabbath and Sunday, in 5th-Century Literature—Pope Leo I (440–461)

a. Easter Sunday Begins the Evening Before, After the Sabbath

SOURCE: Leo I, Letter 9, chap. 2, trans. in NPNF, 2d series, Vol. 12, pp. 7, 8.

[p. 7] The ordination of priests or deacons should not be performed at random on any

day: but after Saturday [Latin *Sabbatum*], the commencement of that night which precedes the dawn of the first day of the week should be chosen on which the sacred benediction should be bestowed on those who are to be consecrated, ordainer and ordained alike fasting. This observance will not be violated, if actually on the morning of the LORD'S day it be celebrated without breaking the Saturday [Latin *Sabbatum*] fast... Those who are to be consecrated should never receive the blessing except on the day of the Lord's resurrection, which is commonly held to begin on the evening of Saturday

[Latin *Sabbatum*], and which has been so often hallowed in the mysterious dispensations of GOD that all the more notable institutions of the LORD were accomplished on that high day. On it the world took its beginning. On it through the resurrection of Christ death received its destruction, and life its commencement. On it the apostles take from the LORD'S hands the trumpet of the gospel [p. 8] which is to be preached to all nations, and receive the sacrament of regeneration which they are to bear to the whole world. On it, as blessed John the Evangelist bears witness when all the disciples were gathered together in one place, and when, the doors being shut, the LORD entered to them, He breathed on them and said: "Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins ye have remitted they are remitted to them: and whose ye have retained they shall be retained." On it lastly the Holy Spirit that had been promised to the Apostles by the LORD came: and so we know it to have been suggested and handed down by a kind of heavenly rule, that on that day we ought to celebrate the mysteries of the blessing of priests on which all these gracious gifts were conferred.

b. Baptisms on Easter and Pentecost

SOURCE: Leo I, Letter 16, chap. 4, trans. in NPNF, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 28.

It is appropriate that the power of baptism should change the old into the new creature on the death-day of the Crucified and the Resurrection-day of the Dead: that Christ's death and His resurrection may operate in the re-born... It must be added, indeed, that the solemn season of Pentecost, hallowed by the coming of the Holy Ghost is also allowed, being, as it were, the sequel and completion of the Paschal feast. And while other festivals are held on other days of the week, this festival (of Pentecost) always occurs on that day, which is marked by the LORD'S resurrection.

c. Vigil on Sabbath

SOURCE: Leo I, Sermon 88, chap. 5, trans. in NPNF, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 199.

On Wednesday and Friday therefore let us fast; and on Saturday [Latin *Sabbatum*] keep vigil all together in the presence of the most blessed apostle Peter, by whose merits and prayers we are sure GOD's mercy will be vouchsafed to us in all things.

1431. Sabbath and Sunday, in 6th-Century Literature—Sabbath Observed by Some in Rome, About 600

SOURCE: Gregory I (Pope, 590–604), *Selected Epistles*, bk. 13, Epistle 1, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 13, pp. 92, 93.

[p. 92] Gregory, servant of the servants of God, to his most beloved sons the Roman citizens.

It has come to my ears that certain men of perverse spirit have sown among you some things that are wrong and opposed to the holy faith, so as to forbid any work being done on the Sabbath day. What else can I call these but preachers of Antichrist, who, when he comes, will cause the Sabbath day as well as the Lord's day to be kept free from all work. For, because he pretends to die and rise again, he wishes the Lord's day to be had in reverence; and, because he compels the people to judaize that he may bring back the outward rite of the law, and subject the perfidy of the Jews to himself, he wishes the Sabbath to be observed.

For this which is said by the prophet, *Ye shall bring in no burden through your gates on the Sabbath day* (Jerem. xvii. 24), could be held to as long as it was lawful for the law to be observed according to the letter. But after that the grace of Almighty God, our Lord Jesus Christ has appeared, the commandments of the law which were spoken figuratively cannot be kept according to the letter. For, if any one says that this about the Sabbath is to be kept, he must needs say that carnal sacrifices are to be offered: he must say too that the commandment about the circumcision of the body is still to be retained. But let him hear the Apostle Paul saying in opposition to him, *If ye be circumcised, Christ profiteth you nothing* (Galat. v. 2).

We therefore accept spiritually, and hold spiritually, this which is written about the Sabbath. For the Sabbath means rest. But we have the true Sabbath in our Redeemer Himself, the Lord Jesus Christ. And whoso acknowledges the light of faith in Him, if he draws the sins of concupiscence through his eyes into his soul, he introduces burdens through the gates on the Sabbath day. We introduce, then, no burden through the gates on the Sabbath day if we draw no weights of sin through the bodily senses to the soul. For we read that the same our Lord and Redeemer did many works on the Sabbath day, so that he reproved the Jews, saying, *Which of you doth not loose his ox or his ass on the Sabbath day, and lead him away to watering* (Luke xiii. 15)? If, then, the very Truth in person commanded that the Sabbath should not be kept according to the letter, whoso keeps the rest of the Sabbath according to the letter of the law, whom else does he contradict but the Truth himself? ...

These things, most dear sons, being endowed with sure constancy and right faith, observe; despise the words of foolish men, and give not easy belief to all that you hear of having been said by them; but [p. 93] weigh it in the scale of reason, so that, while in firm stability you resist the wind of error, you may be able to attain to the solid joys of the heavenly kingdom.

1432. Sabbath, Change of, as a Gradual Process

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 15, 22–25. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 15] A history of the problem shows that in some places, it was really only after some centuries that the Sabbath rest really was entirely abolished, and by that time the practice of observing a bodily rest on the Sunday had taken its place...

[p. 22] The question now arises: Did the transfer of the day of worship from the seventh day to the first day of the week by the early Christians carry with it the obligation of rest which had characterized the Jewish Sabbath? That question is difficult to answer.

All are fairly well agreed that there was no such thing as an immediate transfer of the obligation of rest. This is partly evident from the fact that there were some who regarded the practice of resting from prohibited works on a festival as characteristically Jewish, and therefore something inappropriate for the Christians. Even the Jewish converts themselves did not think of uniting rest with the Sunday. It was the seventh day of the week which typified the rest of God after creation and not the first day. The former day was to be retained as the day of rest even though the Christian worship was held on the night between Saturday and Sunday. "The idea of importing [p. 23] into the Sunday the solemnity of the Sabbath with all its exigencies was an entirely foreign one to the early Christians. This was especially true in regard to the prohibition of work." ⁴⁹ [Note 49: Duchesne, *Christian Worship*,...p. 47.] It was not easy at that early period, nor later as history shows, for the Jewish converts to give up completely the historical Sabbath rest. If a distinction can be made between the converts from paganism and those from Judaism, it can be said that it was probably the pagan converts who first joined a rest from labor with the Sunday.

One writer mentions that this transfer of the day of rest from the seventh to the first day of the week, although it took place gradually, was well nigh complete by the end of the first century. An almost complete absence of evidence makes this statement difficult to prove... As has already been mentioned, if the early Judaeo-Christians kept any day of rest, it was probably the Sabbath, the memorial of crea- [p. 24] tion...

[p. 25] But when it is said that there was no transfer of the obligation of abstaining from prohibited works on the Sabbath to the Sunday, and that no mention of such an obligation can be found in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, one must not conclude that there was actually no abstention whatsoever from work on Sunday even in the beginning.

1433. Sabbath, Change of, by Gradual Development; Both Sabbath and Sunday Observed

SOURCE: "Jesus and the Sabbath," The Earnest Worker, 74 (October, 1943), 609, 610. [FRS No. 60.]

[p. 609] The change from the seventh to the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath was a rather slow development... The fact that Jesus arose from the dead on the first day of the week was the chief factor in the change. The early Christians felt that the Resurrection was of such great importance as to deserve a weekly commemoration and began to observe the first day of the week as a day of worship, calling it the Lord's Day. It is very probable that the first Christians observed both days. However, there would seem to be indications that out in the Gentile world the converts to Christianity from among [p. 610] the Jews kept the Hebrew Sabbath, while those from paganism kept the first day of the week, resulting in that strife over days which Paul rebuked in his Epistles. The legalistic observance of a certain day is not of the spirit of the Christian religion, but the experience of the early church soon revealed the wisdom of having a definite day for worship, resulting in the first day of the week, the day of the Resurrection, becoming the Christian Sabbath.

1434. Sabbath, Change of, by Gradual Steps

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 203. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

The Sunday was in the beginning not looked on as a day of bodily repose; nor was an analogy drawn between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, except as days of worship...

The keeping of the Sunday rest arose from the custom of the people and the constitution of the Church...

Tertullian [3d century; see Nos. 1409, 1567] was probably the first to refer to a cessation of worldly affairs on the Sunday; the Council of Laodicea [4th century; see Nos. 1435, 1638] issued the first conciliar legislation for that day; Constantine I [in 321; see Nos. 1637, 1643–1646] issued the first civil legislation.

1435. Sabbath, Change of—Canon of Council of Laodicea—Sunday Rest Encouraged, Sabbath Rest Forbidden

SOURCE: Council of Laodicea, can. 29, trans. in Charles Joseph Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils,* Vol. 2, trans. and ed. by H. N. Oxenham (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1896), p. 316. [FRS No. 41.]

Christians shall not Judaize and be idle on Saturday [Greek *sabbaton*, the Sabbath] but shall work on that day; but the Lord's day they shall especially honour, and, as being Christians, shall, if possible, do no work on that day. If, however, they are found Judaizing, they shall be shut out from Christ.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The date of this council is unknown, but it is believed to have been held sometime between 343 and 381.

As for the authority of the Council, or as some prefer to call it, the Synod, of Laodicea, it may be remarked that while it was not ecumenical, its acts have never been called in question, and the sixty articles adopted by it became practically a part of the canon law of the Roman Catholic Church. On the significance of this enactment, see No. 1638.]

1436. Sabbath, Change of, Catholic Authority Claimed for SOURCE: James Cardinal Gibbons, "The Claims of the Catholic Church in the Making of the Republic," in John Gilmary Shea and others, *The Cross and the Flag, Our Church and Country* (New York: The Catholic Historical League of America, 1899), pp. 24, 25. [FRS No. 104.]

[p. 24] The Divine institution of a day of rest from ordinary occupations and of religious worship, transferred by the authority of the Church [p. 25] from the Sabbath, the last day, to Sunday, the first day of the week, ... is one of the most patent signs that we are a Christian people.

1437. Sabbath, Change of, a Catholic Change Accepted by Protestants Against the Bible.

SOURCE: *The Christian Sabbath* (2d ed.; Baltimore: The Catholic Mirror, [1893]), pp. 29–31. [FRS No. 30; original editorials, FRS No. 125.]

[p. 29] The Catholic Church for over one thousand years before the existence of a Protestant, by virtue of her Divine mission, changed the day from Saturday to Sunday. We say by virtue of her Divine mission because He [who] has so called Himself "the Lord of the Sabbath," ... commanded all, without exception, "to hear His Church,["] under penalty of being classed by Him as "the heathen and the publican." ...

But the Protestant says: How can I receive the teachings of an apostate Church? How, we ask, have you managed to receive her teaching all your life, *in direct* [p. 30] *opposition* to your recognized teacher, the Bible, on the Sabbath question? ...

[p. 31] The Protestant world at i[t]s birth found the Christian Sabbath too strongly entrenched to run counter to its existence; it was therefore placed under the necessity of acquiescing in the arrangement, thus implying the Church's right to change the day, for over 300 years. The Christian Sabbath is therefore *to this day* the acknowledged offspring of the Catholic Church, as Spouse of the Holy Ghost, without a word of remonstrance from the Protestant world.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This pamphlet is mostly a reprint of four editorials in *The Catholic Mirror* (Baltimore), Sept. 2, 9, 16, 23, 1893. The above quotation from the beginning to the first omission, and the last paragraph, came from the editorial of September 23, but the middle portion is part of an addition inserted by the author when the material was reprinted as a pamphlet. The title, with full subtitle, reads: *The Christian Sabbath*—The Genuine Offspring of the Union of the Holy Spirit, and the Catholic Church, His Spouse. The Claims of Protestantism to any Part Therein Proved to be Groundless, Self-Contradictory and Suicidal. For the text of the original four editorials, see the Review and Herald reprint in pamphlet form, entitled *Rome's Challenge*.]

1438. Sabbath, Change of—Catholic Church Made Transfer

SOURCE: Peter Geiermann, *The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine* (1957 ed.), p. 50. Copyright 1930 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission. [See FRS No. 26.]

Q. Which is the Sabbath day?

A. Saturday is the Sabbath day.

Q. Why do we observe Sunday instead of Saturday?

A. We observe Sunday instead of Saturday because the Catholic Church transferred the solemnity from Saturday to Sunday.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This work received the "apostolic blessing" of Pope Pius X, Jan. 25, 1910. In old editions this statement read "because the Catholic Church *in the Council of Laodicea* (A.D. 336)" made the change. The reference to Laodicea has long been omitted, probably because the date of the council is unknown and the two or three dates formerly cited for it are not valid; probably also because the change of the Sabbath was actually not accomplished by that council alone (see Nos. 1432–1434).]

1439. Sabbath, Change of, Catholic Explanation of

SOURCE: Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 402, 403. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 4.]

[p. 402] But the Church of God has thought it well to transfer the celebration and observance of the Sabbath to Sunday.

For, as on that day light first shone on the world, so by the Resurrection of our Redeemer on the same day, by whom was thrown open to us the gate to eternal life, we were called out of darkness into light; and hence the Apostles would have it called *the Lord's day*.

We also learn from the Sacred Scriptures that the first day [p. 403] of the week was held sacred because on that day the work of creation commenced, and on that day the Holy Ghost was given to the Apostles.

1440. Sabbath, Change of, Catholic Substitution Without Scriptural Authority

SOURCE: Stephen Keenan, *A Doctrinal Catechism* (3d American ed., rev.; New York: T. W. Strong, late Edward Dunigan & Bro., 1876), p. 174. [FRS No. 7.]

Q. Have you any other way of proving that the Church has power to institute festivals of precept?

A. Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her;—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day, a change for which there is no Scriptural authority.

1441. Sabbath, Change of—Catholics Claim Sunday as Protestant Homage to Papal Authority SOURCE: Louis Gaston de Ségur, *Plain Talk About the Protestantism of To-day* (Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1868), p. 225.

It was the Catholic Church which, by the authority of JESUS CHRIST, has transferred this rest to the Sunday in remembrance of the resurrection of our Lord. Thus the observance of Sunday by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Catholic] Church. [See No. 1442.]

1442. Sabbath, Change of, Cited as Proof of Church's Power SOURCE: Daniel Ferris, *Manual of Christian Doctrine: or, Catholic Belief and Practice* (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., 1916), pp. 67, 68. Used by permission. [FRS No. 5.]

[p. 67] The Third Commandment.

Q. What does the word "Sabbath" mean?

A. It means the day of rest.

Q. When did the Sabbath begin to be kept?

A. From the very creation of the world; for then God blessed the seventh day, and rested on it from all His work.—Gen. ii. 2, 3.

Q. When was this Commandment renewed?

A. In the Old Law, when God gave the commandments to Moses on Mount Sinai, written with His own finger on two tables of stone.—Exodus xx.

Q. Why was the Jewish Sabbath changed into the Sunday?

A. Because Christ was born on a Sunday, arose from the dead on a Sunday, and sent down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday—works not inferior to the creation of the world.

Q. By whom was it changed?

A. By the Governors of the Church, the Apostles, who also kept it; for St. John was in spirit on the Lord's day (which was Sunday)—Apoc. i. 10.

Q. How do you prove that the Church has power to command Feasts and Holy-days?

A. By this very act of changing the Sabbath into the Sunday, which is admitted by Protestants, and therefore they contradict themselves by keeping Sunday so strictly, and breaking most other Feasts commanded by the same Church.

Q. How do you prove that?

A. Because by keeping Sunday [p. 68] they acknowledge the power of the Church to ordain Feasts and to command them under sin, and by not keeping the remainder, equally commanded by her, they deny in fact the same power.

[EDITORS' NOTE: A considerable part of this extract was drawn from Henry Tu(r)berville's *An Abridgment of the Christian Doctrine* (known also as the Douay Catechism) of 1649.]

1443. Sabbath, Change of, Cited as Proof That Tradition Is Above

Scripture

SOURCE: Gaspare [Ricciulli] de Fosso (Archbishop of Reggio), Address in the 17th session of the Council of Trent, Jan. 18, 1562, in Mansi SC, Vol. 33, cols. 529, 530. Latin.

[col. 529] Such is the condition of the heretics of this age that on nothing do they rely more than that, under the pretense of the word of God, they overthrow the authority of the church; as though the church, His body, could be opposed to the word of Christ, or the head to the body. On the contrary, the authority of the church, then, is illustrated most clearly by the Scriptures; for while on the one hand she recommends them, declares them to be divine, [col. 530] offers them to us to be read, in doubtful matters explains them faithfully, and condemns whatever is contrary to them; on the other hand, the legal precepts in the Scriptures taught by the Lord have ceased by virtue of the same authority. The Sabbath, the most glorious day in the law, has been changed into the Lord's day.

Circumcision, enjoined upon Abraham and his seed under such threatening that he who had not been circumcised would be destroyed from among his people, has been so abrogated that the apostle asserts: "If ye be circumcised, ye have fallen from grace, and Christ shall profit you nothing." These and other similar matters have not ceased by virtue of Christ's teaching (for He says He has come to fulfill the law, not to destroy it), but they have been changed by the authority of the church. Indeed, if she should be removed (since there must be heresies), who would set forth truth, and confound the obstinacy of heretics? All things will be confused, and soon heresies condemned by her authority will spring up again. [See No. 1444.]

1444. Sabbath, Change of—Cited in Council of Trent as Proof that Tradition Is Above Scripture

SOURCE: Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, *Kanon und Tradition* ("Canon and Tradition") (Ludwigsburg: Druck and Verlag von Ferd. Riehm, 1859), p. 263. German. [FRS No. 72.]

The Council [of Trent] agreed fully with Ambrosius Pelargus, that under no condition should the Protestants be allowed to triumph by saying that the council had condemned the doctrine of the ancient church. But this practice caused untold difficulty without being able to guarantee certainty. For this business, indeed, 'well-nigh divine prudence' was requisite—which the Spanish ambassador acknowledged as belonging to the council on the sixteenth of March, 1562. Indeed, thus far they had not been able to orient themselves to the interchanging, crisscrossing, labyrinthine, twisting passages of an older and newer concept of tradition. But even in this they were to succeed. Finally, at the last opening [see editors' note] on the eighteenth of January, 1562, all hesitation was set aside: [Gaspar de Fosso] the Archbishop of Reggio made a speech [see No. 1443] in which he openly declared that tradition stood above Scripture. The authority of the church could therefore not be bound to the authority of the Scriptures, because the church had changed circumcision into baptism, Sabbath into Sunday, not by the command of Christ, but by its own authority. With this, to be sure, the last illusion was destroyed, and it was declared that tradition does not signify antiquity, but continual inspiration.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This "last opening" of the Council of Trent was not the last day, but the opening of the 17th session, the first meeting of the last series of sessions that was opened, after a lapse of time, under a new pope. The council was in session for longer or shorter periods over a series of years.]

1445. Sabbath, Change of—Eck's Argument for the Church's Superiority Over Scripture

SOURCE: Johann Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communion* ... *Adversus Lutheranos* ("Handbook of Common Places Against the Lutherans") (Venice: Ioan. Antonius & Frates de Sabio, 1533), fols. 4v, 5r, 42v. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank H. Yost. [FRS No. 127.]

[fol. 4v] The Scripture teaches "Remember that you sanctify the day of the Sabbath; six days shall you labor and do all your work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord your God," etc. But the Church has changed the Sabbath into the Lord's (day) by its own author- [fol. 5r] ity, concerning which you have no scripture.

Christ said to his disciples in the mount, "I have not come to dissolve the law but to fulfill it"; and yet the church of the Apostles in the first council has boldly spoken out concerning the cessation of legal things...

The Scripture decrees in the [apostolic] council ... that you abstain from ... blood and from a strangled thing; a matter so clearly defined and expressed the Church has changed by her own authority, for she uses both blood and things strangled. See the power of the church over Scripture.

[fol. 42v] The Sabbath is commanded many times by God; neither in the Gospels nor in Paul is it declared that the Sabbath has ceased; nevertheless the Church has instituted the Lord's day through the tradition of the Apostles without Scripture.

1446. Sabbath, Change of—Influence of Surrounding Paganism SOURCE: Hutton Webster, *Rest Days*, pp. 220, 221. Copyright 1916 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 220] The early Christians had at first adopted the Jewish seven-day week with its numbered weekdays, but by the close of the third century A.D. this began to give way to the planetary week; and in the fourth and fifth centuries the pagan designations became generally accepted in the western half of Christendom. The use of the planetary names by Christians attests the growing influence of astrological speculations introduced by converts from paganism... During these same centuries the spread of Oriental solar worships, especially that of Mithra, in the Roman world, had already led to the

substitution by pagans of *dies Solis* for *dies Saturni*, as the first day of the planetary week... [p. 221] Thus gradually a pagan institution was engrafted on Christianity.

1447. Sabbath, Change of, Jerome's Argument on, Cited by Eck, Opponent of Luther at Leipzig

SOURCE: Johann Eck, *Enchiridion Locorum Communium* ... *Adversus Lutheranos* ("Handbook of Common Places Against the Lutherans") (Venice: Ioan. Antonius & Fratres de Sabio, 1533), fols. 18r, 42v. Latin. Trans. by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank H. Yost. [FRS No. 127.]

[fol. 18r] Anicetus I commanded the Passover to be celebrated on the Lord's day. First Pius confirmed it and finally Victor, and they have maintained it... [fol. 42v] Jerome, concerning the Passover of the Lord: The whole grace of the Sabbath and that ancient festival of this day of the Jews has been changed in this observance. The Sabbath moreover has been changed, because it signifies the first creation, to the Lord's day, in which is commemorated the new creature begun in the resurrection of Christ.

1448. Sabbath, Change of, Lutheran Confession on SOURCE: The Augsburg Confession (1530), part 2, art. 7, "Of Ecclesiastical Power," trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 63, 64.

[p. 63] Besides these things, there is a controversy whether Bishops or Pastors have power to institute ceremonies in the Church, and to make laws concerning meats, and holidays, and degrees, or orders of ministers, etc. They that ascribe this power to Bishops allege this [p. 64] testimony for it: 'I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now; but when that Spirit of truth shall come, he shall teach you all truth' (John xvi. 12, 13). They allege also the examples of the Apostles, who commanded to abstain from blood, and that which was strangled (Acts xv. 29). They allege the change of the Sabbath into the Lord's day, contrary, as it seemeth, to the Decalogue; and they have no example more in their mouths than the change of the Sabbath. They will needs have the Church's power to be very great, because it hath dispensed with a precept of the Decalogue.

But of this question ours do thus teach: that the Bishops have no power to ordain any thing contrary to the Gospel, as was showed before.

1449. Sabbath, Change of—Mingling of Pagan and Christian Ideas in Promotion of Sunday

SOURCE: "Sunday," A Religious Encyclopedia, Vol. 3 (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883), p. 2259.

Sunday (*Dies solis*, of the Roman calendar, "day of the sun," because dedicated to the sun), the first day of the week, was adopted by the early Christians as a day of worship. The "sun" of Latin adoration they interpreted as the "Sun of righteousness." ... No regulations for ... [Sunday] observance are laid down in the New Testament, nor, indeed, is its observance even enjoined.

1450. Sabbath, Change of—Modification of Command Attributed to Christ After His Resurrection

SOURCE: Amos Binney and Daniel Steele, *Theological Compend* (New York: The Methodist Book Concern, 1902), pp. 169–171. [FRS No. 37.]

[p. 169] By this is meant, 1. The day appointed of God, at the close of creation, to be observed by man as a day of rest from all secular employment, *because that in it God himself had rested from his work*. Gen. ii, 1–3. Not that *God's rest* was necessitated by fatigue (Isa. xl, 28); but he rested, that is, *ceased to work*, on the seventh day as an *example* to man; hence assigned it *as a reason* why men should rest on that day. Exod. xx, 11; xxxi, 17. God's *blessing* and *sanctifying* the day, meant that he separated it from a common to a religious use, to be a perpetual memorial or sign [p. 170] that all who thus observed it would show themselves to be the worshipers of that God who made the world in six days and rested on the seventh. Exod. xx, 8, 11; xxxi, 16, 17; Isa. Ivi, 6, 7.

2. The Sabbath is indispensable to man, being promotive of his highest good, physically, intellectually, socially, spiritually, and eternally. Hence its observance is connected with the best of promises, and its violation with the severest penalties. Exod. xxiii, 12; xxxi, 12–18; Neh. xiii, 15–22; Isa. lvi, 2–7; lviii, 13, 14; Jer. xvii, 21–27; Ezek. xx, 12, 13; xxii, 26–31. Its sanctity was very distinctly marked in the gathering of the manna. Exod. xvi, 22–30.

3. The original law of the Sabbath was renewed and made a prominent part of the moral law, or ten commandments, given through Moses at Sinai. Exod. xx, 8–11...

[p. 171] 5. Jesus, after his resurrection, changed the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week; thus showing his authority as Lord even of the Sabbath, Matt. xii, 8; not to *abrogate* or *break it*, but to *preside over* and *modify*, or give new form to it, so as to have it commemorate his resurrection, when he ceased from his redeeming work as God did from his creation work. Heb. iv, 10.

When Jesus gave instructions for this change we are not told, but very likely during the time when he spake to his apostles of the things pertaining to his kingdom. Acts i, 3. This is probably one of the many unrecorded things which Jesus did. John xx, 30; xxi, 25.

1451. Sabbath, Change of, Not by Command of Christ SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 19, 20. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 19] The fact, however, that Christ until His death, and His Apostles at least for a time after Christ's Ascension, observed the Sabbath is evidence enough that our Lord Himself did not substitute the Lord's [p. 20] day for the Sabbath, during His lifetime on earth. Instead, as most agree, He simply gave His Church the power to determine the days to be set aside for the special worship of God... It is easy to surmise that this preference of Christ for the first day of the week greatly influenced the Apostles and the early Christians to keep that day holy, and eventually moved them to make a complete substitution of the Sabbath for the Sunday. There is no conclusive evidence, however, that the Apostles made this change of days by a definite decree.

1452. Sabbath, Change of—Not Change, but Abrogation, Says Alexander Campbell

SOURCE: Alexander Campbell, "Address to the Readers of *The Christian Baptist*, No. III," *The Christian Baptist*, 1 (Feb. 2, 1824), 44, 45, in reprint of 1848, 7 vols. in one. [FRS No. 88.]

[p. 44] Either the law remains in all its force, to the utmost extent of its literal requirements, or it is passed away with the Jewish ceremonies. If it yet exist, let us observe it according to law. And if it does not exist, let us abandon a mock observance of another day for it.

"But," say some, "it was *changed* from the seventh to the first day." Where? when? and by whom? No man can tell. No, it never was changed, nor could it be, unless creation was to be gone through again: for the reason assigned must be changed before the observance, or respect to the reason, can be changed!! It is all old wives' fables to talk of the change of the sabbath from the seventh to the first day. If it be changed, it was that

august personage changed it who changes times and laws *ex officio*—I think his name is DOCTOR ANTICHRIST....

[p. 45] The sabbath was, by the Lord of the sabbath, set aside, as well as every other part of the law of Moses.

1453. Sabbath, Change of, Not Determined by God

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 2. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

Some theologians have held that God likewise directly determined the Sunday as the day of worship in the New Law, that He Himself has explicitly substituted the Sunday for the Sabbath. But this theory is now entirely abandoned. It is now commonly held that God simply gave His Church the power to set aside whatever day or days, she would deem suitable as Holy Days. The Church chose Sunday, the first day of the week, and in the course of time added other days, as holy days.

1454. Sabbath, Change of, Not in Scriptures

SOURCE: George Sverdrup, "En ny Dag" ("A New Day"), in "Sondagen og dens Helligholdelse" ("Sunday and Its Observance"), reprinted from *Kvartal–Skrift* ("Quarterly Journal"), 4 (1878), 5 (1879), in his

Samlede Skrifter ("Collected Works"), ed. by Andreas Helland, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis: Frikirkens Boghandels Forlag, 1909), p. 342. Norwegian. Used by permission of Messenger Printing, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.

For, when there could not be produced one solitary place in the Holy Scriptures which testified that either the Lord Himself or the apostles had ordered such a transfer of the Sabbath to Sunday, then it was not easy to answer the question: Who has transferred the Sabbath, and who has had the right to do it?

1455. Sabbath, Change of, a Reversal of the 4th Commandment SOURCE: N. Summerbell, *History of the Christian Church* (3d ed.; Cincinnati: The Christian Pulpit, 1873), p. 415. [FRS No. 49.]

The Roman Church ... reversed the Fourth Commandment by doing away with the Sabbath of God's word, and instituting Sunday as a holiday.

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This work is not a general church history but a denominational history, dealing with the "Christian Church," (not to be confused with the "Campbellite" Disciples of Christ). This body was known earlier as the Christian Connection, later as the General Convention of the Christian Church, and was merged in 1931 with the Congregationalists. Later this combination, known as the Congregational Christian Churches, united with the Evangelical and Reformed Church to form the United Church of Christ (1957–1961).]

1456. Sabbath, Change of—Rome and Alexandria Lead in Abandoning Sabbath

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus (5th century), *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, p. 132. [FRS No. 118.]

For although almost all churches throughout the world celebrate the sacred mysteries [the Lord's Supper] on the sabbath ²² [Note 22: i.e. Saturday. Sunday is never called 'the Sabbath' by the ancient Fathers and historians...] of every week, yet the Christians of Alexandria and at Rome, on account of some ancient tradition, have ceased to do this. The Egyptians in the neighborhood of Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebaïs, hold their religious assemblies on the sabbath, but do not participate of the mysteries in the manner usual among Christians in general: for ... in the evening ... they partake of the mysteries. [See No. 1429.]

1457. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Celtic Church in England (Late 6th Century)

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 236, 237. Used by permission.

[p. 236] The monks sent to England [in 596] by Pope Gregory the [p. 237] Great soon came to see that the Celtic Church differed from theirs in many respects. Augustine himself [not the better-known Augustine, but a Benedictine abbot], having concluded an alliance between Ethelbert and the Roman See, held several conferences with the Christian Celts in order to accomplish the most difficult task of their subjugation to Roman authority. These differences were largely ritualistic and disciplinary. The Celtic Christians celebrated Easter according to the calculation of Sulpicius Severus, while the Romans had another mode of computing the proper day. The Celts appealed to St. John, the Romans to St. Peter. The Celtic Church might be called a monastic Church, since the abbot ruled over the bishop. The Celts shaved the front of the head from ear to ear as a tonsure, while the Romans shaved the top of the head leaving a "crown of thorns." The Celts permitted their priests to marry, the Romans forbade it. The Celts used a different mode of baptism from that of the Romans, namely, single instead of trine immersion. The calendar for all movable festivals was not the same. The Celts held their own councils and enacted their own laws, independent of Rome. The Celts used a Latin Bible unlike the Vulgate, and kept Saturday as a day of rest, with special religious services on Sunday.⁵ [Note 5: Bellesheim, Hist. of Cath. Ch. in Scot., Edinb., 1887–89, 4 vols., i., 86.1

1458. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Celtic Church in Ireland (Late 6th Century)

SOURCE: Alphons Bellesheim, *History of the Catholic Church in Scotland*, trans. by D. Oswald Hunter Blair, Vol. 1 (Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1887), pp. 86, 250.

[p. 86] On the following Saturday, the saint, leaning on his faithful attendant Diarmaid [or Diormit], went to bless the granary. "This day," said Columba, "in the Holy Scriptures is called the Sabbath, which means rest.¹ [Note 1: We seem to see here an

allusion to the custom, observed in the early monastic Church of Ireland, of keeping the day of rest on Saturday, or the Sabbath.]

[p. 250] The Celtic Church, as has already been pointed out, while observing the Lord's Day as a religious solemnity, appears to have followed the Jews in resting from labour on the Saturday.

[EDITORS' NOTE: If Columba kept the Sabbath, he also observed Sunday. The rest of his remark is quoted in No. 1460. This one statement of Columba is not complete proof of the general practice of the Celtic Church, but it may be taken as implying it, in view of the fact that the Sabbath was long observed as a day of worship, along with Sunday, in the Eastern Church, and there are some indications of a connection between the early Celtic Church of Ireland and the East. A school which, according to tradition, Patrick attended, was modeled after monasteries in Egypt. See De Lacy O'Leary, "The Egyptian Contribution to Christianity," in *The Legacy of Egypt*, ed. by S. R. K. Glanville (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), p. 325.]

1459. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Celtic Church in Scotland (Late 11th Century)

SOURCE: William F. Skene, Celtic Scotland (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1877), Vol. 2, pp. 348-350.

[p. 348] They [certain of the Scots] were wont also to neglect the due observance of the Lord's day, prosecuting their worldly labours on that as on other days, which she [Queen Margaret (c. 1070)] likewise showed, by both argument and authority, was unlawful. "Let us keep," she said, "the Lord's day in reverence, on account of the resurrection of our Lord from the dead on that day, and let us do no servile work on that day on which, as we know, we were redeemed from the slavery of the devil." ...

[p. 349] But in this latter instance they seem to have followed a custom of which we find traces in the early Monastic Church of Ireland, by which they held Saturday to be the Sabbath on which they rested from all their labours, and on Sunday on the Lord's day, they celebrated the resurrection by the service in church... [p. 350] There was no want of veneration for the Sunday, though they held that Saturday was properly the Sabbath on which they abstained from work. [See No. 1460.]

1460. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Celtic Church of Scotland (Late 11th Century)

SOURCE: T. Ratcliffe Barnett, *Margaret of Scotland, Queen and Saint* (London: Oliver and Boyd, 1926), pp. 89, 97, 98. Used by permission.

[p. 89] Queen [Margaret (c. 1070) presided] at an Ecclesiastical Council, the object of which was to convert the older Celtic churchmen to the stricter usage of Rome...

The Five Points of Difference ... were:

- (1) That the Celtic Church began the *Feast of Lent* not on Ash Wednesday, but on the Monday of the first week of Lent, thus fasting thirty-six days instead of forty days.
- (2) That the *Holy Sacrament* was not celebrated on *Easter Day*.
- (3) That in some districts *Mass* was celebrated with a ritual that was barbarous, and opposed to the custom of the whole Church.
- (4) That the Lord's Day was not reverenced because work was done on it.
- (5) That *marriage* was allowed within the forbidden degrees of affinity...

[p. 97] (4) The Celtic Church failed to reverence the Lord's Day, employing it for worldly business.—"Let us," said Margaret, "venerate the Lord's Day, because on it our Saviour rose from the dead." She also added to this a similar testimony from Pope Gregory who punished a certain man with severe rebuke because of earthly labour that he had done on the Lord's Day, and passed decree of excommunication for two months upon those by whose counsels he had done it. The Celts who were unable to oppose these arguments of the wise Queen, reverenced the Holy Day thereafter so that none either carried burdens on it or compelled others to do so.

In this matter the Scots had perhaps kept up the traditional usage of the ancient Irish Church which observed Saturday instead of Sunday as the Day of Rest. In his *Life of Columba*, Adamnan tells us that the Saint of Hy said to his servant Diormet, "This day in the Holy Scriptures is called the Sabbath, which means rest. And this day is indeed [p. 98] a Sabbath to me, for it is the last day of my present labouring life, and on it I rest after the fatigues of my labours. This night, at midnight, which commenceth the solemn Lord's Day, I shall, according to the sayings of Scriptures, go the way of our fathers."

From that passage it is plain that according to the old Columban Rule, what we now call Saturday was considered to be the Day of Rest before the Lord's Day, and in this way the uncanonical custom of working on the Sabbath [he means Sunday] and resting on the Saturday may have arisen in the Celtic Church. [See No. 1459.]

1461. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Christian-Jewish (?) Sect in Lombardy (12th Century)

SOURCE: [J. J.] Ign. v[on] Döllinger, ed., *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 1890), Vol. 2 (Latin source documents on the Waldenses and Cathari), p. 327.

(From the Cod. Ottobon. 136f., pergam)

The Passagii ... say ... that the Mosaic law is to be observed literally, and the Sabbath and circumcision and other legal observances ought still to have [their] place.

[EDITORS' NOTE: David Benedict (*General History of the Baptist Denomination* [Boston: Manning & Loring, 1813], Vol. 2, p. 414) believes that the charge of circumcision is "a slanderous story forged by their enemies," probably because, being Sabbatarians, the Passagii, or Passaginians, were derided as Jews, "and if they were Jews, it followed of course, that they either did or ought to circumcise their followers." However, the medieval sources cited indicate that they were, if not semi-Jewish, at least Arian. See J. L. von Mosheim, *Institutes of Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 3, century 12, part 2, chap. 5; Augustus Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 5th period, sec. 4. 2.]

1462. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Ethiopia (c. 1525) SOURCE: Francisco Alvarez, *Narrative of the Portuguese Embassy to Abyssinia* (1520–1527), trans. by Lord Stanley of Alderley (London: Printed for the Hakluyt Society, 1861), pp. 23, 34. [FRS No. 123.]

[p. 23] When this lesson [the one said at matins] is finished, on Saturdays, Sundays, and feast days, they make a procession with four or five crosses on their poles... They make this procession through the circuit, which is like a cloister. This being ended, on the said Saturdays, Sundays, and feasts, he who has to say mass enters with two others into the chancel; they bring out an effigy of Our Lady, which they have in ancient pictures in all churches...

[p. 34] There is a tomb in this monastery which they say is of an Abba or provincial of this monastery who is named Philip, and they give him the merits of a Saint, saying that there was a King Prester John who commanded that Saturday should not be observed in his kingdoms and lordships, and this Abba Philip went to that King Prester with his friars, and undertook to show how God had commanded that Saturday should be kept, and that whoever did not keep it should die by stoning, and that he would maintain this before all the fathers of Ethiopia: and he made it good before the King. Therefore they say that he was a Saint for making Saturday to be kept, and they treat him as a Saint, and they hold a feast for him every year, in the month of July, which they call *Castar* Philip, which means funeral or memorial of Philip.

1463. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Ethiopia (c. 1532) SOURCE: Zaga Zaba, An Account of the Habassin [Ethiopian] Religion, in Michael Geddes, The Church-History of Ethiopia (London: Chiswell, 1696), pp. 87, 88.

[p. 87] We do celebrate ... *the Sabbath*, ... because God, after he had finished the Creation of the World, rested thereon: Which Day, as God would have it called the *Holy of Holies*, so the not celebrating thereof with great honour and devotion, seems to be plainly contrary to God's [p. 88] Will and Precept, who will *suffer Heaven and Earth to pass away sooner than his Word;* and that especially, *since Christ came not to dissolve the Law, but to fulfil it.* It is not therefore in imitation of the *Jews*, but in obedience to Christ, and his holy Apostles, that we observe that Day... We do observe the *Lord's-Day* after the manner of all other Christians, in memory of *Christ's Resurrection*.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Ethiopians received the Eastern form of doctrine in the fourth century. The Sabbath had not then been discarded as the day of rest, though the Sunday festival was observed. In the seventh century the rise of the Saracen power cut Abyssinia off from the knowledge of the world. Gibbon says: "Encompassed on all sides by the enemies of their religion, the Aethiopians slept near a thousand years, forgetful of the world, by whom they were forgotten" (*Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. 47, par. 37). And when discovered by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century, they were found making the seventh day, as well as Sunday, a day of rest, not having known of its being set fully aside in the course of apostasy. Gibbon relates how the Jesuits never rested until they persuaded the Abyssinian king (A.D. 1604) to submit to the pope, and to prohibit Sabbath observance.]

1464. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Ethiopia (1622) SOURCE: Michael Russell, *Nubia and Abyssinia* (New York: Harper, 1837), pp. 227, 228. [FRS No. 82.]

[p. 227] In the work of Father Lobo, who made a voyage to Abyssinia in the year 1622, and served in that country under the celebrated Mendez, we have a brief account of the pious usages of the people. Incensed by their bigoted attachment to the customs of their ancestors, he denounces their religion as a mixture of Christianity with Jewish and Mohammedan superstitions. He admits, however, that they retain the belief of the principal mysteries of our faith; that they celebrate with a great deal of piety the sufferings and death of our Lord; reverence the cross; pay a profound devotion to the blessed Virgin, the angels, and the saints; observe the festivals, and pay a strict regard to Sunday. Every month they commemorate the Assumption of the Virgin Mary; and are of opinion that no Christians beside themselves have a true sense of the greatness of the mother of God, or render the honours which are due to her name. There are some tribes among them by whom the crime of swearing by her is punished with the forfeiture of goods, [p. 228] and even with the loss of life. Every week they keep a feast in honour of the apostles and angels; they come to mass with great devotion, and love to hear the Word of God; they receive the sacrament often, but do not always prepare themselves for it by confession. The severity of their fasts is equal to that of the primitive church; in Lent they never eat till after sunset; and their abstinence is the more rigid, because milk and butter are forbidden to them. No reason or plea of necessity can procure for them permission to eat flesh; and, as their country produces hardly any fish, they are compelled to exist on roots and pulse only.

There is no nation, he adds, where excommunication carries greater terrors than among the Abyssinians; a circumstance which gives the priests great power over them, as they frequently exert their spiritual authority for personal purposes not quite consistent with the utmost purity of motive. They have certain opinions peculiar to themselves about purgatory, the creation of souls, and some other mysteries. They repeat baptism, or the semblance of it, every year; retain the practice of circumcision; observe the Jewish Sabbath; abstain from eating all those animals which are forbidden by the Mosaical law; and brothers espouse the widows of their brothers, according to the precept of the same ancient institute.

1465. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday), in Ethiopia in 17th Century SOURCE: S. Giacomo Baratti, *The Late Travels of S. Giacomo Baratti*, trans. by G. D. (London: Benjamin Billingsley, 1670), pp. 135–137. [FRS No. 83.]

[p. 135] They [the Ethiopians] do believe whatsoever is in their Books called *Manda* and *Abetil*, as the Gospel it self; they do fancy that the Apostles and Disciples being assembled together at *Jerusalem*, did cause them to be written for the benefit of Christianity. In them are contained these precepts...

To meet together on the Lords day, and then to hear the Reading [p. 136] of the holy Writings of the Apostles and Prophets, which are to be expounded by some appointed for that purpose.

To meet also upon the Sabbath-day, and then to spend the time in prayer and holy duties, in which days it is not permitted to do any servile work. The *Saturday* they keep because God on that day had finished the great Work of the Creation of the world; The Lords-day is also set apart for Religious duties, because Christ on the first day of the week did rise from the dead.

Several other days of the year are kept holy, some are those that are observed in our Church, others are particular days appointed to continue the Memory of some great deliverances and particular favours which that Church and Empire have received.

[p. 137] They do believe that in their Festival days, and in the Sabbath and Lords-day, the souls of the damned are released from their torments until the Evening, but that they can never come out of that place of darkness.

1466. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Norway (1435)

SOURCE: *Diplomatarium Norvegicum*, ed. by C. R. Unger and H. J. Huitfeld, Vol. 7 (Christiania: P. T. Mallings, 1867), No. 397, p. 391. Norwegian.

Together with honorable lords and beloved brethren—the clergy of Nidaros, Oslo, Stavanger, Bergen and Hamar, who were summoned to a provincial council with us in Bergen—we fully agreed and resolved that in harmony with the laws of the holy church, observance of the Saturday must under no circumstance be allowed hereafter unless the church canon so decrees it. We therefore counsel all the friends of God, the Christians in Norway, those who will remain obedient to God's holy church, to refrain from this great evil habit of Saturday observance, as mentioned. But other obstinates, those who persist in this custom, we forbid under the severe penalty of the holy church to keep that day as a holy day from now on; but should there be any who for Godfearing reasons wish to do good on that day instead of on another, then he shall fast or contribute to his cathedral, cloister and honorable men by willingly giving alms from his [fishing] catch which he rightly has made on the Saturday, or from any other types of work.

1467. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Reformation Times in Sweden and Finland

SOURCE: Theodor Norlin, *Svenska Kyrkans Historia* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups, 1864), Vol. 1, pp. 357, 358. Swedish.

[p. 357] We find traces of these Jewish doctrines throughout practically the whole of Sweden of the day, from Finland through northern Sweden, Dalarne, Westmanland and Nerike down to Westergötland and Småland. Already King Gustaf I [1523–1560] had

been obliged to issue a special letter against the delusion current among the laity of Finland 'that because of the hard years the Jews were to keep Saturday holy.' [Footnote: Reg. for December 5, 1554.] The King mentions in this letter that some of the common people would not work on Saturday, but would "keep (it) and behave like Jews under the law of Moses in the Old Testament." They also assert that they through vari- [p. 358] ous dreams and visions were moved to such worship. The letter is really a short theological treatise from the hand of the old king against said delusion.

[EDITORS' NOTE: It is not stated whether these Sabbathkeepers observed Sunday also, but it seems likely, since they were censured for keeping the seventh day, not for refusing to keep the first.]

1468. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Sweden, 16th Cent. SOURCE: L[ars] A[nton] Anjou, *The History of the Reformation in Sweden*, trans. by Henry M. Mason (New York: General Protestant Episcopal Sunday School Union and Church Book Society, 1859), p. 425.

In 1541, there was issued a strict prohibition against the superstitious observance of the Sabbath, or Saturday, which was pertinaciously kept by numbers of people. This prohibition, however, must regard some other than the delusion which, in 1544, was current among some of the inhabitants of Finland, who believed that the hard year and dear times were a punishment from God, because they did not keep Saturday holy, according to the law of Moses, and therefore undertook, according to the Old Testament, to celebrate it as a day of rest. The occasion and extent of this delusion are not known to us. We know it only from a letter of king Gustavus, in which he endeavors to enlighten the deluded, and by admonitions and threats to bring them to reason [see No. 1467].

1469. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday?), in Waldensian Group—Some, Sabbath, Others Sunday

SOURCE: [J. J.] Ign. v[on] Döllinger, ed., *Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters* (Munich: Beck, 1890), Vol. 2 (Latin source documents on the Waldenses and Cathari), p. 662.(Cod. Viennens. Cat. 967, "Summary of the impious and Pharisaical religion of the Picards.")

They [the Picards, or Waldensian Brethren] do not celebrate the feasts of the divine Virgin Mary and of the Apostles; some [observe] only the Lord's day. Some indeed celebrate the Sabbath with the Jews.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Picards, representing a fusion of certain old-line Waldensian elements with the Hussites in Bohemia and Moravia, were called also Waldensian Brethren or simply Waldensians (see Döllinger, pp. 635, 663). Today a prevalent misconception limits the name Waldenses to a people still living in the Italian Alps. These Waldensians are merely the modern remnant of a medieval movement that once included evangelical dissenters of many names in many parts of Europe. It is true that there are records of Sunday observance, but no known record of Sabbathkeeping, among the north Italian Waldenses, whose descendants we know today, yet this source document furnishes contemporary proof that *some* of the Waldenses (cf. GC 577) observed the Sabbath.]

1470. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday)—Zinzendorf and the Moravians

SOURCE: Ludwig von Zinzendorf, "Zurückgelassenes Eventual-Testament an die Gemeine," in his

Theologische und dahin einschlagende Bedencken, part 4, chap. xxi, p. 183. (Büdingen: Johann Christoph Stöhr, 1742.) German.

The days that we observe are Sunday, as the Lord's resurrection day; the Sabbath or the real rest day of the Lord on which we observe days of assembly and the Lord's supper; the important feasts of the ancient church, on which we are reminded of the Lord's special grace, our own days of joy and commemoration. It is known how they are observed among us. On Sundays I admonish the brethren to continue in a state of constant wakefulness before the Lord.

1471. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday)—Zinzendorf and the Moravians in Pennsylvania

SOURCE: August Gottlieb Spangenberg, *The Life of Nicholas Lewis Count Zinzendorf*, trans. by Samuel Jackson (London: Samuel Holdsworth, 1838), p. 302.

He [Zinzendorf] also resolved, with the church at Bethlehem [Pennsylvania], to keep the seventh day as a day of rest.

[EDITORS' NOTE: That he observed Sunday also is clear from other writings. See No. 1472.]

1472. Sabbath Observance (With Sunday)—Zinzendorf's Practice SOURCE: Felix Bovet, *The Banished Count; or, The Life of Nicholas Louis Zinzendorf,* trans. by John Gill (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1865), pp. 223, 224.

[p. 223] It was a habit with Zinzendorf to set apart the Saturday as a day of rest and prayer,—not out of conformity to the Mosaic law, but because of the blessing that God pronounced on that day when He had completed the work of creation. [p. 224] While, however, he was careful to let it be understood that he considered all persons free to do as they saw fit in this matter, he observed the Lord's day in common with the Christian Church at large. But though he thus kept two Sabbaths instead of one, this was not enough to satisfy the rigid notions peculiar to American puritanism; and one Sunday evening, when he was engaged with his daughter in composing some hymns, the justice of the peace made his appearance, and ordered them, in the King's name, to cease writing. The next day they were summoned to answer for their crime, and were fined six shillings each for *profaning the Sabbath*.

1473. Sabbath, So-called, in Babylonia, Not Weekly Sabbath, But Day of Evil Omen

SOURCE: T. G. Pinches, "Sabbath (Babylonian)," in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 10, pp. 889, 890. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[p. 889] Notwithstanding that the Sabbath, as we know it, may be a specifically Hebrew institution, there is every probability that it had its origin in Babylonia. In that country, however, it was not the rest-day ending the seven-day week, owing to the Creator having rested from His work on that day (Gn 2^2), but was due to the festival of the full moon on the 15th [p. 890] day of the month, when the earth's satellite 'rested' for a while at the height of his brilliancy...

S'a-bat and *šapattu*, its derivative were not applied to the seventh day [of the continuous week] by the Babylonians, but another word was used which they evidently considered more appropriate, namely \hat{u} -hul-gallum, from the Sumerian \hat{u} -hul-gala, which they translated by $\hat{u}mu$ limnu, 'evil day.' This was the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th days of every month, so that, as the Babylonian months had 29 or 30 days each, every month consisted of three weeks of seven days each, and one of nine or ten days, according to the length of the month. Two reasons may be suggested for the adoption of this seven-day period: (1) the seven (divine) planetary bodies, and (2) the fact that the period of a lunation may be divided, roughly, into four sections of seven days each.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This so-called "Babylonian sabbath" was not a sabbath at all. The similarity between the Babylonian word for the "rest" of the moon and the Hebrew word for the weekly rest day does not make the full-moon day a sabbath, and the series of unlucky days on the 7th, 14th, etc., did not constitute

weeks (uniform 7-day cycles). Yet this is the basis for the theory that the sabbath originated with the Babylonians.]

1474. Sabbath, So-called, in Buddhist Lands, Not Same as the Seventhday Sabbath

SOURCE: Hutton Webster, "Sabbath (Primitive)," in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 10, p. 885. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

In Buddhist lands the *Uposatha*, which usually falls on the day of the new moon, on the day of the full moon, and on the two days which are eighth from new and full moon,

is marked by fasting and the cessation of secular activities. The *Uposatha* in its origin among the Aryans of ancient India could have owed nothing to Jewish or Christian influence, and in its diffusion throughout S.E. Asia it appears to have been unaffected by the influence of Islam.

1475. Sabbaths, Ceremonial, Referred to in Col. 2:16, Not the Weekly Day of Rest

SOURCE: Albert Barnes, Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistles of Paul to the Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians (New York: Harper, 1851), pp. 306, 307, on Col. 2:16.

[p. 306] Or of the Sabbath days. Gr., 'of the Sabbaths.' The word Sabbath in the Old Testament is applied not only to the seventh day, but to all the days of holy rest that were observed by the Hebrews, and particularly to the beginning and close of their great festivals. There is, doubtless, reference to those days in this place, as the word is used in the plural number, and the apostle does not refer particularly to *the* Sabbath properly so called. There is no evidence from this passage that he would teach that there was no obligation to observe *any* holy time, for there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to teach that one of [p. 307] the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number—'THE Sabbath,' it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to teach that that commandment had ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number, and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not to the moral law, or the ten commandments. No part of the moral law—no one of the ten commandments could be spoken of as 'a shadow of good things to come.' These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation.

1476. Sacraments, Canons on the

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VII (March 3, 1547), Decree on the Sacraments, canons 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 119–122.

[p. 119] CANON I.—If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord; or, that they are more, or less, than seven, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony; or even that any one of these seven is not truly and properly a sacrament: let him be anathema...

[p. 120] CANON IV.—If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law are not necessary unto salvation, but superfluous; and that, without them, or without the desire

thereof, men obtain of God, through faith alone, the grace of justification;—though all are not indeed necessary for every individual: let him be anathema...

CANON VI.—If any one saith, that the sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify; or, that they do not confer that grace on those who do not place an obstacle thereunto: as though they were merely outward signs of grace or justice received through faith, and certain marks of the Chris- [p. 121] tian profession, whereby believers are distinguished amongst men from unbelievers: let him be anathema...

CANON VIII.—If any one saith, that by the said sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred through the act performed, but that faith alone in the divine promise suffices for the obtaining of grace: let him be anathema.

CANON IX.—If any one saith, that, in the three sacraments, to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, and Order, there is not imprinted in the soul a character, that is, a certain spiritual and indelible sign, on account of which they can not be repeated: let him be anathema...

CANON XI.—If any one saith, that, in ministers, when they effect, and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does: let him be anathema.

CANON XII.—If any one saith, [p. 122] that a minister, being in mortal sin,—if so be that he observe all the essentials which belong to the effecting, or conferring of, the sacrament,—neither effects, nor confers the sacrament: let him be anathema.

1477. Sacraments, Catholic Definition of Nature of SOURCE: Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), p. 143. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

No one can doubt that the Sacraments are among the means of attaining righteousness and salvation. But of the many definitions, each of them sufficiently appropriate, which may serve to explain the nature of a Sacrament, there is none more comprehensive, none more perspicuous, than the definition given by St. Augustine and adopted by all scholastic writers. *A Sacrament*, he says, *is a sign of a sacred thing;* or, as it has been expressed in other words of the same import: *A Sacrament is a visible sign of an invisible* grace, instituted for our justification.

1478. Sacraments, Number of, in the Catholic Church

SOURCE: Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 152, 153. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 152] The Sacraments of the Catholic Church are seven in number, as is proved from Scripture, from the tradition handed down to us from the Fathers, and from the authority of Councils. Why they are neither more nor less in number may be shown, at least [p. 153] with some probability, from the analogy that exists between the natural and the spiritual life. In order to exist, to preserve existence, and to contribute to his own and to the public good, seven things seem necessary to man: to be born, to grow, to be nurtured, to be cured when sick, when weak to be strengthened; as far as regards the public welfare, to have magistrates invested with authority to govern, and to perpetuate himself and his species by legitimate offspring. Now, since it is quite clear that all these things are sufficiently analogous to that life by which the soul lives to God, we discover in them a reason to account for the number of the Sacraments.

First comes Baptism, which is the gate, as it were, to all the other Sacraments, and by which we are born again unto Christ. The next is Confirmation, by which we grow up and are strengthened in the grace of God; for, as St. Augustine observes, *to the Apostles who*

had already received Baptism, the Redeemer said: "Stay you in the city till you be endued with power from on high." The third is the Eucharist, that true bread from heaven which nourishes and sustains our souls to eternal life, according to these words of the Saviour: *My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.* The fourth is Penance, through which lost health is recovered after we have been wounded by sin. Next is Extreme Unction, which obliterates the remains of sin and invigorates the powers of the soul; for speaking of this Sacrament St. James says: *If he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.* Then follows Holy Orders, by which power is given to exercise perpetually in the Church the public administration of the Sacraments and to perform all the sacred functions. The last is Matrimony, instituted to the end that, by means of the legitimate and holy union of man and woman, children may be procreated and religiously educated for the service of God, and for the preservation of the human race.

1479. Sacrifice, Continual, and the Mass

SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), pp. 158–161.

[p. 158] What is this "taking away of the continual sacrifice"?

It was taken away in type at the destruction of Jerusalem. The sacrifice of the Temple. that is, of the lamb, morning and evening, in the Temple of God, was entirely abolished with the destruction of the Temple itself. Now the Prophet Malachias says: "From the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation." This passage of the prophet has been interpreted by the Fathers of the Church, beginning with St. Irenaeus, St. Justin Martyr, and I know not how many besides, to be the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, the true Paschal Lamb, which came in the place of the type-namely, the sacrifice of Jesus Himself on Calvary, renewed perpetually and continued for ever in the sacrifice on the altar. Now has that continual sacrifice been taken away? That which was typical of it in old days has been already taken away. But has the reality been taken away? The Holy Fathers who have written upon the subject of Antichrist, and have interpreted these prophecies of Daniel, say that about the end of the world, during the reign of Antichrist, the public offer- [p. 159] ing of the Holy Sacrifice for a little time will cease. Has there ever come to pass any thing which may be called an instalment or a forerunner of such an event as this? Look into the East. The Mahometan superstition, which arose in Arabia, and swept over Palestine and Asia Minor, the region of the Seven Churches, and Egypt, the north of Africa—the home of St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, St. Optatus—and finally penetrated into Constantinople, where soon it became dominant, has in every place persecuted and suppressed the worship and sacrifice of Jesus Christ... Now let us look into the Western world: has the continual sacrifice been taken away in any other land?-for instance, in all those churches of Protestant Germany which were once [p. 160] Catholic, where the holy sacrifice of the Mass was daily offered? throughout Norway, and Sweden, and Denmark, and one half of Switzerland, where there are a multitude of ancient Catholic churches? throughout England, in the cathedrals and the parish churches of this land, which were built simply as shrines of Jesus incarnate in the holy eucharist, as sanctuaries raised for the offering of the holy sacrifice? What is the characteristic mark of the Reformation, but the rejection of the Mass, and all that belongs to it, as declared in the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England to be blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits? The suppression of the continual sacrifice is, above all, the mark and characteristic of the Protestant Reformation... This prophecy of Daniel has

already its fulfilment both in the East and West,—in the two wings, as it were; while in the heart of Christendom the Holy Sacrifice is offered still. What is the great flood of infidelity, revolution, and anarchy, which is now sapping the foundations of Christian society, not only in France, [p. 161] but in Italy, and encompassing Rome, the centre and sanctuary of the Catholic Church, but the abomination which desolates the sanctuary, and takes away the continual sacrifice?

1480. Sacrifice, Daily, Time of Offering of

SOURCE: Mishnah Pesahim 5.1, trans. in The Babylonian Talmud, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.;

London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), Pesahim 58a, p. 287. Used by permission.

The [afternoon] *tamid*¹ [Note 1: The daily burnt-offering: one was brought every morning and another every afternoon. Num. XXVIII, 4.] is slaughtered at eight and a half hours ² [Note 2: The day being counted from sunrise to sunset, i.e., about six a.m. to six p.m.] and is offered at nine and a half hours.³ [Note 3: The sacrificial ceremonies took an hour.] On the eve of Passover it is slaughtered at seven and a half hours and offered at eight and a half hours, whether it is a weekday or the Sabbath. If the eve of Passover fell on Sabbath eve [Friday], it is slaughtered at six and a half hours and offered at seven and a half hours, and the Passover offering after it.

1481. Saints, and Images, Decrees of Trent Concerning SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXV (Dec. 3 and 4, 1563), On the Invocation of Saints, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 167–169. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 167] The holy synod enjoins on all bishops and others who sustain the office and charge of teaching that, agreeably to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and agreeably to the consent of the holy Fathers, and to the decrees of sacred councils, they especially instruct the faithful diligently concerning the intercession and invocation of saints; the honour (paid) to relics; and the legitimate use of images; teaching them that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid and help for obtaining benefits from God, through His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, Who is our alone Redeemer and Saviour... [p. 168] Also that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ, which bodies were the living members of Christ and the temple of the Holy Ghost, and which are by Him to be raised unto eternal life and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful, through which (bodies) many benefits are bestowed by God on men...

[p. 169] Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints are to be had and to be retained particularly in temples, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped; or that anything is to be asked of them; or that trust is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which those images represent; in such wise that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head, and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ; and we venerate the saints whose similitude they bear; as, by the decrees of councils, and especially the second Synod of Nicaea, has been defined against the opponents of images.

1482. Saints, Crossroads Shrines of, Replaced Those of Pagan Gods SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 21, 22.

[p. 21] There were innumerable shrines in their honor [to the Lares compitales, the spirits of the crossroads] throughout the rural districts. Moreover, especially from the time of Augustus, many sanctuaries had been erected to them at street corners in Rome and other cities. Of the popularity of this worship of crossroads spirits there is adequate evidence, and of its survival substantial indications are found in the attacks [p. 22] made by mediaeval writers on the custom of offering sacrifices and lighting candles at crossroads. Nor can it be doubted that the common practice in Italy and other countries of erecting chapels to saints at crossroads goes back ultimately to the pagan worship of the Lares compitales. Apparently the earlier churchmen found that it was impossible to divert the people from their crossroads superstitions, and so they adopted a plan that they used on many other occasions. They tacitly recognized the sanctity of the site, but by substituting Christian saints for pagan spirits they succeeded in giving the religious aspirations of the devotees a new direction. Of the strength of the belief in the efficacy of these wayside shrines, we have evidence in an incident of the epidemic of cholera in Naples in 1884. The people attributed the scourge to the walling up of many of the niches that had been used as street shrines. So vehement was their protest that the old niches were reopened and many new ones added.

1483. Saints, Veneration of—Catholic Explanation

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), p. 38.

Veneration of Saints.

196. Why is it pleasing God to honor the saints?

It is pleasing God to honor the saints because they are in Heaven with God, and are His special friends.

God Himself sanctified the saints—and now honors them in Heaven.

197. Which is the best manner of honoring the saints?

The beast manner of honoring the saints is

- 1) to implore their intercession,
- 2) to imitate their examples,
- 3) to honor their relics and pictures.
 - Patrons saints, patrons of the church and of sodalities.

Relics = means of the body (bones) or of anything pertaining to the saints, e. g. clothing, instruments of martyrdom. The most precious relic is a particle (small piece) of the Holy Cross.—Feasts of saints.

- 198. Why do we honor the images of Christ and of the saints? We honor the images of Christ and of the saints
- 1) because they remind us of Christ and of the saints,
- 2) because whilst looking at them we can pray with greater devotion.

A good child honors the pictures of its parents, brothers and sisters. In every Christian home, there ought to be, at least, a crucifix, an image of the Blessed Virgin, or of the Holy Family.

Crucifix = a Cross with an image of the Lord on it.

1484. Saints, Veneration of—Effects During Rise of Such a Worship

SOURCE: Henry Hallam, *History of Europe During the Middle Ages*, Vol. 3 (rev. ed.; New York: Colonial Press, 1899), pp. 31, 32.

[p. 31] That the exclusive worship of saints, under the guidance of an artful though illiterate priesthood, degraded the understanding and begot a stupid credulity and fanaticism, is sufficiently evident. But it was also so managed as to loosen the bonds of religion and pervert the standard of morality...

[p. 32] This monstrous superstition grew to its height in the twelfth century.

1485. Saints, Veneration of—Miracles, Relics, and Deified Heroes SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 119–121.

[p. 119] One phase of this cult of deified mortals has a very clear tradition, namely, the veneration of relics. Definite evidence of its existence among the Greeks is furnished by the oracle that emanated from Delphi that the Athenians should bring the bones of the hero Theseus to Athens. In Italy the bones of Virgil attained sanctity, and as the centuries passed they were regarded more and more as a guaranty of safety to the city of Naples where they were deposited...

[p. 120] Reports of miracles wrought by human beings were common among the ancient Romans and were accepted by the great mass of the people without question. The Emperor Vespasian was believed to have the power of healing; Apollonius of Tyana was credited with miracles; and many other examples might be cited. How prevalent the belief was in the second century is indicated by Lucian's ridicule of it.

Roman society, therefore, at the time when Christianity emerged, was wholly familiar with the ideas of a man-god, the sacrosanct quality of relics, and the frequent occurrence of miracles. The Christians adapted themselves to the pagan attitude. They matched the miracle-workers of the pagans with wonder-working Saints; and with their success the number of miracles increased. The sanctity of relics, well-established as it had been among the pagans, acquired far greater vogue in Christian times and was given a degree of emphasis that it had never had before. The idea showed extension also in the division of the remains of a Saint and in the efficacy attached even to the smallest relic. Moreover, we find the term Divus which [p. 121] had acquired its special connotation through the deification of emperors applied to Christian Saints. Examples are Divus Ianurius (S. Gennaro), Divus Iosephus (S. Giuseppe), and Diva Agatha (S. Agatha). And at the end of this world's long history is its faded application in modern times to actresses and operasingers.

Like the deified heroes and emperors of pagan times the Saints were honored with altars, sacred edifices, incense, lights, hymns, ex-voto offerings, festivals with illuminations and high hilarity, prayers and invocations. They became intermediate divinities with intercessional and tutelary powers.

That St. Paul and Jesus himself would have regarded many of these beliefs and practices as wholly foreign to the spirit of Christianity is certain. Some of the early Christians themselves protested against the cult of the Saints: for example, Vigilantius and Faustus in the fifth century. But on the other side were such great apologists as Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Basil, who though claiming that God alone was worshipped, expressed full belief in the efficacy of the intercession of the Saints.

1486. Saints, Veneration of—Popular Continuation of Pagan Worship SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 9–12.

[p. 9] There have been many discussions of the relation of the doctrine of the veneration of Saints to various phases of Roman religion, ranging from the notably

temperate treatment of Lucius to the more positive statements [p. 10] of Renan and Harnack and the uncompromising assertions of Trede, "P. Saintyves" and Salomon Reinach. Renan for example says that any peasant who prays to a particular saint for a cure for his horse or ox or drops a coin into the box of a miraculous chapel is in that act pagan. He is responding to the prompting of a religious feeling that is older than Christianity and so deepset that Christianity has not been able to root it out. Harnack sees in the veneration of Saints nothing but a recrudescence of pagan polytheism.

The term "veneration of Saints" has been used advisedly. For in any fair discussion of this subject it should be remembered that the Church has never taught the worship of Saints. Every enlightened churchman knows this, but whether the peasants of southern Italy and other parts of Europe distinguish with any degree of precision between veneration and worship is another question. It is not likely that they do, and for those who are looking for evidence of the continuance of the creative [p. 11] power of Roman religion, the beliefs of the illiterate are of as much importance as the formulated doctrines of the Church. Our subject is not survivals of paganism in the modern Church but survivals in modern times.

A good example of the closeness of the resemblance of the specialization of function of different Saints to that of pagan spirits is found in the published lists of Saints used by Spanish peasants... Here are some of the examples furnished by the Spanish index: San Serapio should be appealed to in case of stomach-ache; Santa Polonia for tooth-ache; San José, San Juan Bautista and Santa Catalina for headache; San Bernardo and San Cirilo for indigestion; San Luis for cholera; San Francisco for colic; San Ignacio and Santa Lutgarda for childbirth; Santa Balsania for scrofula; San Felix for ulcers; Santa Agueda for nursing mothers; San Babilas for burns; San Gorge for an infected cut; Santa Quiteria for dog's bite; [p. 12] San Ciriaco for diseases of the ear; Santa Lucia for the eyes; Santa Bibiana for epilepsy; San Gregorio for frost-bite; San Pantaleon for haermorrhoids; San Roque for the plague; Santa Dorothea for rheumatism; San Pedro for fever; and Santa Rita for the impossible!

1487. Saints, Veneration of—Popular Departmental Deities in

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 3, 5–9. [p. 3] The earliest Roman religion of which we have any record was a system of pandemonism. There was a spirit—a demon it was often called—in every object, every act, every process and sometimes in every stage of a process...

[p. 5] But the evidence of this particularistic character of Roman religion is not confined to these lists of obscure spirits. The gods of the Roman pantheon in general even the greatest of them—showed, in their origin at least, a high degree of specialization. In some cases the original function of the divinity expanded in different directions but in others the early specialization maintained its old limits. Janus was the god of the door, Vesta of the hearth, Faunus of the forest, Pales of pasture land, Fons of springs, Volturnus of running streams, Saturn of sowing, Ceres of growth, Flora of blossom, Pomona of fruit, and Consus of harvest. Even the great god Jupiter, manifold as his powers subsequently became, was at first only the spirit of the bright sky...

[p. 6] The stories of miraculous cures in temples told in his *Sermones sacri* by the rhetorician Aristides who [p. 7] lived in the time of Marcus Aurelius attest the widespread belief in manifold agencies of supernatural assistance. The vogue of the Neo-

platonic philosophy in the third century after Christ resulted in a renewal of belief in the existence of great numbers of subordinate and intermediate spirits...

[p. 8] And it is in the doctrine of the veneration of Saints that the polytheism of the old departmental deities survives. It may be that the founders of Christianity found that the belief of the people—especially the illiterate class—in these specialized spirits of minor grade was one of their greatest problems. They recognized the people's predilection for spirits that would help in specific situations, and they realized also that the masses felt more at home with beings who, while of divine nature or associations, were not too far removed from the human level. They were keenly interested in winning the pagans to the faith and they succeeded. But undoubtedly one element in their success was the inclusion in their system of the doctrine of the veneration of Saints. They seem to [p. 9] have felt that in order to make any headway at all, it was necessary for them to match the swarms of spirits available for the pagans with a multitude of wonder-working saints and martyrs.

1488. Saints, Veneration of—Processions

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 13-15.

[p. 13] The similarity in attitude of mind of pagan and Christian devotees and the survival of the polytheistic idea in modern times may be seen in a comparison of the behavior of the people who watched the procession which preceded the circus games in ancient Rome and that of the crowd which fills the streets of Naples today on the occasion of the festival held in May in honor of San Gennaro, the patron saint of the city. In the old Roman procession a conspicuous place was given to the images of the gods that were borne along in floats; and as they were carried past, pious Romans called upon the names of those whom they regarded as their special protectors. So too at the Naples festival. In the procession referred to the images of many Saints each of them with his own place in the affections of the Neapolitan [p. 14] proletariat, are carried from the Cathedral to the Church of Santa Chiara. Saints of all centuries are there, some of whom attained the dignity hundreds of years ago, while others are more recent creations. As the procession moves along, persons in the crowd call out the name of their patron Saint, and when the image of San Biagio-a sort of Christian Aesculapius with special powers in diseases of the throat—passes by, the Neapolitan mothers hold up their croupy bambini and implore a remedy.

But it is not only in southern Europe that the ancient particularism of divine function still survives. For example in Prussia St. Goar is the patron of potters, St. Crispin of shoemakers; St. Nicholas of boatmen; St. Apollonia cures toothache; St. Laurence rheumatism; and St. Agatha is guardian of the household fire. In the region of the Vosges St. Catharine helps women find husbands, St. Sabina cures the pangs of love, while St. Abdon is believed to drive away fleas. This special- [p. 15] ization of the Saints is clearly recognized in the *Diario Romano* where St. Blaise, St. Liberius and St. Martha are

assigned curative powers in the case of sore throat, gallstone, and epidemics respectively.

1489. Saints, Veneration of, Replaced Worship of the Dead SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 82–84.

[p. 82] The pagan festivals of the dead seem to have been among those that showed persistence in survival. There are indications that they were celebrated even under Christian emperors...

But even after the pagan festivals ceased to be celebrated, the belief that the spirits of the dead could and, if properly approached, would give aid and protection to the living survived. The fathers of the Church saw that this was one of those inherent beliefs to which the people would cling with that unvielding pertinacity that manifests itself in the case of hereditary ideas. They compromised, shifting from the cult of the spirits of ancestors to the veneration of persons whose virtues, sufferings, or miraculous deeds justified their being regarded as intermediaries between God and man. [p. 83] In other words the Saints succeeded to the worship of the dead just as they succeeded to the cult of the departmental deities and to the "little gods" of the Roman household... While the Church never gave the Saints a higher place than that of intermediaries and intercessors whose aid might prove efficacious in gaining the favor of God, the masses of the population made no such fine distinctions, and confusing means and end came to regard the Saints themselves as present helps in trouble and addressed their prayers directly to them. They were more interested in their power to help them in their troubles than in their virtuous lives or harrowing deaths. Prior to the Reformation the efforts to check this tendency toward polytheism took the form of ecclesiastical legislation but this proved ineffectual.

Apart from the general doctrine of the veneration of Saints, there are some specific festivals of the modern Church that go back directly to pagan customs connected with the [p. 84] dead. One of these is All Saints' Day, now celebrated on the first of November but till the time of Pope Gregory III observed on the thirteenth of May, which was one of the days of the Roman festival of the dead, the Lemuria. Whether there is any connection between these dates or not, the rites of All Saints' Day are a survival not of the Lemuria but of the Parentalia. For in the modern festival the faithful visit the tombs of the Saints, venerate their relics, and pray for their blessing. The next day also, the second of November, All Souls' Day, unquestionably reproduces some of the features of the Parentalia. People go in great numbers to the cemeteries and deck the graves of the members of their family with flowers and candles, and the mass, which takes the place of the ancient sacrifice, is directed to the repose of the souls of the departed.

1490. Saints, Veneration of—Saints Replaced Pagan Gods SOURCE: Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. by Neil Buchanan, Vol. 4 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898), p. 308.

As a residuum of the idea that all Christians were "saints", and that the Church possessed apostles, prophets, and spiritual teachers, the conviction had remained that there had been a Heroic Age, and that those who had then won a name for themselves were "saints". They were added to the Patriarchs and Old Testament Prophets, and they continued to receive successors in the martyrs and great ascetics. The most cultured theologians had already set up theories of the power of these heroes to intercede with God, and of their special relation to Christ. The anniversaries of the birth or death of the saints were celebrated, and thus they offered themselves in the most natural way to take the place of the dethroned gods and their festivals. They fell into line with the angelic powers, and were held to be more trustworthy than the latter. Among them Mary came to the front, and the course of the development of dogma specially favoured her, and her alone. A woman, a mother, made her appearance in proximity to the deity; and thus at last it became possible to include in Christianity—homage paid to sex … in a female form.

1491. Saints, Veneration of, Survival From Paganism

SOURCE: Ernest Renan, *Lectures on the Influence ... of Rome, on Christianity* (The Hibbert Lectures, 1880), trans. by Charles Beard (4th ed.; London: Williams and Norgate, 1898), p. 32.

All pagan cults were essentially superstitious. The peasant of our day, who drops a coin into the box of a miraculous chapel, who asks the aid of a particular saint for his oxen or his horses, who drinks a certain water to cure a special disease, is, in so far, pagan. Almost all our superstitions are the remains of a religion anterior to Christianity, and which Christianity has not been able entirely to root out.

1492. Salvation Army

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1562, 1563.

[p. 1562] *History*. This movement attributes its origin to a great missionary impulse that surged in the heart of its founder, William Booth. He, an ordained minister of the Methodist New Connection Body in England, had long felt a deep concern for that vast section of the population of British cities which was quite beyond the pale of existing church activities. It was in the year 1865 that a memorable excursion was made by him into the streets where this forgotten mass of mankind lived and resorted. What he there saw and heard moved him profoundly. He returned to his home and solemnly told his devoted wife, Catherine, that he had found his destiny. The recital of that experience stirred within her similar emotions and mutually they gave themselves to the service of seeking the lost.

The East London Mission resulted. Commencing with street meetings and then going to a tent it was found that many were amenable to this kind of effort and interest. Moral miracles were wrought as the gross darkness was penetrated.

At the inception there was no thought of creating a separate organization. It was expected that the work would be regarded as supplementary to, and associated with, existing churches. This proved, however, to be impracticable. The nature of the work and the status of its clientele compelled distinctive organization. The success and development of the mission was such that its aid was invoked for other parts of London and at large centers of population throughout Great Britain. These many mission stations were all under the guidance of Rev. William Booth, who by common consent was made the "general superintendent." Expanding thus, the name had to be changed and "The Christian Mission" became descriptive. Mr. Booth being a Methodist, it was perfectly natural that the government of this string of missions should take that form. Conference met annually, but in the interim it was often found that decisions had to be given that brooked no delay. The general superintendent was thus often compelled to make decisions in advance of the conference meetings.

It was in the year 1878 that Mr. Booth, when preparing his report for conference, in company with his assistant and his secretary, was noting the distinctive military methods which had gradually developed by the very force of circumstances that the following phrase was used: "The Christian Mission is a volunteer army." Exception was taken to the qualifying word and William Booth took his pen, and, leaning over his secretary's shoulder, erased "volunteer" and wrote in "salvation." The report went to the conference and was acclaimed as giving a splendidly fitting descriptive to a movement that was devoted to unrelenting war upon the forces of evil. The mission which had become to a considerable extent an army in fact was henceforth to be so known in name. Its "missionaries" were to be "captains" and its general superintendent "general."

While much progress had been made up to this time, yet the change in name and tactics was the signal for exceptional advance. The innovation caught the imagination of a great part of the people. The "Christian Mission Magazine" (monthly) became "The War Cry" (weekly) and "members" became "soldiers."

Under this impulse the organization crossed the seas and the United States was the first country outside the British Isles to be "invaded." By a similar process Canada, Australia, and other lands were occupied. Some 95 different countries and colonies are now knowing the beneficent work of this movement.

Doctrine. In doctrine the Salvation Army is strictly "fundamental." Its people believe in a Holy God, a Holy Bible, and a holy people. Holiness of life is probably the most insistent claim it makes upon its people. It believes that basic to all effective service is a right life.

In its interpretation of Biblical truths it is Arminian rather than Calvinistic. The love of God is as wide as the world. The atoning sacrifice is as universal as is the need.

In regard to the forms and sacraments of religion, such as the Lord's Supper, baptism, and other rites, the position occupied is neutral. The sacraments that save are spiritual.

The soldiery all subscribe to a simple statement of faith in which each definitely affirms himself as willingly surrendered to God and that he will do his utmost to [p. 1563] persuade others to do likewise. Every Salvation soldier is a pledged nonuser of intoxicating drinks and all harmful drugs. This statement is known as the "Articles of War."

Organization. As implied by its name, the government of the Salvation Army is of a military character...

The unit of the organized Salvation Army is the corps. Sometimes there are several in one large city. To join these corps one becomes a recruit (conversion of course is basic) and upon signing "Articles" he or she is "sworn in." If officership is desired, the soldier becomes a candidate, and a rigid examination follows, covering spiritual, mental, educational, and physical fitness for such a career...

Every rank is open to every cadet who enters the training college. Fitness, merit, and time service are factors having to do with promotion. Being militaristic, it is necessarily autocratic in its control, yet the whole is shot through with the paternalistic idea, for fundamentally it is a service of love and anything violative of this basic principle would be entirely out of place. The originating spirit that gave birth to the movement must ever remain its vitalizing force. To nurture and to safeguard this all are in a holy conspiracy.

The international headquarters are in London. For administrative purposes there are many territorial headquarters in various parts of the world... Each of these headquarters houses, officially, the commander of the respective territory and the departmental chiefs. [EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 253,061 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257).]

EDITORS NOTE. Membership (1939), 235,001 (TAC, 1901, p. 2.

1493. Sargon, "Unknown" Until Excavations

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, Archeology and the Old Testament, p. 16. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

Similar to the case of Belshazzar in Daniel 5 is what used to be an enigmatic reference to a certain "Sargon the king of Assyria" in Isaiah 20:1. Previous to the advent of modern archeology with its remarkable recovery of the civilization of ancient Babylonia-Assyria from its grave in the mounds of Mesopotamian cities, the name of Sargon did not occur in any source except in this sole passage in Isaiah. As a result the Biblical reference was commonly dismissed as completely worthless historically.

The discovery of Sargon's palace at Khorsabad (Dur-Sharrukin or Sargonsburg) in 1843 by Paul Emile Botta and further explorations of the site in more recent years by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, have changed the whole picture.

1494. Scapegoat—Meaning of the Term "Azazel"

SOURCE: W. Volck, "Azazel," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 1, p. 389. Copyright 1908 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

AZAZEL a-zê'zel or a-zā'zel (Heb. 'aza'zel): The word translated "scapegoat" in the A.V., found only in Lev. xvi, in the legislation concerning the Day of Atonement, where the high priest is directed to take two goats as sin-offering for the people, to choose by lot one of them "for Yahweh" and the other "for Azazel" (ver. 8), and to send the latter forth into the wilderness (ver. 10, 21–22 ...). The meaning of the word has occasioned much discussion. Starting from the fact that "for Yahweh" and "for Azazel" stand in opposition (ver. 8), many think that it is the name of a being opposed to Yahweh—a desert-monster, a demon, or directly Satan. Such as attempt an etymological interpretation then explain it as characterizing the demon or Satan as removed or apostatized from God, or a being repelled by men (*averruncus*), or one which does things apart and in secret (from *azal*, "to go away"). Others conceive of Azazel, not as a proper name, but as an appellative noun and modified reduplicated form of a root '*azal*, "to remove, retire," signifying *longe*

remotus or porro abiens. The sense of verses 8, 10, and 26, then, is that the goat is designated by the lot as an azazel, i.e., something which is to go far away, and is sent into the wilderness as such; and the idea is expressed symbolically that with the sending away of the goat, sin has also been removed from the people for whom atonement has been made, and they regard themselves as freed and released from their sins. The contrast between "for Yahweh" and "for Azazel," however, in ver. 8 favors the interpretation of Azazel as a proper noun, and a reference to Satan suggests itself. It has been urged that nowhere else in the Pentateuch is Satan mentioned, and that afterward, when the idea of Satan comes out more fully in the consciousness of the Old Testament congregation, the name Azazel is not found. But it may be that Azazel-whatever its meaning may bewas the name of an old heathen idol or of one belonging to Semitic mythology and thought of as the evil principle, which older Judaism made the head of the demons as later Judaism used the name of the Philistine Baal Zebub. A definite explanation, satisfactory to all, can hardly be looked for. The name of Azazel, like Belial and Beelzebub, is transferred from the Old Testament language into the Book of Enoch as designation of a power of evil.

1495. Science, Illustrates Spiritual Realm

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 24–27. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 24] Because Science has made such enormous strides and can explain to our satisfaction so much of the physical world, and thus offers intelligent explanations of what was previously sheer mystery, we are inclined to forget that Science at its apparently most omniscient is only dealing with one particular stratum or aspect of Truth...

[p. 25] In this modern age, which treats as commonplace that which our grandparents would have thought miraculous, we ought to be able to grasp numerous analogies to help

us understand how several media or dimensions can coexist. Let us select one very obvious but useful example from our common modern life. As I write these words I am aware of various things through my physical senses. As it happens, at the moment these are chiefly the light and warmth of sunshine, the beauty of trees in full leaf, the varied songs of birds and the distant sound of children at play. I am also mentally aware of the truth I am trying to express, and of you, my imaginary reader, following the line of thought I am trying to make clear. Doubtless as you read you are taking in similar sense impressions, as well as having your thoughts guided by the complicated system of marks made upon paper which we call printing. But simultaneously, in the immediate world of you the reader and me the writer, there are radio programs of various kinds actually in our rooms with us. The "ether" (for that is the name given to this all-pervasive but intangible medium) is continually pulsing and vibrating, strongly or feebly, with perhaps a hundred or more near or distant radio transmissions. In common parlance we frequently say that a certain program is "on the air"; but that, of course, is quite inaccurate. Radio transmissions are not vibrations in the air. They would function just as well if there were no air at all, and they make their way, as we all know, with very little hindrance through such things as timber, stone, and concrete. It is only when they meet conductors or partial conductors of electricity that these [p. 26] inaudible, invisible vibrations become minute electric currents, and even then they are undetectable except by that commonplace but quite complicated piece of circuitry known as a radio set. In your body, as in my body, there are at this very moment minute electrical currents of which we are quite unaware. They are, in fact, an untuned jumble of electrical vibrations representing the assorted offerings of many radio transmissions. Now we are unaware of this and normally we take no notice of it. It is only when we want to hear a particular radio program that we tune in a certain band of these etheric vibrations and by means of the radio set turn them back into audible sound. For even if we disapprove of radio, even if we refuse to believe in its all-pervasive presence, it makes not the slightest difference to the *fact*. Whether we like it or not, or whether we believe it or not, we are permeated by this mysterious "ether," and that is a fact which can easily be demonstrated. Before the advent of radio less than a century ago, such an idea would have seemed in the highest degree improbable and even impossible. We know today that it is true; that simultaneously with our ordinary-world sense impressions there coexists a world of mysterious "ether" of which we only become aware when certain apparatus is used.

Now, this seems to me a most helpful, if simple, analogy. Suppose it is possible that the whole material world and the whole psychological world are interpenetrated by what we may call the "spiritual." For some reason or other we are inclined to think of the physical world and even the demonstrable world of the "ether" as somehow real, while the "spiritual" is regarded as unreal and imaginary. I believe the opposite to be true. As Paul foresaw long ago, "The things which are seen are temporal; but the things [p. 27] which are not seen are eternal." Suppose what we are seeing and measuring and observing are the outward expressions in the time and space setup of what is really eternal and spiritual! If we make such a supposition we are in for a revolution in our whole way of thinking...

To sense the reality of the God-dimension, to conform to its purpose and order, to perceive its working in and through the visible world system, is, speaking broadly, what the Bible calls faith.

1496. Science, Impotent to Solve Basic Social Problems

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 104–107. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 104] I am sure that it would do us all a power of good if we would take time off and use our imaginations to see what is really happening on this earth from the point of view of Heaven. We might see how pathetically ready man is to be fascinated by what we might call the technical marvels of the age, how thrilled he is with the so-called electronic "brain," with the breaking of speed records, by the possibility of an artificial satellite and such-like achievements. Yet if we [p. 105] were observing life from the true point of view, we should see how infinitely more important it is to recognize what is really going on in the world of human beings than to goggle at any number of physical marvels. We should see, how few, how tragically few, are even trying to find out what the Creator's Plan might be for this world, and how even fewer are prepared to cooperate with it. From the angels' point of view what enormous waste of energy, courage, talent, and personality there must be in many of Man's highly lauded projects! The angels might well ask themselves, "Why does he want to go so fast, to climb so high, to dive so deep, and to complicate his life with so many inventions while he leaves the heart of the matter untouched?" For since Man has been promised a share in the timeless life of God, how blind and earthbound he must appear as he spends his best ingenuities, his highest intellects, and the bulk of his resources upon what is merely ephemeral!...

[p. 106] If we will train ourselves to see life steadily from the true point of view, we cannot help seeing how very slowly it dawns upon modern man that his real problems, his real conflicts, can never be resolved on the physical plane. A man may travel far faster than sound, but that does not help him in the least to deal with the problem of his own marriage, which is fast breaking up. He may successfully launch an artificial satellite, but that does nothing to solve the squalid conditions in which his fellow men have to live only a few streets away. He may invent and produce commercially 3-D television for every home, but he has not made the slightest contribution toward solving the problems that arise in home, industry, and nation—the selfishness, cruelty, and greed, the fears, resentments, and suspicions that poison our common life. Perhaps the time is not too distant when the bankruptcy of scientific achievement to solve human problems will become in- [p. 107] creasingly obvious. Perhaps Man will then return, not indeed to rediscover any old-fashioned "hell-fire" religion, but to seek realistically that quality of living which transforms personality, and which we may fairly call New Testament Christianity.

1497. Second Advent — Ancient Term for "Coming" (Parusia) Amplified

SOURCE: Adolf Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East*, trans. by Lionel R. M. Strachan (rev. ed.; London: Hodder and Stoughton, [1927]), pp. 368, 369. Used by permission of the publisher and Harper & Brothers, New York.

[p. 368] Yet another of the central ideas of the oldest Christian worship receives light from the new texts, viz. $\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\sigma\sigma\alpha$, "advent, coming." ... The parusia of the sovereign must have been something well known even to the people, as shown by the facts that special payments in kind and taxes to defray the cost of the parusia were exacted, that in Greece a new era was reckoned from the parusia of the Emperor Hadrian, that all over the world advent-coins were struck after a parusia of the emperor, and that we are even able to quote examples of advent-sacrifices. The subject of parusia dues and taxes in Egypt has been [p. 369] treated in detail by Wilcken. The oldest passage he mentions is in the Flinders Petric Papyrus II.39e, of the 3rd cent. B.C., where, according to his ingenius interpretation, contributions are noted for a crown of gold to be presented to the king at his parusia. [Cites *Griechische Ostraka*, I. p. 274ff., 296.] This papyrus supplies an exceptionally fine background of contrast to the figurative language of St. Paul, in which *Parusia* (or *Epiphany*, "appearing") and *crown*

[cites *Griechische*, I.309] occur in collocation. While the sovereigns of this world expect at their parusia a costly crown for themselves, "at the parusia of our Lord Jesus" the apostle will wear a crown—the "crown of glory" (1 Thess. ii.19) won by his work among the churches, or the "crown of righteousness" which the Lord will give to him and to all them that have loved His appearing (2 Tim. iv.8).

1498. Second Advent, at Heart of Redemptive Truth SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 5, 6. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 5] At the heart of Biblical redemptive truth is the Blessed Hope of the personal, glorious second advent of Jesus Christ. Salvation has to do both with the redemption of men as individuals and as a society. Salvation of individual believers includes the "redemption of the body" (Rom. 8:23). We must not only be saved from the guilt of sin, and delivered from the power of sin. Redemption is not completed until we are delivered from the very effects of sin in our mortal bodies. The Biblical doctrine of the resurrection is a redemptive truth: it means the salvation of the body. This salvation will be realized only by the personal second coming of Christ...

[p. 6] The second coming of Jesus Christ is an absolutely indispensable doctrine in the Biblical teaching of redemption. Apart from His glorious return, God's work will forever be incomplete. At the center of redemption past is Christ on the cross; at the center of redemption future is Christ returning in glory.

1499. Second Advent, Catholic Indifference to

SOURCE: Judith N. Shklar, *After Utopia*, pp. 179, 180. Copyright © 1957 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 179] The revival of apocalyptic expectations among the orthodox is particularly startling since it is not sanctioned by tradition. The Catholic Church has long repudiated the hope of an early second coming which the early Christians cherished, for these expectations threw doubt upon the doctrine that Christ founded the church [that is, as the kingdom of God on earth]. Again Bossuet's belief in a slow evolu- [p. 180] tion of God's design in history postpones its fulfillment indefinitely. In any case, the historical despair of the present does not even resemble the milleniarism of the past, for it is derived from the deductions of social theology and from political analysis.

1500. Second Advent—Child Preachers in Sweden—Description of Phenomena and Messages

- SOURCE: Einiges über die rufenden Stimmen oder die sogenannte Predigtkrankheit in Småland in den Jahren 1842 und 1843, von einem Augenzeugen. Aus dem Schwedischen ("Something Concerning the Calling Voices or the So-called Preaching-Sickness in Småland in the Years 1842 and 1843, by an Eyewitness") (Leipzig: Leopold Michelsen, 1843), pages as indicated below.
- [a. Physical Phenomena Accompanying the Preaching]

[p. 36] As far as outward circumstances were concerned, the genuine voices lie in a state of insensibility for half an hour, at times a whole hour, before the drive to cry out

opens the mouth. What happens to them as soon as they fall asleep is a remarkable sight—how the convulsive movements begin in the tips of the fingers and feet and proceed through the limbs to the chest, which comes into motion, and eventually rise to the mouth. Some lie still, pale as a corpse, completely motionless, except that the chest is moving before the cry begins, a circumstance true of all. Respiration is not observable, although, without doubt they breathe. The voices know nothing of what goes on while the unconsciousness and the convulsive movements continue.

[b. General Tenor of Teachings]

[p. 27] Brandy they call wine of wrath, and describe the drinking of brandy in terrible pictures and warn against partaking of the Lord's supper unworthily. Dancing parties they designate as damnable for Christians. They condemn hypocrisy and repeatedly insert calls to sincere and earnest repentance, adding that the time is short, and urging the people to test themselves by the standard of the ten commandments.

The voices say that they are by no means preachers, but they are sent by the Saviour to give the call to repentance; that no one, including the angels know when the final judgment will come; that those who set the time are false voices, as are those who speak solely of clothing, gold and silver, complexion and pearls; that the beggar in his rags can as easily go to hell as the one clothed in silk reasonably can go to heaven; that the people should rend their hearts and not their garments, and should permit Jesus to come into their hearts; then of itself would vanish outward splendour.

[c. Claim Fulfillment of Joel's Prophecy]

[p. 38] The voices believe that the prophecy of the prophet Joel (the second chapter), "The Lord will pour out his Spirit upon all flesh," continues, and that therefore God's holy Spirit must not have ceased to express Himself in wonderful ways, because He had revealed Himself already in a wonderful way to the apostles and disciples at the feast of Pentecost. They themselves call attention to the fact that it is not mentioned in Acts that at that time also "sons and daughters, servants and handmaids" received the Holy Spirit. The voices believe that Joel's prophecy reaches to the end of the world.

[d. Reported Message of a Two-Year-Old Child]

[p. 20] But she had nothing further to say except, "Behold, how the heaven is streaming! Oh! heaven is so beautiful." She repeated this for a quarter of an hour, then awakened perfectly fresh.

[e. Reported Message of a Four-Year-Old Girl]

[p. 18] The beginning is always, "In the name of the Father and of the Son, and in the name of the Holy Spirit." She says, "God in Heaven open the hearts of all sinners for this hour. Dear souls! Have you read the Bible of your heart? Repent, the time is short. Dear souls, go to Golgatha; there lie our wedding garments. No one can come to the great supper without wedding garments. When Jesus prepares his table, the devil prepares his also; but his table must stand in the background; Jesus' stands in the foreground. Dear souls, do not go to the table in the back, but press forward where you can find Jesus. Dear souls, believe on Jesus. It is of no value [p. 19] to seek God with locked hearts. If you do not believe the Bible, you will not believe our calls. If Jesus did not tell me what to cry out, what would I have to say? Tell me that!

[f. Reported Message of a Twenty-one-Year Old Servant Girl]

[p. 23] Dear Pilgrims! what kind of companions do you have in this short time? Here earnestness in the matter is what counts. A half conversion is thoroughly worthless. Here

prayer upon prayer, cry upon cry on the name of Jesus is what counts. We are surely living in the third woe.

[g. Warning of False Voices Among the Genuine]

[p. 27] They say that there must be false voices among the true, that weeds have always grown among the wheat, and must grow till the harvest; that, however, the weeds had taken over, and that is why the Lord had sent the voices, and that it did not depend upon them what they wished to speak.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The author identifies himself simply as a man who was prompted by a love for truth and who aimed to share some of the reports concerning the calling voices of Smaland, or the so-called preaching-sickness, after he had sought information at the source, partly through the personal testimonies of the calling ones and other reliable persons, and partly from painstaking research before, during, and after listening to their speeches, which were accompanied by peculiar phenomena.]

1501. Second Advent, Crown of Glory Awarded at (Calvin on) SOURCE: John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, bk. 3, chap. 25, sec. 6, trans. by John Allen (7th American ed., rev.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), Vol. 2, p. 253.

Scriptures uniformly commands us to look forward with eager expectation to the coming of Christ, and defers the crown of glory which awaits us till that period.

1502. Second Advent, Crowning Event of Redemption

SOURCE: A. J. Gordon, Ecce Venit: Behold He Cometh (New York: Revell, 1889), pp. 2, 3.

[p. 2] The second coming of Christ is the crowning event of redemption; and the belief of it constitutes the crowning article of an evangelical creed. For we hold that the excellence of faith is according to the proportion of the Lord's redemptive work which that faith embraces. Some accept merely the earthly life of Christ, knowing Him only after the flesh; and the religion of such is rarely more than a cold, external morality. Others receive His vicarious death and resurrection, but seem not to have strength as yet to follow Him into the heavens; such may be able to rejoice in their justification without knowing much of walking in the glorified life of Christ. Blessed are they who, believing all that has gone before,—life, death, and resurrection,—can joyfully add this confession also: "*We have a great High Priest who is passed through the heavens;*" [p. 3] and thrice blessed they who can join to this confession still another: "*From whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ.*" For it is the essential part of our Redeemer's priesthood that, having entered in, to make intercession for His people, He shall again come forth to bless them.

1503. Second Advent, Doctrine of, Emphasized by Religious Leaders of the Past

SOURCE: John McNicol, "The Hope of the Church," in *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*, Vol. 6 (Chicago: Testimony Publishing Company, [1910]), pp. 126, 127.

[p. 126] The great leaders who have left their impress on the history of the Church did not discard this doctrine, but made it a real hope in their own lives. Martin Luther, in the midst of the throes of the Reformation, wrote, "I ardently hope that, amidst these internal dissensions on the earth, Jesus Christ will hasten the day of his coming." The acute and learned Calvin saw that this was the Church's true hope. "We must hunger after Christ," he said, "till the dawning of that great day when our Lord will fully manifest the glory of his kingdom. The whole family of the faithful will keep in view that day." ... [p. 127] John Wesley believed this same truth, as is shown by his comment on the closing verses of Revelation: "The spirit of adoption in the bride in the heart of every true believer says, with earnest desire and expectation, 'Come and accomplish all the words of this prophecy." It formed the burden of Milton's sublime supplication: "Come forth out of Thy royal chambers, O Prince of all the kings of the earth; put on the visible robes of Thy imperial majesty; take up that unlimited scepter which Thy Almighty Father hath bequeathed Thee. For now the voice of Thy bride calls Thee, and all creatures sigh to be renewed." ... And if we would follow in the steps of these men, we will return to the simple, unmistakable New Testament type of experience, and, with faces uplifted towards the veil, within which the Lord of glory waits, and with hearts all aglow with a personal love for Him, we will carry on through all our life and service the same apostolic prayer.

1504. Second Advent, Doctrine of, Taught in Creeds (Apostles' Creed) SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 45.

He ascended into heaven; and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

1505. Second Advent, Doctrine of, Taught in Creeds (Athanasian Creed) SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 69.

39. He [Christ] ... sitteth on the right hand of the Father God [God the Father] Almighty.

40. From whence [thence] he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. [EDITORS' NOTE: Brackets in translation.]

1506. Second Advent, Doctrine of, Taught in Creeds (Nicene Creed) SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, p. 29. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

1507. Second Advent, Hope of, in Early Church

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *The Christian Outlook*, p. 189. Copyright 1948 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

To many of the early disciples, perhaps to the overwhelming majority, the early return of their Lord was an inspiring hope. That return would mean the victory of Christ. Right would prevail and God's will would be fully done. Of that they had no doubt. A new heaven and a new earth would appear in which righteousness would dwell. But had any one suggested that this would come by slow stages and without the sudden irruption of divine judgment they would have looked at him in puzzled incomprehension. The gradual evolution of a perfect order would have been to them an entirely alien idea.

1508. Second Advent, Hope of the Christian Today SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 51–53. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 51] The Christian who is spiritually linked to the timeless life of God, and who is, not by courtesy title but in reality, a son of God, cannot escape a certain painful tension throughout his earthly life. He is only a temporary resident here; his home, his treasure, the final fulfillment of his hope do not lie in this transitory life at all. He must resist the temptation to withdraw from this benighted, sin-infected world and spend all his spare time in pietistic reflection of the world to which he is bound. He must hold fast to the belief that God is active and contemporary, working wherever He is given opportunity, in the present passing scene. "My Father is busy up to this very moment," said Christ, "and so am I." The servant is in the same position as his Master. He too must be busy as his Father is busy. His love and concern must be to some degree a reflection of the God Who "so loved the world" that He would go to any length to rescue and redeem it. But if the world rejects the truth, if the world willfully refuses to follow the revealed pattern of living, the Christian need not for one moment think that the Faith to which he is

committed has failed, even if to the very end of what we call time upon this planet those who own allegiance to the Unseen King remain a small minority. This does not disprove the truth and validity of the Christian Faith... It would indeed be difficult to find any evidence in the New Testament that the end of this earthly experiment that we call life is the world-wide acceptance of Christ and [p. 52] the universal establishment of His Kingdom. Many excellent Christians seem to regard this as the ultimate goal of Christian teaching, preaching, worshiping, and witnessing. Yet as far as I can discover, apart from cheery hymns usually sung in optimistic periods between world wars, this rosy view belongs entirely to isolated texts of Scripture. One is, "For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." I for one am rather doubtful whether that is meant to be a prophecy of the universal acceptance of Christ. Another comes from that strange book in which John is told in one of his visions that "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever." But this prophecy, if studied in its context, is a prophecy not of universal acceptance but of universal judgment. Truth has finally judged error, and that this is no popular event is shown in verse 18 when we read that "the nations were angry."

It is impossible without being dishonest to dismiss the question of New Testament hope without mentioning the Second Coming of Christ... The hope may have become deferred in its fulfillment, but it is still a very real hope. New Testament Christians may well have modified their early views as to the imme- [p. 53] diacy of Christ's return, yet the fact of His coming again in judgment of the world is always implicit in their thinking and hoping. We need to remember that among the early Christians were quite a number who were actually present when the Son of God ascended back to Heaven—a symbolic action, of course, but historically true. Such men would not readily forget the words of the heavenly messenger who told them quite plainly that "this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

1509. Second Advent, Koran on

SOURCE: Koran, Sura xliii. 61–64, in *The Holy Qur-an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 2, p. 1337. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D. C.

And (Jesus) shall be 4662 61. A sign (for the coming Of) the Hour (of Judgment): Therefore have no doubt About the (Hour), but Follow ye Me: this Is a Straight Way. Let not the Evil One 62. Hinder you: for he is To you an enemy avowed. 63. When Jesus came With Clear Signs, he said: "Now have I come To you with Wisdom,⁴⁶⁶³

And in order to make Clear to you some Of the (points) on which Ye dispute: therefore fear God And obey me. 64. "For God, He is my Lord

And your Lord."

[Note 4662:] This is understood to refer to the second coming of Jesus in the Last Days just before the Resurrection, when he will destroy the false doctrines that pass under his name, and prepare the way for the

universal acceptance of Islam, the Gospel of Unity and Peace, the Straight Way of the Qur-an.

[Note 4663:] True wisdom consists in understanding the unity of the Divine purpose and the Unity of the Divine Personality. The man Jesus came to reconcile the jarring sects in Israel, and his true teaching was just the same as that which was expounded in a wider form by Islam.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The notes express the views of the translator and form no part of the Koran itself.] **1510. Second Advent,** Nearness of, Luther on

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, trans. and ed. by William Hazlitt (London: George Bell and Sons, 1902), pp. 7, 8, 90. [See FRS No. 44.]

[p. 7] I hope the last day will not be long delayed. The darkness grows thicker around us, and godly servants of the Most High become rarer and more rare. Impiety and licentiousness are rampant throughout the world, [p. 8] and we live like pigs, like wild beasts, devoid of all reason. But a voice will soon be heard thundering forth: *Behold, the bridegroom cometh*. God will not be able to bear this wicked world much longer, but will come, with the dreadful day, and chastise the scorners of his word...

[p. 90] The prophets spoke and preached of the second coming of Christ as we do now; we know that the last day will come yet we know not what and how it will be after this life, but only in general, that we, who are true Christians, shall have everlasting joy, peace, and salvation. The prophets held likewise, that soon after the coming of Christ, the last day would appear. First, they named the day of the Messiah the last day. Secondly, they set the signs of the first and second coming both together, as if they would happen at one time.

1511. Second Advent, Nearness of, Luther's Belief in

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Luther's Church Postil Gospels*, ed. by John Nicholas Lenker (Minneapolis, Minn.: Lutherans in all Lands Co., 1905), pp. 62, 63. [FRS No. 46.]

[p. 62] These words [Luke 17:24, 26–30] abundantly show that people will rest so secure and will be so deeply buried beneath the cares of this life, that they will not believe the day is at hand.

4. There is now no doubt that Christ did not foretell these signs in the expectation that no one would note nor recognize them when they should appear; although few indeed will do so, just as in the days of Noah and Lot but few knew the punishment in store for them. Were this not true, the admonition of Christ would have been in vain: "When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh." Then, "Lift up your heads, because your redemption draweth nigh." There must then be some, at least, who do recognize the signs, and lift up their heads and wait for their redemption, although they do not really know on what day that will come. We should be careful, therefore, to note whether the signs are being fulfilled now, or have been or will be in the future.

5. I do not wish to force any one to believe as I do; neither will I permit anyone to deny me the right to believe that the last day is near at hand. These words and signs of Christ compel me to believe that such is the case. For the history of the centuries that have passed since the birth of Christ nowhere reveals conditions like those of the present. There has never been such building and planting in the world. [p. 63] There has never been such gluttonous and varied eating and drinking as now. Wearing apparel has reached its limit in costliness. Who has ever heard of such commerce as now encircles the earth? There have arisen all kinds of art and sculpture, embroidery and engraving, the like of which has not been seen during the whole Christian era.

6. In addition men are so delving into the mysteries of things that today a boy of twenty knows more than twenty doctors formerly knew. There is such a knowledge of languages and all manner of wisdom that it must be confessed, the world has reached such great heights in the things that pertain to the body, or as Christ calls them, "cares of life," eating, drinking, building, planting, buying, selling, marrying and giving in marriage, that every one must see and say either ruin or a change must come. It is hard to see how a change can come. Day after day dawns and the same conditions remain. There was never such keenness, understanding and judgment among Christians in bodily and temporal things as now—I forbear to speak of the new inventions, printing, fire-arms, and other implements of war.

7. But not only have such great strides been made in the world of commerce, but also in the spiritual field have there been great changes. Error, sin, and falsehood have never held sway in the world as in these last centuries. The Gospel has been openly condemned at Constance, and the false teachings of the Pope have been adopted as law though he practiced the greatest extortion. Daily mass is celebrated many hundred thousand times in the world, and thereby the greatest sin committed. By confession, sacrament, indulgence, rules and laws, so many souls are driven to condemnation that it seems God has given the whole world over to the devil. In short it is not possible that there should be greater falsehood, more heinous error, more dreadful blindness, and more obdurate blasphemy than have ruled in the church through the bishops, cloisters, and universities. As a result Aristotle, a blind heathen, teaches and rules Christians more than does Christ.

1512. Second Advent, Nearness of, Luther's Estimates of the Time *a. In 300 Years*

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther*, trans. by Henry Bell (a new ed., rev. by Joseph Kerby; London: Baldwin, Craddock, and Joy, 1818), pp. 7, 8.

[p. 7] I hope the last Day of Judgment is not far, I persuade myself verily it will not be absent full three hundred years longer; for God's Word [p. 8] will decrease and be darkened for want of true shepherds and servants of God. The voice will sound and be heard ere long: Behold, the Bridegroom cometh. God neither will nor can suffer this wicked world much longer, but must strike in with the dreadful day, and punish the contemning of his Word, and so will quite beat out the barrel's head.

b. In 100 Years at Most

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, trans. and ed. by William Hazlitt (London: George Bell and Sons, 1902), p. 325.

The world cannot stand long, perhaps a hundred years at the outside.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Luther is quoted also as mentioning (in 1536) a hundred years as the maximum interval he expected before the end. He said, "In the Revelation we have come to the white horse. The

world cannot stand long; if God will, not over one hundred years. The Lord deliver us from evil, Amen"

(Tischreden, chap. 51, sec. 4, in his Sämmtliche Schriften, Walch, ed., vol. 22, col. 1334).]

c. In Luther's Day

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther*, trans. by Henry Bell (a new ed., rev. by Joseph Kerby; London: Baldwin, Craddock, and Joy, 1818), pp. 407.

Ah, loving God come once; I wait continually for that day... The name of the Lord be praised, who hath taught us to sigh and yearn after that day... I hope, truly, that day is not far off.

[EDITORS' NOTE: According to the *Tischreden* in his *Sämmtliche Schriften* (Walch ed.), vol. 22, col. 1331, Luther is quoted as saying: "I hope that day is not far off and we shall still see it." Again, Luther is reported to have expected the end in a very few years: When Melanchthon remarked that the Emperor (according to astrology) would live until 1548, Luther argued from Ezekiel that the world would not last that long. This incident is not included in the traditional *Table Talk*, but in the more recently published source material from which the *Table Talk* was compiled (*Conversations with Luther*, ed. by Preserved Smith and Herbert Percival Gallinger [New York: Pilgrim Press, 1915], p. 229).]

1513. Second Advent, Nearness of, Widely Taught in Early 19th Century

SOURCE: Mourant Brock, *Glorification* (American ed.; Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1847), p. 135, note. It is not merely in Great Britain that the expectation of the near return of the

Redeemer is entertained, and the voice of warning raised, but also in America, India, and on the continent of Europe. I was lately told by one of our German missionaries that in Wirtemburgh [*sic*] there is a Christian colony of several hundreds, one of the chief features of which is the looking for the Second Advent. And a Christian minister from near the shores of the Caspian Sea has told me, that there is the same daily expectation among his nation. They constantly speak of it as "the day of consolation." In a little publication, entitled "The Millennium," the writer says that he understands in America about 300 ministers of the Word are thus preaching "the Gospel of the kingdom;" whilst in this country, he adds, about 700 of the Church of England are raising the same cry.

1514. Second Advent — No Opportunity to Choose Sides Then SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *The Case of Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 55, 56. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 55] Another possible objection is this: Why is God landing in this enemy-occupied world in disguise and starting a sort of secret society to undermine the devil? Why isn't he landing in force, invading it? Is it that He isn't strong enough? Well, Christians think He's going to land in force; we don't know when. But we can guess why He's delaying. He wants to give us the chance of joining His side freely. I don't suppose you and I would think much of a Frenchman who waited till the Allies were marching into Berlin and then announced he was on our side. God will invade. But I wonder whether people who ask God to interfere openly and directly in our world quite realise what it will be like when [p. 56] He does. When that happens, it's the end of the world. When the author walks on to the stage the play's over. God's going to invade, all right: but what's the good of saying you're on His side *then*, when you see the whole natural universe melting away like a dream and something else-something it never entered your head to conceive—comes crashing in; something so beautiful to some of us and so terrible to others that none of us will have any choice left? For this time it will be God without disguise; something so overwhelming that it will strike either irresistible love or irresistible horror into every creature. It will be too late then to choose your side. There's

no good saying you choose to lie down when it has become impossible to stand up. That won't be the time for choosing: it will be the time when we discover which side we really have chosen, whether we realised it before or not. *Now* is our chance to choose the right side. God is holding back to give us that chance. It won't last for ever. We must take it or leave it.

1515. Second Advent, No Probation After (Belgic Confession)

SOURCE: W. J. Grier, *The Momentous Event* (Belfast: The Evangelical Book Shop, 1945), p. 25. Used by permission.

The "Belgic Confession," which was widely adopted in Holland, Belgium, and Germany, guards the statement respecting the second advent of Christ by teaching that the time of its occurrence is unknown to all created beings, and that it will not take place *until the number of the elect is complete*. This guards against one of the worst features of the common pre-millenarian scheme [see No. 1073n], namely, that there will be people saved *after* Christ comes.

1516. Second Advent, Not at Death, but Future

SOURCE: D. L. Moody, The Second Coming of Christ (rev. ed.; Chicago: Revell, 1877), pp. 10, 11.

[p. 10] "Therefore be ye also ready, for in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh." Some people say that means death; but the Word of God does not say it means death. Death is our enemy, but our Lord hath the keys of Death; He has conquered death, hell and the grave... Christ is the Prince of Life; there is [p. 11] no death where He is; death flees at His coming; dead bodies sprang to life when He touched them or spoke to them. His coming is not death; He is the resurrection and the life; when He sets up His kingdom there is to be no death, but life forevermore.

1517. Second Advent—Personal and Visible (Luther on)

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Luther's Church Postil Gospels*, ed. by John Nicholas Lenker, (Minneapolis, Minn.: Lutherans in all Lands Co., 1905), pp. 74, 75. [FRS No. 46.]

[p. 74] "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory."

36. Here power may again signify the hosts of angels, saints, and all creatures that will come with Christ to judgment (I believe this is the correct interpretation); or it may mean the special power and might which will characterize this coming of Christ in contradistinction to his first coming. He says not only that he will come, but that they shall see him come. At his birth he came also, but men did not recognize him. He comes now through the Gospel in a spiritual manner, into the hearts of believers. This is also is not by observation. But his last coming will be such that all must see him as Rev. 1, 7 says, "And every eye shall see him." And they shall see that he is none other than the man Christ Jesus, in bodily form, as he was born of the virgin Mary and walked upon this earth.

He might have said they shall see me, but that would not have clearly indicated his bodily form. But when he says: "They shall see the Son of man," he clearly indicates that it will be a bodily coming, a bodily seeing in bodily form: a com- [p. 75] ing in great power and glory, accompanied by the hosts of heaven. He shall sit upon the clouds and be accompanied by all the saints. The Scriptures speak much of that day and everywhere point to the same. This, then, is said concerning the signs. The Saviour adds words of comfort for Christians in the presence of these signs.

1518. Second Advent, a Precious Doctrine (Moody) SOURCE: D. L. Moody, *The Second Coming of Christ* (rev. ed.; Chicago: Revell, 1877), pp. 6, 7. [p. 6] To my mind this precious doctrine—for such I must call it—of the return of the Lord to this earth is taught in the New Testament as clearly as any other doctrine in it; yet I was in the Church fifteen or sixteen years before I ever heard a sermon on it. There is hardly any church that doesn't make a great deal of baptism, but in all of Paul's epistles I believe baptism is only spoken of thirteen times, while it speaks about the return of our Lord fifty times; and yet the Church has had very little to say about it. Now, I can see a reason for this; the devil does not want us to see this truth, for nothing would wake up the Church so much. The moment a man takes hold of the truth that Jesus Christ is coming back again to receive his followers to himself, this world loses [p. 7] its hold upon him. Gas stocks and water stocks and stocks in banks and railroads are of very much less consequence to him then. His heart is free, and he looks for the blessed appearing of His [i.e. his] Lord, who, at His coming, will take him into His blessed Kingdom.

1519. Second Advent—Premillennialist View of SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 5–7. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 5] God's redemptive purpose involves not only the salvation of individuals; God has a purpose and a goal for mankind as a society inhabiting the earth. The Bible teaches that throughout the entire course of this age, the power and reign of Satan manifests itself not only in the sinfulness and the physical sufferings and mortality of individuals, but also in the evils of corporate historical experience. Satan offered to our Lord authority over the nations, "for it hath been delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it" (Luke 4:6). While God is sovereign and Satan can do nothing apart from the will of God, there is truth in this declaration of the Evil One. God has permitted Satan to exercise his power in human history. Our generation has witnessed diabolical evils which the preceding generation would have said were impossible for enlightened, civilized men. The demonic element in history is increasingly manifesting itself.

God will not permit Satan to exercise his power in human history forever. Man will not destroy himself from the face of the earth, nor will this planet become a cold, [p. 6] lifeless star. The day is surely coming when the knowledge of God shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, when peace and righteousness shall prevail instead of war and evil. The day is surely coming when God will take the reins of government into His hands and the kingdom of God will come on earth [see No. 1073n] and His will be done even as it is in heaven. This glorious destiny for man will be achieved only by the personal, visible, glorious return of Christ. He is destined to be Lord of lords and King of kings. The second coming of Jesus Christ is an absolutely indispensable doctrine in the Biblical teaching of redemption. Apart from His glorious return, God's work will forever be incomplete. At the center of redemption past is Christ on the cross; at the center of redemption future is Christ returning in glory...

[p. 7] The kingdom of God in its outward manifestation will not come until the Lord Jesus returns in glory. The present mission of the Church is not to save the world and thus establish the kingdom of God but to evangelize the world by the proclamation of the Gospel. The second coming of Christ is thus both the Blessed Hope of the Church and the hope of human history. His coming will mean both salvation and judgment. To this glorious truth the author steadfastly holds; it may be designated by the term *premillennnialism*.

1520. Second Advent—"Rapture," as Defined Literally and

Theologically

SOURCE: The Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933). Used by permission.

Rapture... 4. The act of conveying a person from one place to another, esp. to heaven; the fact of being so conveyed... 5. Transport of mind.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The root verb means to seize or carry off. In the Merriam-Webster unabridged

dictionary the entry for the related adjective rapt gives the derivation: "L[atin] raptus, past part. of

rapere to seize"; and definition number 2 for *rapture*, classified as "now rare" in general modern usage, has the idea of movement, of being transported. This is precisely the theological meaning as used in the phrase "secret rapture," referring to the saints' being "caught up" together to meet the Lord at His second coming (1 Thess. 4:17). The rapture, then, means nothing more or less than the taking up of the resurrected and transformed saints by Christ. But its use is confined almost entirely to the futurist-dispensationalist wing of premillennialism, where it appears as a technical term for an alleged removal of the church from the earth before the final tribulation that precedes the Second Advent. See Nos. 1253, 1740.]

1521. Second Advent—"Rapture" (i.e., the Taking Up of the Saints) Not Separate From the Visible Coming

SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1945), pp. 181–185. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission.

[p. 181] I. The Words for Rapture and Revelation or Appearing. ...

a. The New Testament Usage of these Words

(1) By Paul

(*a*) "Coming" (*parousia*) is used by Paul 14 times, 8 of which refer to the coming of Christ. 1 Thess. iv.15, which speaks of the catching up of living believers, clearly refers to the rapture [see No. 1520]; likewise 2 Thess. ii.1, which speaks of our "gathering together unto him." On the other hand, 1 Thess. iii.13 [p. 182] speaks of the "coming of our Lord Jesus with all his saints." If "saints" means or includes the Church, as all Dispensationalists believe, this verse speaks quite as plainly of the appearing. In 2 Thes. ii.8, which clearly refers to the appearing, since it speaks of the slaying of Antichrist, the expression used is "the manifestation" (or "brightness," epiphany) of his

"coming" (*parousia*). Consequently, we must recognize that Paul uses *coming* both of the rapture and of the appearing and even combines the two expressions in 2 Thess. ii.8, to describe what is apparently one and the same event.

(b) "Revelation" (apocalypse) is used 13 times by Paul. In 1 Cor. i.7 it is used of the rapture. It is what the Christian waits for. In 2 Thess. i.7 the reference is as plainly to the appearing, the coming in glory.

(c) "Appearing" (epiphany). This word is used only by Paul. In 1 Tim. vi.14, the reference to the rapture seems unmistakable. In 2 Tim. iv.1, 8 the allusions to judgment as in Tit. ii.13 to glory favor the reference to the appearing...

Paul uses all three words and he uses them am- [p. 183] biguously. Particularly clear is the fact that he uses *parousia* both of the rapture and of the appearing... How is this to be explained, if he had been told by the Lord that there was an important difference between these two events? ...

[p. 184] The question which confronts us is this. If the distinction between the rapture and the appearing is of a great moment as Dispensationalists assert, how are we to explain Paul's failure to distinguish clearly between them? And the failure of other

writers, Peter, James, and John, to do the same? Paul was a logician. He was able to draw sharp distinctions. If he had wanted, or regarded it important, to distinguish between these events, he could have done so very easily. Why did he use language which Dispensationalists must admit to be confusing? Feinberg recently made the following surprising statement regarding the three words we have been discussing: "We conclude, then, [p. 185] that from a study of the Greek words themselves the distinction between the coming of the Lord for His saints and with His saints is not to be gleaned" ²¹ [Note 21: *Premillennialism or Amillennialism?*, p. 207]. Such an admission raises the question whether the distinction itself is valid. If the distinction is of importance, Paul's ambiguous language is, we say it reverently, inexcusable. If the distinction is negligible, accuracy of statement would be quite unnecessary. We conclude, therefore, that the usage of the New Testament and especially of Paul not merely fails to prove the distinction insisted on by Dispensationalists but rather by its very ambiguity indicates clearly and unmistakably that no such distinction exists.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The attempt to distinguish between the "rapture" and the "appearing" (see Nos. 1524, 1525) on the basis of the meaning of the two Greek words involved is no longer a mainstay of pretribulationist writers (see above quotation from Feinberg). The above extract is included merely because some readers may encounter this theory without knowing that it is obsolete.]

1522. Second Advent—"Rapture," Secret, Impossible, for There Is Only One Second Coming

SOURCE: W. J. Grier, *The Momentous Event* (Belfast: The Evangelical Book Shop, 1945), pp. 55, 56. Used by permission.

[p. 55] Paul associates with the second coming both the resurrection and ensuing glory of the saints *and* the sudden destruction of the wicked. Without the shadow of a doubt, "that day" has its reference to both parties:—believers are to look for it (1 Thessalonians 5:4–10), for *then* they shall obtain salvation in all its fullness (verse 9), *then* they shall "live together with Him" (verse 10); while that *same* day will bring the false security of unbelievers to an end in their "sudden destruction." ...

[p. 56] We may notice that when the Saviour comes for the deliverance of His troubled saints, He comes "in flaming fire"—no *secret* rapture [see No. 1520] here! But it is even more important still to notice how the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked are interwoven with each other *as to time*, and made to follow, both of them, immediately on the coming of the Lord.

Surely this passage [2 Thess. 1:7–10] should make perfectly clear that there is no secret rapture to be followed at an interval of several years by an open revelation of the Lord and His glory to the world.

Surely it is perfectly clear also that since the coming of the Lord brings upon the wicked "eternal destruction away from the face of the Lord," there are no wicked who will survive His coming to be ruled over in a millennium to follow. But there must be wicked people surviving, according to the pre-millennial scheme [that is, the majority view; for the Adventist exception (Millerite and Seventh-day Adventist view), see No.7n].

1523. Second Advent, Theories of—Postmillennialism Separates Events of the Second Coming

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 307, 308. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 307] The separation of the second advent of Christ from the destruction of the beast and the false prophet [is a postmillennialist "dislocation"]. The antichristian character of these beasts is usually recognized, and therefore they are commonly held to be essentially the same as the antichrist of whom John speaks in his Epistles, and also with the man of sin and son of perdition of whom Paul speaks in II Thess. 2. Indeed, the marks of identification are so plain, that it would be needlessly multiplying the eschatological factors to assume that the course of history will produce a man of sin next to an antichrist and both next to the apocalyptic beast...

[p. 308] Brakel was a Postmillenarian and expected a millennium subsequent to the destruction of the antichristian power which he identified with the beast and with the papacy. But he denied a visible return of Christ to our earth while history is still continuing. To his mind, this was altogether too earthly a conception to entertain of our glorified Lord. For that reason he broke the connection which II Thess. 2 so clearly establishes and transposed the return of Christ from the beginning to the end of the millennium. He adduced a whole string of arguments in support of this operation. They are: a return of Christ for the destruction of antichrist would take Him away from the blessed in heaven; it would limit the enjoyment of His presence upon earth to but few; it militates against His priesthood which according to Hebrews must be exercised in heaven; it would deprive the believers of their advocate in heaven; and Scripture knows of only one return of Christ for the judgment and the resurrection of the dead.

This is definitely poor argumentation... I have still to meet a good exegetical reason for this separation of Christ's visible return from the destruction of antichrist.

1524. Second Advent, Theories of—Pretribulationism, as Related to Premillennialism

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 8, 9. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 8] However, the program of prophetic events which they [many modern premillennialists] taught included important elements which are not found in the early church. Among these were the teachings of the Rapture of the Church [see No. 1520] at the beginning of the Tribulation and the expectation of an any-moment secret coming of Christ for the purpose of rupturing the Church. Since the coming of Christ would precede the appearance of Antichrist and the Tribulation, it would be unheralded by any preceding signs and could therefore occur at any moment after His ascension to heaven. The coming of Christ is "imminent"; i.e., it can take place at any moment. "Imminence" means that no prophesied event must take place before Christ's return to rapture the Church.

We may designate this teaching by the word *pretribulationism*, because it teaches a pretribulation rapture of the Church so that it escapes the Tribulation. Premillennialism and pretribulationism hold much in common... Both expect a short period of fearful tribulation at the end of the age. Both are looking for the glorious coming of Christ to

3

³Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

establish His millennial kingdom. Pretribulationism adds several other features which are not essential to the main outlines of premillennial truth. Thus premillennialism and pretribulationism are not synonymous. All pretribulationists will be premillennialists, but not all premillennialists will be pretibulationists. Many premillennialists believe that the Scriptures do not teach that Christ will return secretly to rapture the Church before the Tribulation. However, this teaching has been spread widely throughout American Fundamentalism through the godly influence of such men as James M. Gray, A. C. Gaebelein, R. A. Torrey, W. B. Riley, I. M. Haldeman, H. A. Ironside, L. S. Chafer, and many others.

[p. 9] No instrument has been more influential than the Scofield Reference Bible in implanting this view in the thinking of millions of Christians. Most of the Bible schools which have trained a host of young people in the Word of God have been devoted to this pattern of prophetic teaching, and the prophetic conference movement along with many summer Bible conferences has propagated this view. So deeply intrenched has it become that many pastors and Christian leaders have been led to assume that this teaching has been an essential doctrine in the history of the Church extending back to apostolic times and has prevailed widely in all ages among believers who have had a sincere love for the Word of God and who have cherished the Blessed Hope of Christ's return.

During the first half of the present century, occasional voices were raised within the circle of premillennial interpretation in defense of a modification of some of the details of this prophetic program. Honored leaders such as Robert Cameron, W. J. Eerdman, Rowland Bingham and Henry Frost were compelled from their further study of the Word to dissent from pretribulationism. Holding steadfastly to the premillennial coming of Christ to establish His kingdom, they felt they could no longer accept the teaching of a secret return of Christ to rapture the Church before the Tribulation. If the Tribulation were to precede Christ's return, it was obvious that the doctrine of an any-moment coming was impossible. Some of these men were sharply criticized for their deviation from the teaching of an any-moment coming of Christ to remove the Church from the world before the Tribulation begins. They were nevertheless recognized to be men of God who were true to the Gospel and unswerving in their defense of the faith once delivered to the saints, and men who loved His appearing. Although they were thought to be in error in their teaching about the Rapture and the Tribulation, this deviation was not considered to be ground for attacking their essential soundness, orthodoxy, and lovalty to the Word of God.

1525. Second Advent, Theories of—Pretribulationism Defined and Leading Advocates Identified

SOURCE: Floyd E. Hamilton, *The Basis of Millennial Faith*, pp. 23–26. Copyright 1942 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 23] About a hundred years ago a man named J. N. Darby, founded a group of Christians who have become known as "The Brethren," or "Plymouth Brethren." His followers, Wm. Kelly, W. Trotter, and C. H. M., were the pioneers of the movement, but in more recent times W. E. Blackstone, in "Jesus is Coming," F. W. Grant, James M. Gray, A. C. Gaebelein, F. C. Ottman, and particularly C. I. Scofield, the author of the "Scofield Reference Bible," have popularized what we may call a new view of the events preceding and following the Coming of Christ. It is important to note that [p. 24] there is

a vast difference between the teachings of these men and the teachings of the old historic premillennialists.

- 1. Instead of one Second Coming of Christ, there are two distinct stages, so that in reality we should speak of the Second and Third Comings of Christ. The Second Coming [i.e., of Christ *for* His saints, the "rapture"] will concern the church alone, and will occur at the beginning of the Seventieth Week of Daniel 9:24–27, when Christ comes for His church. the Third Coming [i.e., of Christ *with* His saints, the "appearing"] will concern Israel and the world, and occurs at the close of the Seventieth Week, when Christ comes *with* his church. Between the Second and Third Comings of Christ there will be at least seven years, the Seventieth Week of Daniel 9:24–27.
- 2. At the Second Coming of Christ the Righteous dead of New Testament times with the Righteous dead of the Old Testament, and the living Church of Christ, will be transfigured, after the first resurrection, and raptured [i.e., snatched away; see No. 1520] to be with Christ during the seven years, where they receive rewards at the Marriage Feast of the Lamb. (Most of this group hold that the Rapture will be a *Secret* Rapture, while this group again breaks up into those who believe that only those who are *looking* for the Second Coming will be raptured, while other Christians who are not looking for it will be left behind to go through the Great Tribulation. The other group hold that all Christians who are in the Church of Christ will be raptured at that time.)
- 3. After the rapture of the church, the Antichrist sets up his kingdom, and institutes the Great Tribulation. The church which has already been raptured, therefore, will not pass through the Great Tribulation.
- 4. The Holy Spirit is removed from the world at the time of the Second Coming... After the Second Coming, the Jews return to Palestine, mostly in unbelief. However, there is a small *Remnant* who remain faithful to the true God, though they do not [p. 25] accept the saving work of Christ. During the latter part of the week they preach the *Gospel of the Kingdom* far and wide according to the Great Commission of Matthew 28:19. An immense number of the inhabitants of the world believe this *Gospel of the Kingdom*, and pass through the Great Tribulation, though they are not yet true believers or a part of the true Church of Christ.
- 5. At the close of the seven years there will be another resurrection of the martyred saints of the tribulation period, though these resurrected saints will not be connected with the Church of God.
- 6. At the close of the seven year period the Antichrist gathers his hosts against the Remnant and those Gentile believers who have not been martyred, at the Battle of Armageddon (Rev. 16:16). Christ then comes in glory *with* the church, holds the Sheep and Goat judgment, (the basis of which is how the nations have treated the Jews, who are the "brethren" of the Lord, the separation thus being on the basis of good works). The living Remnant, and the Gentile "nations," then enter the Millennial Kingdom set up by Christ, but with unglorified bodies...
- 8. The millennial kingdom is set up with the Jews in the chief authority, with the temple and its worship again established in Jerusalem. The believing Jews and the "nations" who are ruled over with "the rod of iron," still have natural bodies, but sin is sternly repressed, and though the nations are rebellious at heart, they are forced to bow the knee to Christ who rules from Jerusalem.

- [p. 26] 9. Satan was of course bound at the close of the seven year period, but at the end of the millennium he is loosed from his prison, gathers the rebellious nations to war against the saints, and these nations are destroyed by fire from heaven. This is followed by the resurrection of the wicked, the Great White Throne Judgment and the setting up of the eternal kingdom of God.
- 10. During the millennium it is not quite clear what the relationship of the Church is to the unglorified believers in the earth. Most probably would say that their real home is in heaven but that they could visit the millennial kingdom at will. Some would doubtless say that the church will join in the millennial reign of Christ.

It is seen at a glance that this whole scheme is totally different from that of the old historic premillennialism.

1526. Second Advent, Theories of Pretribulationism, Rise of SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 40, 41, 43–45, 58. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 40] A second out-growth of the prophetic awakening of the early nineteenth century was Darbyism, or Dispensationalism, which had its birth within the Plymouth Brethren movement. A pretribulation rapture [see No. 1520] is an essential element of this system. The Brethren movement had its beginnings in Dublin in 1825 when a small group of earnest men, dissatisfied with the spiritual condition of the Protestant church in Ireland, met for prayer and fellowship. Soon others joined the fellowship and other similar groups sprang up. In 1827, J. N. Darby entered the fellowship. Although there was an interest from the start in prophetic truth, the center of emphasis was "The Nature and Unity of the Church of Christ" (the title of Darby's first tract) in reaction to the deadness and formalism of the organized church and the ordained ministry. Outstanding among the new groups which arose in Ireland and England was the fellowship in Plymouth, from which the movement derived its name. Leader of the Plymouth fellowship for many years was B. W. Newton, a man of considerable learning and scholarship. Two other outstanding Brethren were S. P. Tregelles, recognized by the entire world of Biblical scholarship for his contribution to the study of the history of the Greek text of the New Testament, and George Muller, the great man of praver.

We have already mentioned the Albury Park conference and the Powerscourt meetings. Darby and other leaders of the new movement attended the meetings at Powerscourt, and Darby's leadership in the area of prophetic interpretation here became evident. It was at Powerscourt that the teaching of a pretribulation rapture of the Church took shape. Tregelles, a member of the Brethren in these early days, tells us that the idea of a secret rapture at a [p. 41] secret coming of Christ had its origin in an "utterance" in Edward Irving's church, and that this was taken to be the voice of the Spirit. Tregelles says, "It was from that supposed revelation that the modern doctrine and the modern phraseology respecting it arose. It came not from Holy Scripture, but from that which falsely pretended to be the Spirit of God." This doctrine together with other important modifications of the traditional futuristic view were vigorously promoted by Darby, and they have been popularized by the writings of William Kelly.

Not all of the Brethren accepted the teaching of a pretribulation rapture. In 1842, B. W. Newton of Plymouth published a book entitled *Thoughts on the Apocalypse* in which he taught the traditional view that the Church would go through the Tribulation. There arose a sharp contention over the issue of pretribulationism between the two men. Newton "considered Mr. Darby's dispensational teaching as the height of speculative

nonsense" (H. A. Ironside). He was supported in his posttribulation views by Tregelles. A rift followed which was never healed. This was the first of a series of many contentions which marred the history of the Brethren movement.

Within early Brethrenism, we find two types of prophetic interpretation: The traditional futurism, and Darbyism or Dispensationalism. The influence which has extended to prophetic study in America has been the latter. Doubtless Newton's views on the Church and the Tribulation were discredited because he was accused of holding unsound views on the person of Christ. [p. 43] ... Against this background of prevailing postmillennialism and a groping search for a more satisfying interpretation of prophecy, it is easy to see how Darbyan futurism possessed such attraction and impelling power. It came with a freshness and vitality which guite captured American Christians. Darby visited America six times between 1859 and 1874 and was warmly welcomed. His system of prophetic interpretation was eagerly adopted... Darbyism to many Christians meant the rediscovery of the precious Biblical truth of Christ's glorious second coming, even though the basic truth was accompanied by some important details which were not essential to the premillennial return of Christ and which many later came to feel were not in the Word of God. Once more, as in the early church, the return of Christ became a living and vital expectation in the lives of Christian people and in the pulpit ministry of many a preacher. Little wonder that the view has been cherished and defended with such deep emotional overtones. Darbyism in fact restored something precious which had long been lost.

This new prophetic emphasis at once found expression in the prophetic and Bible conference movement. A. C. Gaebelein, telling the story of the Scofield Reference Bible, finds its background within this movement. Interest in premillennialism grew to a point where a great prophetic conference was suggested by Nathaniel West. A call was issued by a committee of eight men, among whom were [p. 44] James H. Brookes and A. J. Gordon, with the indorsement of one hundred and fourteen "Bishops, Professors, Ministers and Brethren." The conference was called to meet in the church of the Holy Trinity (Episcopal) in 1878. A second prophetic conference was held in Chicago in 1886. Prominent in these conferences were such men as Stephen Tyng, W. R. Nicholson, Nathaniel West, S. H. Kellogg, A. J. Gordon, James H. Brooks, W. J. Erdman, W. G. Moorehead and A. T. Pierson.

Another series of meetings of even greater importance was that which met at Niagara on Lake Ontario from 1883–1897. This conference was the outgrowth of a small Bible study fellowship initiated in 1875 by a handful of men among whom were Nathaniel West, J. H. Brookes and W. J. Erdman. They were joined the next year by A. J. Gordon. This group met from place to place until the conference at Ontario was undertaken. Among the leading teachers of the Ontario conferences, according to A. C. Gaebelein, were James H. Brookes, A. J. Gordon, W. J. Erdman, Albert Erdman, George C. Needham, A. C. Dickson, L. W. Mundhall, H. M. Parsons, Canon Howitt, E. P. Marvin, Hudson Taylor, J. M. Stifler, Robert Cameron, W. G. Moorehead and A. T. Pierson. After this pioneer of American Bible conferences was discontinued, a new conference at Seacliff, Long Island, was opened in 1901, and it was here that the plan for the Reference Bible embodying the dispensational system of interpretation occurred to Dr. C. I. Scofield. In view of the modern notion that pretribulationism has been one of the foundational tenets of a sound presentation of prophetic truth, it is important to note that many of the leaders of this early prophetic, Bible conference movement either were or became posttribulationists [for definition see editors' note below]. Many of the teachers at the Niagara Conference accepted J. N. Darby's [p. 45] pretribulation rapture along with the doctrine of Christ's return. Of the men named above, James H. Brookes, A. T. Pierson, and C. I. Scofield have been among the most influential supporters of this view. However, other teachers did not accept it, and still others accepted it at first only to give it up after more mature study of the Word of God. Since it is often thought that all good and godly premillennialists must be pretribulationists, we shall note the views of several of these leaders who did not adhere to the pretribulation teaching [i.e., Nathaniel West, A. J. Gordon, W. J. Erdman, Robert Cameron, Henry W. Frost, W. G. Moorehead, Charles R. Erdman, Philip Mauro, Rowland V. Bingham, G. Campbell Morgan, Bishop Frank Houghton, Oswald J. Smith, Harold John Ockenga; see pp. 45–57 of the work cited]...

[p. 58] These men, like those of the earlier generation, passed through the experience of accepting dispensational teaching but of being driven to conclude that it did not coincide with the teachings of the Word of God. But who is to say that Mauro, Bingham, Morgan, Houghton, Smith and Ockenga are any less men of God and true to the Word? The author is personally acquainted with other Christian leaders who have given up pretribulationism; but they have not gone on record and so cannot be quoted.

Pretribulationism has not been and never ought to be a test of a sound view of prophetic truth. Pretribulationism is a recent view which was formulated 125 years ago by one wing of the Plymouth Brethren and accepted in America by a circle of devout and godly men but rejected by others who were equally devout and godly and equally devoted to the propagation of the truth of the Lord's return.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Posttribulationism is the view that the church remains on this earth through the final tribulation, and is taken to heaven at the Second Advent. It is held by amillennialists, postmillennialists, and all premillennialists except the pretribulationists.]

1527. Second Advent, Theories of—Pretribulationism's Secret Rapture Refuted

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 157–159. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 157] The second coming of Christ and the expectation of entering into a perfected fellowship with Him when we shall see Him face to face is the Blessed Hope of the Church. Perhaps the most common objection raised against a posttribulation teaching is this. The second coming of Christ is no longer a Blessed Hope if the Church must first pass through the Tribulation. If we must look for tribulation rather than for a rapture [see No. 1520] before the Tribulation, then the Blessed Hope has lost its blessed character and becomes instead a day of dread and fear.

In answer to this position, two things are to be said. First, we have already demonstrated that the Church will not experience the wrath of God. The Great Tribulation so far as it involves the outpouring of God's wrath will not engulf the Church. If that were not the case, the Tribulation would be an experience of unimaginable horror. However, God has not destined us to wrath but to obtain salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Secondly, the Word of God *does not teach that the Blessed Hope of the Church is a hope of deliverance from persecution*. The coming of Christ is described as the Blessed

Hope in one verse: Titus 2:13. "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." Did the Spirit of God know what He was doing when He inspired these words? Did He give to Paul a vague thought leaving him to confuse it with inaccurate language? We think not. The Blessed [p. 158] Hope is not deliverance from tribulation; it is not even the Rapture itself; it is the epiphany [appearing], the outshining of the glory of our great God and Savior. If this verse is any guide, the Blessed Hope is not a secret coming of Christ; it is not the resurrection of the dead; it is not the transformation of the living; it is not the catching up of the Church; the Blessed Hope is the glorious epiphany of *Our Lord Himself*, which occurs at the end of the Great Tribulation.

To insist that the Blessed Hope must be escape from the Great Tribulation is to place the emphasis where the Scripture does not place it; it is in fact to impose an interpretation upon the Scripture in place of what the Word of of God actually says. As we indicated in an earlier chapter, the Word of God everywhere assures us that in this age we are to expect tribulation and persecution. The last great persecution of Antichrist [see No. 1740] will indeed be worse and more fearful than anything the world has ever seen; but when we contemplate the history of martyrdom, why should we ask deliverance from what millions have already suffered? When we read in the books of the Maccabees of the tortures inflicted upon the Jews who were faithful to the teachings of the Law by the manifestation of antichrist in the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphanes; when we recall the thousands of Christians who fell in torture and death and did it gladly in the name of Christ at the hands of the manifestation of the spirit of antichrist in the Roman emperors; when we are reminded of the Inquisition with its rack and wheel and flame; when we remember from our own generation the liquidation of several millions of Jews by a modern antichrist, and even more recently the martyrdom of tens of thousands of Korean Christians, what kind of a faith does the Church of today exemplify and what sort of a gospel is it which we proclaim if we insist that God must deliver us from the hands of the last manifestation of antichrist at the end of the age?

[p. 159] There is one very sobering question which weighs heavily upon the writer's heart, and he would ask his readers to share it. Many of God's people are being assured today that the Rapture will take place before the Tribulation and that the Church will not experience those terrible days...

Suppose that suddenly the people of God find themselves engulfed in a horrible persecution at the hands of the Antichrist when they had been assured repeatedly on the authority of the Word of God that this experience would never befall them. What will be the result? We leave it to the reader's imagination.

1528. Second Advent, Theories of—Pretribulationist View, Errors of SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, p. 309. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

They [the Darbyites; see No. 1526] assume a rapture [see No. 1520] of the believers prior to the manifestation of the Son of Man for the destruction of antichrist... A rapture [or taking up] of the believers at Christ's second coming is plainly taught in I Thess. 4:13–18 and has found recognition as early as Ireneus. But the assumption that that rapture will precede the appearance of the Son of Man in public on the clouds of heaven so clearly contradicts the order of events as indicated in Matth. 24:30, 31, that it is puzzling to meet with the theory as often as one does without a word of explanation. In Matth. 24:30, 31, the order is very distinctly and unmistakably indicated as being first the

public appearance of the Son of Man at which all the nations shall mourn, and then in that appearance of the Son of Man at which all the nations shall mourn, and then in that appearance the ingathering of His elect by His angels.

The Darbyites are not the only ones who commit this violence to the biblical order of the eschatological events, but, apparently under their influence, many others [i.e., the dispensationalists] do the same. An ingathering of the elect prior to Christ's public appearance would necessarily partake of the nature of secrecy as far as the world at large is concerned; and by many such secrecy is actually ascribed to the rapture. For the Darbyites and all who with them hold to the belief that the great tribulation intervenes between the rapture, whether secret or not, and the appearing of Christ, this dislocation is of course a necessity. Without it, they would not be able to save the believers from passing through the great tribulation. Again the dislocation is dictated by the view. Since this view identifies the great tribulation with the appearance of the beast and the false prophet, it leaves no room for their appearance and identification until the secret rapture shall have taken the believers away. In other words, this view dictates also a futuristic understanding of the Apocalypse, in which book the antichrist comes on the scene as early as chap. 13.

1529. Sennacherib, Two Campaigns of, Against Jerusalem SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "New Light From Egypt on the Chronology and History of Israel and Judah," *BASOR*, 130 (April, 1953), 8, 9. Used by permission.

[p. 8] The account of Sennacherib's war with Hezekiah in II Kings 18–19–Isa. 36–37 suggests that there was only one campaign, in the 14th year of the king of Judah (701 B.C., according to the clear-cut Assyrian evidence); but since George Rawlinson first proposed the two-campaign theory in 1858, there have not been lacking proponents of the latter alternative...

According to the protagonists of the one-campaign theory, the reference to the advance of Tirhakah (Taharqo) northward against Sennacherib in II Kings 19:9–Isa. 37:9 either refers to the military activity of the Ethiopian twelve years before he became king of Egypt or is based on some later confusion. The biblical story of the destruction of the Assyrian army by pestilence is, they declare, either later fiction or gross exaggeration.

Laming Macadam's belated publication of the important inscriptions of Tirhakah from Kawa in Nubia, completely transforms the state of our knowledge of Tirhakah's early life. In these inscriptions it is re- [p. 9] peatedly stated that he first came from Nubia to be associated with his brother Shebteko when he was twenty years old. Macadam has proved convincingly that Tirhakah was then coregent with Shebteko for six years before the death of the latter. During these six years he was obviously in control of the situation. Since Borchardt has shown that Tirhakah became king in 690/689 B.C., it follows that he was born about 710/709 and was not over nine years of age at the time of Sennacherib's campaign of 701. It was, in fact, impossible for him to take part in any military activity directed against the Assyrians until 688 or later.

I have for a long time dated the accession of Hezekiah (in accord with the Assyrian dating of the events of his 14th year in 701) in the year 715/4. This is also Mowinckel's date, and nearly Thiele's. The 29 years of his reign are very well attested in the Hebrew sources, and it is virtually certain that the regnal years were by this time computed according to Assyrian postdating practice, as against Egyptian antedating custom in this period. Hezekiah's reign would then fall into the years 715–686. In 691 Sennacherib was defeated at Khalul by the Babylonian and Elamite allies; news of his defeat would

unquestionably stir the West to thoughts of new revolt, especially when accompanied (as they had been before 701) by incitation from Babylonia. If revolt broke out in 690 or 689, it would not be until 688 that Sennacherib was free to turn westward. Meanwhile he had leveled Babylon to the ground (689), eliminating this dangerous threat to his rear before moving west. Other arguments in favor of inserting a second campaign against Hezekiah in the period between 689 and 686 (scarcely later) have been advanced elsewhere. Sidney Smith's variant proposal, to date the pestilence in Esarhaddon's reign, c. 675 B.C., would carry with it a complete rewriting of the biblical tradition, which would be taken out of Hezekiah's reign and put into that of Manasseh. The present text is altogether too precise and correct in its historical background (cf. II Kings 19:12–13–Isa. 37:12–13, which mentions nine distinct historical events of the ninth-eighth century, nearly all of which can be validated from the Assyrian records!) to admit of such distortion. That the Deuteronomic compiler telescoped two parallel campaigns is now certain, but there is no evidence that he distorted the material which had come down to him.

1530. Seventh-day Adventist Church

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 27-29.

[p. 27] *History*. The religious denomination known as Seventh-day Adventists had its rise about the middle of the nineteenth century. The name is based upon two of the distinctive beliefs they hold, namely, the observance of the Sabbath of the Scriptures, and the imminent, personal second advent of Christ.

In those years, not only in the United States, but in other countries of the world, many students of Bible prophecy became convinced that the second advent was drawing near, and this belief resulted in a great religious awakening, in Britain, in some countries of the Continent of Europe, and in North America. "Whether this doctrine is orthodox or not," wrote the historian Macaulay, in 1829, "many who hold it are distinguished by rank, wealth, and ability. It is preached from pulpits both of the Scottish and of the English church." One English writer of the time estimated that in the years just before 1840 about 700 clergymen of the Church of England were taking part in the awakening movement.

In the United States and Canada came a parallel movement, in which were represented Christians of all the churches. Among prominent leaders in the publishing and evangelistic work of this second advent evangelism were William Miller, a Baptist layman, of Low Hampton, N. Y., and Joshua V. Himes, a clergyman, of Boston. Monthly and weekly papers devoted to this work were issued in Boston, New York, and many other parts.

It was from among the Adventists engaged in this movement in America that there arose a small group in 1844, in Washington, N. H., who began to observe the seventh-day Sabbath, as they found it enjoined in the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. Thus came the first Seventh-day Adventists, though the name was not formally adopted until later years.

Prominent among those who pioneered the work were Joseph Bates, James White, his wife, Mrs. Ellen G. White, Hiram Edson, Frederick Wheeler, and S. W. Rhodes. Later came J. H. Waggoner, J. N. Loughborough, J. N. Andrews (who was the first Seventhday Adventist missionary to be sent overseas from the United States), Uriah Smith, and S. N. Haskell.

By 1860 the movement had grown until, in connection with the organization of the first publishing house in Battle Creek, Mich., the denominational name was assumed. The

following year saw the beginning of the organization of State conferences of churches, and in 1863 the General Conference was organized, with John Byington as its first president. In order to decentralize and distribute administrative responsibility, local State conferences are grouped in fairly large areas as a union conference, with a union corps of officers. The union conferences in continental areas are grouped again as divisions—as North American, South American, southern Asia, Australasian, etc., covering all continents—each division having its staff of officers... Representatives from each division make up the General Conference committee, with headquarters in Washington, D. C. For about half a century the headquarters had been at Battle Creek, Mich., where the first equipped publishing house was built, also their first medical sanitarium (with which grew up the early health food promotion), and their first college. In 1903, however, the general offices were removed to Washington [where they are still situated].

Doctrine. Very briefly stated, the main features of Seventh-day Adventist teaching are as follows:

- 1. Holy Scripture the rule of faith and practice. (2 Tim. 3:15–17.)
- 2. The Godhead, or Trinity, consists of the Eternal Father, the Son of the Eternal Father, through whom all things were created, the Holy Spirit, the third person of the Godhead, the great regenerating power in the work of redemption. (Matt. 28:19.)
- 3. Jesus Christ is very God. While retaining His divine nature He took upon Himself the nature of the human family, died for our sins, rose from the dead, and in heaven ever lives to make intercession for us. (John 1:1, 14; Heb. 2:9–18; 8:1, 2; 7:25.)
- [p. 28] 4. The new birth, through faith, by the recreative power of God. (John 3:3, 16.)
- 5. Baptism of believers, by immersion. (Mark 16:16; Rom. 6:1–6.)
- 6. The ten commandments, the moral law of God, the standard of the judgment. (Ex. 20:1–17; Matt. 5:17–19; Eccl. 12:13, 14.)
- 7. The fourth commandment of God's law enjoins the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath of the Lord our God, made holy for all mankind. (Gen. 2:1–3; Ex. 20:8–11; Mark 2:27, 28.)
- 8. "Sin is the transgression of the law." (1 John 3:4.) "The wages of sin is death." (Rom. 6:23.) Having sinned, man cannot save himself, nor can the law justify him. God so loved the world that He gave His Son, even Jesus Christ, to die in man's stead; accepting Christ by faith, as his substitute, the sinner is justified by the Saviour's grace, who cleanses from sin, creates the new heart, and abides within by His Spirit, to work obedience. Thus the gospel becomes "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Rom. 1:16.)
- 9. Man is by nature mortal. God "only hath immortality." (1 Tim. 6:16.) Immortality and eternal life come to redeemed man only as the free gift in Christ; and "this mortal shall put on immortality" at the second coming of Christ. (1 Cor. 15:51–55.)
- 10. The condition of man in death is that of unconscious sleep. All men, good and evil alike, in death remain in the grave until the resurrection. (Eccl. 9:5, 6; Ps. 146:3, 4; John 5:28, 29.)
- The resurrection of the just takes place at the second advent of Christ (1 Thess. 4:13–18), that of the unjust, a thousand years later, at the close of the millennium. (Rev. 20:5–10.)
- 12. The impenitent, including Satan, the author of sin, are destroyed, brought to a state of nonexistence. (Rom. 6:23; Mal. 4:1–3; Rev. 20:9, 10; Obadiah 16.)

- 13. The Christian is to live and act and eat and drink to the glory of God, recognizing his body as the temple of the Holy Spirit. Thus the believer will clothe the body in neat, modest, dignified apparel, and will be led to abstain from all intoxicating drinks, tobacco, and other narcotics. (1 Cor. 3:16, 17; 9:25; 10:31; 1 Tim. 2:9, 10; 1 John 2:6.)
- 14. Gospel work is to be supported by the Scripture plan of tithes and offerings. (Lev. 27:30; Mal. 3:8–12; 1 Cor. 9:9–14; 2 Cor. 9:6–15.)
- 15. Seventh-day Adventists believe that the Bible and the Bible alone is the authority for all faith and doctrine, and the standard by which all religious teaching is to be judged. Believing also in the impartation of the Holy Spirit to the church for all time, they accept the Scriptural teaching regarding the manifestation of spiritual gifts as a means by which the church is edified and built up—the gifts of apostleship, prophecy, teaching, evangelism, etc. (1 Cor. 12:28–30; Eph. 4:11–14.) As the gift of prophecy is among these gifts listed, they accept the admonition of Paul, "Despise not prophesyings. Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." From the beginning of the movement they have had constant and cumulative evidence that through the counsels and writings of Ellen G. White, the Holy Spirit has given special help to the church. The counsel and instruction thus received, has been a potent factor in the maintenance of unity of doctrine and of organization for world-wide service.
- 16. The second coming of Christ is the hope of the church, the climax of the plan of salvation, spoken of by all the prophets "since the world began." (Acts 3:19–21.) While no man knows the day and the hour, Christ and all prophecy have foretold signs by which it may be known when it "is near, even at the doors." The gospel message in these times, it is believed, must call attention to the signs of the times and to the message of preparation to meet the Lord. The closing ministry of Jesus in heaven, before He comes, is a work of judgment, which will determine between the just and the unjust. (Dan. 7:9, 10.) When that judgment begins in the heavenly temple, the gospel message is due to the world; "The hour of His judgment is come." (Rev. 14:6, 7.) Seventh-day Adventists believe it is their work to carry that message to every people and tongue.
- 17. The order of events of the second advent are understood to be as follows: The voice of Christ calls forth the just of all the ages from their graves, the living righteous being translated. All ascend with Jesus to heaven. The glory of His coming has consumed the unjust. The earth is desolated, uninhabited by men for a thousand years, the prison house of Satan. (1 Thess. 4:16, 17; 1:7–9; Rev. 20:1–3, 5.)
- 18. The millennial reign of Christ covers the period between the first and second resurrection, during which the saved live with Him in heaven. At the end of the thousand years, the Holy City, with Christ and the saved, descend to earth, [p. 29] the wicked are raised in the second resurrection; led by Satan they come up against the Lord and the city. Final judgment is pronounced upon them, and fire consumes them utterly. Death itself is destroyed, and the grave. Satan is no more. All traces of sin are removed by the purifying fires, and the earth comes forth, recreated, restored to the purity and beauty of the original Eden. "The meek shall inherit the earth." It becomes the eternal home of the redeemed of Adam's race. (Rev. 20:7–15; 21:1–5.) There is then no sin or pain in all the universe, and every creature gives praise to God. (Rev. 5:13.)

Organization. The local church.—The local church is congregational in its government, although under the general supervision of the conference of which it is a member...

Local, union, and General Conference.—A number of churches are united to form a conference or mission. The conference meets biennially and is composed of delegates elected by the churches. The conference has general supervision of the churches and their work. In some large States there are two or more of these conferences, and as a matter of convenience the term "local conference" has come into use. The local conferences or missions are united into groups to form union conferences, which hold sessions quadrennially, and to which delegates are elected by the local conferences. The union conferences and union missions throughout the world are united in the General Conference, which holds quadrennial sessions composed of delegates from union conferences and union missions throughout the world. For convenience in administering the work of the General Conference, the world field is divided into 12 divisions [now 13], each with its staff of division officers, presided over by a vice president of the General Conference.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The 1960 membership for North America as reported by the Statistical Department of the General Conference of SDA is 332,364. The world membership in 1960 is reported at 1,245,125.]

1531. Seventy Weeks, Continuity of

SOURCE: George L. Murray, *Millennial Studies*, pp. 99–104. Copyright 1948 by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 99] The angel Gabriel, having given Daniel a general statement of the events that should come to pass during the seventy weeks, then proceeded to tell him when the seventy weeks were to begin and how they were to be divided and punctuated by events of unsurpassed importance...

The seventy weeks were to be divided into three periods. The first period consisted of seven weeks, or forty-nine years, during which the city of Jerusalem was to be rebuilt. From the time that the city should be rebuilt until the coming of the Messiah should be sixty-two weeks. The seven weeks of years required for the rebuilding of the city and sixty-two weeks of years extending from that time until the day of Christ account for sixty-nine prophetic weeks, "and after threescore and two weeks" (in addition to the first seven) "shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself" (Daniel 9:26). It is scarcely neces-[p. 100] sary to comment on the meaning of this passage. We all know that the Messiah was cut off. The question that is difficult to answer is why, when Messiah was cut off after the sixty-ninth week, dispensationalists deny that it happened in the seventieth week. The teaching of dispensationalism is that while sixty-nine of the seventy weeks were fulfilled in proper and natural chronological order, the seventieth week was separated from the other sixty-nine by twenty centuries. The logic employed here is, we believe, without precedent. It has neither precedent nor pattern in the Word of God, and is hardly in keeping with the vaunted literalism of our dispensational brethren. Let us suppose for a moment that this manner of interpretation were applied to other parts of Scripture. God told Abraham that his seed should be in bondage in Egypt for four hundred years, but there is no record of any believer manipulating those figures to include an extra twenty centuries for good measure. God told Jeremiah that the captivity in Babylon would last seventy years, and Daniel understood by the writings of Jeremiah that the captivity was about to end. Suppose Daniel had in dispensational fashion believed that an unreckoned period of time should separate the seventieth year from the sixty-ninth year of the captivity in Babylon—say a period of twenty centuries—then surely prophecy would become an absurdity. It is contended that the angel separated the seventieth week of Daniel's prophecy from the rest for no other purpose than that there

should be "a great parenthesis" between them. We answer, however, that the angel separated the first seven weeks of years were notable because of the events which transpired during those weeks. Likewise, the seventieth week was separated from the other sixty-nine because that seventieth week was separated from the other sixty-nine because that seventieth week was separated from the other sixty-nine because that seventieth week was the most eventful in all of human history and was, in fact, the week that so divided human history that henceforth events became dated *A.D. Anno Domini, the year of our Lord* instead [p. 101] of *B.C. Before Christ.* Men are surely taking strange liberties with the truth of God when they laboriously build a mountain of doctrine upon a molehill of symbolism or conjecture.

There is no authority in Scripture for the assumption that the seventieth week of Daniel is still in the future. On the contrary, there is satisfactory and abundant proof that the seventieth week followed the sixty-ninth without any break, as every rule of logic and history would demand. Surely if any man, to say nothing of an angel acting as the spokesman of the Most High, were to guarantee and to determine something to happen within seventy weeks, it could not reasonably be interpreted as meaning seventy weeks plus twenty centuries. It is universally agreed that the events predicted for the seven-week period and the sixty-two weeks period following it have taken place; yet in some quarters it is denied, regardless of evidence to the contrary, that the events of the seventieth week have followed those of the sixty-ninth...

[p. 102] Speculation reaches a climax and history is utterly disregarded in the interpretation of the latter part of Daniel 9:26: "... the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined." There are few events recorded in all the annals of human history more dreadful than the literal fulfillment of these words, as seen in the utter destruction of Jerusalem under the Roman general Titus in the year seventy A.D. Dispensational conjecture is at its best in interpreting this verse. It admits the undeniable, that the Romans did destroy Jerusalem in the year seventy A.D. by the people of "the prince which is to come," but insists that the prince himself is still in the future...

[p. 103] The closing verse of Daniel nine has long been a stronghold for dispensationalism. Here, it is alleged, the angel describes and predicts the coming of Antichrist. Instead of reading out of the passage what it contains, the tendency is to read into it what some people think it ought to teach. Dispensationalism maintains that Daniel 9:27 teaches that a great prince shall rise in the last days with whom apostate Jews will make a covenant under which they will be permitted to continue their sacrificial rites. "In the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease," and shall compel men to worship himself...

[p. 104] It seems clear to us that the seventieth week of Daniel's prophecy is very distinctly marked here by this unmistakable event which took place in the midst of the week and which so marvelously fulfilled Gabriel's prediction. In the midst of the week our Lord, by His death, abolished the necessity of further sacrifice. During the remainder of the seventieth week the Gospel continued to be preached to the Jews whose hearts were being constantly hardened in consequence of their rejection of the Messiah, and whose desolation was now hastening on as determined.

As we follow these great events of the Gospel age in this prophecy, we cannot but be impressed and solemnized as we see God's faithfulness to His Word. The events of the seventieth week are not in the future. They followed the events of the sixty-ninth week in natural and logical sequence.

1532. Seventy Weeks, Dispensationalist Theory of

SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Re. formed, 1945), pp. 115–118, 122. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission.

[p. 115] (1) The Events of Verse 24 [of Dan. 9] still Future

[p. 116] According to the "traditional" interpretation of this prophecy there is, as we have seen, good warrant for the view that all the events described in vs. 24 have been fulfilled. The claim to the contrary is based largely on that literalistic method of interpretation which is insisted upon by Dispensationalists. If, for example, "to make an end of sins" means to eliminate moral evil completely from this world, then it is quite obvious that the accomplishment of the prophecy must lie in the future. But the expression need not mean this; and the emphasis placed in vs. 26f. on the atonement may properly be regarded as indicating that the reference is to it. The special reason that Dispensationalists must insist that vs. 24 refers to the future is quite clear. If the fulfillment of the prophecy is still incomplete, and if the predictions relating to the 69 weeks had their fulfilment centuries ago, then the 70th week must be still future. Hence there must be an interval between the end of the 69th week and the beginning of the 70th week; and the entire Church age can be regarded as forming a parenthesis at this point...

According to Dispensationalists the 69th week ends with the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem a few days before His death. The only basis for this claim is the expression "unto the anointed one, the prince." But the word "prince" (*nagid*) is far too indefinite an expression to warrant such an inference...

There are several weaknesses [p. 117] in this mathematical demonstration [of 483 years ending with the triumphal entry]...

The question whether the "cutting off" of the Anointed One is to be regarded as taking place in the last week depends entirely upon whether the 70th week follows immediately on the 69th or not. That it would do so, is a natural and proper inference from the statement that 70 weeks are included in the scope of the prophecy. Dispensationalists have become so accustomed to the idea of hidden intervals or parentheses in prophecy and have found them so helpful in solving the problems which beset the path of the literalist interpreter that it is easy for [p. 118] them to overlook the difficulty which confronts them at this point. It is a very serious difficulty. Is it credible that this prophecy, which speaks so definitely of 70 weeks and then subdivides the 70 into 7 and 62 and 1, should require for its correct interpretation that an interval be discovered between the last two of the weeks far longer than the entire period covered by the prophecy itself? If the 69 weeks are exactly 483 consecutive years, exact to the very day, and if the 1 week is to be exactly 7 consecutive years, is it credible that an interval which is already more than 1900 years, nearly four times as long as the period covered by the prophecy, is to be introduced into it and allowed to interrupt its fulfilment? ... 483+7 is 490, no more and no less, 483+x+7 is a very different total, especially if x is an "unknown," already proved to represent more than 1900. Furthermore, the fact that the 62 weeks are regarded as following directly on the 7 would indicate that the last week is to follow immediately on the 62...

Dispensationalists are fond of the illustration of a clock. The ticking clock, they tell us, represents "Jewish" time. The mystery parenthesis is "time out." God only counts

time in dealing with Israel, when the people are in the land. Some add to this the further specification, when "they are governed by God." Neither of these requirements is met by the interval which they find here in the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks. Consequently, the clock ceased to tick at the time of the triumphal entry. It will not tick again until that moment, still future, when God resumes His direct dealings with Israel. This will be when the people are once more in their own land. It will follow the rapture and be marked by the appearance of [Antichrist]...

[p. 122] According to Dispensationalists, ... [the Antichrist] is yet to make a covenant for seven years with the Jews and permit them to ... rebuild the temple, and restore the Mosaic ritual of sacrifice; and then, in the midst of the week, he will break the covenant, abolish the temple worship and inaugurate that reign of terror which is commonly called the great tribulation.

1533. Seventy Weeks—Traditional Interpretation as Presented by Allis SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1945), pp. 113, 114, 122, 123. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission. [Brackets, except for page numbers, in the original.]

[p. 113] The "Traditional" Interpretation of the Seventy Weeks [of Dan. 9].

(1) According to this view, all of the great transactions referred to in vs. 24 are to be regarded as having been fulfilled at the first advent and, more specifically, in what is to be regarded as the climactic event of the prophecy, the redemption at Calvary, which is referred to literally in vs. 26 and figuratively in vs. 27. Thus the words, "to finish transgression and to make an end of (or seal up) sins and to make reconciliation for iniquity," are to be regarded as referring to that atonement for sin which was accomplished, fully and completely, once for all, on the cross...

[p. 114] (2) According to this view, the 69th week ended with the beginning of the ministry of John the Baptist and the baptism of Jesus; and the 70th week followed immediately upon it. Consequently, the "cutting off" of the Anointed One which occurred "after the threescore and two weeks" must be regarded as having taken place in the 70th week; and a reference to it is to be found in the words, "in the midst [half] of the week, he [the Messiah] shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease." That Christ by His death put an end to the Jewish ritual of sacrifice, substituting for bulls and goats "a sacrifice of nobler name and richer blood than they," is the great argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. So interpreted, it is the Messiah who makes firm or confirms the covenant for the one (the 70th) week; and the crucifixion which takes place in the midst of it is the great event of that week and may be regarded as the climax of the entire prophecy...

[p. 122] The words, "and he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease," find a very appropriate fulfilment in the atoning work of Christ on the cross. The same applies to the words, "and he shall confirm [or, cause to be strong, or, to prevail] covenant [or, a covenant] for many (for) one week." … This may properly be taken to mean that during the brief period of His earthly ministry Jesus fulfilled the terms of the ancient covenant made with the seed of Abraham (cf. Rom. xv. 8), that He secured its benefits to "many," that is "to the believers in Israel," for the period up to the stoning of Stephen, or perhaps, in mercy, until the time of the destruction of Jerusalem…

The superiority of the older interpretation of this prophecy is clearly indicated by the arguments in its favor stated above. They may be summarized as follows:

- (*a*) The view that Messiah is the subject of the verb "make firm" regards the 70th week as following immediately on the 69th week. It does not destroy the chronological sequence and value of the prophecy by inserting between a predicted period [p. 123] of exactly 483 years, which is completely past, and a period of exactly 7 years, which it regards as wholly future, an indefinite period of time which is already more than 1900 years (*i.e.*, almost four times the length of time covered by the prophecy) and which may even now be very far from ended.
- (b) It gives to the death of Christ its proper and climactic place as central in the last week; it does not place it outside the compass of the weeks altogether and make it of minor importance as compared with a far less important event, the triumphal entry.
- (c) It does not involve the inconsistency of declaring that the "coming prince" will "make firm" a covenant for a week and declaring also that he will break it (by causing sacrifice and oblation to cease) in the midst of the week.
- (*d*) It recognizes that the abolishing of sacrifice and oblation took place at Calvary, as Hebrews tells us so plainly was the case. It does not involve and require the future restoration of "Jewish" ordinances by the Roman Prince, in order that they may then be speedily abolished by him.
- (e) It seeks to explain and does explain the events of the last week as actual events of history. It does not refer them to a future, the course of which is dark and mysterious. So interpreted Daniel ix. does not skip over the Church age as a hidden parenthesis between the 69th and 70th weeks of the prophecy. On the contrary, it finds in the 70th week the prediction of that great climactic event upon which the Christian Church is founded, the atoning death of the Messiah as the fulfilment and authentication of the types and prophecies of the Old Testament.

1534. Sin, Defined as Breaking of Ten Commandments SOURCE: Billy Graham, quoted in Sherwood Eliot Wirt, *Crusade at the Golden Gate* (New York: Harper, [1959]), pp. 174, 175. Copyright 1959 by Sherwood Eliot Wirt. Used by permission.

[p. 174] The Bible teaches, "For all—all—A-L-L—have sinned"; whatever your social standing, whatever your financial accounting, whatever your racial background; whoever you are, "For ALL have sinned and come short of the glory of God." That's your trouble. That's my trouble. We are sinners. You say, "Now wait a minute, Billy. You can say all of that in New York; we know they're sinners back there. But this is the Bay Area, and we're not so bad out here." The Bible says that the best of you have sinned against God.

Do you know what sin is? Sin is the breaking of the Ten [p. 175] Commandments. It is the transgression of the Law. And every person in this audience today has broken the Ten Commandments. But suppose you had kept all the commandments and had only broken one: the Bible says you are guilty of all. But in addition to that, sin means that you have come short of God's moral requirements. We have failed to live up to the Sermon on the Mount. We have failed to live up to the teachings of Christ. We have all sinned. We have failed. The Bible says that God, being a Holy God, cannot look on sin. And so we find ourselves separated from God by sin.

Now God loves us. God wants to help us. But God can do nothing for us until we come to Him.

1535. Sin, Original, Definition of, in Augsburg Confession SOURCE: The Augsburg Confession (Lutheran, 1530), art. II, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 8.

ART. II.—Of Original Sin.

Also they [the Lutherans] teach that, after Adam's fall, all men begotten after the common course of nature are born with sin; that is, without the fear of God, without trust in him, and with fleshly appetite; and that this disease, or original fault, is truly sin, condemning and bringing eternal death now also upon all that are not born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit.

1536. Spiritualism—Beliefs Spiritualists Hold in Common

SOURCE: C. E. Bechhofer Roberts, *The Truth About Spiritualism* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1932), p. 13. Used by permission.

A Spiritualist is a person who is convinced (1) that human personality survives beyond bodily death, and (2) that the surviving spirits can, and constantly do, communicate with living people through the intermediacy of especially endowed individuals known as "mediums."

1537. Spiritualism—Catholic Church Has Not Declared on Diabolic Theory

SOURCE: p. J. Gearon, *Spiritism: Its Failure* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., [1931]), pp. 116, 117. Used by permission.

[p. 116] As we have remarked in an opening chapter, the Catholic Church does not view every extraordinary happening as being of a miraculous nature. In the investigation of abnormal phenomena she examines each case with unfailing care, admitting nothing as miraculous until she has clearly proved it to be beyond the power of natural causes. She has thus set us an example which it would be a matter of wisdom to follow in our search for the origin of Spiritistic phenomena.

There are those who, after rejecting the fraudulent occurrences at séances, maintain that the abnormal happenings are due to Satan. Others, however, hold that only a certain substratum is due to diabolical intervention.

No one can deny that, at first sight, the Diabolic Theory [see Nos. 1538, 1539] is exceedingly persuasive. That the medium sometimes utters blasphemies, propounds immoral doctrines, and, in general, exhibits certain signs which would seem to point to the direct action of Satan, is undeniable.

We consider that it is impossible to hold the diabolic theory in general without implying that all mediums in question are possessed.

[p. 117] This is not the place to enter into a full discussion of the nature of diabolic possession.

The devil could, if God permitted, so act on a man, for diabolic possession is an historic fact that cannot be called in question.

What seems to increase the force of the arguments put forward by those maintaining the presence of a certain residuum of diabolic origin is that the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore seems, at least at first sight, to urge it. But we are disposed to question whether any conclusive proof can be deduced from this source.

The Council meant, doubtless, in the document in question, to denounce Spiritistic practices, but, I fear, it willed in no sense to give definite witness on behalf of any diabolic intervention.

The Catholic Church has not declared that it is the spirits, disembodied or evil, who communicate with us by way of the mediums.

1538. Spiritualism, Catholic Warning Against

SOURCE: Bernard Vaughan, Foreword, in Elliot O'Donnell, *The Menace of Spiritualism* (London: T. Werner Laurie, [1920]), pp. 1–3. Used by permission of the publishers and J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.

[p. 1] Although I do not subscribe to all the doctrine and teachings expressed between the covers of this brochure, yet do I gladly recommend it to the public as an exposition of the menace of Spiritualism in our midst. The public has plenty of temptations to encounter on the road of life without its being enticed and drawn into these side-shows where freaks, frauds, and fiends may rob them not only of their money, but, perhaps, even leave them stripped of their physical outfit and of their moral attributes.

Naturally I do not place all under the same damnation because I can but judge of the ruin wrought though Spiritualism by the cases that have come under my own observation. But you may depend upon it that the Catholic Church would not forbid her children to have anything at all to do with this insidious form of necromancy unless she was satisfied that harm only and no good comes out of it. Her experience of [p. 2] Spiritualism covers nearly two thousand years, and she seems to regard it, not as a means of getting into communion with saints, but as a snare trapping you into communion with devils...

It looks as if the penalty of trying to force the hand of God, and of lifting the veil to communicate with the Great Beyond was total loss of that childlike and clinging faith which is the priceless inheritance of the sons of God—"Unless you become as a little child." ...

[p. 3] To some of us who have studied Spiritualism in many of its phases, the wonder is that any persons, with common sense and appreciation of life's values, can allow themselves to be sucked into such a vortex.

Firstly, let me remind you that no one attending a séance in which spirits from the vast deep make themselves heard or seen can prove that their spirit visitants are the creatures they claim to be. How can anyone disprove them to be satanic spirits? You may be sure that evil spirits can quite as cleverly personate the dead as music-hall artists do the living.

Secondly, let me ask, what have spirits, after thousands of years practice, revealed to mankind calculated to be of any practical service to humanity? As yet they have not even solved the problem as to what is a sardine, or what a new-laid egg.

There is a great deal to say against Spiritism, but not much that I know of for it. **1539. Spiritualism**—Catholic Writer on Diabolic Theory

Source: Donald Hole, *Spiritualism and the Church* (Milwaukee, Wis.: Morehouse, 1929), pp. 65–67.

[p. 65] There is a strong inclination among Cath- [p. 66] olics who feel constrained to admit the genuineness of spirit-messages to assert that these are produced by the agency of the devil; that the message does not come from any departed friend, but from an evil spirit personating him.

This diabolic theory, like the telepathic theory, is certainly one which will cover the facts, and is one which, from the nature of the case, is incapable of either proof or disproof. Our knowledge of the power and capabilities of evil spirits is as vague as our knowledge of telepathy. We know that Satan is capable of transforming himself into "an angel of light," and he is presumably capable of transforming himself into the likeness of my Uncle John, of mimicking his voice and of reproducing his handwriting. If it be objected that the message contains high and lofty and even Christian sentiments, it may be replied that the evil spirit is deliberately adopting this rôle in order to deceive us and lead us on so as to ruin our souls.

The diabolic theory affords an explanation which can be made to cover all the facts. The only question is, Is it the most *probable* explanation? Judging the tree by its fruits, can [p. 67] it be said that the results of resorting to mediums are uniformly evil, and such as would lead us to infer diabolic agency?

1540. Spiritualism, Catholics Warned Against Participation in SOURCE: p. J. Gearon, *Spiritism: Its Failure* (London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., [1931]), pp. 126, 127. Used by permission.

[p. 126] Although we do not favour the diabolic theory in connection with that residuum of abnormal happenings at séances, no greater calamity could befall the reader than to believe that the practice of Spiritism involves no moral or physical danger. No device of Satan would be more crafty than to lead the reader to such a conclusion.

Mother Church, it is true, has not declared whether there are any spirits in the matter, either disembodied or demoniacal. Nevertheless, Rome has definitely forbidden her children to take part in Spiritistic gatherings.

We may rest assured that the Catholic Church would not forbid her children to have anything to do with this insidious form of necromancy were she not fully satisfied that only harm would come from it.

We find in Holy Scripture an express condemnation of the practice of consulting the dead through sorcerers, necromancers, magicians and similar agencies. Thus we have it: "The soul that shall go aside after magicians and soothsayers... I will set My face against that soul, and destroy it out of the midst of its people." (Leviticus xx, 6). And in Exodus (xxii, 18) we find something more than pro- [p. 127] hibition and malediction: "Wizards thou shalt not suffer to live."

Let us remark in passing that Holy Writ does not say that the dead are really put in communication with those who evoke them. It is the attempted communication with the dead for the purpose of gaining knowledge of occult things which is thus referred to.

1541. Spiritualism—Declaration of Principles of the National

Spiritualist Association

Source: National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America Year Book, 1946, pp. 6–8. [p. 6] 1. We believe in Infinite Intelligence.

By this we express our belief in a supreme Impersonal Power, everywhere present, manifesting as life, through all forms of organized matter called by some, God, by others, Spirit and by Spiritualists, Infinite Intelligence.

2. We believe that the phenomena of Nature, both physical and spiritual, are the expression of Infinite Intelligence.

In this manner we express our belief in the immanence of Spirit and that all forms of life are manifestations of Spirit or Infinite Intelligence, and thus that all men are children of God.

3. We affirm that a correct understanding of such expression and living in accordance therewith constitute true religion.

A correct understanding of the laws of nature, on the physical, mental and spiritual planes of life, and living in accordance therewith will unfold the highest aspirations and attributes of the Soul, which is the correct function of True Religion.

4. We affirm that the existence and personal identity of the individual continue after the change called death.

(Quote) Life here and life hereafter is all one life whose continuity of consciousness is unbroken by that mere change in form whose process we call death. Lilian Whiting.

[p. 7] 5. We affirm that communication with the so-called dead is a fact, scientifically proven by the phenomena of Spiritualism.

Spirit communication has been in evidence in all ages of the world and is amply recorded in both sacred and profane literature of all ages. Orthodoxy has accepted these manifestations and has interpreted them in dogma and creed in terms of the supernatural. Spiritualism accepts and recognizes these manifestations and interprets them in the understanding and light of Natural Law.

6. We believe that the highest morality is contained in the Golden Rule. "Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye also unto them."

This precept we believe to be true. It points the way to harmony, peace and happiness. Wherever tried it has proven successful, and when fully understood and practiced, will bring peace and happiness to man on earth.

7. We affirm the moral responsibility of the individual, and that he makes his own happiness or unhappiness as he obeys or disobeys nature's physical and spiritual laws.

Man himself is responsible for the welfare of the world in which he lives; for its welfare or its misery, for its happiness or unhappiness and if he is to obtain Heaven upon Earth, he himself must learn to make that heaven, for himself and for others. Individually man is responsible for his own spiritual growth and welfare. Sins and wrongdoing must be outgrown and overcome. Virtue and love of good must take their place. Spiritual growth and advancement must be attained by aspiration and personal striving. Vicarious atonement has no place in the philosophy of Spiritualism. Each one must carry his own cross to Calvary's Height in the overcoming of wrong doing and replacing it with the right.

[p. 8] 8. We affirm that the doorway to reformation is never closed against any human soul, here or hereafter.

We discard entirely the terrible wrong and illogical teachings of eternal damnation, and in place thereof we accept and present for consideration of thinking people the thought of the continuity of life beyond the change called death.

A natural life, where the opportunity for growth and progress to better, higher and more spiritual conditions are open to all, even as they are here on the earth plane of life. We accept no such teaching as a "Hell Fire," but we do teach that sin and wrong doing will necessarily bring remorse and suffering that would be difficult to describe in words and which can only be relieved by the individual's own efforts if not here, then in the hereafter. If we make our own lives better while here, and that of our neighbors happier, we shall unfold that happiness or heaven on earth which we shall carry with us into the Spirit World.

9. We affirm that the Precepts of Prophecy contained in the Bible are scientifically proven through Mediumship.

We thus affirm our belief in and acceptance of the truths which are contained in the Bible and assert that Prophecy and Mediumship are not unique nor of recent occurrence alone, but that they are universal and everlasting, and have been witnessed and observed in all ages of the world.

1542. Spiritualism, Defined—What It Is and Does

SOURCE: National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America Year Book, 1946, p. 14.

It teaches personal responsibility.

It removes all fear of death, which is really the portal of the spirit world.

It teaches that death is not the cessation of life, but mere change of condition.

It teaches, not that a man has a soul, but that man is a soul, and has a body.

That man is a spiritual being now, even while encased in flesh.

That as man sows on earth he reaps in the life to come.

That those who have passed on are conscious—not asleep.

That communion between the living and the "dead" is scientifically proved.

It thus brings comfort to the bereaved, and alleviates sorrow.

Spiritualism is the Science, Philosophy and Religion of continuous life, based upon the demonstrated fact of communication, by means of mediumship, with those who live in the Spirit World.

It brings to the surface man's spiritual gifts, such as inspiration, clairvoyance, clairaudience and healing powers.

It teaches that the spark of divinity dwells in all.

That as a flower gradually unfolds in beauty, so the spirit of man unfolds and develops in the spirit spheres.

Spiritualism is God's message to mortals, declaring that There Is No Death. That all who have passed on still live. That there is hope in the life beyond for the most sinful.

That every soul will progress through the ages to heights, sublime and glorious, where God Is Love and Love Is God.

It is a manifestation, a demonstration, and a proof of the continuity of life and of the truth of the many Spirit manifestations recorded in the Bible.

It demonstrates the many Spiritual gifts with which mankind is endowed but which through want of knowledge have been allowed to lie dormant, or through prejudice have been violently and unjustly suppressed.

1543. Spiritualism—Definitions by National Spiritualist Association, Adopted October, 1914, 1919, 1930

SOURCE: National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America Year Book, 1946, p. 30.

- 1. Spiritualism is the Science. Philosophy and Religion of a continuous life, based upon the demonstrated fact of communication, by means of mediumship, with those who live in the Spirit World.
- 2. A Spiritualist is one who believes, as the basis of his or her religion, in the communication between this and the spirit world by means of mediumship, and who endeavors to mould his or her character and conduct in accordance with the highest teachings derived from such communion.
- 3. A Medium is one whose organism is sensitive to vibrations from the spirit world and through whose instrumentality intelligences in that world are able to convey messages and produce the phenomena of Spiritualism.
- 4. A Spiritualist healer is one who, either through his own inherent powers, or through his mediumship, is able to impart vital, curative force to pathologic conditions.

"Spiritualism Is a Science" because it investigates, analyzes and classifies facts and manifestations demonstrated from the spirit side of life.

"Spiritualism Is a Philosophy" because it studies the laws of nature both on the seen and unseen sides of life and bases its conclusions upon present observed facts. It accepts statements of observed facts of past ages and conclusions drawn therefrom, when sustained by reason and by results of observed facts of the present day.

"Spiritualism Is a Religion" because it strives to understand and to comply with the Physical, Mental and Spiritual Laws of Nature, "which are the laws of God".

1544. Spiritualism—Explanation of Objects of

SOURCE: National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America Year Book, 1946, p. 22. The objects of the organized movement of Spiritualism may be stated in part as

follows:

To teach the truths and principles expressed in the Declaration of Principles and in the Definitions of "SPIRITUALISM," "A SPIRITUALIST," "A MEDIUM," and "A SPIRITUALIST HEALER," as adopted by the National Spiritualist Association of the United States of America.

To teach and proclaim the science, philosophy and religion of modern Spiritualism, to encourage lectures on all subjects pertaining to the Spiritual and Secular Welfare of mankind. To protest against every attempt to compel mankind to worship God in any particular or prescribed manner. To advocate and promote spiritual healing and to protect and encourage spiritual teachers and mediums in all laudable efforts in giving evidence or proof to mankind of a continued intercourse and relationship between the living and the so-called dead. To encourage every person in holding present beliefs always open to restatement as growing thought and investigation reveal new truth, thereby leaving every individual free to follow the dictates of reason and conscience in spiritual as in secular affairs.

1545. Spiritualism, Introductory Statement Concerning, by a Spiritualist SOURCE: Ernest Thompson, *The History of Modern Spiritualism* (Manchester [new address, St. Andrews House, 32/36 Holborn Viaduct, London, E.C.1.]: The Two Worlds Publishing Company Ltd., 1948), Introduction, pp. 11–13. Copyright 1948 by the Author. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 11] Modern Spiritualism commenced with spontaneous spirit manifestations in a cottage, inhabited by an ordinary working man and his family, in Hydesville, New York State, America, in 1848. This was the beginning of a wave of psychical phenomena which spread over the entire surface of the earth.

Arising from the facts of these phenomena the rudiments of a new science (psychics) gradually emerged. Later it was realised that these phenomena had philosophical implications and these, in turn, a religious content.

Religious teachings were given through mediums by the communicating spirits revealing a fundamentally different spiritual approach to God, human destiny and morality. These teachings were so contradictory to orthodox beliefs that those who accepted them realised the necessity for an organisation for the propagation of the new revelation, and gradually the Spiritualist Movement came into being.

This Movement is primarily a religious Movement and differs from orthodox religions chiefly because it is basically a spiritual revelation from within, and not fashioned upon an external pattern. It is not *a* religion, it *is* religion, because it brings experience, to those who embrace it, of the main factors in all religious beliefs. Survival of the human spirit and the existence of a spiritual world become an experience and not a belief.

It is important to appreciate this opposition between the beliefs of orthodoxy and the facts of Spiritualism in order to fully understand the developments which have taken place during these last hundred years.

What are these fundamental differences? The idea of God has always been the dominating principle of all religions. Like all other aspects of human thought this idea has changed and evolved as Man's knowledge of himself and his environment has increased. Spiritualists regard God as the life-giving principle or power which manifests in every aspect of natural phenomena. He is the Eternal Indwelling Spirit of the whole Universe.

Natural phenomena are therefore a constant demonstration to us of His Being and a manifestation of the working of His Spirit. The Eternal Spirit of the Universe, manifesting through natural phenomena, is consequently a God of whom we can have direct and personal experience, for he is not only within us but within everything around us, and by a study of natural law we can try to understand Him in order to serve Him more perfectly.

[p. 12] This is in direct opposition to the orthodox concept of an external, anthropomorphical God (a God in the likeness of man) who possesses not only the human attributes of love but also those of hate and vengeance—a God who kills his enemies. Santayana, the American philosopher, makes an interesting observation in this respect— "It is pathetic to observe how lowly are the motives that religion, even the highest, attributes to deity, and from what a hard pressed and bitter existence they have been drawn. To be given the best morsel, to be remembered, to be praised, to be obeyed blindly and punctiliously; these have been thought points of honour with the gods, for which they would dispense favours and punishments on the most exorbitant scale."

Brotherhood is the next most important principle in any religion. A Universal Brotherhood of all men, incarnate and discarnate, is made a living reality by means of mediumship which daily links us, in loving co-operation, with our spiritual brothers and sisters. This is in direct opposition to the attitude of orthodoxy which condemns spirit communications, on biblical authority, as the work of the Devil.

The communion of spirits and the ministry of angels, being a living experience, have a profound influence upon the life of the individual whether incarnate or discarnate.

By means of spirit guidance we are helped along the road of life whilst those lost spirits, who stray into our home circles, are directed by us to happier states of existence. There is no reference to such practical expressions of love between the departed and ourselves in the teachings of orthodoxy.

The continuous existence of the human soul becomes a fact to the sensitive in mental phenomena, and also to the ordinary person by the evidence of spirit messages and of spirit materialisations which can be directly perceived by the normal senses.

Whereas psychical experiences can become the common experience of all people, the orthodox hope of continuous existence is founded upon a somewhat distorted account of the individual experiences of one man who lived nearly 2,000 years ago, and which were unrecorded until many decades after his "resurrection" appearances.

Spiritualists believe in personal responsibility for all our thoughts and actions, and it is in this principle where we find the contradiction most developed between orthodox beliefs and the teachings of Spiritualism. The facts of the life hereafter, given to us by those who have had experience of them, confirm that our spiritual progress is only the net result of our own efforts, and that our sins cannot be forgiven or remitted by the vicarious atonement of a Saviour. To perpetuate this idea by the practice of religious ceremonies such as the eating of bread (the body) and the drinking of wine (the blood) is to demonstrate before the world a continuing belief [p. 13] in the miraculous nature of the human sacrifice of Jesus, and to proclaim a denial of the principle of personal responsibility.

The idea that we receive compensation for all our good works, and experience retribution for all our evil deeds, done whilst on the earth, is proved by the operation of the spiritual law of gravitation when we pass into spirit life. This causes advanced spirits to rise to the more refined, happier and higher vibrationary spheres of existence, and forces backward spirits to remain in the more dense, more miserable and lower vibrationary planes.

This is a fundamental change to conditions operating on earth where the wise and ignorant, good and evil, share the same material plane together. Whereas this conception is based on the experiences of spirits, who dwell in this spirit world, the belief in a judgement by an anthropomorphical God is merely the opinion of the founders of the orthodox church, which cannot be proved.

All the facts of Spiritualism support the principle that eternal progress is the opportunity of every human being.

As the Church denies the facts of Spiritualism, it can offer no case whatsoever which could satisfy the agnostic that he is a spirit, with eternal progress as his natural inheritance. Without such a glorious destiny however, personal endeavour would be robbed of its purpose; for to contemplate that all we create is eventually destroyed is to give life an appearance of ultimate uselessness.

Finally Spiritualism, through an intelligent interpretation of its Seven Principles, reveals to the understanding, the deepest significance of service to others, and transforms life from selfishness to unselfishness, from individualism to social co-operation.

Only on such a foundation can love and truth and all other spiritual values have any practical meaning or reality.

As this is an approved text book for the National Education Scheme of the Spiritualists National Union, the chapters have been divided into lecturettes for the convenience of the students and discussion groups. It covers briefly the history of the Spiritualists' Movement over a period of exactly one hundred years, 1848–1948.

1546. Spiritualism—Origin in Animism

SOURCE: George Whitehead, An Inquiry Into Spiritualism (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), p. 9.

Spiritualism has its roots in savage and infantile psychology. As a religious belief it antedates all others. Immature minds everywhere conceive of Nature, especially of those aspects which are mysterious, as being animated by spirits responsible for their manifestations. Even Pythagoras thought that it was its spirit which shrieked with pain when a brass gong was struck; and to this day we speak of methylated spirits, etc., as a survival of the days when spirits were supposed to constitute the essences of the various elements in use.

1547. Spiritualism, Origin of, in America

SOURCE: C. E. Bechhofer Roberts, *The Truth About Spiritualism* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1932), pp. 45–48. Used by permission.

[p. 45] In 1848 a small wooden house in the village of Hydes- [p. 46] ville, part of the little town of Arcadia, in the State of New York, was occupied by John D. Fox, a Methodist farmer. His household consisted of his wife and two daughters, Margaretta,

aged fifteen, and Catherine (Katie), aged twelve. A third daughter, at that time named Mrs. Fish (she later became Mrs. Brown and, still later, Mrs. Underhill), lived not far away in Rochester. On the evening of March 31 the two little girls were in bed; their parents were about to join them, in the same room, when mysterious raps were heard. It is impossible to discover from contemporary accounts why these rappings were attributed to a spirit, but they were. A code was agreed upon: the alphabet was recited until a rap selected the appropriate letter. Thus addressed, the spirit answered, giving information especially about local events. It was soon accepted that the raps were made by the spirit of a man who was buried in the cellar; and this theory was later amplified by a legend that raps had been heard in the house before the Foxes occupied it.

Shortly after the beginning of these experiences, Margaretta went to Rochester to stay with her sister, Mrs. Fish, and Katie paid a visit to Auburn, another neighbouring township. Wherever they went raps were heard. Mrs. Fish and others became mediums also, and the contagion spread with amazing rapidity. In three or four years communication with spirits through the intermediacy of mediums was established up and down the Atlantic coast and inland. By 1851 it was estimated that there were a hundred mediums in New York alone, and fifty in Philadelphia. The three Fox sisters travelled [p. 47] widely, giving demonstrations to large audiences. Their claims were frequently investigated, and they were accused of fraud several times, in particular by a committee of doctors in Buffalo in February, 1851; on the other hand, many prominent and intelligent people declared themselves unable to explain the phenomena except by some supernormal cause.

In that same year, 1851, Mrs. Culver, a believer in the spirit raps, became suspicious of Katie Fox, and the latter, it is said, showed her how to produce raps with the joints of her knees and toes. In 1888 both Katie and her sister Margaretta made a public confession that the whole of their supposedly supernormal phenomena had been produced by fraud, the raps being made principally by cracking their toe-joints—a feat which, by the way, very many people can perform. But by that time both sisters were far gone in alcoholic excess, from which they soon died, and this confession need not be taken as wholly authentic: indeed, they afterwards retracted it.

There are hints, however, of admissions by Margaretta in letters written to her by her husband, Dr. Kane, the Arctic explorer. After his death his widow, who became a Roman Catholic from 1856 to 1867 and during that period gave no sittings, published a volume, now exceedingly rare, called *The Love-Life of Dr. Kane,* and consisting mainly of his letters to her. In these occur such passages as: "Oh, Maggie, are you never tired of this weary, weary sameness of continual deceit? Are you doomed thus to spend your days, doomed never to rise to better things?" And again: "Do avoid 'spirits.' I cannot bear to think of you as engaged in a course of wickedness and deception. Maggie, you have no friend but me, whose interest in you is disconnected from this cursed rapping. Pardon my [p. 48] saying so; but is it not deceit even to listen when others are deceived?" It should be mentioned that Kane was not a Roman Catholic.

Genuine or not, these confessions and hints of confessions have one remarkable feature in common with the confessions and exposures of countless mediums in more recent years: they produced little effect, so far as the believers were concerned, on the status either of the mediums concerned or of the Spiritualist Movement as a whole. To this day the Fox sisters are spoken of by ardent Spiritualists in the highest terms, and regarded by them as endowed with a special mission to humanity.

1548. Spiritualism—Origin of Modern Movement

SOURCE: George Whitehead, An Inquiry Into Spiritualism (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), pp. 40, 41.

[p. 40] Although its roots are found in primitive animism, according to Professor Hyslop, Spiritualism derives its modern fillip from the work of Swedenborg. But it was the magnetic force which was brought before the educated section of the public in the eighteenth century by Galvani and Volta which really paved the way to the acceptance of Spiritualism in later years. This animal magnetism, as it was called, was conceived as a fluid stored in metals, animals and human beings. It was believed to perform wonders. As certain persons were supposed to possess more of this electric or magnetic fluid than others, circles were started to develop phenomena now associated with seances. All over Europe in the decade before 1780 animal magnetism was engaging the interest of many men and women. This mysterious force or fluid was believed to account for the movements of the tables until an epidemic of table-turning spread from the Continent to England, becoming particularly acute about 1847.

This prepared the way for the news in 1848 that mysterious raps had been heard in the house of a farmer named Fox, who lived in an obscure hamlet called Hydesville, situated about 250 miles from New York, U.S.A. In February of 1848 uncanny raps sounded on the floor and furniture of any room occupied by the two daughters of Fox. Loud raps occurred as they lay in bed, but neither Margaretta, aged fifteen, nor Katherine, aged twelve, seemed perturbed, although we read that the mother's hair turned white in a week. A code was established and a message rapped out relative to the story of a murdered pedlar, the name of the murderer being given. Bones were then reported to have been found in the creek nearby, and the neighbours used to assemble to listen to the messages of the "spirit" of the victim. Information was rapped out regarding the age and condition of the people present, and before very long a veritable contagion of rappings was spread, after which the sisters separated, one to live with her married sister at Rochester, and the other [p, 41] to live with relatives at Auburn. Their friends and relatives caught the contagion and other visitors spread it to their towns. Within a few months the epidemic was all over the State of New York and modern Spiritualism was founded.

1549. Spiritualism, Origin of—Rejection of Fox Sisters' Admission of Fraud by Leaders

SOURCE: John Mulholland, *Beware Familiar Spirits*, p. 283. Copyright 1938 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

Arthur Conan Doyle believed what he said about a divine purpose in spiritualism in spite of what Margaret Fox wrote in a signed story in *The New York World* for October 21, 1888. In the story she said, "Spiritualism is a fraud and a deception. It is a branch of legerdemain, but it has to be closely studied to gain perfection." Sir Arthur did not believe her. Neither was the confession of fraud by Margaret Fox acceptable to Henry J. Newton, the president of The First Spiritual Society of New York. His reply to the Fox article was, "Nothing that she could say in that regard would in the least change my opinion, nor would it that of any one else who had become profoundly convinced that there is an occult influence connecting us with an invisible world."

1550. Spiritualism, Peter Marshall as a Young Man Warned Against Toying With

SOURCE: Catherine Marshall, *To Live Again* (Carmel, N.Y.: Guideposts Associates, Inc.), pp. 201, 202. Copyright, 1957, by Catherine Marshall. Used by permission of McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York.

[p. 201] When Peter [Marshall] was eighteen, before he emigrated to America, [p. 202] he and two friends went one night to visit a man who had what the Scots call "second sight." That evening the man claimed that he could receive messages through table-rapping. There were various messages, including one said to be from a man who had lived in France 200 years before. He told his name (Peter always remembered it; I do not), some facts about his life, where he was buried.

Then the table rapped out the name "Peter Marshall." Some facts followed which jibed with what Peter knew of his father's early life ... the date of his marriage to Peter's mother in Switzerland; the full names and certain facts about long-dead relatives. Then came this message for Peter: "You must never again toy with spiritualism. For you, it is very dangerous." That was all.

Peter took that as authoritative and obeyed it to the letter—not because he was certain that the message really had come from his father, but because an instinct told him that the warning was authentic. Though to the end of his life he found the subject compelling, thereafter he never went outside the framework of the Christian church to investigate it.

1551. Spiritualism, Phenomena of, Doubted as Proof That the Dead Are Alive

SOURCE: Hamlin Garland, *Forty Years of Psychic Research* (New York: Macmillan, 1936), pp. 385–387. Copyright 1936 by Hamlin Garland. Used by permission of Isabel Garland Lord and Constance Garland Lord.

[p. 385] While it would not be quite true to say that as an investigator I am at the point from which I started forty-five years ago, I shall no doubt disappoint some of my readers when I confess to a state of doubt...

Already the larger part of my generation have become intangible, and many of those who remain on the earth are seeking, like myself, some evidence, some assurance of a life beyond the black deep whose waters they must [p. 386] soon cross. That I should welcome a hail from that dim other shore, is true, but the voice must be real and not imaginary.

As I bring this record of many personal experiments to a close, I am urged by my friends to state my conclusions. To them I must reply: "I have no conclusions. I am still the seeker, the questioner." I can only put into this final chapter some of my convictions along with a candid statement of the intellectual barriers which have thus far prevented me from an acceptance of the spirit hypothesis...

[p. 387] I should like to share this faith. I should like to believe that my father and mother, in restored youth, are walking a new and lovely country, feeding on astral fruits and grains while waiting for me to join them—but alas! I can not compass such a belief. I can not find the passage through the hill-side into the changeless "realm of the Shee."

In writing of my doubts, I have no wish to weaken any other man's faith; I am merely stating the reasons which prevent me from accepting the spiritist interpretation of psychic phenomena, phenomena which I have abundantly proven to exist—I am still questioning the identity of the manifesting intelligences. My dissent is not upon the phenomena but upon their interpretation.

1552. Spiritualism, Phenomena of—Hallucination Defined

SOURCE: George Whitehead, An Inquiry Into Spiritualism (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), p. 43.

Under a variety of circumstances the senses register misleading impressions, and the reason draws faulty inferences. In classifying anything we see, not only are the eye and the optic nerve involved, but memory and reason are called upon to help to designate correctly that reflection of the rays of light which are registered on the retina as the impression of a table or other object. The art of recognition is more than a mere sensation, and a general stock of ideas is essential before classification is possible. What is termed "psychic blindness" is operative in persons who may retain eyesight unimpaired but who, owing to the disorganization of some portion of the cortex, are unable to derive any meaning from what is seen. In addition, even in more or less normal people, hallucinations, illusions and delusions may occur to falsify the facts of life.

We speak of an illusion in the case of one whose sensations are mistaken regarding some real object, as for example when an oar half immersed in water appears to be bent; hallucination is present when we receive the sensation in the complete absence of the objective stimulation, as when thirsty travellers in the desert are confident that they can see an oasis although none is actually in sight; delusion occurs not only in respect to mistaken impressions of the senses but when the mind draws wrong conclusions from the data provided by the senses, as when a charwoman is convinced she is the Queen of England and is being kept from her rightful inheritance by the attendants of the asylum.

1553. Spiritualism—Phenomena of, Not Accepted as Proof of Immortality

SOURCE: Corliss Lamont, *The Illusion of Immortality* (2d ed.; New York: Philosophical Library, 1950), pp. 155–160, 162, 163. Copyright 1950 by Corliss Lamont. Used by permission of the publisher and author.

[p. 155] Historically connected to some extent with the Swedenborgian movement, but offering what purports to be evidence of a future life far more weighty and empirical, are the divers varieties of Spiritualists and psychic researchers.* [Note *: It should be noted that on the whole the Societies for Psychical Research are more scientific in their methods and more restrained in their conclusions than the Spiritualist groups. Among the psychic researchers are many who do not agree that the theory of personal survival is the best explanation of the strange and uncanny facts which they have uncovered; and others who do not think that any explanation so far offered is satisfactory.] Their experiments have resulted in an imposing amount of what appear to be [p. 156] at least supernormal phenomena and have constituted real contributions to the field of abnormal psychology. But their findings have not carried a great deal of conviction as proving the survival of the dead. The phenomena that occur are one thing, while the interpretation given to them as establishing immortality is another. Such phenomena are not characteristic simply of recent times, though only in recent times have they been recorded with any considerable degree of accuracy. As a matter of fact, ghosts, clairvoyancy, appearances at a distance, telepathy, conversing with apparitions, a sense of the presence of the dead and many other such occult occurrences have been variously reported as far back in history as the mind of man can reach. The hypothesis of existence beyond the grave has traditionally been a favorite explanation of these wonders. But today, as in the past, that suspiciously easy and sweeping hypothesis is subject to the very gravest doubts by all who have respect for scientific method and objective thinking.

No scientist worthy of the name considers an hypothesis proved until it is shown beyond all reasonable doubt to be the only possible explanation of the phenomena under examination. The Spiritualists, however, are very far from having demonstrated that the hypothesis of personal survival is the sole and certain explanation of the data they have gathered. In the first place it is generally admitted, even by leading Spiritualists themselves, that a very large proportion of the results obtained are contaminated by conscious or unconscious fraud on the part of the mediums or others participating. To the ordinary layman it will always seem suspicious that most of the Spiritualist experiments must be carried on in darkness or with very dim lights and that the greater part of them can be repeated in broad daylight by profes- [p. 157] sional magicians like the late Harry Houdini and Joseph Dunninger.

This is not to imply that all the performances of mediums can be reduced to the art of expert magicians or that some mediums do not possess the most extraordinary psychic powers. Undoubtedly, some of the things that mediums do are at present not wholly intelligible according to any known scientific laws. But if a detective in a murder case is unable to find the murderer, he does not at once claim that a ghost must have done the deed. And the Spiritualists are surely not justified in calling in so promptly supernatural spirits to explain even the most baffling phenomena. This is equivalent to the argument from ignorance, to saying that because we do not for the time being know the exact cause of a phenomenon, therefore it must be due to the influence of the dead.

There can be no doubt that much of what goes on during the seances of the Spiritualists can be understood in terms of purely naturalistic modern sciences such as abnormal psychology, religious psychology and psychiatry. For example, the common occurrence of a supposedly departed spirit taking control of a medium's mind or vocal apparatus and issuing thereby all sorts of statements seems to be closely akin to what happens in the case of dissociated or multiple personality. There is a temporary submergence or splitting off of the medium's normal personality and an arising from the psychic depths of a strangely unfamiliar and different personality. The process may be entirely unconscious; but the secondary personality speedily learns to play its role with singular skill, carries over from the normal state clews of knowledge suitable for its purposes and is quick to make the most of hints dropped by those present during its period of activity.

Studies of human dream-consciousness, of hyp- [p. 158] notic trances, of hysteria, of epilepsy, of high-fever delirium and of the regular patients in mental hospitals suggest that the behavior and revelations of the ordinary medium have natural rather than supernatural causes. The additional fact that, for various reasons, close to four-fifths of the mediums or "Sensitives," as they are sometimes known, are members of the female sex is likewise not without significance. Two or three centuries ago women who did things like present-day Spiritualist mediums were burnt as witches. And the witchcraft hypothesis is in a number of ways just as sensible as the Spiritualist interpretation.

Also, what is revealed through the medium is ordinarily so much a part of the regular furniture of the average mind that we hardly need resort for explanation to the talkative inhabitants of some other world. That communications from the beyond are, in general, so earth-bound and conventional is accounted for by the Spiritualists on the ground that it is very difficult for the departed to transmit complex and coherent messages about their new circumstances. But if immortal souls can dictate pages and pages of detailed description concerning the future life, showing how very similar it is to this one; if they can get across tedious two-volume dissertations on the higher philosophy and metaphysics; if they can produce, through the automatic writing of a medium, whole books of plays and poetry signed by spirits purporting to be William Shakespeare and other great literary geniuses; if they can do all this, the excuse of the Spiritualists does not appear to be very substantial.

For if the best minds of the other world can deliver themselves of such lengthy remarks, often complicated though almost always commonplace, there seems to be no good reason why they should not be able to make real contributions to human knowledge [p. 159] and to the solution of earthly problems, especially since they are supposed to have grown in wisdom since their sojourn here below. And if spirits can, as claimed, locate lost jewelry and sundry knick-knacks for friends and relatives still on earth, then surely they should be able to locate murderers, in at least a few cases where they were victims, for the police. Yet no criminals have as yet been apprehended in this manner. And desperadoes continue to operate successfully on the basis of the age-long assumption that dead men tell no tales.

But assuming for the sake of argument that the medium actually gets in touch with and transmits from something that objectively and independently exists outside of her won conscious and subconscious mind, does this necessarily indicate that she has come into contact with an immortal soul? Considering how freakish and mischievous are many of the communications and physical manifestations that occur at séances, the hypothesis that impish and non-human demons or elfs are the cause is not without merit. The traditional belief of the Church in diabolical possession, still held in many quarters, is possibly more plausible than the theories of the Spiritualists. Or perhaps the medium is dipping into a great impersonal sea of consciousness or reservoir of memory that holds the psychic life of the past and of every deceased individual intact within it. It is also well known that human beings radiate energy and it has been suggested that somehow mediums sense and interpret the enduring traces of human vibrations which have left their mark on material objects and in familiar places. This might also account for the appearance of apparitions to persons of especial sensitiveness. But these apparitions would no more be conscious and organized personal- [p. 160] ities than are material reminders of dead persons in the form of photographs.

It is possible, too, that mediums might be in touch with faintly surviving personalities which go on for a time beyond death but gradually fade out completely. A temporary after-existence of this sort is hardly the same as the life everlasting of immortality. Or, as Mr. H. G. Wells suggests, perhaps there is survival of *fragments* of personal will and memory. "Suppose," he writes, "a medium to produce some trivial secret between myself and some departed intimate known to no one else; that no more proves that my friend is still mentally alive than a corrupting fragment of his face, with a characteristic scar, would prove his bodily survival." Professor Broad, the English philosopher, proposes a similar theory. He believes that there may be a persistence after death of a "psychic factor" formerly an element in the living personality of the deceased. This "mind-kin," as he calls it, "may become temporarily united with the organism of an entranced medium."

[p. 162] But even if the Spiritualist findings be taken as reliable testimony of an afterexistence for the personality, the kind of future life indicated and the methods used to establish it are far from agreeable to the great majority of immortalists. The reasons for this are not difficult to discern. The whole atmosphere surrounding the Spiritualists' attempt to prove empirically a hereafter is likely to repel the sensitive [p. 163] and reverent immortalist. The common taint of fraud, the unpleasant odor of sensationalism, the inevitable association with morbid emotionalism, combine to create a general impression that this is not exactly a movement for the truly religious and high-minded. For not a few there is something inherently undignified in dear departed grandfather's indulging himself in table-rapping, playing weird tunes on cheap musical instruments or telling the secrets of his past to strange women mediums. For others, the whole business is deplorable because it gives over to public gossip the most intimate of private affairs.

As to the nature of the immortality promised by the Spiritualists, it was William James, long a most sympathetic student of psychic phenomena, who wrote: "The spirit-hypothesis exhibits a vacancy, triviality and incoherence of mind painful to think of as the state of the departed." The great English scientist, Thomas H. Huxley, held a similar opinion. "Supposing the phenomena to be genuine," he declared, "they do not interest me. If anybody would endow me with the faculty of listening to the chatter of old women and curates in the nearest cathedral town, I should decline the privilege, having better things to do… The only good that I can see in a demonstration of the truth of 'Spiritualism' is to furnish an additional argument against suicide. Better live a crossing-sweeper than die and be made to talk twaddle by a 'medium' hired at a guinea a séance."

1554. Spiritualism, Phenomena of, Not All Fraudulent SOURCE: George Whitehead, *An Inquiry Into Spiritualism* (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), p. 232.

On the other hand professional "thought-readers" have an obvious inducement to manipulate codes and mechanical devices so as to produce what appear to be genuine phenomena. This has been done on a prodigious scale. Obviously, even if some genuine clairvoyant power is possessed, as this cannot always function at the word of command, it has to be eked out with some more reliable method in the case of those who are obliged to provide "phenomena" at every performance. This applies, although perhaps to a less extent, in the case of professional mediums who accordingly frequently introduce spurious "phenomena" on those occasions when psychic power is not available. In neither case does trickery, prevalent on some occasions, justify us in dismissing the possibility of genuine phenomena, however much a discovery of fraud lessens our faith in the alleged powers of that particular exponent. Indeed, we are not justified in declaring all the phenomena of a medium or clairvoyant are fraudulent, even if on several occasions he has been detected in trickery. It may be mentioned that Dr. Hereward Carrington, who has written a standard work on the fraudulent aspect of all kinds of phenomena, The *Physical Phenomena of Spiritualism*, in which he gives hundreds of pages of explanation as to the means employed, is nevertheless quite convinced of the genuine nature of telepathy and clairvoyance. And Mr. W. W. Baggally, the author of *Telepathy*: Fraudulent and Genuine, in his title implies his own belief.

1555. Spiritualism, Phenomena of, Trickery Common in SOURCE: John Mulholland, *Beware Familiar Spirits*, pp. 231–233. Copyright 1938 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. 231] "Our experience during the past thirty years in supplying mediums and others with the peculiar effects in this line enable us to place before you only those which are practical... Remember that we guarantee everything just as represented...

"We can furnish you with the explanation and, where necessary, the materials for the production of any known public 'tests' or 'phenomena' not mentioned in this, our latest list.

[p. 232] "You are aware that our effects are being used by nearly all prominent mediums, entertainers and others of the entire world, and you can, therefore, be assured of receiving fraternal and honest treatment in all transactions. To those who have not dealt with us [we] would call your attention to the fact that in listing many effects the word 'Spirit' is used in describing them. It should be borne in mind that this is only the customary name used to explain the effect, as 'Spirit,' in the general acceptation of the name, are not a factor in their presentation, although, 'for the good of the cause,' that impression has been fostered by many..."

With this introduction in a well-illustrated printed catalog one of the old supply houses of equipment for tricky mediums offers seventy items... [p. 233] I have many such catalogs and the total number of "effects" they offer run well into the hundreds... When one knows such a dealer well it is not hard to get permission to inspect his list of patrons. One such dealer in a Mid-Western city allowed me to go over his list most carefully. [The author is a magician.] The list contained two thousand names of mediums of various degrees of renown. It was particularly interesting to me to note that in many cases a description of their séances read quite like the description in the catalog of the "effects" which they had purchased. A number of the mediums were well known in various associations of mediums and spirits. I took the trouble to go to a few of them and to mention that the manifestations of their séances were most reminiscent of the tricks of my dealer acquaintance. All but one of the mediums protested their ignorance of the dealer and declared that it was utterly impossible to duplicate fraudulently their manifestations. The one medium told me that he knew the dealer and as a matter of fact had purchased several pieces of his apparatus in order to be quite familiar with the methods of "those fakers whom every true medium despises."

1556. Spiritualism, Phenomena of—Trickery or Genuineness Not Readily Provable by Ordinary Observer

SOURCE: John Mulholland, *Beware Familiar Spirits*, pp. 300, 303, 305. Copyright 1938 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. 300] Most of the followers of mediums have become convinced of the reality of the phenomena because they "saw it with their own eyes." During meetings of spiritists people give testimony about what they "saw," and "heard" during a time when the medium was "under complete control." I am perfectly willing to have the people believe that they are accurate in their impressions but as a magician I state that I am in a position to prove that they cannot know.

A magician depends upon the fact that if something which he has to do can be made to seem quite unimportant, no one in his audience will see him do it...

[p. 303] Mind you, I do not say that all mediums use trickery. I am only attempting to point out that: first, it takes a large amount of knowledge and special training to observe correctly a mediumistic exhibition; second, that the layman's opinion of the way a magician works is not according to fact; third, that merely because one does not suspect that a medium knows how to do tricks, or that he has had an opportunity to learn them, is not proof that he is not a trickster.

People believe the evidence of their senses, yet nothing is more deceptive. Even those trained to observe certain things may be faulty in the observation of other things which they have not studied...

[p. 305] A magician is trained in his subject and he is apt to notice indications of trickery that a person knowing nothing of either the psychology or method of magic would pass over. He cannot make a blanket statement, however, and have it mean anything more than any other blanket statement would mean.

Another thing I feel should be noted is that because a magician seemingly can duplicate a phenomenon, the medium is not thereby proven a fraud. An oasis is no less real because some people think that they see one when all they see is a mirage. When, however, a medium can produce his phenomenon only under the conditions necessary for the performance of a feat of magic, it seems to me that he is asking for a stretching of credulity when he desires that it be accepted as genuine. A mirage is no less a mirage because some one is able to prove the existence of an oasis.

One more thing which should be mentioned is that while our senses are most untrustworthy there are occasionally found people with some sense particularly acute. These people have developed a sense which was naturally very sensitive. I have seen and tested people who could, by the sense of touch alone, tell how many playing cards or tickets they held.

1557. Spiritualism, Phenomena of—Unreliability of Human Testimony SOURCE: George Whitehead, *An Inquiry Into Spiritualism* (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), pp. 17, 18, 20.

[p. 17] To the student of psychology there is no more outstanding fact than the unreliability of human testimony. Even in the normal events of life, where no particular emotions are greatly involved, the accounts given by two different persons regarding what has occurred will vary enormously even to the point of contradiction. When intense personal interests and emotional stresses are introduced, or reasons in explanation of occurrences are demanded, the testimony varies almost in relation to the idiosyncrasies of the persons concerned, objective facts being coloured to almost any hue.

Without considering the divergent estimates put upon any historical event by the partisans of different religious and political faiths, one need only remember how the reports of a visit to Soviet Russia, or the logic of a stateman's speech, vary according to the sympathies of the persons who are questioned. A visit to a law court emphasises the inability of the average man or woman to describe any event as it objectively happened, illiteracy being one but by no means the only reason.

In spite of the confidence placed in them by the average man, the senses cannot always be trusted to register correct impressions. Indeed, contrary to popular belief, we do not see only with the eyes, or hear with the ears, but rather with the brain. Philosophers have argued for centuries regarding the possibility of becoming acquainted with objective reality. It is now admitted by even the most materialistic thinkers that all we can know about any object is not the thing in itself but only states of consciousness regarding its appearances and attributes. And these perceptions and conceptions may not only be quite differently registered in the minds of various individuals, but are probably in all cases inexact reproductions of [p. 18] the object considered. The most dispassionate and accurate conception provides not reality as it is, but only what Herbert Spencer called a "transfigured reality" based upon the incapacity of our senses to assimilate that which is behind all appearances. We cannot accommodate any tangible object in either the brain or the mind, but only a mental photograph which is affected by individual variations of the cerebral lens and the other apparatus of the brain and senses. Waves of light or sound, etc., impinge upon the optical nerve and tympanum and induce sensations or vibrations which are translated into ideas, conceptions and memories, affected not only by the strength of the original stimulus, but by the preferences and antipathies latent in the previous acquirements. And it is obvious that our general views of reality would be completely altered if human organs of sense were reduced from five to two or increased to ten.

The fact is, apart from individual variations in the acuteness of the organs of sense, we see largely with the eye of the mind, and the other senses have also their mental analogues. Thus, frequently, we see not what is, but what we expect or hope to see, as when we are awaiting the arrival of a person at the railway station and in the distance imagine a stranger is the friend we are awaiting, or in the seance room, when a generalised description of a spirit is claimed as the dead father of several unrelated members of the company...

[p. 20] How unreliable the one sense may be when not checked or helped by another was demonstrated by Professor Munsterberg in a series of experiments. One person, for example, thought the sound from a tuning fork was like the growl of a lion, while another declared it was more like a fog-horn. Amusing results have been recorded of the transformation undergone by a sentence when repeated by a hundred tongues, the last version frequently being a complete perversion of the first. When the opinions or emotions of any narrators are concerned, the probability of grotesque transformation is still more likely. How erroneous a description may be without emotional encouragements to falsification is illustrated by the following example. At a conference of psychologists held in Göttingen a clown forced his way into the hall with a negro in close pursuit. A fight ensued between the two which was terminated by a pistol shot, whereupon the clown rushed out of the room again pursued by the negro. The President then said that as legal proceedings might have to be taken he would be obliged if each member present would furnish a report stating exactly what had transpired. The whole affair, which occupied less than twenty seconds, had been carefully rehearsed and photographed in advance. Of the forty reports made by extra-competent observers, only one contained less than twenty per cent. of mistakes as to the chief facts; fourteen contained between twenty and forty per cent. and thirteen contained over fifty per cent of mistakes. Twenty-four of the reports contained ten per cent. of details which were pure inventions. Thus ten of the accounts were quite false, twenty-four were half legendary, and only six were even approximately accurate. This example helps us to recognise how unreliable the reports given of a seance are likely to be when the whole atmosphere is charged with mystery and among the sitters are strong emotional urges to encourage falsification of impressions.

1558. Spiritualism, Seen as Breaking Down Barriers Between Sects SOURCE: Arthur Conan Doyle, Letter, quoted in John Mulholland, *Beware Familiar Spirits*, p. 283. Copyright 1938 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

"The ultimate merit of that revelation [spiritualism], which came in so humble a shape [to the Fox sisters], will be the simplification of religion, the breaking down of the barriers between sects, and a universal creed which will combine the ethics of real Christianity with direct spiritual communication, receiving our teaching not from bygone traditions and documents, but from actual contact with beings higher than ourselves. I pray that God may bless you, and that the great cause which is committed to your care may ever progress, discarding its lower manifestations and extending its higher ones, until the divine purpose has been fulfilled."

1559. Spiritualism—Summary of an Investigation

SOURCE: George Whitehead, An Inquiry Into Spiritualism (London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson, Ltd., 1934), pp. 458, 459.

[p. 458] In concluding this attempt to unearth the natural roots of Spiritualism I have had no intention of dealing with the general problem of whether or not man survives death. Instead I have tried to explain what modern psychology has to say in explanation of certain mysterious happenings which are interpreted by the [p. 459] mystics on a spiritual basis. That supernormal phenomena do occur in the absence of trickery, certainly in connection with matters psychological and probably in matters physical, has been admitted, although the wide ramifications of fraud make it impossible to say accurately how far the phenomena are genuine. It is not contended that the interpretations in this volume are at every point final; nor is it argued that Spiritualism as a hypothesis can be dogmatically dismissed as unsound. The Spiritualists have a plausible theory which may indeed to many minds seem overwhelming, especially to those unfamiliar with naturalistic explanations. I do not say that spirit communication is impossible; but merely that in my opinion the balance of probabilities is against it. No explanation deals satisfactorily with all the data. We need more investigators upon those aspects of Nature called supernormal by the psychical researcher and supernatural by the Spiritualist. Sceptical denial of unpleasant facts or credulous acceptance of medieval interpretations are alike useless if all the expressions of matter and mind are to be correlated in one orderly scheme satisfactory to those who are prepared to banish preconceived opinions in favour of generalisations wedded to the data. The present volume is intended to be suggestive and not conclusive. It attempts to apply reason in realms where in the nature of the case, since fundamental emotions are involved, sentimentality on the one side and sceptical impatience on the other have too frequently intervened. Here, then, for what it is worth, is another attempt to peep behind the scenes into Spiritland.

1560. Spiritualists, Religious Bodies

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, p. 1593.

General Statement. In 1906 the only organized Spiritualist body was the National Spiritualist Association. It was claimed by this association and by others that there were numbers of individuals, and even of small communities, that were not included in its enrollment, and later a new body was formed under the name "Progressive Spiritual Church." In 1913 another group was formed, the National Spiritual Alliance, and in 1936 the General Assembly of Spiritualists was reported, both holding doctrines so similar to the two older bodies that it has seemed appropriate to combine them all under one head.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The largest Spiritualist religious body at present is the International General Assembly of Spiritualists, with a membership (1956) of 164,072 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257). For statements of the beliefs and principles of Spiritualism, see Nos. 1541, 1544, 1545.]

1561. Spiritualists—Religious Service of, Described

SOURCE: C. E. Bechhofer Roberts, *The Truth About Spiritualism* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1932), pp. 18–22. Used by permission.

[p. 18] It will be helpful, before entering on the more analytical task of this book, to describe a service in a Spiritualist church, and see how it compares with services in more

orthodox churches. Naturally there are degrees and kinds of Spiritualist services; the one I have synthetically selected would take place in a richer and better staffed church in a large manufacturing town.

We find ourselves in a hall solely devoted to its present purpose. On a platform at one end sit three persons: the chairman, the speaker, and the clairvoyant. The chairman, a member of the local community, begins by announcing the names of the two others, for here, as in most Spiritualist churches, they change from week to week. Then we are asked to sing a hymn:

"I've beautiful home on the other shore,

A home on the golden strand;

Some dear ones have gone to that home before,

My home in the spirit-land.

"They come to me now since their souls are set free,

And gently they press my hand;

They say there are treasures in store for me At home in the spirit-hand...

"I've a father and mother and sisters dear,

Who form there a happy band!

O, when shall I see that bright mansion fair,

My home in the spirit-land?"

The speaker, a prominent lecturer known by name to most of his audience, offers up an improvised prayer, similar in many ways to those heard in any religious community, but emphasizing the rôle of departed spirits as the sources of hope and inspiration. The prayer is [p. 19] followed by a reading from the Bible, though in many Spiritualist churches, somewhat out of harmony with official Christianity, chapters from a Spiritualist or other work are substituted for the Bible. The speaker next reads a list of members of the church for whom the Congregation's prayers are requested, and himself prays for them, again invoking the consolation and protection of the spirits. Another hymn is sung:

"Who says there is no future life?

Who says that Death ends all?

The fool, whose view is circumscribed,

Whose mind is cramped and small.

The lowliest insect doth provide

Against a future time.

Shall man no further vision have,

His mind no further climb?"

During the singing of this hymn a collection is taken which, in wealthy churches, often produces a large sum. The speaker offers up thanks for the collection, praying that good use be made of it, and proceeds to his address, of which the following will serve as a fair summary: "I wonder, dear friends assembled here this morning, if we all recognize as fully as we should the wonderful nature of the revelation which has been given to us. Do we realize the marvellous meaning that lay behind those rappings in the house of the Fox family at Hydesville eighty years ago? When those simple farmers heard the knockings, they knew that at last the barrier of death had been broken, and that one human spirit at least had survived into a better and fuller life and had returned to tell [p. 20] them of this great truth. How wonderfully would this truth revolutionize the world, if

only the world understood its implications! Would not the politicians and statesmen lay aside their wordy warfare? But we cannot blame them for their indifference, if we ourselves do not show them an example.

"We, who know the truth, who know what it is to realize that our beloved ones have passed on into the brighter realms, we ought to show in our day-to-day conduct our knowledge that our dear ones are ever with us, doing their best to help us when we need aid, to cheer us when we are downcast, to lead our erring footsteps when these would stray. My own dear wife, who passed on nearly ten years ago, has many a time told me through a psychic channel-through the wonderful medium whom we are privileged to have with us this morning as our clairvoyant—how the spirits of our dear ones are always trying to come in contact with our inner spiritual selves, only too often to be repelled by the dense wall of our materialism. If only we would realize that, when we have ended the few years which remain to us here, we have before us the prospect, nay, the absolute certainty, the acknowledged and experienced certainty, of our loved ones awaiting us to be eternally united with us! When I think of that world which awaits us, of the ever radiant warmth, of the twenty-four daily hours of joy,* [Note *: Spiritualists assume that sleep, being a function of the physical body, does not exist in the spirit world.] of the beautiful cities spotlessly white, of the broad avenues, the noble houses, the honest intercourse and commerce—when I think of these things, how impatiently my soul aspires upwards and seeks to rid itself of this fleshly envelope!

"It is for us, who have received the greatest truth of all [p. 21] time, to show ourselves worthy of it. Let us show in our lives that we seek to foreshadow in this world the glory and the beauty and the wonders everlasting of that eternal world to which we know we shall attain."

This address, no more or less eloquent—though certainly shorter—than hundreds delivered every Sunday at Spiritualist services, is followed by "clairvoyance." The public clairvoyant is a somewhat different type from the private medium, though many people combine the two offices. We will imagine a typical medium at this service, a woman of self-assured personality, quick and shrewd, and we will show her functioning with at least average success. "I desire," she says, "to bring something for that lady in the middle of the hall—yes, that lady with the large hat." She addresses her directly. "I see, standing by you, two spirits. One is a tall, elderly gentleman with white hair; the other is a little girl with blue eyes, who looks sad. Do you recognize them?" The woman hesitates; after all, she has known many elderly men and little girls. "Well, don't think about it now; you will recognize them afterwards. I just want to tell you that the elderly gentleman says he has just welcomed the little girl and is looking after her. When you go home and think about it, I am sure you will recognize them both. I can't be wrong, for I see them standing by you and hear them speak. You see, friends," the medium tells her whole audience, "it often happens that people do not at once recognize the spirits I see, but afterwards they always remember.

"Now a spirit wants me to bring a message to that gentleman over there, in the third row, on the left. Have you a lady in the spirit connected with you?" The man nods. "I can see her looking down at you very lovingly. She is rather above middle height and has grey eyes, and [p. 22] her hair is worn long." A puzzled look may appear on the man's face. "That's not quite right? Oh, well, I am not concerned so much with their physical appearance before they passed on—we can easily make mistakes about that—as with their messages. This lady says that you must not be too anxious to join her yet, because you have still many years of active work for the great cause. Do you understand that? Yes? Thank you so much.

"Now I have a message for the lady in the front row, at the end on the right, in the blue dress. I hear the voices of two spirits connected with you. Their names are Emily and Frederick. Do you recognize those names? No? That's strange; I'll listen again. That's what they say—Emily and Frederick—they are very insistent. Is there anybody in this hall to whom those names apply? Ah, the gentleman in the gallery! I'm so glad; they are anxious to tell you that they are happy; they want you to be happy too, and to stop worrying about the little money difficulty. That will come right. Do you understand this? Yes? Thank you." (One cannot help wishing that the spirit messages were not so uniformly optimistic. What a relief it would be if, sometimes at least, they announced that the little money difficulty would get worse!)

The medium returns to her chair, and the chairman advances. He calls upon his audience to rejoice at this example of spirit intervention and to join him in a prayer wherein he begs the spirits to strengthen our faith, to open our eyes to the great truths of Spiritualism, to bless the work of the mediums through whom they communicate, and to hasten the day when Spiritualism shall triumph throughout the earth.

1562. Sun, Babylonian Kings Compared With

SOURCE: Henri Frankfort, *Kingship and the Gods*, pp. 307–309. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 307] In Mesopotamia, as in Egypt, the ruler is often compared with the sun. Hammurabi stated in the preamble of his law (Code, V, 4–9): "I am the sun of Babylon who causes light to rise over the land of Sumer and Akkad." The deified Amar-Sin calls himself "a true god, the [p. 308] sun of his land." If in the translation of Hammurabi's epithet we have used "sun" rather than "sun-god," while the Akkadian Shamshu may mean either, we have done so precisely because we consider these expressions to be metaphors. Moreover, the qualifications "of his land," "of Babylon," agree better with the translation "sun" than with the notion implied in the English "sun-god." In Egyptian texts of the New Kingdom we find similar expressions. However, these do not occur in older inscriptions but appear when Pharaoh's rightful dominion over the whole earth had been challenged by strong Asiatic peoples. Tuthmosis III is called "Ruler of Rulers, Sun of All Lands"; Seti I, "Re of Egypt and Moon of all Lands," or "King of Egypt, Re of the Nine Bows"—the latter being the traditional formula for foreign peoples. These expressions are unusual in Egypt, where the normal way of comparing Pharaoh with the sun is based on the intimate relation between prototype and successor, progenitor and offspring... Hammurabi states, a little before the quotation we have given, that Anu and Enlil, when they chose Marduk as ruler over all men, also named him "to make legislation appear in the land, to destroy the evil and the wicked, so that the strong should not harm the weak, so that I should appear like the sun to the black-headed people and make light the land, and create well-being for mankind" (Code, I, 32-48).

In dealing with Egyptian beliefs, we have described how the sun quite universally appears to be symbolical of order and hence also of the order of justice; and in this respect the king could be viewed, in Mesopotamia as elsewhere, as an image of the sungod. Hence the prayer "May Ur-Ninurta, like Shamash, rule the country for many years," which re- [p. 309] sembles the words spoken nowadays in Westminster Abbey before the

enthronement of the king of England, when the archbishop prays that God may establish his throne in righteousness, that "it may stand fast for evermore, like as the sun before him, and as the faithful witness in heaven."

When the Mesopotamia king was compared with the sun, the essential distinction between the earthly prince and the sun-god was not ignored; and the same qualification applies to a number of phrases which were applied to the ruler as well as to the gods. None of these expresses an identity; all merely proclaim that, from the point of view of the subject, the king seems godlike. Hence we read in the prayer of an ill-fated Babylonian:

May the god who rejected me help me!

May the goddess who [resented me] have pity on me!

May the shepherd, the sun of men (the king), who is like a god (be gracious to me)!In this derived sense the comparison of the king with the sun is common throughout the ancient Near East, but only in Egypt is there a precise theological concept implied in the view that the king is the image of the sun upon earth.

1563. Sun—Solstice Festivals—June 24

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 98, 99.

[p. 98] The festival of Fortuna, "the goddess who brings" (*fero*), was held on the twenty-fourth of June. Difficult as is the question of the original significance of the cult, there is no doubt of an early connection with agriculture. We know that the farmers regarded Fortuna as a power who could bring them good crops or on the other hand manifest her displeasure by a lean year. Moreover, the time of year at which the festival took place and the nature of the festivities support the theory of an agricultural connection. It was the season of harvest and rustic celebrations were appropriate. Whether the fact that this was the time of the summer solstice was an element in determining the date of the festival is not certain, but in all probability it had something to do with it. The occasion was one of great merriment and the festival has sometimes been described as a summer Saturnalia.

The twenty-fourth of June is now St. John [p. 99] the Baptist's Day, and the modern festival may owe its date to the pagan celebration. It is almost certain that it does if the summer solstice was a factor in the dating of the Roman holiday. Some even claim that the midsummer fires and other quaint customs till recently so common at this season in Great Britain and Ireland and on the Continent may be traced back to this festival. This contention, however, hardly admits of demonstration in detail. To be sure both the ancient and modern customs belong to the sphere of rustic merrymaking, and the practice of leaping over a fire cited by Brand for various places in Great Britain has ancient Roman precedent. But neither of these facts bears directly on the question of actual influence of the ancient on the modern festival. For in the first place we have no evidence that the lighting of bon-fires was a part of the Roman festival; and secondly the leaping over a fire was a feature not of the festival of Fortuna on the twenty-fourth of June but of the feast of Pales (Parilia) on the twenty-first of April.

1564. Sun-gods—Babylonian Shamash as Upholder of Truth and Justice SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 28, 29. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 28] Shamash, the sun-god, was thought of as the son of Sin [the moon-god]. Here again, while the cult of the sun-god may have been brought into Mesopotamia by [p. 29]

the invading Semites, since Shamash is a Semitic name, he is also found in the early Sumerian lists under the name of Babbar, or Utu.

Shamash is frequently represented on Babylonian seals as rising from the mountains with rays coming out of his shoulders, while at night he was thought to descend again through the mountain gates and to traverse the underworld either on foot, or in a chariot drawn by fiery mules. He was worshipped by all classes of people, and his special function was that of upholder of truth and justice in the life of the community. On the stele which contains the famous Code of Hammurabi, Shamash is represented as giving the Laws to the king. Together with Adad he was regarded as specially concerned with the giving and interpretation of oracles. His sacred number was 20, and the usual symbol by which he is represented on seals and monuments is the solar disk with a four-pointed star inside it and rays emerging from between the points of the star. In Assyria his symbol, which seems to have been also a symbol of royalty, was a winged disk, closely resembling the Egyptian winged solar disk. The chief seat of the cult of Shamash in northern Babylonia was Sippar, and in south Babylonia Larsa. In Ashur he shared a temple with Sin.

1565. Sun-gods, Other Gods Changed to, in Hellenistic-Roman Times SOURCE: Franz Cumont, "The Frontier Provinces of the East," in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), pp. 643, 646, 647. Used by permission of Cambridge University Press.

[p. 643] The solar theology of the 'Chaldaeans' [that is, of "the Babylonian priests of the Hellenistic age" and after] had a decisive effect upon the final development of Semitic paganism...

[p. 646] In the great temples [of Syria] an educated priesthood which meditated on the nature of divine beings and the meaning of the traditions inherited from far-off ancestors, could not escape from the influence of the science of the Chaldaeans. At the same time as it accepted their astrology and their fatalistic view of the world ..., it followed them in seeing in the sun the directing power of the cosmic system. All the Baals were thence forward turned into suns, the sun being the mover of the other stars, like it eternal and 'unconquerable.' ... Such was the final form reached by the religion of the pagan Semites, and, following them, by that of the Romans when [p. 647] Aurelian, the conqueror of Palmyra, had raised *Sol invictus* [the Invincible Sun] to the rank of

supreme divinity in the Empire [see No. 1572]. **1566. Sun-gods,**—Sol Invictus as Ancestor of Constantine and Later Emperors

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 55.

With [Constantine's father] Constantius Chlorus (305 A.D.) there ascended the throne a solar dynasty which, connecting itself with Claudius II. Gothicus, a votary of the worship of Apollo, professed to have *Sol Invictus* [the Unconquered Sun] as its special

protector and ancestor. Even the Christian emperors, Constantine [see No. 530] and Constantius, did not altogether forget the pretensions which they could derive from so illustrious a descent, and the last pagan who occupied the throne of the Caesars, Julian the Apostate, [was a sun worshiper].

1567. Sun Worship, Accusation of, Faced by Early Christians SOURCE: Tertullian, *Apology*, chap. 16, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 31.

Others, again, certainly with more information and greater verisimilitude, believe that the sun is our god... The idea no doubt has originated from our being known to turn to the east in prayer [see No. 1409e]. But you, many of you, also under pretence sometimes of worshipping the heavenly bodies, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise. In the same way, if we devote Sun-day to rejoicing, from a far different reason than Sunworship, we have some resemblance to those of you who devote the day of Saturn to ease and luxury, though they too go far away from Jewish ways, of which indeed they are ignorant.

1568. Sun Worship, as Dominant Cult in Early Egypt

SOURCE: Josephine Mayer and Tom Prideaux, eds., *Never to Die: The Egyptians in Their Own Words* (New York: The Viking Press, 1938), p. 18. Copyright, 1938, by Josephine Mayer and Tom Prideaux. Used by permission.

From earliest times, when the sun-god was pictured as a hunter standing in his boat, poling his way among the marshes, until long after Ikhnaton philosophized about a universal god embodied in the life-giving energy of the sun, the Egyptians were sun-lovers. Every Pharaoh was an earthly incarnation of the sun, and every city worshipped its favourite form of the sun-god. The course of Egypt herself is like the course of the sun as it rises out of darkness in the east, shines long and high over the Nile, and sinks behind the tombs in the Valley of the Kings.

1569. Sun Worship, as Employed by Roman Emperors

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 53, 54.

[p. 53] The triumph of Oriental religions [in the Roman Empire] was simultaneously the triumph of astral religion, but to secure recognition by all pagan peoples, it needed an official sanction. The influence which it had acquired among the populace, was finally assured when the emperors lent it an interested support...

The Oriental clergy ... preached doctrines which tended to elevate sovereigns above mankind, and they supplied the emperors with a dogmatic justification of their despotism... [p. 54] The emperor is the image of the Sun on earth, like him invincible and eternal. [See No. 1345.]

1570. Sun Worship, as Official Cult of Roman Empire—Abortive Attempt of Elagabalus

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, p. 224. Copyright 1954 by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by Permission.

An astral hierarchy, ruled by the sun, now contended with and finally superseded the official deities of the Roman empire. The first apostle on the imperial throne to preach the new gospel to an amazed and soon infuriated Roman public was a grandnephew of Philostratus' patroness, Julia Domna, the grandson of her sister, Maesa, the sun priest Elagabalus [ruled A.D. 218–222].

1571. Sun Worship, as Official Cult of Roman Empire, Derived from Chaldea

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), p. 134.

Solar pantheism, which grew up among the Syrians of the Hellenistic period as a result of the influence of Chaldean astrolatry [Babylonian star and sun worship], imposed itself upon the whole Roman world under the empire... That theological system shows incidentally the last form assumed by the pagan idea of God. In this matter Syria was

Rome's teacher and predecessor. The last formula reached by the religion of the pagan Semites and in consequence by that of the Romans, was a divinity unique, almighty, eternal, universal and ineffable, that revealed itself throughout nature, but whose most splendid and most energetic manifestation was the sun.

1572. Sun Worship, Final Form of Roman Paganism

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960) pp. 73, 74.

[p. 73] From astronomical speculations the Chaldeans had deduced a whole system of religious dogmas. The sun, set in the midst of the superimposed planets, regulates their harmonious movements...

[p. 74] By a succession of emissions and absorptions he [the Sun] will alternately cause these fiery emanations to descend into the bodies which they animate, and after death will gather them up and make them reascend into his bosom. This coherent and magnificent theology, founded upon the discoveries of ancient astronomy in its zenith, gradually imposed on mankind the cult of the "Invincible Sun" as the master of all nature, creator and preserver of men.

This Sun-worship was the final form which Roman paganism assumed. In 274 the emperor Aurelian, as we have seen [see No. 1344], conferred on it official recognition ...; and in the following century, the Claudian emperors [including Constantine; see No. 1566] worshipped the almighty star not only as the patron but also as the author of its race. The invincible Sun ... tends to absorb or subordinate to himself all the other divinities of ancient Olympus.

1573. Sun Worship, Final Phase of Roman Paganism

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), p. 276. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

This solar faith was the culmination of Hellenistic-Oriental and Roman Paganism. It was the vitalizing power in pagan theology and afforded the most convincing symbol of that light which was the aim of philosophy and religion. It was the source of a mystical devotion in which peasant and philosopher could participate.

Heliolatry, the last refuge of monotheism in heathenism, which refused to accept the religion of Galilee, swept all the great worships of strong vitality into its system, softened their differences, accentuated their similarities, by every effort of fancy, false science, or reckless etymology, and in the end, 'Sol Invictus' and Mithra were left masters of the field.³ [Note 3: Dill, *Rom. Society from Nero*, p. 556.]

1574. Sun Worship, in Early Christian Period

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, Survivals of Roman Religion (New York: Longmans, 1931), p. 192.

Cults of the sun, as we know from many sources, had attained great vogue during the second, third, and fourth centuries. Sun-worshippers indeed formed one of the big groups in that religious world in which Christianity was fighting for a place. Many of them became converts to Christianity and in all probability carried into their new religion some remnants of their old beliefs. The complaint of Pope Leo in the fifth century that worshippers in St. Peter's turned away from the altar and faced the door so that they could adore the rising sun is not without its significance in regard to the number of Christians who at one time had been adherents of some form of sun-worship. It is of course impossible to say precisely in what way their influence manifested itself. We do know, however, of analogues between Christ and the sun; he was designated the Sun of Righteousness; and our Christmas falls on the date of the festival of a popular sun-god in Rome.

1575. Sun Worship, in Late Astrological Pantheism

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), pp. 274, 275. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

[p. 274] In the hot plains of Mesopotamia the Moon had the premier place, but as Babylonian celestial lore moved westwards and northwards to colder climates where the Sun was not so overpowering, it was inevitable that the Sun should secure its place of primacy. But other factors were working towards the practice of adoration of the Sun. The scientific influence of Greek astronomy working on Oriental astrology was bound to recognize the natural superiority of the Sun. Further, Stoic hylozoism, with its deification of the world, and its theory of a universally penetrating principle, easily lent itself to the advance of astral pantheism, which also recognized a "heart of the world." ... [p. 275] As men looked upon the external world as divine and replete with symbols of divinity, it was inevitable that the Sun should be accepted as the supreme symbol of the divine unity. It might—with that ancient disregard of the distinction between symbol and that beyond the symbol common to Pagans and Christians—be regarded indifferently as the symbol of the Supreme God or the Supreme God Himself.

1576. Sun Worship, in Mithraism

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, trans. by Thomas J. McCormack (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), pp. 190, 191. [FRS No. 95.]

[p. 190] The rites which they [the Mithraists] practised offered numerous analogies. The secretaries of the Persian god, like the Christians, purified themselves by baptism; received, by a species of confirmation, the power necessary to combat the spirits of evil; and expected [p. 191] from a Lord's Supper salvation of body and soul. Like the latter, they also held Sunday sacred, and celebrated the birth of the Sun on the 25th of December, the same day on which Christmas has been celebrated, since the fourth century at least. They both preached a categorical system of ethics, regarded asceticism as meritorious, and counted among their principal virtues abstinence and continence, renunciation and self-control. Their conceptions of the world and of the destiny of man were similar. They both admitted the existence of a Heaven inhabited by beatified ones, situate in the upper regions, and of a Hell peopled by demons, situate in the bowels of the earth. They both a placed a Flood at the beginning of history; they both assigned as the source of their traditions a primitive revelation; they both, finally, believed in the immortality of the soul, in a last judgment, and in a resurrection of the dead, consequent upon a final conflagration of the universe.

1577. Sun Worship, Permanent Results of

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greek and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 89, 90.

[p. 89] Concerning the worship which was paid to the stars in the West we possess very few data, even for the most important of all, that of the Sun... We shall only mention some liturgical practices which have had permanent results.

It was customary to worship the rising Sun (*Oriens*) at drawn, at the moment when its first rays struck the demons who invaded the earth in the darkness. Tacitus describes to us how, at the battle of Bedriacum in 69 A.D., the soldiers of Vespasian saluted the rising sun with loud shouts after the Syrian custom.² [Note 2: Tacit., *Hist.*, iii., 24.] In temples thrice a day—at dawn, at midday, and at dusk—a prayer was addressed to the heavenly source of light, the worshipper turning towards the East in the morning, towards the

South at midday, and towards the West in the evening. Perhaps this custom survived in the three daily services of the early Church.

A very general observance required that on the 25th of December the birth of the "new Sun" should be celebrated, when after the winter solstice the days began to lengthen and the "invincible" star triumphed again over darkness... The pre-eminence assigned to the *dies Solis* also certainly [p. 90] contributed to the general recognition of Sunday as a holiday. This is connected with a more important fact, namely, the adoption of the week by all European nations.

1578. Sun Worship, Roman Official Cult in Constantine's Day SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, p. 4. Copyright 1954 by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

A star cult, sun-worship, became (in the third century A.D.) the dominant official creed, paving the road for the ultimate triumph of Judaeo-Christian monotheism. So strong was the belief in the Invincible Sun (*Sol Invictus*) that for example Constantine I (d. 337), himself at first a devotee of the sun cult, found it, indeed perfectly compatible with his pro-Christian sympathies to authorize his own portrayal as Helios. And in 354 the ascendant Christian church in the reign of his pious but unsavory son, Constantius II, found it prudent to change the celebration of the birth of Jesus from the traditional date (January 6) to December 25, in order to combat the pagan Sun god's popularity—his "birthday" being December 25.

[EDITORS' NOTE: December 25 is mentioned here, but an earlier example of the influence of this official sun worship on Christianity is Constantine's law of A.D. 321 uniting Christians and pagans in the observance of the "venerable day of the sun" (see Nos. 1642, 1644). It is to be noted that this official solar worship, the final form of paganism in the empire (see No. 1571), was not the traditional Roman-Greek religion of Jupiter, Apollo, Venus, and the other Olympian deities. It was a product of the mingling Hellenistic-Oriental elements, exemplified in Aurelian's establishment of Eastern Sun worship at Rome as the official religion of the empire, and in his new temple enshrining Syrian statutes statues of Bel and the sun (see Nos. 154, 1344). Thus at last Bel, the god of Babylon, came into the official imperial temple of Rome, the center of the imperial religion. It was this late Roman-Oriental worship of one supreme god, symbolized by the sun and absording lesser divinities as by the sun and absording lesser divinities as by the sun and absording lesser divinities as the Roman religion that went down in defeat but infiltrated and colored the victorious church with its own elements, some of which can be seen to this day.]

1579. Sun Worship, Sacred Days of, in Christianity

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 60. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Remains of the struggle are found in two institutions adopted from its rival by Christianity in the fourth century, the two Mithraic sacred days, December twenty-fifth,

dies natalis solis [birthday of the sun], as the birthday of Jesus, and Sunday, "the venerable day of the Sun," as Constantine called it in his edict of 321.

1580. Sunday, and Pagan Origin of Name

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, p. 19. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

This word [Sunday] is of heathen origin. It, or a corresponding term in languages and cultures other than Anglo-Saxon, indicates a day dedicated particularly to the worshipful recognition of some deity in the particular pantheon involved. Obviously the exact name indicates the day devoted to the worship of the sun. In pagan use the name, whatever it may be, does not indicate exaltation of this deity above all others, nor exclusive worship

of that deity on that day, but only special emphasis on his worship. When in the Roman Empire the sun gained prominence as the symbol of highest divinity this constituted a preparation for the political and ecclesiastical identification of the Lord's Day for Sunday... With the expansion of Christianity in Europe the day for special Christian worship falling on that of sun worship the name was simply taken over. It has no direct reference to the Hebrew Sabbath. And, of course, there is no close connection between the origin of the name and Christian practice.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This quotation should not be interpreted as indicating on the part of Dr. Carver any lack of commitment to the observance of the first day of the week as "the Christian's Lord's Day."]

1581. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship SOURCE: William L. Gildea, "Paschale Gaudium," *The Catholic World*, 58 (March, 1894), 809. [FRS No. 100.]

The church took the pagan philosophy and made it the buckler of faith against the heathen. She took the pagan, Roman Pantheon, temple of all the gods, and made it sacred to all the martyrs; so it stands to this day. She took the pagan Sunday and made it the Christian Sunday. She took the pagan Easter and made it the feast we celebrate during this season.

Sunday and Easter day are, if we consider their derivation, much the same. In truth, all Sundays are Sundays only because they are a weekly, partial recurrence of Easter day. The pagan Sunday was, in a manner, an unconscious preparation for Easter day. The Sun was a foremost god with heathendom. Balder the beautiful, the White God, the old Scandinavians called him. The sun has worshippers at this hour in Persia and other lands. "Some of you," says Carlyle, "may remember that fancy of Plato's. A man is kept in some dark, underground cave from childhood till maturity; then suddenly is carried to the upper airs. For the first time he sees the sun shining in its splendor overhead. He must fall down, says Plato, and adore it." There is, in truth, something royal, kingly about the sun, making it a fit emblem of Jesus, the Sun of Justice. Hence the church in these countries would seem to have said, "Keep that old, pagan name. It shall remain consecrated, sanctified." And thus the pagan Sunday, dedicated to Balder, became the Christian Sunday, sacred to Jesus. The sun is a fitting emblem of Jesus. The Fathers often compared Jesus to the sun; as they compared Mary to the moon, the beautiful moon, the beautiful Mary, shedding her mild, beneficent light on the darkness and night of this world—not light of her own; no Catholic says this; but—light reflected from the sun, Jesus.

1582. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship in 3d Century

SOURCE: Tertullian, Ad Nationes, bk. 1, chap. 13, trans. in ANF, Vol. 3, p. 123.

Do not many among you [pagans], with an affection of sometimes worshipping the heavenly bodies likewise, move your lips in the direction of the sunrise? It is you, at all events, who have even admitted the sun into the calendar of the week; and you have selected its day [Sunday], in preference to the preceding day, as the most suitable in the week for either an entire abstinence from the bath, or for its postponement until the evening, or for taking rest and for banqueting. By resorting to these customs, you deliberately deviate from your own religious rites to those of strangers.

[EDITORS' NOTE: See also No. 1409e.]

1583. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship in 4th Century

SOURCE: Porphyry, On the Oracle of Apollo, quoted in Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica ("The Preparation of the Gospel"), bk. v, chap. 14, MPG, Vol. 21. col. 348. Greek.

Remember to invoke in private prayer at the same time Mercury, and the sun on the day sacred to the sun, and the moon when its well-known day will have come, then Saturn, and then Aphrodite [Venus].

1584. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship—Mithraism

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, trans. by Thomas J. McCormack (reprint: New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), pp. 167, 191. [FRS No. 95.]

[p. 167] Each day in the week, the Planet to which the day was sacred was invoked in a fixed spot in the crypt; and Sunday, over which the Sun presided, was especially holy...

[p. 191] [The worshippers of Mithra] held Sunday sacred, and celebrated the birth of the Sun on the 25th of December.

1585. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship—Mithraism

SOURCE: H. G. Wells, *The Outline of History*, pp. 499, 512, 513. Copyright 1920 and 1921 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and by H. G. Wells. Used by permission of Prof. G. p. Wells. [See FRS No. 110.]

[p. 499] The observance of the Jewish Sabbath, again, transferred to the Mithraic Sun-day, is an important feature of many Christian cults...

[p. 512] During this indefinite time [the 1st and 2d centuries] a considerable amount of a sort of theocrasia seems to have gone on between the Christian cult and the almost equally popular and widely diffused Mithraic cult, and the cult of Serapis-Isis-Horus. From the former it would seem the Christians adopted Sun-day as their chief day [p. 513] of worship instead of the Jewish Sabbath.

1586. Sunday, and Pagan Sun Worship—Power of Mithras Cult

SOURCE: H. Lamer, "Mithras," *Wörterbuch der Antike* (2d ed.; Leipzig: A. Kröner, 1933). Used by permission. German.

Concerning the power of the Mithras cult we still have evidence in the fact that it is not the Jewish in the fact that it is not the Jewish Sabbath that is the sacred week-day, which Christianity, coming out of Judaism, had nearest at hand, but Sunday, dedicated to the Sun-god Mithras.

1587. Sunday, and Pagan Sun's Day

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 257, 258, 260. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 257] Modern Christians who talk of keeping Sunday as a "holy" day, as in the still extant "Blue Laws" of colonial America, should know that as a "holy" day of rest and cessation from labor and amusements Sunday was unknown to Jesus... It formed no tenet of the primitive Church and became "sacred" only in course of time. Outside the Church and became "sacred" only in course of time. Outside the Church its observance was legalized for the Roman Empire through a series of decrees starting with the famous one of Constantine in 321, an edict due to his political and social policies rather than, as Eusebius thought, to religious ones. For he took the day not because of the Christian custom of meeting then to commemorate the Resurrection but from "the venerable day of the Sun" (Mithra), and especially in order to give to Roman slaves respite from labor which their Semitic brothers had enjoyed for centuries. So much confusion in identifying Sunday and the Sabbath has been inherited by Britain and America through Puritan influence that it seems well to recapitulate the well-known facts...

As the Jewish element in the Church waned the Christians came to feel the need of a fixed day for [p. 258] meetings to replace the Sabbath. Then Sunday, like other pagan

festivals such as Christmas, came gradually into being, first as a fit day for worship and later one for rest...

[p. 260] Parallel to the Church movement ... but independent of it another had been developing in the State which after an obscure past culminated in Constantine's decree of 321 when the observance of the "day of the Sun" was imposed on the Empire, a decree marking an epoch in the history of Sunday as the beginning of both civil and later of ecclesiastical legislation. Now *dies Solis*, sacred in various solar cults and notably in Mithraism, was to play a role as the Christian Sunday as Christmas did a little later.

1588. Sunday, and Semi-Pagan Manichaean Sun Worship SOURCE: *Reply to Faustus the Manichaean* xviii. 5, trans. in *NPNF*, 1st series, Vol. 4, p. 238. [FRS No. 65.]

We are not afraid to meet your scoff at the Sabbath, when you [Faustus] call it the fetters of Saturn. It is a silly and unmeaning expression, which occurred to you only because you are in the habit of worshipping the sun on what you call Sunday. What you call Sunday we call the Lord's day, and on it we do not worship the sun, but the Lord's resurrection. And in the same way, the fathers observed the rest of the Sabbath, not because they worshipped Saturn, but because it was incumbent at that time; for it was a shadow of things to come, as the apostle testifies. The Gentiles, of whom the apostle says that they "worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator," gave the names of their gods to the days of the week. And so far you do the same, except that you worship only the two brightest luminaries, and not the rest of the stars, as the Gentiles did.

1589. Sunday—Anglican Archbishop Declares Tradition as Its Origin SOURCE: News Item, *Albertan* (Calgary, Alberta, Canada), Oct. 28, 1949. Used by permission.

TORONTO, Oct. 27 (BUP).—Rev. Philip Carrington, Anglican Archbishop of Quebec, sent local clergymen into a huddle today by saying outright that there was nothing to support Sunday being kept holy.

Carrington defiantly told a church meeting in this city of straight-laced protestantism that tradition, not the Bible, had made Sunday the day of worship.

He quoted the biblical commandment which said the seventh day should be one of rest, and then stated: "That is Saturday."

"Nowhere in the Bible is it laid down that worship should be done on Sunday," the Archbishop told a hushed, still audience.

Local parsons read his comments today with set, determined looks. They refused comment [see, however, No. 1605].

1590. Sunday, as Part of Church's Policy of Adopting Pagan Festivals SOURCE: Arthur Weigall, *The Paganism in Our Christianity*, p. 145. Copyright 1928 by G. p. Putnam's Sons, New York. Used with their permission.

The Church made a sacred day of Sunday ... largely because it was the weekly festival of the sun; for it was a definite Christian policy to take over the pagan festivals endeared to the people by tradition, and to give them a Christian significance.

1591. Sunday, Authority for—A Human Ordinance

SOURCE: Augustus Neander, *The History of the Christian Religion and Church*, trans. by Henry John Rose (Philadelphia: James M. Campbell & Co., 1843), p. 186. [FRS No. 31.]

The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a Divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic Church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps, at the end of the second century a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered labouring on Sunday as a sin...

The Jewish Christian Churches, [i.e., Churches consisting of Jewish converts,] although they received the festival of Sunday, retained also that of the Sabbath; and from them the custom spread abroad in the Oriental Church, of distinguishing this day, as well as the Sunday, by not fasting and by praying in an erect posture; in the Western Churches, particularly the Roman, where opposition to Judaism was the prevailing tendency, this very opposition produced the custom of celebrating the Saturday in particular as a fast day.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The brackets are in the original. This is the translation from Neander's first German edition. Later editions have omitted the statement that Sunday was only a human ordinance.]

1592. Sunday—Authority for—Catholic Church SOURCE: Richard Challoner, *The Catholic Christian Instructed* (New York: E. Dunigan and Brother, 1853), pp. 209, 211. [FRS No. 19.]

[p. 209] Q. What are the days which the Church commands to be kept holy?

A. 1st, The Sunday, or the Lord's day, which we observe by apostolical tradition, instead of the Sabbath...

Q. What warrant have you for keeping the Sunday, preferable to the ancient Sabbath, which was the Saturday?

A. We have for it the authority of the Catholic Church, and apostolical tradition.

Q. Does the scripture any where command the Sunday to be kept for the Sabbath?

A. The scripture commands us to hear the Church, St. Matt. xviii. 17. St. Luke x. 16, and to hold fast the traditions of the Apostles, 2 Thess. ii. 15, but the scripture does not in particular mention this change of the Sabbath...

[p. 211] Q. What was the reason why the weekly Sabbath was changed from the Saturday to the Sunday?

A. Because our Lord fully accomplished the work of our redemption by rising from the dead on a Sunday, and by sending down the Holy Ghost on a Sunday—as therefore the work of our redemption was a greater work than that of our creation, the primitive Church thought the day, in which this work was completely finished, was more worthy [of] her religious observation than that in which God rested from the creation, and should be properly called the Lord's day.

1593. Sunday, Authority for—Faulty Argument (Gamble's "First of the Sabbaths") Debunked

SOURCE: Wilbur Fletcher Steele, "Must Syntax Die That the Sabbath May Live?" *Methodist Review*, 81 (May–June, 1899), 401, 402.

[p. 401] In the contest with the tireless seventh-day Sabbatarians increasingly are certain Methodist writers insisting that the resurrection of Christ upon the first day of the week recovered and reenacted the original, creational, and true Sabbath. With hearty sympathy does the writer view their every legitimate argument to establish the sanctity and foster the hallowing of the Lord's Day. But when a claim on its behalf is distinctly based upon, or forcibly corroborated by, a gross wresting of the Holy Scripture, suspicion as to its validity instinctively sets in, to say nothing of mortification and repugnance...

[p. 402] This widely heralded Klondike discovery as to $\mu i \alpha \nu \zeta \alpha \beta \beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ turns out to be only the glitter of fool's gold. It rests upon the profoundest ignoring or ignorance of a law of syntax fundamental to inflected speech, and especially of the usage and influence

of the Aramaic tongue which was the vernacular of Jesus and his apostles. Must syntax die that the Sabbath may live?

Let these affirmations be traversed: "4. No Greek word for 'day' occurs in any of the passages." Made for simple readers of English, that statement lacks candor. Said word is there, latent, to a much greater degree than it is in our phrase, "The 25th of the month." Upon being asked, "The 25th what?" the veriest child instantly replies, "day." But stronger yet is the case in hand. The adjectival word μ (αv is in the feminine gender, and an immutable law requires adjective modifiers to agree with their nouns in gender. $\Sigma \dot{\alpha}\beta\beta\alpha\Theta v$ is of the neuter gender (Mark ii, 27, $\Theta \dot{o} \zeta \dot{\alpha}\beta\beta\alpha\Theta v$; iii, 2, $\Theta \hat{o} \zeta \zeta \dot{\alpha}\beta\beta\alpha\zeta v$), and out of the question. What feminine Greek word is latent in this phrase, and yet so patent as to reflect upon this adjective [*sic*] numeral its feminine hue? Plainly the feminine word $\dot{\eta}\mu\dot{\phi}\phi$, "day," as analogously it is found in Mark xiv, 12, $\pi\phi\dot{\omega}\Theta\eta \dot{\eta}\mu\dot{\epsilon}\phi\phi \Theta\hat{\omega}v \dot{\alpha}\xi\dot{\nu}\mu\omega\nu$, though latent in Matthew's parallel (xxvi, 17), $\pi\phi\dot{\omega}\Theta\eta \Theta\hat{\omega}v \dot{\alpha}\xi\dot{\nu}\mu\omega\nu$, "the first day of unleavened bread." Baldly to aver that "no Greek word for 'day' occurs in any of the passages," is to blind the simple English reader to the fact that an inflected language, by its numerous genders and cases, can indicate the presence and force of latent words to an extent undreamed in English...

As a vital or corroboratory part of any argument for the sanctifying of the Lord's Day this traversed exegesis, instead of being a monumental discovery, is but a monumental blunder. Thereby our foes will have us in derision.

Tell it not in Gath,

Publish it not in the streets of Battle Creek;

Lest the daughters of the Sabbatarians rejoice,

Lest the daughters of the Saturdarians triumph.

1594. Sunday, Authority for—New Testament Texts Not Sufficient SOURCE: "Lord's Day," *Smith's Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. by Samuel W. Barnum (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1884), p. 560.

Taken separately, perhaps, and even all together, these [NT "first-day"] passages seem scarcely adequate to prove that the dedication of the first day of the week to the purposes above-mentioned was a matter of apostolic institution, or even of apostolic practice.

1595. Sunday, Authority for—Not Bible, but Church

SOURCE: "To Tell You The Truth," The Catholic Virginia, 22 (Oct. 3, 1947), 9. [FRS No. 130.]

All of us believe many things in regard to religion that we do not find in the Bible. For example, nowhere in the Bible do we find that Christ or the Apostles ordered that the Sabbath be changed from Saturday to Sunday. We have the commandment of God given to Moses to keep holy the Sabbath Day, that is the 7th day of the week, Saturday. Today most Christians keep Sunday because it has been revealed to us by the Church outside the Bible.

1596. Sunday, Authority for—Not Bible but Church Tradition SOURCE: John L. Stoddard, *Rebuilding a Lost Faith* (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1826), p. 80. [FRS No. 56.]

Protestants often deride the authority of Church tradition, and claimed to be directed by the Bible only; yet they, too, have been guided by customs of the ancient Church, which find no warrant in the Bible, but rest on Church tradition only A striking instance of this is the following:—The first positive command in the Decalogue is to "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy," and this precept was enforced by the Jews for thousands of years. But the Sabbath Day, the observance of which God commanded, was our Saturday. Yet who among either Catholics or Protestants, except a sect or two, like the "Seventh Day Baptists," ever keep that commandment now? None. Why is this? The Bible, which Protestants claim to obey exclusively, gives no authorisation for the substitution of the first day of the week for the seventh. On what authority, therefore, have they done so? Plainly on the authority of that very Catholic Church which they abandoned, and whose traditions they condemn.

1597, Sunday, Authority for, Not From the Bible, but From the Catholic Church

SOURCE: *The Christian Sabbath* (2d ed.; Baltimore: The Catholic Mirror, [1893]), pp. 5–7. [FRS No. 30; original editorials, FRS No. 125.]

[p. 5] The Israelite respects the authority of the Old Testa- [p. 6] ment only, but the Adventist, who is a Christian, accepts the New Testament on the same ground as the Old, viz: an inspired record also. He finds that the Bible, his teacher, is consistent in both parts; that the Redeemer, during His mortal life, never kept any other day than Saturday. The Gospels plainly evince to Him this fact; whilst, in the pages of the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles and the Apocalypse, not the vestige of an act canceling the Saturday arrangement can be found...

The Protestant world has been, from its infancy, in the Sixteenth century, in thorough accord with the Catholic Church, in keeping "holy" not Saturday, but Sunday... If, how-[p. 7] ever, on the other hand, the latter furnish the arguments, incontrovertible by the great mass of Protestants, both classes of litigants, appealing to their common teacher, the Bible, the great body of Protestants, so far from clamoring, as they do with vigorous pertinacity for the strict keeping of Sunday, have no other resource left than the admission that they have been teaching and practicing *what is Scripturally false for over three centuries*, by adopting the teaching and practice of what they have always pretended to believe an apostate church, contrary to every warrant and teaching of Sacred Scripture. To add to the intensity of this Scriptural and unpardonable blunder, it involves one of the most positive and emphatic commands of God to His servant, man: "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy."

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract came originally from *The Catholic Mirror* of Sept. 2, 1893. See No. 1437.]

1598. Sunday, Authority for—Not in Bible

SOURCE: Henry M. Taber, Faith or Fact (New York: Peter Eckler, Publisher, 1897), p. 114. [FRS No. 67.]

Why will not Christian people investigate and find out for themselves (which they easily can), that the keeping of Sunday as a "holy Sabbath day," is wholly *without warrant*.

I challenge any priest or minister of the Christian religion, to show me the *slightest* authority for the religious observance of Sunday. And, if such cannot be shown by them, why is it that they are constantly preaching about Sunday as a *holy day*? Are they not open to the suspicion of *imposing* upon the confidence and credulity of their hearers? Surely they are deliberately and *knowingly* practicing deception upon those who look to them for candor and for truth, *unless* they can give satisfactory reasons for teaching that Sunday *is* a sacred day. There never was, and is not now, any such "satisfactory reasons." No student of the Bible has ever brought to light a single verse, line or word, world, which can, by any possibility, be construed into a warrant for the religious observance of Sunday. Quotations from the writings of the "Church Fathers," and others familiar with

Church history, support this statement, and include the names of Tertul[l]ian, Eusebius, Ireneus, Victorinus, Theodoretus, Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, Luther, Melanc[h]thon, Zwingle, Knox, Tyndale, Grotius, Neander, Mosheim, Heylyn, Frith, Milton, Priestly, Domville. John Calvin had so little respect for the day that he could be found playing bowls most any Sunday.

The claim that Sunday takes the place of Saturday, and that because of the Jews were supposed to be commanded to keep the *seventh* day of the week holy, *therefore* that the *first* day of the week should be so kept by Christians, is so utterly absurd as to be hardly worth considering.

1599. Sunday, Authority for, Not in Bible, Yet Non-Catholics Observe It SOURCE: Martin J. Scott, *Things Catholic Are Asked About*, p. 136. Copyright 1927 by P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 57.]

Some non-Catholics object to Purgatory because there is no specific mention of it in Scripture. There is no specific mention of the word Sunday in Scripture. The Sabbath is mentioned, but Sabbath means Saturday. Yet the Christians of almost all denominations worship on Sunday not on Saturday. The Jews observe Saturday. Nowhere in the Bible is it stated that worship should be changed from Saturday to Sunday.

1600. Sunday, Authority for, Not Scriptural

SOURCE: James Cardinal Gibbons, *The Faith of Our Fathers* (92d ed., rev.; Baltimore: John Murphy Company, [192–]), p. 89. [See FRS No. 25.]

Is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday and to abstain on that day from unnecessary servile work? Is not the observance of this law among the most prominent of our sacred duties? But you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday. The Scriptures enforce the religious observance of Saturday, a day which we never sanctify.

1601. Sunday, Authority for, Not the Fourth Commandment SOURCE: John Milton, "A Posthumous Treatise on the Christian Doctrine," bk. 2, chap. 7, trans. by Charles R. Sumner, in *The Prose Works of John Milton* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1877), Vol. 5, pp. 70, 71, 74

[p. 70] It is impossible to extort such a sense from the words of the commandment; seeing that the reason for which the command itself was originally given, namely, as a memorial of God's having rested from the creation of the world, cannot be transferred from the seventh day to the first; nor can any new motive be substituted in its place, whether the resurrection of our Lord or any other, without [p. 71] the sanction of a divine commandment...

[p. 74] For if we under the gospel are to regulate the time of our public worship by the prescriptions of the decalogue, it will surely be far safer to observe the seventh day, according to the express commandment of God, than on the authority of mere human conjecture to adopt the first.

1602. Sunday, Authority for—"One Day in Seven" Theory (Presbyterian)

SOURCE: Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 23 (originally 21), "Of Religious Worship and the Sabbath Day," sec. 7, in *A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards*, ed. by James Benjamin Green (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1958), pp. 161, 162.

[p. 161] 7. As it is of the law of nature that, in general, a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God; so, in his word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual commandment, binding all men in all ages, He hath particularly appointed one day in

seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto him: which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in Scripture is called the Lord's day, and is to be continued to the end [p. 162] of the world as the Christian Sabbath.

1603. Sunday, Authority for, Same as for Purgatory

SOURCE: Martin J. Scott, *Things Catholics Are Asked About*, p. 136. Copyright 1927 by P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 57.]

Now the Church ... instituted, by God's authority, Sunday as the day of worship. This same Church, by the same divine authority, taught the doctrine of Purgatory... We have, therefore, the same authority for Purgatory as we have for Sunday.

1604. Sunday, Authority for —Tradition

SOURCE: John Milner, Letter 11, To James Brown, Esq., in his *The End of Religious Controversy, in a Friendly Correspondence Between a Religious Society of Protestants, and a Roman Catholic Divine* (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1897), p. 89. [FRS No. 105.]

The first precept in the Bible, is that of sanctifying the seventh day: God blessed the **SEVENTH DAY**, and sanctified it. Gen. ii. 3. This precept was confirmed by God, in the Ten Commandments: Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. The **SEVENTH DAY** is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. Exod. xx. On the other hand Christ declares that he is not come to destroy the law but to fulfil it. Mat. v. 17. He himself observed the Sabbath: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day: Luke iv. 16. His disciples likewise observed it, after his death: They rested on the Sabbath day according to the commandment. Luke xxiii. 56. Yet, with all this weight of Scripture authority for keeping the Sabbath or seventh day holy, Protestants, of all denominations, make this a profane day and transfer the obligation of it to the first day of the week, or the Sunday. Now what authority have they for doing this? None at all, but the unwritten Word, or tradition of the Catholic church, which declares that the apostles made the change in honour of Christ's resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Ghost on that day of the week.

1605. Sunday, Authority for—Tradition, Not Bible Ordinance, Clergy Sav

SOURCE: New Items, Toronto (Canada) Daily Star, Oct. 26, 1949, p. 3. Used by permission.

Sunday is kept holy by Christians, not because there is any Scriptural injunction but because there are religious traditions associated with that day among Christians, Protestant and Catholic spokesmen for St. Augustine's, the Roman Catholic seminary for the diocese of Toronto, said today. They were commenting on a statement of Most Rev. Philip Carrington, Anglican Archbishop of Quebec, that there is no commandment which states Sunday must be kept holy [see No. 1589].

Rabbi's Recollections

A rabbi recalled that the first Christians were Jews and celebrated the Sabbath on the last day of the week and it was not until the reign of the Emperor Constantine that the day was changed by Christians.

At a service commemorating the 400th anniversary of the Church of England prayer book, Archbishop Carrington recalled that "the Bible commandment says on the seventh day thou shalt rest. That is Saturday. Nowhere in the Bible is it laid down that worship should be done on Sunday." Tradition, he said, had made it a day of worship. A spokeman for St. Augutine's, the Roman Catholic seminar for the diocese of Toronto, said: "Strictly speaking, that archbishop is correct. There is no scriptural rule for the observance of Sunday. But he doesn't go far enough.

Evidence in the Bible

"In the Bible, there is evidence that Christ established a church, to carry on his work. He gave that Church authority to carry out God's rule on earth. Because of the resurrection occurred on Sunday, and because of the general acceptance today of Sunday as a day of rest, it's fitting that now Sunday should be observed instead of Saturday, as under the old rule."

The Church has a specific church commandment stating Sunday should be observed. Protestants observed Sunday because for many centuries they had been part of the Roman Catholic Church, and had observed the church commandment, he said.

"There is no specific command in the New Testament about which day shall be kept holy," said Rev. G. H. Dowker of Grace Church-on-the-Hill. "The simple fact is, we keep holy the first day of the week because it was the day of the resurrection of Christ."

Rev. Northcote Burke of Christ church, Deer Park, said he thought the archbishop used the statement merely to illustrate church tradition. "Certainly the tradition of the Sabbath has always been to keep the Lord's day on the first day of the week. The early Christians used it because it was the day Christ arose again."

Jesuit Gives His View

"Our Lord rose from the dead on the first day of the week," said Father Hourigan of the Jesuit Seminary. "That is why the church changed the day of obligation from the seventh day to the first day of the week. The Anglicans and other denominations retained that tradition when the Reformation came along."

Rabbi David Monson, of Beth Sholom synagogue, said the change was made because of Emperor Constantine. "He changed the Christian Sabbath to Sunday," he said. "The original Christians were all Jews. They celebrated the Sabbath on Saturday.'[']

Rev. W. H. Grotheer of First Seventh Day Adventists church, Awde St., said he agreed with Archbishop Carrington's statement. He explained Adventists still observe Saturday as the sabbath, in harmony with the fourth commandment which says "Six days shalt thou labor but the seventh day is the Sabbath." Mr. Grotheer recalled "Jesus rose on the first day (of the week) according to Mark 16.9 and in Luke 23.56 it definitely states the day before the resurrection is the Sabbath according to the fourth commandment."

Rev. Herbert Delaney, speaking for the chancery of the Roman Catholic diocese of Toronto, agreed that under the old rule of the Scriptures, the Sabbath was the holy day. But he said Sunday was observed under a specific commandment of the Church, after the coming of Christ, in an interpretation of the original commandment.

Father Delaney said the reason for the change from Saturday to Sunday under the new rules was that Christ had risen on Sunday.

Not Only Tradition

Dr. E. Crossley Hunter of Trinity United church said the explanation lies not only in tradition, but also in records of the New Testament.

"Again and again in the New Testament we find reference to the Lord's day as the first day of the week whereas in the Old Testament it refers to the seventh day," he said. "However, the archbishop is quite right in the literal meaning of the commandment." ...

One minister remarked: "We've become so accustomed to keeping Sunday as our holy day that it isn't likely this belated discovery is going to change our attitude overnight. Certainly not in Toronto."

1606. Sunday—Development—at First Supplemental to the Sabbath SOURCE: L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, trans. from the 3d French edition by M. L. McClure (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1903), p. 47.

From a very early period the Christians adopted the Sunday. It is possible that, at the very outset, the choice of this day was not suggested by any hostility towards Jewish customs, but that they observed it merely in order to have side by side with the ancient Sabbath, which they celebrated with their Israelite brethren, a day set apart for exclusively Christian assemblies... The observance of the Sunday was at first supplemental to that of the Sabbath, but in proportion as the gulf between the Church and the synagogue widened, the Sabbath became less and less important, and ended at length in being entirely neglected.

1607. Sunday—Development Gradual

SOURCE: A[ntoine] Villien, *A History of the Commandments of the Church* (St. Louis: Herder, 1915), pp. 23–26, 30, 32. Copyright 1915 by Joseph Gummersbach. Used by permission. [FRS No. 63.]

[p. 23] In the Time of the Apostles. The sanctification of Sunday is of Apostolic origin, but it would be an error to attribute it to a definite decision of the Apostles. There is no such decision mentioned in the Apostolic documents. This law was evolved by the force of circumstances. After the death of [p. 24] our Lord the Apostles continued to attend the Jewish liturgical gatherings. The Acts show that they frequented the Temple, and visited the synagogues. On arriving in a city, they put themselves in contact with the Jewish colony, faithfully assisted at the gatherings of the synagogue, and partook in its worship. Paul and Barnabas, entering the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia on the day of the Sabbath, take their place among the other Jews. After the reading of the Law and the Prophets, the elders of the synagogue send one of their assistants to tell them: "Brethren, if you have any exhortation to give the people, speak." Paul stands up and addresses the assembly, preaching Christ, His coming, His death, and His resurrection. His discourse stirs up some emotion and he is asked to come again on the following Sabbath. The same thing occurs at Iconium, at Thessalonica, where St. Paul, "according to his custom," enters the synagogue on three successive Sabbaths and preaches the Gospel; thus also at Athens and at Corinth. The Apostles and their first disciples therefore continued to frequent the Temple and the synagogues and to take part in the sabbatic gatherings.

[p. 25] However this common worship could not suffice them; as disciples of Jesus they felt the need of adoring among themselves alone that Messiah whom the majority of their compatriots refused to recognize. For that worship they needed private gatherings, which became more and more necessary when the first Gentiles, absolute strangers to Judaism, were added to the number of the faithful. Sunday, already mentioned once in the Acts and once in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, was soon joined to the Sabbath. This addition probably occurred as follows: After having assisted at the services in the synagogue, the Apostles and their disciples came together apart from the Jews to partake of the Eucharistic meal "in memory" of Christ. Their gathering began towards evening and lasted till daybreak. This must have been the usual order, especially at the time when the Christians were scattered in small communities, each of which could not have an Apostle or priest, and were consequently obliged to travel a longer distance than was allowed on the Sabbath if they wished to partake of the Last Supper in common. Thus the

first day of the week was added to the Sabbath... [p. 26] In being substituted for the Sabbath, as a more perfect form of worship, Sunday assumed those of its obligations that were reconcilable with the law of the Gospel...

[p. 30] In the meantime [by the fourth century] the practice of the Christian populace and the teaching of the bishops had inspired Constantine to take measures which were destined to exercise a wholesome influence. Eusebius in his Life of Constantine tells us that the first Christian Emperor desired that one day be consecrated to prayer, and chose Sunday. He not only encouraged the observance of this practice by his example but also made use of various means to enable others to do likewise. All Christian soldiers were free to obey the precept of the Church on that day and gathered together in an appointed place to address to God a prayer which the Emperor himself had composed...

[p. 32] "Come to church every Sunday," says Caesarius [of Arles (470?–543?)]; "on Sunday Christians must occupy themselves only with God and must gather in church for the salvation of their souls. He affirms that Sunday is reserved to Divine worship by Divine institution: "The apostles and Apostolic men have decided that Sunday should be consecrated to acts of religion, and on that day Divine worship only should be attended to. To that day they transferred the glory of the Jewish Sabbath. Let us therefore observe the Sunday, my dear brethren, and let us sanctify it as the Divine Legislator commanded the ancients to observe the Sabbath. From Saturday night to Sunday night let us give ourselves up entirely to divine worship."

1608. Sunday—Development Gradual—Church Authority and Custom SOURCE: "Sunday in Place of Sabbath," *The Sign*, 21 (August, 1941), 47, 48. Copyright 1941 by The Passionist Missions, Inc., Union City, N.J. Used by permission. [FRS No. 52.]

[p. 47] The Seventh Day Adventists say that the Apostles had no right nor power to change the Sabbath into the Sunday. Christ, they say, came to fulfill the Law of God, and not one iota has been broken. They maintain that the resurrection of Christ on a Sunday and the descent of the Holy Ghost on a Sunday are no reasons to change the Law.— PROVIDENCE, R. I.

The Apostles did not change the Sabbath into the Sunday; they remain distinct days of the week. But what the Apostles and their successors did was to transfer the obligations attaching to the Sabbath, divine worship and cessation from servile work, to the Sunday. This was done gradually. It was not until about the second century of the Christian era that the observance of the Sunday in place of the Sabbath became universal. Saint Thomas Aquinas teaches that the observance of Sunday in the New Law succeeds to the observance of the Sabbath in the Old Law, not by virtue of a divine precept, but from the authority of the Church and the custom of Christians. The introduction of this change by the Church must have had the sanction of Christ, Who is the Lord of the Sabbath, and Who promised to be "with" the Church even to the consummation of the world.

The Seventh Day Adventist tenet is an instance of individualism and private judgment against the custom of the whole Christian Church (though it is logical for those who maintain the "Bible and the Bible only" theory). They insist that divine worship and bodily rest must be observed on the seventh day of the week, instead of the first. In this they agree with the Jews. In the Old Law the Sabbath was a figure of things to come, while in the New Law the Sunday is a symbol of the accomplishment of the prophecies in the Redeemer. By continuing the Sabbath observance, the Adventist, though they call themselves Christians, not only associate themselves with the Jews, who are still hoping for the Redeemer, but they also contradict the [p. 48] practice of the whole Christian Church. Is it not presumptuous for them to decide what the Apostles could not do? The Apostles were given the power to bind and loose, and their decisions were ratified in heaven (Matt. 18:18).

The sanctification of one day in the week is of divine law, but the determination of the day in the New Law was left to the authority of the Church. Since the ceremonial and judicial precepts of the Old Law were abolished by the New Law, the Church determined that the first day of the week was to be devoted to divine worship and bodily rest, in order to distinguish the true religion from the Mosaic, which was supplanted by Christianity.

1609. Sunday—Development Gradual, Conclusions of a Modern Catholic Writer on

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 203. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of the America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author. After this study of the matter of the negative part of the Sunday precept, the

conclusions reached are:

- (1) That the Sunday was in the beginning not looked on as a day of bodily repose; nor was an analogy drawn between the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, except as days of worship.
- (2) The application rest of the Jewish Sabbath norms of a bodily rest to the Sunday was really due to the erroneous idea that the Sunday was but a continuation of the Sabbath.
- (3) The keeping of the Sunday rest arose from the custom of the people and the constitution of the Church.
- (4) Through the years the insistance [*sic*] on and the observance of the Sunday repose has varied greatly. It was most strict when the sabbatarian spirit was most strong.
- (5) Tertullian was probably the first to refer to a cessation of worldly affairs on the Sunday; the Council of Laodicea issued the first conciliar legislation for that day; Constantine I issued the first civil legislation. St. Martin of Braga was probably the first to use the term "servile work" in its present theological sense.
- (6) The term "servile work" was originally used by Christian writers to designate sin. It was probably not until the sixth century that it was used to signify bodily work. For a long while after its adoption it was generally identified with rural works.

1610. Sunday, Established as Soon as Persecution Ceased (4th Century) SOURCE: John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1906), p. 369. [FRS No. 73.]

St. Paul denounces distinctions in meat and drink, the observance of Sabbaths and holydays, and of ordinances, and the worship of Angels; yet Christians, from the first, were rigid in their stated fastings, venerated, as St. Justin tells us, the Angelic intelligences, and established the observance of the Lord's day as soon as persecution ceased.

1611. Sunday, Establishment of, Based on Need for Holy Days SOURCE: John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1906), p. 373. [FRS No. 73.]

The same reason, the need of holydays for the multitude, is assigned by Origen, St. Gregory's master, to explain the establishment of the Lord's Day also, and the Paschal and the Pentecostal festivals.

1612. Sunday, Establishment of, by Council of Laodicea

SOURCE: Augustus Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, trans. by Joseph Torrey (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1851), pp. 424, 425. [FRS No. 98.]

[p. 424] As to the celebration of Sunday, the custom, which had long prevailed in the church, of consecrating this day in a special manner to religious employments, and of abstaining from all worldly business [see No. 1638] was established by a synodal law, the twenty-ninth canon of the council of Laodicea, yet with this restriction, that all Christians should abstain from their worldly business if they were able. A collision betwixt this ecclesiastical ordinance and the relations to the state, which must have arisen in the earlier situation of the church, could now be easily removed, when the state itself recognized the church as such, and endeavoured to uphold her in the prose- [p. 425] cution of her principles and the attainment of her ends. We have already said, that the emperor Constantine, in a law enacted previous to the year 321, commanded the suspension of all suits and courts of justice on Sunday. It was a beautiful exception, wholly in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, by which he provided that the emancipation of slaves, after the usual forms, should be permitted to take place on Sunday. As Eusebius, in his life of Constantine, relates, he also forbad all military exercises on this day. By a law of the year 386, those older changes effected by the emperor Constantine were more rigorously enforced, and, in general, civil transactions of every kind on Sunday were strictly forbidden.

1613. Sunday, Evening to Evening, in 8th Century

SOURCE: Charlemagne, *Capitularia* (Capitularies [Laws]), in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Leges*, Vol. 1 (reprint; Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1925), pp. 57, 71. Latin.

a. Capitulare Ecclesias[t]icum a[nno] 789 (Ecclesiastical Capitulary for the year 789), sec. 15

[p. 57] 15. Likewise in the same council [Laodicaea], that from evening (*vespera*) until evening shall the Lord's day (*dies dominica*) be kept.

b. Capitulare Francofurtense (Frankfurt Capitulary), sec. 21

[p. 71] 21. That the Lord's day (*dies dominica*) is to be kept from evening until evening.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Actually, the Council of Laodicea (see Canon 29) does not mention the beginning or ending of the day.]

1614. Sunday — Ignatius' Statement (Magnesians ix) Explained SOURCE: Baden Powell, "Lord's Day," in John Kitto, ed., *A Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature* (New York: Mark H. Newman, [1846]), Vol. 2, p. 270. [FRS No. 120.]

But we must here notice one other passage of earlier date than any of these, which has often been referred to as bearing on the subject of the Lord's Day, though it certainly *contains* no mention of it. It occurs in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians (about A.D. 100). The whole passage is confessedly obscure, and the text may be corrupt. It has, however, been understood in a totally different sense, and as referring to a distinct subject; and such we confess appears to us to be the most obvious and natural construction of it.

The passage is as follows:— 'Εἰ οῦ οἱ ἐν παλαιοῖς πφάγμαςιν ἀαςτφαφένΘες, εἰς χαινότητα ελπίδοτ ἠθον—μηχέτι ςαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ χατά χυριαχὴν ζωὴν ζῶντες—(ἐ ἢ χαὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἡῶν ἀέτειλεν δἱ αὐτοῦ, χαὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ [ὄν τινες ἀροῦνται], δἰ οῦ μυςτηρίου ἐλάβομεν ... &c.), πώς ἡμεῖς δυνηςόμεθα ζήςαι κωρὶς αὐτοῦ; ...,' &c. (Ignatius, *ad Magnesios*, § ix.; Jacobson's *Patres Apost*. ii. 322. Oxford, 1840).

Now many commentators assume (on what ground does not appear), that after $\chi \upsilon \rho \iota \alpha \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ the word $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \alpha \nu$ is to be understood. On this hypothesis they endeavour to make the rest of the sentence accord with a reference to the observance of the Lord's day, by further supposing $\dot{\epsilon}$ $\dot{\eta}$ to refer to $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \alpha$ understood, and the whole to be put in contrast with $\varsigma \alpha \beta \beta \alpha \tau i \zeta \circ \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ in the former clause. For opinions in support of this view, the reader is referred to the Notes in Jacobson's edition, p. 324.

Dr. Neander, in his *History of Christianity*, translated by Mr. Rose (i. 336), refers to this passage adopting this supposition, on which the translator remarks (in a note) very truly, though somewhat laconically, that he can only find 'something of the kind' in the passage. The meaning of Neander's version is altogether very confused, but seems to represent the Lord's day as a sort of emblem of the new life of a Christian.

Let us now look at the passage simply as it stands. The defect of the sentence is the want of a substantive to which $\eta\mu$ ép α can refer. This defect, so far from being remedied, is rendered still more glaring by the introduction of $\eta\mu$ ép α . Now if we take $\chi \nu\rho \iota \alpha \chi \eta \zeta \omega \eta$ as simply 'the life of the Lord,' having a more personal meaning, it certainly goes nearer to supplying the substantive to $\alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \upsilon \vartheta$. Again, $\dot{\varepsilon} \upsilon \eta$ may well refer to $\zeta \omega \eta$, and $\chi \nu \rho \iota \alpha \chi \eta \zeta \omega \eta$, meaning our Lord's *life*, as emphatically including his *resurrection* (as in Rom. v. 10, &c.), presents precisely the same analogy to the spiritual life of the Christian as is conveyed both in Rom. v.; Coloss. iii. 3, 4, and many other passages. Thus upon the whole the meaning might be given thus:—

'If those who lived under the old dispensation have come to the newness of hope, no longer keeping Sabbaths, but living according to our Lord's life (in which, as it were, our life has risen again, through him, and his death [which some deny], through whom we have received the mystery, &c....), how shall we be able to live without him?' ...

In this way (allowing for the involved style of the whole) the meaning seems to us simple, consistent, and grammatical, without any gratuitous introduction of words understood; and this view has been followed by many, though it is a subject on which considerable controversy has existed. On this view the passage does not refer at all to the Lord's day; but even on the opposite supposition it cannot be regarded as affording any positive evidence to the early use of the term 'Lord's day' (for which it is often cited), since the material word $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$ is purely conjectural. It however offers an instance of that species of contrast which the early fathers were so fond of drawing between the Christian and Jewish dispensations, and between the new life of the Christian and the ceremonial spirit of the law, to which the Lord's day (if it be imagined to be referred to) is represented as opposed.

To return, however, to the nature of this observance in the Christian church, we will merely remark that though in later times we find considerable reference to a sort of *consecration of the day*, it does not seem at any period of the ancient church to have assumed the form of such an observance as some modern religious communities have contended for. Nor do these writers in any instance pretend to allege *any divine command*, *or even apostolic practice*, in support of it.

In the laws of Constantine (A.D. 300), cessation from ordinary work on the Lord's day was first enjoined, but with an express exception in favour of the labours of agriculture. (See Jortin's *Remarks on Eccles. Hist.* iii. 236.)

Chrysostom (A.D. 360) concludes one of his Homilies by dismissing his audience to their respective ordinary occupations. The Council of Laodicea (A.D. 364), however, enjoined Christians to rest ($\zeta \kappa o \lambda \dot{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \iota v$) on the Lord's day. To the same effect is an injunction in the forgery called the *Apostolical Constitutions* (vii. 24), and various later enactments from A.D. 600 to A.D. 1100, though by no means extending to the prohibition of all secular business.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For the uncertainty of the date of the Council of Laodicea, see No. 1435n.]

1615. Sunday, No Correlation of, With Jewish Sabbath

SOURCE: Lawrence L. McReavy, "Sabbatarianism and the Decalogue," *The Clergy Review*, 20 (June, 1941), 498. Used by permission.

There can be few popular misconceptions more deeply rooted among Christians, Catholic as well as Protestant, than that correlation of the Christian Sunday to the Jewish Sabbath (resulting normally in Sunday observance according to sabbatical precedents) which we call "sabbatarianism"... The Catechism, like the average manual of Moral Theology, by its treatment of Sunday observance under the Third, or Sabbath Commandment of the Decalogue, rather than under the First, or Festal Commandment of the Church, goes a long way to confirm the prevailing impression that Sabbath and Sunday are but two names for the same thing.

This mistaken impression is either based upon, or else leads to ..., a false view of the Decalogue.

1616. Sunday, Not Continuation of Seventh-day Sabbath

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. xi, 2. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. xi] This association of the law with the Third [Fourth] Commandment has indeed been one of the difficult features to explain away. In fact, those who admit the erroneousness of such a foundation, very frequently find themselves quoting Sabbatical texts when they strive to emphasize the proper observance of the Sunday. However by attempting to correct this false notion of the Sunday as a mere continuation of the Jewish Sabbath, we do not intend or wish to say that there is no strict obligation to observe the Sunday repose. We must never forget that the Church has the power to bind under sin, and there has never been a doubt of the obligation of the Church's law of Sunday repose...

[p. 2] Some theologians have held that God likewise directly determined the Sunday as the day of worship in the New Law, that He Himself has explicitly substituted the Sunday for the Sabbath. But this theory is now entirely abandoned. It is now commonly held that God simply gave His Church the power to set aside whatever day or days, she would deem suitable as Holy Days. The Church chose Sunday, the first day of the week, and in the course of time added other days, as holy days.

1617. Sunday, Not Substitute for the Sabbath

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, pp. 49, 52, 54. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

[p. 49] There was never any formal or authoritative change from the Jewish Seventh Day Sabbath to the Christian First Day observance. The early Christians leave no evidence that they thought of their day of worship as a substitution for the pre-Christian Sabbath, or as continuing that Sabbath. Jewish Christians at first seem to have continued to observe the Sabbath as Jews. As their independent Christian consciousness grew and incorporated the whole of their religious experience, life and program, under their own ideals and forms, they more and more left the Jewish Sabbath out of their thought...

[p. 52] There are in the New Testament no commands, no prescriptions, no rules, no liturgies applying to the observance of the Lord's Day...

[p. 54] There is no organic connection between the Hebrew Sabbath and the Christian Lord's Day. Jewish Christians naturally brought over their Hebrew consciousness with reference to the day. It was only a short while until gentiles predominated in the Christian movement. They brought over the consciousness of various observances in the pagan religions, pre-eminently the worship of the sun—a sort of Sunday consciousness. Both groups subordinated and reinterpreted their previous ideas to conform to the characteristic Christian concept...

There is consequently no proper question of "change of the day."

[EDITORS' NOTE: This quotation should not be interpreted as indicating on the part of Dr. Carver any lack of commitment to the observance of the first day of the week as "the Christian's Lord's Day."]

1618. Sunday, Not the Sabbath

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 14–17, 41. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 14] In the Scriptures these two days are never confounded [the seventh day and the first day], nor are they in any way exchanged the one for the other. On the contrary they are set in contrast, and are kept as distinct as the two general dispensations to which they respectively belong. The one is set apart and sanctified by divine commandment; the other is set apart and sanctified only as men sanctify the Lord Christ in their hearts...

[p. 15] In current usage these two days have two secular names. The seventh is called Saturday, and the first is called Sunday. In no case are these names used interchangeably. The seventh day is never called Sunday, nor is the first called Saturday...

[p. 16] The sacred name of the seventh day is Sabbath. This fact is too clear to require argument. The truth is stated in concise terms: "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God." This utterance is repeated in Exodus 16:26, 23:12, 31:15, 35:2, Leviticus 23:3, and [p. 17] Deuteronomy 5:14. On this point the plain teaching of the word has been admitted in all ages. Except to certain special sabbaths appointed in Levitical law, and these invariably governed by the month rather than the week, the Bible in all its utterances never, no, not once, applies the name Sabbath to any other day.

The sacred name of the first day of the week is Lord's Day. Between it and the Sabbath the distinction is made very clear: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week." ...

[p. 41] Not once did they [the disciples] apply the Sabbath law to the first day of the week,—that folly was left for a later age, nor did they pretend that the first day supplanted the seventh.

1619. Sunday, Not the Sabbath—Names Never Confused by Ancient Writers

SOURCE: Translator's footnote in *The Ecclesiastical History of Socrates* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1874), p. 289 (on bk. 5, chap. 22).

That is, upon the Saturday. It should be observed, that Sunday is never called "the

Sabbath" ($\tau \delta \varsigma \delta \beta \delta \alpha \tau \sigma v$) by the ancient Fathers and historians... The Latins kept the sabbath as a fast, the Greeks as a feast; and the 64th of the Apostolical Canons forbids any of the clergy to fast on the sabbath (Saturday) under pain of being deposed, and likewise a layman under the penalty of ex-communication.

1620. Sunday, Not the Sabbath, Says Roger Williams

SOURCE: Roger Williams, Letter to Major John Mason of Connecticut, June 22, 1670, in *Letters of Roger Williams*, ed. by John Russell Bartlett (*Publications of the Narragansett Club*, 1st series, Vol. 6. Providence: The Narragansett Club, 1874), pp. 333, 346, 347. [FRS No. 62.]

[p. 333] PROVIDENCE, June 22, 1670, (*ut vulgo*.)

MAJOR MASON,—My honored, dear and ancient friend, my due respects and earnest desires to God, for your eternal peace, &c. ...

- [p. 346; 1.] Some of yours [i.e., Connecticut Puritans], as I heard lately, told tales to the Archbishop of Canterbury, viz.: that we [in Rhode Island] are a profane people, and do not keep the Sabbath, but some do plough, &c. But, first, you told him not how we suffer freely all other persuasions, yea, the common prayer, which yourselves will not suffer. If you say you will, you confess you must suffer more, as we do.
- 2. You know this is but a color to your design, for, first, you know that all England itself (after the formality and superstition of morning and evening prayer) play away their Sabbath. 2d. You know yourselves do not keep the Sabbath, that is the seventh day, &c.
- 3. You know that famous Calvin and thousands more [p. 347] held it but ceremonial and figurative from Colossians 2, &c., and vanished; and that the day of worship was alterable at the churches' pleasure. Thus also all the Romanists confess, saying, viz.: that there is no express scripture, first, for infants' baptism; nor, second, for abolishing the seventh day, and instituting of the eighth day worship, but that it is at the churches' pleasure.
- 4. You know, that generally, all this whole colony observe the first day, only here and there one out of conscience, another out of covetousness, make no conscience of it.
- 5. You know the greatest part of the world make no conscience of a seventh day. The next part of the world, Turks, Jews and Christians, keep three different days, Friday, Saturday, Sunday for their Sabbath and day of worship, and every one maintains his own by the longest sword.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Those mentioned in sec. 4, who "out of conscience" did not keep Sunday, were Seventh Day Baptists, or "Sabbatarian Baptists," as these English witnesses to God's Sabbath were first called in those times. In 1664 Stephen Mumford, of one of these London congregations, was sent over to New England. He settled in Rhode Island, where the Baptist pioneer of religious liberty, Roger Williams, had founded his colony. In 1671 the first Sabbatarian church in America was formed in Rhode Island. Evidently this movement created a stir; for the report went over to England that the Rhode Island colony did not keep the Sabbath—meaning Sunday. Roger Williams wrote this letter denying the report, but calling attention to the fact that there was no Scripture for "abolishing the seventh day," and remarking: "You know yourselves do not keep the Sabbath, that is the seventh day."

Williams' toleration of Sabbathkeepers contrasted with the intolerance in other New England colonies, such as Connecticut (which, as he points out in sec. 1, did not allow "the common prayer," that is, Anglican worship), and in England. In 1684 Francis Bampfield—formerly an influential minister of the Church of England, but later pastor of a Sabbathkeeping congregation meeting in Pinner's Hall, London—died of hardships in Newgate prison, for the Sabbath of the Lord.

Williams himself, though friendly to the Seventh Day Baptists, wrote to one of them that after reading on the subject of the seventh day he still held that "all those sabbaths of seven days were figures, types and shadows, and fore-runners of the Son of God, and that the change is made from the remembrance of the first creation, and that (figurative) rest on the seventh day, to the remembrance of the second creation on the first [day], on which our Lord arose conqueror from the dead" (Letter to Samuel Hubbard, 1672, in Isaac Backus, *History of New England, With Particular Reference to ... Baptists* [2d ed.; Newton, Mass.: The Backus Society, 1871], Vol. 1, p. 411).]

1621. Sunday, Observance of, Catholic Teaching on

SOURCE: Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 404, 405. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 404] Thou shalt do no work on it, says the Lord, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy beast, nor the stranger that is within thy gates.

These words teach us, in the first place, to avoid whatever may interfere with the worship of God. Hence it is not difficult to perceive that all servile works are forbidden, not because they are improper or evil in themselves, but because they withdraw the attention from the worship of God, which is the great end of the Commandment.

The faithful should be still more careful to avoid sin, which not only withdraws the mind from the contemplation of divine things, but entirely alienates us from the love of God...

[p. 405] The pastor should also not omit carefully to teach what works and actions Christians should perform on festival days. These are: to go to church, and there, with heartfelt piety and devotion, to assist at the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; and to approach frequently the Sacraments of the Church, instituted for our salvation in order to obtain a remedy for the wounds of the soul...

The faithful should also listen with attention and reverence to sermons. Nothing is more intolerable, nothing more unworthy than to despise the words of Christ, or hear them with indifference.

Likewise the faithful should give themselves to frequent prayer and the praises of God; and an object of their special attention should be to learn those things which pertain to a Christian life, and to practice with care the duties of piety, such as giving alms to the poor and needy, visiting the sick, and administering consolation to the sorrowful and afflicted. *Religion clean and undefiled before God and the Father is this,* says St. James, *to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation.*

1622. Sunday, Observance of, Claimed as Sign That Americans Are a Christian People

SOURCE: James Cardinal Gibbons, "The Claims of the Catholic Church in the Making of the Republic," in John Gilmary Shea and others, *The Cross and The Flag, Our Church and Country* (New York: The Catholic Historical League of America, 1899), pp. 24, 25. [FRS No. 104.]

[p. 24] The Divine institution of a day of rest from ordinary occupations and of religious worship, transferred by the authority of the Church [p. 25] from the Sabbath, the last day, to Sunday, the first day of the week, has always been revered in this country, has entered into our legislation and customs, and is one of the most patent signs that we are a Christian people.

The neglect and abandonment of this observance would be sure evidence of a departure from the Christian spirit in which our past national life has been moulded. In our times, as in all times past, the enemies of religion are the opponents, secret or avowed, of the Christian Sabbath. A close observer cannot fail to note the dangerous inroads that have been made on the Lord's Day in this country within the last quarter of a century. He renders a service to his country who tries to check this dangerous tendency to desecration.

It would not be difficult to show that the observance of Sunday is fraught with the greatest social blessing; as proof, look at the social ills that have befallen those Christian nations that have lost respect for it. Solicitous to avert from the United States those

disastrous consequences, the Catholic Church has been a strenuous upholder of the sacred character of the Lord's Day.

1623. Sunday, Observance of, in Pius XII's Program of Action SOURCE: "Pope Calls for Moral and Religious Action, Not Just Planning" (by the Associated Press), *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., Sept. 8, 1947, p. A-12. Used by permission of Wide World Photo, Inc., New York.

VATICAN CITY, Sept. 8.—Pope Pius XII told a throng of 250,000 Catholic worshippers gathered in St. Peter's Square yesterday that "the time for reflection and planning is past," in religious and moral fields and the "time for action" has arrived...

The Pope ... declared that the battle in religious and moral fields hinged on five points:

Religious culture, the sanctifying of Sunday, the savings [*sic*] of the Christian family, social justice and loyalty and truthfulness in dealings.

1624. Sunday, Observance of, Pope John XXIII Sees as Social and Religious Obligation

SOURCE: Pope John XXIII, Encyclical *Mater et Magistra* (Mother and Teacher), 1961, translation released by the Vatican Press Office. Used by permission of the National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service. (The same extract appears also on page 8B of the encyclical as printed in the supplement to *Our Sunday Visitor*, Aug. 6, 1961, also in versions published by the Paulist Press [pp. 75, 76] and by the American Press [p. 66.]

To safeguard the dignity of man as a creature endowed with a soul formed in the image and likeness of God, the Church has always demanded an exact observance of the third precept of the decalogue: "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day." God has a right to demand of man that he dedicate a day of the week to worship, in which the spirit, free from material preoccupations, can lift itself up and open itself by thought and by love to heavenly things, examining in the secret of its conscience its obligatory and necessary relations towards its Creator.

In addition, man has the right and even the need to rest in order to renew the bodily strength used up by hard daily work, to give suitable recreation to the senses and to promote domestic unity, which requires frequent contact and a peaceful living together of all the members of the family.

Consequently, religion, morality and hygiene, all unite in the law of periodic repose which the Church has for centuries translated into the sanctification of Sunday through participation in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, a memorial and application of the redemptive work of Christ for souls.

It is with great grief that We must acknowledge and deplore the negligence of, if not the downright disrespect for, this sacred law and the consequent harmful results for the health of both body and soul of Our beloved workers.

In the name of God and for the material and spiritual interests of men, We call upon all, public authorities, employers and workers, to observe the precepts of God and His Church, and We remind each one of his grave responsibilities before God and society.

1625. Sunday—Protestant State's Inconsistency in Disowning Catholic Authority

SOURCE: John Gilmary Shea, "The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement," *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 8 (January, 1883), 139, 149, 152. [FRS No. 121.]

[p. 139] Strange as it may seem, the State, in passing laws for the due sanctification of Sunday, is unwittingly acknowledging the authority of the Catholic Church, and carrying out more or less faithfully its prescriptions.

The Sunday, as a day of the week set apart for the obligatory public worship of Almighty God, to be sanctified by a suspension of all servile labor, trade, and worldly avocations and by exercises of devotion, is purely a creation of the Catholic Church.

It is not the Jewish Sabbath; it is, in fact, entirely distinct from it, and not governed by the enactments of the Mosaic law. It is part and parcel of the system of the Catholic Church, as absolutely as Christian marriage is or any other of her sacraments, her festivals and fasts, her days of joy and mourning, her indulgences and her jubilees...

[p. 149] The Catholic Church created the Sunday and made the very regulations which have come down on the statute-books, and she still constantly, from her pulpits, her catechists' chairs, and the confessional, calls on her faithful to obey them, to sanctify the day, and refrain from all that descrates it...

[p. 152] Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Church, has no good reason for its Sunday theory, and ought, logically, to keep Saturday as the Sabbath, with the Jews and Seventh-Day Baptists. For their present practice Protestants in general have no authority but that of a Church which they disown, and there cannot be a greater inconsistency than theirs in asking the state to enforce the Sunday laws.

1626. Sunday, Protestants Follow Catholic Church in SOURCE: Bertrand L. Conway, *The Question-Box Answers* (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 254, 255. Issued earlier by "The Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle in the State of New York." [FRS No. 6.]

[p. 254] What Bible authority is there for changing the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week?

Who gave the Pope the authority to change a command of God?

If the Bible is the only guide for the Christian, then the Seventh Day Adventist is right in observing the Saturday with the Jew. But Catholics learn what to believe and do from the divine, infallible authority established by Jesus Christ, the Catholic Church, which in Apostolic times made Sunday the day of rest to honor our Lord's resurrection on that day, [p. 255] and to mark off clearly the Jew from the Christian. St. Justin Martyr (Apol., c. 67) speaks of the early Christians meeting for the holy sacrifice of the Mass on Sunday.

Is it not strange that those who make the Bible their only teacher should inconsistently follow in this matter the tradition of the Church?

1627. Sunday, Protestants Have No Basis for

SOURCE: John Gilmary Shea, "The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement," The American Catholic Quarterly Review, 8, (January 1883), 139, 152. [FRS No. 121.]

[p. 139] Sunday ... is purely a creation of the Catholic Church...

[p. 152] For ages all Christian nations looked to the Catholic Church, and, as we have seen, the various states enforced by law her ordinances as to worship and cessation of labor on Sunday. Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Church, has no good reason for its Sunday theory, and ought, logically, to keep Saturday as the Sabbath.

1628. Sunday, Protestants Taunted for Observance of, Against Clear Bible Command

SOURCE: Tract, "Why Don't You Keep Holy the Sabbath-Day?" pp. 3–15, in *The Clifton Tracts*, Vol. 4 (New York: T. W. Strong, 1869). [FRS No. 53.]

[p. 3] I am going to propose a very plain and serious question, to which I would entreat all who profess to follow "the Bible and the Bible only" to give their most earnest attention. It is this: Why do you not keep holy the Sabbath-day?

The command of Almighty God stands clearly written in the Bible in these words: "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work" (Exod. xx. 8, 9). And again, "Six days shall work be done; but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire through out your habitations upon the Sabbath-day" (Exod. xxxv. 2, 3). How strict and precise is [p. 4] God's commandment upon this head! No work whatever was to be done on the day which He had chosen to set apart for Himself and to make holy; He required of His people that they should not even light a fire upon that day. And accordingly, when the children of Israel "found a man that gathered sticks upon the Sabbath-day," "the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp" (Numbers xv. 35). Such being God's command then, I ask again, Why do you not obey it? Why do you not keep holy the Sabbath-day?

You will answer me, perhaps, that you *do* keep holy the Sabbath-day; for that you abstain from all worldly business, and diligently go to church, and say your prayers, and read your Bible at home, every Sunday of your lives.

But Sunday is not the Sabbath-day. Sunday is the first day of the week; the Sabbathday was the seventh day of the week. Almighty God did not give a commandment that men should keep holy one day in seven; but He named His own day, and said distinctly, "Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day;" and He assign- [p. 5] ed a reason for choosing this day rather than any other-a reason which belongs only to the seventh day of the week, and cannot be applied to the rest. He says, "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it." Almighty God ordered that all men should rest from their labor on the seventh day, because He too had rested on that day. He did not rest on Sunday, but on Saturday. On Sunday, which is the first day of the week, He began the work of creation. He did not finish it; it was on Saturday that He "ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made; and God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made" (Gen. ii. 2, 3). Nothing can be more plain and easy to understand than all this; and there is nobody who attempts to deny it; it is acknowledged by everybody that the day which Almighty God appointed to be kept holy was Saturday, not Sunday. Why do you then keep holy the Sunday, and not Saturday?

You will tell me that Saturday was the *Jew*- [p. 6] *ish* Sabbath, but that the *Christian* Sabbath has been changed to Sunday. Changed! but by whom? Who has authority to change an express commandment of Almighty God? When God has spoken and said, Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day, who shall dare to say, Nay, thou mayest work and do all manner of worldly business on the seventh day; but thou shalt keep holy the first day in its stead? This is a most important question, which I know not how you can answer.

You are a Protestant, and you profess to go by the Bible and the Bible only; and yet in so important a matter as the observance of one day in seven as a holy day, you go against the plain letter of the Bible, and put another day in the place of that day which the Bible has commanded. The command to keep holy the seventh day is one of the ten commandments; you believe that the other nine are still binding; who gave you authority to tamper with the fourth? If you are consistent with your own principles, if you really follow the Bible and the Bible only, you ought to be able to produce some portion of the New Testament in which this fourth commandment is expressly altered, or at least from which you may confi- [p. 7] dently infer that it was the will of God that Christians should make that change in its observance which you have made. Let us see whether any such passages can be found. I will look for them in the writings of your own champions, who have attempted to defend your practice in this matter.

- 1. The first text which I find quoted upon the subject is this: "Let no man judge you in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days" (Col. ii. 16). I could understand a Bible Christian arguing from this passage, that we ought to make no difference between Saturday, Sunday, and every other day of the week; that under the Christian dispensation all such distinctions of days were done away with; one day was as good and as holy as another; there were to be no Sabbaths, no holy days at all. But not one syllable does it say about the obligation of the Sabbath being *transferred* from one day to another.
- 2. Secondly, the words of St. John are quoted, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Apoc. i. 10). Is it possible that anybody can for a moment imagine that here is a safe and clear rule for changing the weekly feast from the seventh to the first day? This pas- [p. 8] sage is utterly silent upon such a subject; it does but give us Scriptural authority for calling some one day in particular (it does not even say *which* day) "the Lord's day."
- 3. Next we are reminded that St. Paul bade his Corinthian converts, "upon the first day of the week, lay by them in store, that there might be no gatherings" when he himself came (1 Cor. xvi. 2). How is this supposed to affect the law of the Jewish Sabbath? It commands a certain act of almsgiving to be done on the first day of the week. It says absolutely nothing about not doing certain other acts of prayer and public worship on the seventh day.
- 4. But it was "on the first day of the week" when the disciples were assembled with closed doors for fear of the Jews, and Jesus stood in the midst of them; and again, it was eight days afterwards (that is, on the first day of the following week) that "the disciples were within, and Thomas with them," and Jesus again came and stood in the midst (John xx. 19, 26): that is to say, it was on the evening of the day of the Resurrection that our Lord first showed Himself to many disciples gathered together; and after eight days He again showed Himself to the same company, with the further addition [p. 9] of St. Thomas. What is there in these facts to do away with the obligation of keeping holy the seventh day? Our Lord rose from the dead on the first day of the week, and on the same day at evening He appears to many of His disciples; He appears again on that day week, and perhaps also on other days in the interval. Let Protestants, if they will, keep holy the first day of the week in grateful commemoration of that stupendous mystery, the Resurrection of Christ, and of the evidences which He vouchsafed to give of it to His doubting disciples; but this is no scriptural authority for ceasing to keep holy another day of the

week which God had expressly commanded to be kept holy for another and altogether different reason.

5. But lastly, we have the example of the Apostles themselves. "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight" (Acts xx. 7). Here we have clear proof that the disciples came together for the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, and that they heard a sermon on a Sunday. But is there any proof that they had not done the [p. 10] same on the Saturday also? Is it not expressly written concerning those early Christians, that they "continued *daily* with one accord in the temple, breaking bread from house to house?" (Acts ii. 46). And as a matter of fact, do we not know from other sources that, in many parts of the Church, the ancient Christians were in the habit of meeting together for public worship, to receive Holy Communion, and to perform the other offices, on Saturdays just the same as on Sundays? Again, then, I say, let Protestants keep holy, if they will, the first day of the week, in order that they may resemble those Christians who were gathered together on that day in an upper chamber in Troas: but let them remember that this cannot possibly release them from the obligation of keeping holy another day which Almighty God has ordered to be kept holy, because on that day He "rested from all His work."

I do not know of any other passages of holy Scripture which Protestants are in the habit of quoting to defend their practice of keeping holy the first day of the week instead of the seventh; yet surely those which I have quoted are not such as should satisfy any reasonable man, who looks upon the written word of God as *they* [p. 11] profess to look upon it, namely, as the one only appointed means of learning God's will, and who really desires to learn and to obey that will in all things with humbleness and simplicity of heart. It is absolutely impossible that a reasonable and thoughtful person should be satisfied, by the texts that I have quoted, that Almighty God intended the obligation of Saturday under the old law to be transferred to Sunday under the new. And yet Protestants do so transfer it, and never seem to have the slightest misgivings lest, in doing so, they should be guilty of breaking one of God's commandments. Why is this? Because, although they talk so largely about following the Bible and the Bible only, they are really guided in this matter by the voice of tradition. Yes, much as they may hate and denounce the word, they have in fact no other authority to allege for this most important change. The present generation of Protestants keep Sunday holy instead of Saturday, because they received it as part of the Christian religion from the last generation, and that generation received it from the generation before, and so on backwards from one generation to another, by a continual succession, until we come to the time of the (so-[p. 12] called) Reformation, when it so happened that those who conducted the change of religion in this country left this particular portion of Catholic faith and practice untouched.

But, had it happened otherwise,—had some one or other of the "Reformers" taken it into his head to denounce the observance of Sunday as a Popish corruption and superstition, and to insist upon it that Saturday was the day which God had appointed to be kept holy, and that He had never authorized the observance of any other,—all Protestants would have been obliged, in obedience to their professed principle of following the Bible and the Bible only, either to acknowledge this teaching as true, and to return to the observance of the ancient Jewish Sabbath, or else to deny that there is any Sabbath at all. And so, in like manner, any one at the present day who should set about, honestly and without prejudice, to draw up for himself a form of religious belief and practice out of the written Word of God, must needs come to the same conclusion: he must either believe that the Jewish Sabbath is still binding upon men's consciences, because of the Divine command, "Thou shalt keep holy the seventh day;" or he must believe that non Sabbath at [p. 13] all is binding upon them, because of the Apostolic injunction, "Let no man judge you in respect of a festival day, or of the Sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is Christ's." Either one or the other of these conclusions he might honestly come to; but he would know nothing whatever of a *Christian* Sabbath distinct from the Jewish, celebrated on a different day, and observed in a different manner, simply because Holy Scripture itself nowhere speaks of such a thing.

Now, mind, in all this you would greatly misunderstand me if you supposed I was quarrelling with you for acting in this matter on a true and right principle, in other words, a Catholic principle, viz., the acceptance, without hesitation, of that which has been handed down to you by an unbroken tradition. I would not tear from you a single one of those shreds and fragments of Divine truth which you have retained. God forbid! They are the most precious things you possess, and by God's blessing may serve as clues to bring you out of that labyrinth of error in which you find yourselves involved, far more by the fault of your forefathers three centuries ago than by your own. What I do quarrel with you for is, not your inconsistency [p. 14] in occasionally acting on a true principle, but your adoption, as a general rule, of a false one. You keep the Sunday, and not the Saturday; and you do so rightly, for this was the practice of all Christians when Protestantism began; but you have abandoned other Catholic observances which were equally universal at that day, preferring the novelties introduced by the men who invented Protestantism, to the unvarying tradition of above 1500 years. We blame you not for making Sunday your weekly holiday instead of Saturday, but for rejecting tradition, which is the only safe and clear rule by which this observance can be justified. In outward act we do the same as yourselves in this matter; we too no longer observe the Jewish Sabbath, but Sunday in its stead: but then there is this important difference between us, that we do not pretend, as you do, to derive our authority for so doing from a book, but we derive it from a living teacher, and that teacher is the Church. Moreover, we believe that not every thing which God would have us to know and to do is written in the Bible, but that there is also an *unwritten* word of God, which we are bound to believe and to obey, just as we believe and obey the Bible itself, according to that say- [p. 15] ing of the Apostle, "Stand fast and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle" (2 Thess. ii. 14). We Catholics, then, have precisely the same authority for keeping Sunday holy instead of Saturday as we have for every other article of our creed, namely, the authority of "the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii. 15); whereas you who are Protestants have really no authority for it whatever; for there is no authority for it in the Bible, and you will not allow that there can be authority for it anywhere else. Both you and we do, in fact, follow tradition in this matter; but we follow it, believing it to be a part of God's word, and the Church to be its divinely-appointed guardian and interpreter; you follow it, denouncing it all the time as a fallible and treacherous guide, which often "makes the commandment of God of none effect."

1629. Sunday, Protestants Taunted for Observance of—Only Seventhday Adventists Consistent

SOURCE: "The Question Box," *The Catholic Universe Bulletin*, 69 (Aug. 14, 1942), 4. [FRS No. 51.] By what authority did the Church change the observance of the Sabbath from

Saturday to Sunday?

The Church changed the observance of the Sabbath to Sunday by right of the divine, infallible authority given to her by her Founder, Jesus Christ. The Protestant, claiming the Bible to be the only guide of faith, has no warrant for observing Sunday. In this matter the Seventh Day Adventist is the only consistent Protestant. Sunday as the day of rest to honor our Lord's Resurrection dates to Apostolic times and was so established among other reasons, to mark off the Jew from the Christian. St. Justin the Martyr, speaks of it in his Apologies.

1630. Sunday—Protestants Taunted with Seventh-day Adventists' Example

SOURCE: F. G. Lentz, *The Question Box* (New York: Christian Press Association, 1900), pp. 98, 99. [FRS No. 54.]

[p. 98] Q. (*a*) The Bible says "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord," and we read in your literature that it is the only Bible Sabbath there is. Will you please explain how the Sunday observance originated? (b) Do you think the Seventh Day Adventists keep the right day?

A. (*a*) If you follow the Bible alone there can be no question that you are obliged to keep Saturday holy, since that is the day especially prescribed by Almighty God to be kept holy to the Lord. In keeping Sunday, [p. 99] non-Catholics are simply following the practise of the Catholic Church for 1800 years, a tradition, and not a Bible ordinance. What we would like to know is: Since they deny the authority of the Church, on what grounds can they base their faith of keeping Sunday. Those who keep Saturday, like the Seventh Day Adventists, unquestionably have them by the hip in this practice. And they cannot give them any sufficient answer which would satisfy an unprejudiced mind. With the Catholics there is no difficulty about the matter. For, since we deny that the Bible is the sole rule of faith, we can fall back upon the constant practise and tradition of the Church which, long before the reign of Constantine, even in the very days of the apostles themselves, were accustomed to keep the first day of the week instead of the last.

1631. Sunday, "Puritan Sabbath"

SOURCE: W. B. Selbie, "The Influence of the Old Testament on Puritanism," in Edwyn R. Bevan and Charles Singer, eds., *The Legacy of Israel* (1928), pp. 421–423. Copyright 1927 Clarendon Press, Oxford. Used by permission.

[p. 421] Under the Church of Rome Sunday was kept as a festival. After early mass the day was given up to recreation and work was not forbidden [except "servile work"; see No. 1621]. The first indication of a stricter observance is found in a *Treatise on the Sabbath* issued by Dr. Richmond Bound in 1595. Its argument was to the effect that for the proper regulation of the Christian [p. 422] Sunday we must look to the Old Testament precepts regarding the Jewish Sabbath. These precepts were meant for all time and the command to keep holy the Sabbath day was one which Christians were bound to obey. Any form of work or recreation on Sunday was therefore unlawful. God meant man to give up to Him a seventh of his time and this was to determine his use of every day. This doctrine was not altogether new. In England the Jewish name Sabbath had been used for Sunday in a public proclamation in 1580 and in an Act of Parliament in 1585, but it was

not until Puritanism had attained a measure of strength that strict Sabbatarianism was enjoined upon all Christian people. The injunction resulted in reducing Sunday to a day of gloom and idleness and in the creation of a number of artificial sins. It was in Scotland ... that Sabbatarianism was carried to extremes... The following are typical: 'Cite Isobell Balfort, servant to William Gordone tailyeor, beeing found sleeping at the Loche syde on the Lord's Day in tyme of Sermon,' 'It was reported that Margaret Brotherstone did water her kaill upon the Sabbath day, and was thairupon ordained to be cited.' ^cComplained Margaret Brotherstone, and confessed her breach of Sabbath in watering of her kaill and thairupon ordained to give evidence in public of her repentance the next Lord's Day.' There is a very curious parallel in all this to Rabbinical regulations about the Sabbath which became so great a feature in later Judaism. We see the spirit of Old Testament legalism working itself out to the same ends under very different people. In this respect, [p. 423] among others, the Puritan influence has been very persistent. In many sections of the Christian Church to-day the attitude towards Sunday observance savours far more of the spirit of Puritanism than of the teaching of Him who said: 'The sabbath was made for man, not man for the sabbath.' A good example of the temper of the Scottish Presbyterians is to be found in their treatment of Quaker doctrine at the time of the visit of George Fox in 1647. The ministers were so much alarmed at the spread of his teaching that they drew up a number of curses which were to be read aloud in the churches and to which the people were called to say 'Amen' after the manner of the Israelites on Mount Ebal, e.g. 'Cursed is he that saith, "Every man hath a light within him sufficient to lead him into salvation;" and let all the people say Amen. Cursed is he that denieth the Sabbath Day, and let all the people say Amen.' Though it is not necessary for our argument it should perhaps be pointed out that the Sabbath as observed by the Jews themselves is not what the Puritans conceived it to be. To the Jews it is a day of happiness. The synagogue liturgy of the Sabbath is full of the joyous note. It is marked by gay dress, sumptuous meals, and a general sense of exhilaration. The Puritans knew little or nothing of synagogue worship or of Jewish homes. They had no experience of 'the joy of the commandment'—a phrase often on Jewish lips and in Jewish hearts. They interpreted the Scripture injunctions in their own dour spirit.

1632. Sunday—"Puritan Sabbath" Established by a Backward Somersault and as an Insult to the Jews

SOURCE: Conrad Henry Moehlman, *The Wall of Separation Between Church and State*, pp. 172–174. Copyright 1951 by The Beacon Press, Boston. Used by permission.

[p. 172] Let us briefly review how the "Christian Sabbath" became a secular day of rest.

The early Protestant reformers were practically unanimous in concluding that the Sabbath was abrogated by the founding of Christianity...

[p. 173] The Protestant confessions of faith adopted in the sixteenth century fail to identify Sabbath and first day.

It was in 1595 A.D. that Nicholas Bownde published *The Doctrine of the Sabbath Plainly Laid Forth and Soundly Proven*. Bownde argued that the Sabbath existed from creation, that the first seventh day had been sanctified, that every seventh day since the first seventh day had likewise been sanctified, and that the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath was eternally obligatory. At this point he turned a backward somersault and transformed the eternally valid seventh day into "Christian Sabbath." He thus, as Calvin puts it, "insulted the Jews."

The English Baptists in 1611 still called the first day of the week the "Lord's day" and regarded it as a day of worship.

In 1647, the *Westminster Confession of Faith* accepted the curious transformation of Bownde, and in Chapter XXI affirmed: ...

[God] appointed one day in seven for a sabbath to be kept holy unto him; which, from the beginning of the world to the resurrection [p. 174] of Christ, was the last day of the week; and, from the resurrection of Christ, was changed into the first day of the week, which in turn is called the Lord's day, and is to be continued to the end of the world, as the Christian sabbath...

This new theology Calvinistic Protestantism soon generally endorsed. "Christian sabbath," a sixteenth-century coinage, was thereupon read back into the documents of the New Testament. By the twentieth century the earlier distinctions had been so obscured that the common man is today "sure" that the fourth commandment is concerned with Sunday—an identification utterly foreign to Moses, Jesus and Paul, to say nothing of the entire Christian church prior to the sixteenth century. Moreover, the leading Christian ministers of all denominations are unaware of the fact that the New Testament nowhere changes the last day of the week into the first. The Bible has often been made to say what its authors never dreamed of saying.

1633. Sunday, Puritan Theory of

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 6 (2d ed. rev.; New York: Scribner, 1901), pp. 493, 494.

[p. 493] The Anglo-American theory of the Lord's Day, which is based on the perpetual essential obligation of the Fourth Commandment, as a part of the moral law to be observed with Christian freedom in the light of Christ's res- [p. 494] urrection, is of Puritan origin at the close of the sixteenth century, and was first symbolically sanctioned by the Westminster standards in 1647, but has worked itself into the flesh and blood of all English-speaking Christendom.

1634. Sunday, Puritan View of

SOURCE: Henry Hallam, *Constitutional History of England* (reprint; London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1930), chap. 7, Vol. 1, p. 367.

The founders of the English reformation, after abolishing most of the festivals kept before that time, had made little or no change as to the mode of observance of those they retained. Sundays and holidays stood much on the same footing as days on which no work except for good cause was to be performed, the service of the church was to be attended, and any lawful amusement might be indulged in. A just distinction, however, soon grew up; an industrious people could spare time for very few holidays; and the more scrupulous party, while they slighted the church festivals as of human appointment, prescribed a stricter observance of the Lord's day. But it was not till about 1595 that they [the English Puritans] began to place it very nearly on the footing of the Jewish sabbath, interdicting not only the slightest action of worldly business, but even every sort of pastime and recreation.

1635. Sunday, Puritans Use the Word "Sabbath" Instead of SOURCE: Henry Hallam, *Constitutional History of England* (reprint; London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1930), chap. 7, Vol. 1, pp. 370, 371.

[p. 370] The House of Commons displayed their attachment to the puritan maxims, or their dislike of the prelatical clergy, by bringing in bills to enforce a greater strictness in this respect. A circumstance that occurred in the session of 1621 will serve to prove their

fanatical violence. A bill having been brought in "for the better observance of the Sabbath, usually called Sunday," one Mr. Shepherd, sneering at the puritans, remarked that, as Saturday was dies Sabbati, this might be entitled a bill for the observance of Saturday, commonly called Sunday. This witticism brought on his head the wrath of that dangerous assembly... The use of the word Sabbath [p. 371] instead of Sunday became in that age a distinctive mark of the puritan party.

1636. Sunday, Reformers' View of (Ordained by Church, Not Based on Decalogue)

SOURCE: The Augsburg Confession (Lutheran, 1530), part 2, art. 7, "Of Ecclesiastical Power," trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 68, 69.

[p. 68] What is, then, to be thought of the Lord's day, and of like rites of temples? Hereunto they [ours] answer, that it is lawful for Bishops or Pastors to make ordinances, whereby things may be done in order in the Church; not that by them we may merit grace, or satisfy for sins, or that men's consciences should be bound to esteem them as necessary services, and think that they sin when they violate them, without the offense of others. So Paul ordained, 'that women should cover their heads in the congregation' (1 Cor. xi. 6); 'that the interpreters of Scripture should be heard in order in the Church' (1 Cor. xiv. 27), etc...

Such is the observation of the [p. 69] Lord's day, of Easter, of Pentecost, and like holidays and rites. For they that think that the observation of the Lord's day was appointed by the authority of the Church, instead of the Sabbath, as necessary, are greatly deceived. The Scripture, which teacheth that all the Mosaical ceremonies can be omitted after the Gospel is revealed, has abrogated the Sabbath. And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when they ought to come together, it appears that the [Christian] Church did for that purpose appoint the Lord's day: which for this cause also seemed to have been pleasing, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observation, neither of the Sabbath, nor of another day, was of necessity.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Schaff in his footnote rejects "this view of the Christian Sabbath, which was held by all the Reformers," and still prevails on the Continent of Europe. It overlooks, he says, the fact that "the Sabbath has a moral as well as a ceremonial aspect, and is a part of the *Decalogue*, which the Lord did not come 'to destroy, but to fulfill' (Matt. v. 17, 18; comp. xxii. 37–40; Rom. iii. 31; x. 4). As a periodical day of rest for the body, and worship for the soul, the Sabbath is founded in the physical and moral constitution of man, and reflects the rest of God after the work of creation (Gen. ii. 3). Under this view it is of primitive origin, like the institution of marriage, and of perpetual obligation, like the other commandments of the *Decalogue*. A lax theory of the Sabbath naturally leads to a lax practice, and tends to destroy the blessing of this holy day. The Anglo-American churches have an unspeakable advantage over those of the Continent of Europe in their higher theory and practice of Sabbath observance, which dates from the close of the sixteenth century. Even Puritan rigor is better than the opposite extreme."]

1637. Sunday, Rest on—Constantine's Law and Later Legislation SOURCE: George Park Fisher, *History of the Christian Church* (New York: Scribner, 1900), p. 118. [FRS No. 99.]

From earlier times it had been the custom of the Church to observe Sunday by special religious exercises and by an increasing abstinence from the pursuits of secular life. This custom was made a [church] law by the Council of Laodicea...

Constantine legally recognized it, in 321, by forbidding the courts of justice to hold their sessions on that day, except for the humane purpose of manumitting slaves. He also commanded his soldiers to refrain from their customary military exercises. The public games, however, still continued to attract many from the proper observance of Sunday and of the Church festivals. But in 425 a law was passed forbidding all games on such days.

1638. Sunday, Rest on, Council of Laodicea Represents First Church Legislation on

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 30, 31. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 30] The first important conciliar decree in the history of the Sunday observance is that contained in the 29th canon of the Council of Laodicea [4th century]... The Christians of Phrygia had fallen into the Jewish practice of abstaining from work on Saturdays and were insisting that others do likewise. Against these "Judaizers," the Council acted, warning the faithful that they should work on Saturday and not rest like the Jews. However, the council adds, let them as Christians rest on Sunday in memory of the Resurrection, "if that be possible" [see No. 1416]. Suarez explains this phrase "if that be possible" (*si modo possunt*) in his treatise on Sunday observance. The remarkable feature about this canon was its extreme moderation, for it enjoined Sunday rest only *as far as pos*- [p. 31] *sible*—a clear proof that as yet there was none of the strictness that characterized the later Sunday law.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Sunday observance had already long existed, and Sabbath church services and private observance lasted long afterwards, but this council took the first step in a series of church enactments on the subject, and it included, along with an exhortation to rest on Sunday, a clear-cut prohibition of Sabbath rest, under anathema.]

1639. Sunday, Rest on, Councils of the Church Enforce

SOURCE: M. G. Glazebrook, "Sunday," in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 12, pp. 105, 106. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[p. 105] The Council of Orleans (538), while protesting [p. 106] against an excessive Sabbatarianism, forbade all field work under pain of censure; and the Council of Macon (585) laid down that the Lord's Day 'is the day of perpetual rest, which is suggested to us by the type of the seventh day in the law and the prophets,' and ordered a complete cessation of all kinds of business. How far the movement had gone by the end of the 6th cent. is shown by a letter of Gregory the Great (pope 590–604) protesting against the prohibition of baths on Sunday.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For the first church council that legislated on Sunday observance, see No. 1638.]

1640. Sunday, Rest on, Not Obligatory in Jerome's Day

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, pp. 31, 32. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 31] The writings of St. Jerome should be one of the first places in which one would search and hope for light on the relation of the Sunday to the Sabbath. However, one thing which one promptly notices in the writings of this great Scriptural writer in his references to the Sunday is his spiritual interpretation of the Sunday repose, and the absence of an insistence on a legal and sabbatical observance of the day. Two references to a corporal Sunday rest are met, in one of which such rest seems to be pictured as the practice, while the other seems to indicate the contrary. In a letter to Eustochium, he described the lives of some monks of the desert, and mentioned that on Sunday they devoted their time entirely to prayer and to reading, thus implying a rest from the labors of the week. However, in [p. 32] a later letter (incidentally to the same lady), he described the life of a certain community of nuns of Bethlehem, who went to church on Sunday

only, and on their return went to their allotted tasks and made garments either for themselves or for others. Surely if there had been any universal obligation of Sunday rest, this practice of the nuns would have drawn some criticism from the Saint. However, from the tone of the letter, he seemed rather to be praising the diligence of the nuns. From these references one may infer that the Sunday rest was a matter of local custom.

1641. Sunday, Rest on, Not Obligatory on Nuns in Jerome's Day SOURCE: *The Letters of St. Jerome*, Letter 108, To Eustochium, sec. 20, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 6, p. 206.

On the Lord's day only they [nuns in Bethlehem] proceeded to the church beside which they lived, each company following its own mother-superior. Returning home in the same order, they then devoted themselves to their allotted tasks, and made garments either for themselves or else for others.

1642. Sunday Law, First (March, 321), City Business Closed by

SOURCE: *Codex Justinianus*, lib. 3, tit. 12, 3; trans. in Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 380, note 1. [See FRS No. 39.]

On the venerable Day of the Sun let the magistrates and people residing in cities rest, and let all workshops be closed. In the country, however, persons engaged in agriculture may freely and lawfully continue their pursuits; because it often happens that another day is not so suitable for grain-sowing or for vine-planting; lest by neglecting the proper moment for such operations the bounty of heaven should be lost. (Given the 7th day of March, Crispus and Constantine being consuls each of them for the second time [A.D. 321].)

1643. Sunday Law, First (March, 321), Civil, Not Christian SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), pp. 379, 380.

[p. 379] So long as Christianity was not recognized and protected by the state, the observance of Sunday was purely religious, a strictly voluntary service, but exposed to continual interruption from the bustle of the world and a hostile community...

Constantine is the founder, in part at least, of the *civil* observance of Sunday, by which alone the religious observance of it in the church could be made universal and could be properly secured... [p. 380] But the Sunday law of Constantine must not be overrated... There is no reference whatever in his law either to the fourth commandment or to the resurrection of Christ. Besides he expressly exempted the country districts, where paganism still prevailed, from the prohibition of labor... Christians and pagans had been accustomed to festival rests; Constantine made these rests to synchronize, and gave the preference to Sunday.

1644. Sunday Law, First—Constantine's Attempt to Unite Pagans and Christians

SOURCE: H. G. Heggtveit, *Illustreret Kirkehistorie* (Christiania: Cammermeyers Boghandel, 1891–95), p. 202.

Constantine labored at this time untiringly to unite the worshipers of the old and the new faith in one religion. All his laws and contrivances are aimed at promoting this amalgamation of religions. He would by all lawful and peaceable means melt together a purified heathenism and a moderated Christianity... His injunction that the "Day of the Sun" should be a general rest day was characteristic of his standpoint... Of all his blending and melting together of Christianity and heathenism none is more easy to see

through than this making of his Sunday law. "The Christians worshiped their Christ, the heathen their sun-god; according to the opinion of the Emperor, the objects for worship in both religions were essentially the same."

1645. Sunday Law, First, Pagan and Christian in Scope SOURCE: Arthur Weigall, *The Paganism in Our Christianity*, pp. 236, 237. Copyright 1928 by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. Used with their permission.

[p. 236] In the year 321 the Emperor Constantine, who was not yet a declared Christian, but was still hovering between paganism and Christianity, issued a decree making Sunday a compulsory day of rest; but the fact that he speaks of Sunday as "the venerable day of the Sun" shows that he was thinking of it as a traditional sun-festival at the same time that he thought of it as a Christian holy-day... Sunday came to be observed throughout Europe as it is still observed [p. 237] by Roman Catholics, namely, as a day on which, like our Christmas, people went to church in the morning and then gave themselves over to rest or to holiday-making and sports.

1646. Sunday Law, First, "Parent" of Sunday Laws of Church and State SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 261. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

This [Constantine's decree of March, 321] is the "parent" Sunday law making it a day of rest and release from labor. For from this day to the present there have been decrees about the observance of Sunday which have profoundly influenced European and American society. When the Church became a part of State under the Christian emperors Sunday observance was enforced by civil statutes and later, when the Empire was past, the Church in the hands of the papacy enforced it by ecclesiastical, and also influenced it by civil enactments.

1647. Sunday Law, of Constantine (July, 321), Permitting Manumission of Slaves on Sunday

SOURCE: *Theodosian Code* 2. 8. 1, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 44. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

Just as it appears to Us most unseemly that the Day of the Sun (Sunday), which is celebrated on account of its own veneration, should be occupied with legal altercations and with noxious controversies of the litigation of contending parties, so it is pleasant and fitting that those acts which are especially desired shall be accomplished on that day. I. Therefore all men shall have the right to emancipate and to manumit on this festive day, and the legal formalities thereof are not forbidden. [July 3, 321.]

1648. Sunday Laws, After Constantine

SOURCE: Vincent J. Kelly, *Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations*, p. 29. Copyright 1943 by the Catholic University of America Press, Washington. Used by permission of the author.

Constantine's decree marked the beginning of a long, though intermittent series of imperial decrees in support of Sunday rest.

1649. Sunday Laws, After Constantine—Change From Pagan Ordinance to Christian Regulation

SOURCE: Hutton Webster, *Rest Days*, pp. 122, 123, 270. Copyright 1916 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 122] This legislation by Constantine probably bore no relation to Christianity; it appears, on the contrary, that the emperor, in his capacity of Pontifex Maximus, was only adding the day of the Sun, the worship of which was then firmly [p. 123] established in the Roman Empire, to the other ferial days of the sacred calendar...

[p. 270] What began, however, as a pagan ordinance, ended as a Christian regulation; and a long series of imperial decrees, during the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, enjoined with increasing stringency abstinence from labour on Sunday.

1650. Sunday Laws, After Constantine—Increased Strictness SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 261. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The emperors after Constantine made Sunday observance more stringent but in no case was their legislation based on the Old Testament... At the Third Synod of Aureliani (Orléans) in 538 rural work was forbidden but the restriction against preparing meals and similar work on Sunday was regarded as a superstition. After Justinian's death in 565

various *epistolae decretales* were passed by the popes about Sunday. One of Gregory I (590–604) forbade men "to yoke oxen or to perform any other work, except for approved reasons," while another of Gregory II (715–731) said: "We decree that all Sundays be observed from vespers to vespers and that all unlawful work be abstained from." ...

Charlemagne at Aquisgranum (Aachen) in 788 decreed that all ordinary labor on the Lord's Day be forbidden since it was against the Fourth Commandment, especially labor in the field or vineyard which Constantine had exempted.

1651. Sunday Laws, After Constantine—Theodosius I and Colleagues Forbid Litigation on the "Lord's Day"

SOURCE: Law of Gratian Valentinian, and Theodosius, Nov. 3, 386, in *Theodosian Code* 11. 7. 13, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 300. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

On the Day of the Sun (Sunday), which our ancestors rightly called the Lord's Day, the prosecution of all litigation and actions shall entirely cease. No person shall demand payment of either a public or a private debt. There shall be no cognizance of any contention, even before arbitrators, whether these arbitrators be demanded in court or voluntarily chosen. If any person should turn aside from the inspiration and ritual of holy religion, he shall be adjudged not only infamous but also sacrilegious.

1652. Sunday Laws, After Constantine—Theodosius II Forbids Circus and Theater on Sunday

SOURCE: Law of Theodosius II, Feb. 1, 425, in *Theodosian Code* 15. 5. 5, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 433. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

On the following occasions all amusements of the theaters and the circuses shall be denied throughout all cities to the people thereof, and the minds of Christians and of the faithful shall be wholly occupied in the worship of God: namely, on the Lord's day, which is the first day of the whole week, on the Natal Day and Epiphany of Christ, and on the day of Easter and of Pentecost, as long as the vestments that imitate the light of the celestial font attest to the new light of holy baptism; at the time also when the commemoration of the Apostolic Passion, the teacher of all Christianity, is duly celebrated by everyone. If any persons even now are enslaved by the madness of the Jewish impiety or the error and insanity of stupid paganism, they must know that there is a time for prayer and a time for pleasure. No man shall suppose that in the case of spectacles in honor of Our Divine Majesty he is, as it were, under some major compulsion by reason of the necessity in his duty to the Emperor, and that he will incur for himself the displeasure of Our Serenity unless he should neglect the divine religion and should give attention to such spectacles and if he should show less devotion to Us

than customary. Let no one doubt that then especially is devotion paid to Our Clemency by humankind, when the reverence of the whole earth is paid to the virtues and merits of the omnipotent God.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Schaff (*History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3, p. 106) shows that the Council of Carthage (399 or 401) had insisted upon this legislation. The bishops wished to find a way of compelling church attendance.]

1653. Sunday Laws, After Fall of Western Rome, Charlemagne, 789 SOURCE: Charlemagne, *Capitularia* (Capitularies [Laws]), Capitulare Ecclesias[t]icum a[nno] 789 (Ecclesiastical Capitulary for the year 789), sec. 81, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Leges*, Vol. 1 (reprint; Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1925), p. 66. Latin.

To the Bishops, to All: And we decree according to what the Lord commanded also in the law, that servile work shall not be done on the Lord's days, and just as my father of blessed memory commanded in his synodal edicts, that is, that men shall not carry on rural work, neither in cultivating the vine, nor in plowing in the fields [etc.]... Likewise the women shall not do weaving [etc.]... in order that in every way the honor and rest of the Lord's day may be kept. But let them come together from everywhere to the church to the celebration of the mass, and praise God in all the good things which He has done for us on that day.

1654. Sunday Laws, American Colonial (New Haven Colony) SOURCE: Charles J. Hoadly, *Records of the Colony or Jurisdiction of New Haven, From May, 1653, to the Union, Together With the New Haven Code of 1656* (Hartford: Case, Lockwood and Company, 1858), p. 605.

Whosoever shall prophane the Lords day, or any part of it, either by sinful servile work, or by unlawful sport, Recreation, or otherwise, whether wilfully, or in a careless neglect, shall be duly punished by fine, imprisonment, or corporally according to the nature, and measure of the sinn, and offence. But if the Court upon examination, by clear, and satisfying evidence find That the sin was proudly, presumptuously, & with a high hand committed against the known command and authority of the blessed God, such a person therein despising and reproaching the Lord, shall be put to death, That all others may feare and shun such provoking Rebellious courses.

1655. Sunday Laws, American Colonial (Virginia)

SOURCE: For the Colony in Virginea Britannia. *Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, c,* in Peter Force, *Tracts and Other Papers Relating Principally to the Colonies in North America* (Washington: William Q. Force, 1844), Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 11.

Every man and woman shall repaire in the morning to the divine service, and Sermons preached upon the Sabbath both day, and in the afternoon to divine service, and Cathechising, vpon paine for the first fault to lose their provision, and allowance for the whole weeke following, for the second to lose the said allowance, and also to be whiptt, and for the third to suffer death.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This was not a law enacted by the Colony of Virginia, but was part of a set of harsh laws imposed by an English governor. It was never actually enforced.]

1656. Sunday Laws, British—Charles II's Law, Model for American Laws

SOURCE: 29 Charles II, chap. 7, in [British] Statutes at Large (1763), Vol. 3, p. 388.

Be it enacted ... that all and every Person and Persons whatsoever, shall on every Lord's Day apply themselves to the Observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the Duties of Piety and true Religion, publickly and privately; (4) and that no ... Person whatsoever, shall do or exercise any worldly Labour, Business or Work of their ordinary Callings, upon the Lord's Day, or any Part thereof (Works of Necessity and Charity only excepted;) ... (6) and that no Person or Persons whatsoever, shall publickly cry, shew forth, or expose to Sale, any Wares, Merchandizes, Fruit, Herbs, Goods or Chattels whatsoever.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This law of the 29th year of Charles II, valid in England for nearly two centuries, became the model for many American colonial laws, hence of our State Sunday laws.]

1657. Sunday Laws—Canada (Lord's Day Act, 1952)

SOURCE: The Revised Statutes of Canada 1952, chap. 171; Vol. 3, pp. 3709–3713. [p. 3709] CHAPTER 171.

An Act respecting the Lord's Day.

Short Title.

1. This Act may be cited as the *Lord's Day Act.* R.S., c. 123, s. 1. *Interpretation.*

2. In this Act,

(*a*) "employer" includes every person to whose orders or directions any other person is by his employment bound to conform;

- (b) "Lord's Day" means the period of time that begins at twelve o'clock on Saturday afternoon and ends at twelve o'clock on the following afternoon;
- (c) "performance" includes any game, match, sport, contest, exhibition or entertainment;
- (d) "person" has the meaning that it has in the *Criminal Code*;
- (e) "provincial Act" means the charter of any municipality, or any public Act of any province, whether passed before or since Confederation;
- (f) "railway" includes steam railway, electric railway, street railway and tramway; and
- (g) "vessel" includes any kind of vessel or boat used for conveying passengers or freight by water. R.S., c. 123, s. 2.

3. (1) Nothing herein prevents the operation on the Lord's Day for passenger traffic by any railway company incorporated by or subject to the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada of its railway where such operation is not otherwise prohibited.

(2) Nothing herein prevents the operation on the Lord's Day for passenger traffic of any railway subject to the legislative authority of any province, unless such railway is prohibited by provincial authority from so operating. R.S., c. 123, s. 3. [p. 3710] Prohibitions.

4. It is not lawful for any person on the Lord's Day, except as provided herein, or in any provincial Act or law now or hereafter in force, to sell or offer for sale or purchase any goods, chattels, or other personal property, or any real estate, or to carry on or transact any business of his ordinary calling, or in connection with such calling, or for gain to do, or employ any other person to do, on that day, any work, business, or labour, R.S., c. 123, s. 4.

5. Except in cases of emergency, it is not lawful for any person to require any employee engaged in any work of receiving, transmitting or delivering telegraph or telephone messages, or in the work of any industrial process, or in connection with transportation, to do on the Lord's Day the usual work of his ordinary calling, unless such employee is allowed during the next six days of such week, twenty-four consecutive hours without labour. R.S., c. 123, s. 5.

6. (1) It is not lawful for any person, on the Lord's Day, except as provided in any provincial Act or law now or hereafter in force, to engage in any public game or contest for gain, or for any prize or reward, or to be present thereat, or to provide, engage in, or

be present at any performance or public meeting, elsewhere than in a church, at which any fee is charged, directly or indirectly, either for admission to such performance or meeting, or to any place within which the same is provided, or for any service or privilege thereat.

(2) When any performance at which an admission fee or any other fee is so charged is provided in any building or place to which persons are conveyed for hire by the proprietors or managers of such performance or by any one acting as their agent or under their control, the charge for such conveyance shall be deemed an indirect payment of such fee within the meaning of this section. R.S., c. 123, s. 6.

7. It is not lawful for any person on the Lord's Day, except as provided by any provincial Act or law now or hereafter in force, to run, conduct, or convey by any mode of conveyance any excursion on which passengers are conveyed for hire, and having for its principal or only object the carriage on that day of such passengers for amusement or pleasure, and passengers so conveyed shall not be deemed to be travellers within the meaning of this Act. R.S., c. 123, s. 7.

[p. 3711] 8. (1) It is not lawful for any person to advertise in any manner whatsoever any performance or other thing prohibited by this Act.

(2) It is not lawful for any person to advertise in Canada in any manner whatsoever any performance or other thing that if given or done in Canada would be a violation of this Act. R.S., c. 123, s. 8.

9. It is not lawful for any person on the Lord's Day to shoot with or use any gun, rifle or other similar engine, either for gain, or in such a manner or in such places as to disturb other persons in attendance at public worship or in the observance of that day. R.S., c. 123, s. 9.

10. It is not lawful for any person to bring into Canada for sale or distribution, or to sell or distribute within Canada, on the Lord's Day, any foreign newspaper or publication classified as a newspaper. R.S., c. 123, s. 10.

Works of Necessity and Mercy Excepted.

11. Notwithstanding anything herein contained, any person may on the Lord's Day do any work of necessity or mercy, and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the ordinary meaning of the expression "work of necessity or mercy," it is hereby declared that it shall be deemed to include the following classes of work:

- (a) any necessary or customary work in connection with divine worship;
- (b) work for the relief of sickness and suffering, including the sale of drugs, medicines and surgical appliances by retail;
- (c) receiving, transmitting, or delivering telegraph or telephone messages;
- (d) starting or maintaining fires, making repairs to furnaces and repairs in cases of emergency, and doing any other work, when such fires, repairs or work are essential to any industry or industrial process of such a continuous nature that it cannot be stopped without serious injury to such industry, or its product, or to the plant or property used in such process;
- (e) starting or maintaining fires, and ventilating, pumping out and inspecting mines, when any such work is essential to the protection of property, life or health;
- (f) any work without the doing of which on the Lord's Day, electric current, light, heat, cold air, water or gas cannot be continuously supplied for lawful purposes;
- [p. 3712] (g) the conveying of travelers and work incidental thereto;

- (*h*) the continuance to their destination of trains and vessels in transit when the Lord's Day begins, and work incidental thereto;
- (*i*) loading and unloading merchandise, at intermediate points, on or from passenger boats or passenger trains;
- (*j*) keeping railway tracks clear of snow or ice, making repairs in cases of emergency, or doing any other work of a like incidental character necessary to keep the lines and tracks open on the Lord's Day;
- (*k*) work before six o'clock in the forenoon and after eight o'clock in the afternoon of yard crews in handling cars in railway yards;
- (*l*) loading, unloading and operating any ocean-going vessel that otherwise would be unduly delayed after her scheduled time of sailing, or any vessel that otherwise would be in imminent danger of being stopped by the closing of navigation; or loading or unloading before seven o'clock in the morning or after eight o'clock in the afternoon any grain, coal or ore-carrying vessel after the 15th of September;
- (*m*) the caring for milk, cheese, and live animals, and the unloading of and caring for perishable products and live animals, arriving at any point during the Lord's Day;
- (*n*) the operation of any toll or draw-bridge, or any ferry or boat authorized by competent authority to carry passengers on the Lord's Day;
- (*o*) the hiring of horses and carriages or small boats for the personal use of the hirer or his family for any purpose not prohibited by this Act;
- (*p*) any unavoidable work after six o'clock in the afternoon of the Lord's Day, in the preparation of the regular Monday morning edition of a daily newspaper;
- (q) the conveying Her Majesty's mails and work incidental thereto;
- (*r*) the delivery of milk for domestic use, and the work of domestic servants and watchmen;
- (s) the operation by any Canadian electric street railway company, whose line is interprovincial or international, of its cars, for passenger traffic, on the Lord's Day, on any line or branch that is, on the day of the coming into force of this Act, regularly so operated;
- (*t*) work done by any person in the public service of Her Majesty while acting therein under any regulation or direction of any department of the Government;
- [p. 3713] (u) any unavoidable work by fishermen after six o'clock in the afternoon of the Lord's Day, in the taking of fish;
- (*v*) all operations connected with the making of maple sugar and maple syrup in the maple grove;
- (w) any unavoidable work on the Lord's Day to save property in cases of emergency, or where such property is in imminent danger of destruction or serious injury; and
- (x) any work that the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada, having regard to the object of this Act, and with the object of preventing undue delay, deems necessary to permit in connection with the freight traffic of any railway. R.S., c. 123, s. 11; 1938, c. 53, s. 3.

1658. Sunday Laws, Catholic Church New Champion of

SOURCE: Richard Cohen, "Blue Sunday," *The Christian Century*, 78 (Jan. 4, 1961), 11. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

For three centuries Protestantism was the sole guardian in America of the Christian Sabbath. To police enforcement of Sunday statutes and to resist efforts to liberalize the laws, the Lord's Day Alliance was founded, just as the Anti-Saloon League, the Society for the Suppression of Vice and the Watch and Ward Society were established to meet other threats to the Protestant moral code.

In recent years, however, organized Protestantism seems to have yielded primary responsibility for guarding the Christian Sabbath to the Roman Catholic Church. Interest in Sunday laws and their enforcement is no longer of major importance in the Protestant hierarchy of values, and the Lord's Day Alliance has become something of a stepchild of American Protestantism. The Catholic Church has become the new champion of the Sabbath [Sunday].

1659. Sunday Laws, a Catholic Program Includes

SOURCE: Louis [François] Veuillot, 'Illusion Libérale ("The Liberal Illusion"), first printed 1866, in his

Oeuvres Complètes ("Complete Works"), Vol. 10 (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1929), pp. 347, 348. [See FRS No 27.]

[p. 347] Error has no divine right to teach; it has no divine right to increase and multiply. Truth may tolerate error [if it so desires]; error owes it freedom.

Second, partisans of error having taken the upper hand and enthroned in the world socalled principles which are the negation of truth, and consequently are an element of destruction of order, we leave to them these false principles until they become disillusioned or die because of them, and we keep our truths, by which we live.

Third, when the time comes, when proof has been made and it will be necessary to rebuild the social edifice according to eternal rules, whether it be tomorrow or [p. 348] centuries from now, Catholics will arrange things to suit themselves. Without thought for those who would remain in death, they will establish laws of life. They will put Jesus Christ in His place, at the top, and He will no longer be insulted. They will bring up their children to know God and to honor their fathers. They will enforce the indissolubility of marriage and, if the dissenters do not approve, their sons will approve. They will impose religious observance of Sunday in behalf and for the good of society as a whole, even though forced to let free-thinkers and Jews observe, on their own, *incognito*, Monday or Saturday. Those whom this law might inconvenience, will be inconvenienced. No longer will respect be refused to the Creator, nor rest to the human being, for the sole purpose of

giving satisfaction to certain maniacs whose frenzy so stupidly and so insolently lead a whole people into sin. Moreover, their houses, like ours, will thus be made stronger, and their fields more fertile.

1660. Sunday Laws, Catholic Support of, Earlier Position Reversed SOURCE: Paul Blanshard, *God and Man in Washington* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960), p. 71. Copyright 1960 by Paul Blanshard. Used by permission.

One of the oddities of the situation is that—in the North, at least—the Catholic Church, which was once the chief opponent of Sunday laws, has now become one of their chief defenders in the commercial sphere. Only ten years ago Canon Stokes was able to say that "the Roman Catholic Church as distinct from Protestantism is not much interested in Sunday laws." Today, while the Protestant-dominated Lord's Day Alliance has declined in power, Catholicism has begun to place new emphasis on a noncommercial Sunday. Both Cardinal Spellman and Cardinal Stritch issued special statements in 1956 championing Sunday laws. Cardinal Cushing, in 1959, severely criticized a three-judge federal court in Massachusetts for declaring the Sunday law of that state unconstitutional in a kosher market case. He said: "Let us ourselves eliminate from Sunday the unrestrained commercialism which the courts, in deference to what they interpret to be our own wishes, are attempting to legalize."

1661. Sunday Laws—Coercion by Statute Useless

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 75, 76. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 75] The nature of the day [Sunday] indicates the absurdity of human legislation to enforce its observance. Church membership, baptism, the breaking of bread in memory of the Lord, the assembling of disciples in the church, the bringing of gifts for the work of the kingdom,—all these are clearly recognized in the New Testament as belonging to Christian life; but in every case the obligation is left with the enlightened conscience, and any effort to coerce men by statutory enactment is repudiated by all liberty loving states. The same principle applies with equal force to the Lord's Day.

All men ought to honor the Lord, who loved them, and gave himself for them; but if they do not, nothing is gained for him or for them by legal compulsion. As well compel men to observe the ordinances of the Lord's house as to observe the sanctities of the Lord's Day. A form of godliness without the power thereof [p. 76] counts for nothing in the conflicts of life.

1662. Sunday Laws, Contrary to the Gospel (Alexander Campbell) SOURCE: Alexander Campbell, quoted in Robert Richardson, *Memoirs of Alexander Campbell*, Vol. 1 (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1868), p. 528.

The gospel commands no duty which can be performed without faith in the Son of God. "Whatever is not of faith is sin."

But to compel men destitute of faith to observe any Christian institution, such as the Lord's day, is commanding duty to be performed without faith in God.

Therefore, to command unbelievers or natural men to observe, in any sense, the Lord's day, is anti-evangelical or contrary to the gospel.

1663. Sunday Laws, Enactment of, an Unwitting Acknowledgment of Catholic Authority

SOURCE: John Gilmary Shea, "The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement," *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 8 (January, 1883), 139. [FRS No. 121.]

Strange as it may seem, the State [of New York], in passing laws for the due sanctification of Sunday, is unwittingly acknowledging the authority of the Catholic Church, and carrying out more or less faithfully its prescriptions. [See No. 1624.]

1664. Sunday Laws, Evil of

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, p. 67. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

In any form Sunday legislation is either religious or secular. If religious, it violates the principle of separation between church and state. If secular, it tends to secularize the Lord's Day and to obliterate the distinction between the righteous and the wicked by having the same human rule for each. In either case it works mischief, and ought to be expunged from the statute books of every enlightened state.

1665. Sunday Laws, Not Sabbath Laws

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 51, 52. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 51] On the baseless assumption that the seventh day, set apart and established in the law, has been in some way superseded by the first day, recognized in the gospel, a good deal of hurtful legislation has been enacted on the pretext of sanctifying the Sabbath

and honoring God. Men who really do know better are willing to wrest the Scriptures and appeal to popular ignorance in order to gain a point. Such conduct is unworthy of any good cause.

[p. 52] This error had its origin in the iniquitous union of church and state, and is a relic of that oppressive system. Early Christians never confounded the Sabbath and the Lord's Day. For five hundred years after Christ the distinction between the two, so clearly marked in the Scriptures, was strictly maintained.

1666. Sunday Laws, Principle of Church-State Separation Often Overlooked in

SOURCE: Ronald Goetz, "An Eschatological Manifesto," *The Christian Century*, 76 (Nov. 2, 1960), 1274. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

Often the Protestants who argue most militantly against government aid to churchsponsored institutions, such as parochial schools, see no contradiction of the principle of separation of church and state in their advocacy of blue laws, Sunday closing laws or prohibition—which are in the last analysis nothing but the legislation of what such Protestants take to be Christian morality. Nor are such Protestants embarrassed in accepting patronage from the state: tax advantages, special mail rates and the like.

1667. Sunday Laws—Underlying Assumption Is Vicious

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, p. 58. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

In current usage the so-called Sabbath legislation does not apply to the Bible Sabbath at all, but to the first day of the week. The practical effect of such legislation generally is to annul the divine commandment, and to put in its place a human statute. The vicious assumption underlying such legislation is that divine law may be changed or amended by human enactment. In thousands of minds to-day the law of God concerning the Sabbath day is rendered of none effect by the so-called Sabbath legislation enacted by civil governments. Such legislation belittles the authority of Jehovah.

1668. Sunday Laws, a Union of Church and State

SOURCE: John Gilmary Shea, "The Observance of Sunday and Civil Laws for Its Enforcement," *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, 8 (January, 1883), 152. [FRS No. 121.]

For ages all Christian nations looked to the Catholic Church, and, as we have seen, the various states enforced by law her ordinances as to worship and cessation of labor on Sunday. Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Church has no good reason for its Sunday theory... There cannot be a greater inconsistency than theirs in asking the state to enforce the Sunday laws.

If it be a mere state holiday, most of the legislative provisions are a mere tyrannical interference with the liberty of a citizen...

It is not a mere legal holiday; it is the Lord's day, set apart by the Catholic Church. It is a religious holiday, and so long as it is maintained by law it is therefore only a sorry farce to tell us that in this country there is no union of Church and State.

1669. Sunday Laws — U.S. Supreme Court Approves Maryland Law SOURCE: U.S. Supreme Court, opinion of the Court, rendered by Chief Justice [Earl] Warren, in *McGowan* v. *Maryland*, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 420, at pp. 431–434, 444, 445, 449–453.

[p. 431] The essence of appellants' "establishment" argument is that Sunday is the Sabbath day of the predominant Christian sects; that the purpose of the enforced stoppage of labor on that day is to facilitate and encourage church attendance; that the purpose of

setting Sunday as a day of universal rest is to induce people with no religion or people with marginal religious beliefs to join the predominant Christian sects; that the purpose of the atmosphere of tranquility created by Sunday closing is to aid the conduct of church services and religious observance of the sacred day. In substantiating their "establishment" argument, appellants rely on the wording of the present Maryland statutes, on earlier versions of the current Sunday laws and on prior judicial characterizations of these laws by the Maryland Court of Appeals. Although only the constitutionality of \Box 521, the section under which appellants have been convicted, is immediately before us in this litigation, inquiry into the history of Sunday Closing Laws in our country, in addition to an examination of the Maryland Sunday closing statutes in their entirety and of their history, is relevant to the decision of whether the Maryland Sunday law in question is one respecting an establishment of religion. There is no dispute that the original laws which dealt with Sunday labor were motivated by religious forces. But what we must decide is whether present Sunday legislation, having undergone extensive changes from the earliest forms, still retains its religious character.

Sunday Closing Laws go far back into American history, having been brought to the colonies with a background of English legislation dating to the thirteenth century. In 1237, Henry III forbade the frequenting of markets on [p. 432] Sunday; the Sunday showing of wools at the staple was banned by Edward III in 1354; in 1409, Henry IV prohibited the playing of unlawful games on Sunday; Henry VI proscribed Sunday fairs in churchyards in 1444 and, four years later, made unlawful all fairs and markets and all showings of any goods or merchandise; Edward VI disallowed Sunday bodily labor by several injunctions in the mid-sixteenth century; various Sunday sports and amusements were restricted in 1625 by Charles I. Lewis, A Critical History of Sunday Legislation, 82–108; Johnson and Yost, Separation of Church and State, 221. The law of the colonies to the time of the Revolution and the basis of the Sunday laws in the States was 29 Charles II, c. 7 (1677). It provided, in part:

"For the better observation and keeping holy the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday: be it enacted ... that all the laws enacted and in force concerning the observation of the day, *and repairing to the church thereon*, be carefully put in execution; and that all and every person and persons whatsoever shall upon every Lord's day apply themselves to the observation of the same, by exercising themselves thereon in the duties of piety and true religion, publicly and privately; and that no tradesman, artificer, workman, laborer, or other person whatsoever, *shall do or exercise any worldly labor or business or work* of their ordinary callings upon the Lord's day, or any part thereof (works of necessity and charity only excepted); ... and that no person or persons whatsoever shall publicly cry, show forth, or expose for sale any wares, merchandise, fruit, herbs, goods, or chattels, whatsoever, upon the Lord's day, or any part thereof..." (Emphasis added.)

[p. 433] Observation of the above language, and of that of the prior mandates, reveals clearly that the English Sunday legislation was in aid of the established church.

The American colonial Sunday restrictions arose soon after settlement. Starting in 1650, the Plymouth Colony proscribed servile work, unnecessary travelling, sports, and the sale of alcoholic beverages on the Lord's day and enacted laws concerning church attendance. The Massachusetts Bay Colony and the Connecticut and New Haven Colonies enacted similar prohibitions, some even earlier in the seventeenth century. The religious orientation of the colonial statutes was equally apparent. For example, a 1629 Massachusetts Bay instruction began, "And to the end the Sabbath may be celebrated in a religious manner..." A 1653 enactment spoke of Sunday activities "which things tend much to the dishonor of God, the reproach of religion, and the profanation of his holy

Sabbath, the sanctification whereof is sometimes put for all duties immediately respecting the service of God..." Lewis, *op. cit., supra*, at pp. 160–195, particularly at 167, 169. These laws persevered after the Revolution and, at about the time of the First Amendment's adoption, each of the colonies had laws of some sort restricting Sunday labor. See note, 73 Harv. L. Rev. 729–730, 739–740; Johnson and Yost, *op. cit., supra*, at pp. 222–223.

But, despite the strongly religious origin of these laws, beginning before the eighteenth century, nonreligious [p. 434] arguments for Sunday closing began to be heard more distinctly...

[p. 444] In light of the evolution of our Sunday Closing Laws through the centuries, and of their more or less recent emphasis upon secular considerations, it is not difficult to discern that as presently written and administered, most of them, at least, are of a secular rather than of a religious character, and that presently they bear no relationship to establishment of religion as those words are used in the Constitution of the United States.

Throughout this century and longer, both the federal and state governments have oriented their activities very largely toward improvement of the health, safety, recreation and general well-being of our citizens. Nu- [p. 445] merous laws affecting public health, safety factors in industry, laws affecting hours and conditions of labor of women and children, week-end diversion at parks and beaches, and cultural activities of various kinds, now point the way toward the good life for all. Sunday Closing Laws, like those before us, have become part and parcel of this great governmental concern wholly apart from their original purposes or connotations. The present purpose and effect of most of them is to provide a uniform day of rest for all citizens; the fact that this day is Sunday, a day of particular significance for the dominant Christian sects, does not bar the State from achieving its secular goals. To say that the States cannot prescribe Sunday as a day of rest for these purposes solely because centuries ago such laws had their genesis in religion would give a constitutional interpretation of hostility to the public welfare rather than one of mere separation of church and State...

[p. 449] After engaging in the close scrutiny demanded of us when First Amendment liberties are at issue, we accept the State Supreme Court's determination that the statutes' present purpose and effect is not to aid religion but to set aside a day of rest and recreation.

But, this does not answer all of appellant's contentions. We are told that the State has other means at its disposal [p. 450] to accomplish its secular purpose, other courses that would not even remotely or incidentally give state aid to religion. On this basis, we are asked to hold these statutes invalid on the ground that the State's power to regulate conduct in the public interest may only be executed in a way that does not unduly or unnecessarily infringe upon the religious provisions of the First Amendment. See *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut, supra,* at pp. 304–305. However relevant this argument may be, we believe that the factual basis on which it rests is not supportable. It is true that if the State's interest were simply to provide for its citizens a periodic respite from work, a regulation demanding that everyone rest one day in seven, leaving the choice of the day to the individual, would suffice.

However, the State's purpose is not merely to provide a one-day-in-seven work stoppage. In addition to this, the State seeks to set one day apart from all others as a day of rest, repose, recreation and tranquility—a day which all members of the family and

community have the opportunity to spend and enjoy together, a day on which there exists relative quiet and disassociation from the everyday intensity of commercial activities, a day on which people may visit friends and relatives who are not available during working days.

[p. 451] Obviously, a State is empowered to determine that a rest-one-day-in-seven statute would not accomplish this purpose; that it would not provide for a general cessation of activity, a special atmosphere of tranquility, a day which all members of the family or friends and relatives might spend together. Furthermore, it seems plain that the problems involved in enforcing such a provision would be exceedingly more difficult than those in enforcing a common-day-of-rest provision.

Moreover, it is common knowledge that the first day of the week has come to have special significance as a rest day in this country. People of all religions and [p. 452] people with no religion regard Sunday as a time for family activity, for visiting friends and relatives, for late sleeping, for passive and active entertainments, for dining out, and the like. "Vast masses of our people, in fact, literally millions, go out into the countryside on fine Sunday afternoons in the Summer..." 308 Parliamentary Debates, Commons 2159. Sunday is a day apart from all others. The cause is irrelevant; the fact exists. It would seem unrealistic for enforcement purposes and perhaps detrimental to the general welfare to require a State to choose a common day of rest other than which most persons would select of their own accord. For these reasons, we hold that the Maryland statutes are not laws respecting an establishment of religion...

[p. 453] Finally, we should make clear that this case deals only with the constitutionality of § 521 of the Maryland statute before us. We do not hold that Sunday legislation may not be a violation of the "Establishment" Clause if it can be demonstrated that its purpose—evidenced either on the face of the legislation, in conjunction with its legislative history, or in its operative effect—is to use the State's coercive power to aid religion.

Accordingly, the decision is Affirmed.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This is the longest of the opinions rendered May 29, 1961, upholding the constitutionality of State Sunday laws in four cases: *McGowan* v. *Maryland, Gallagher* v. *Crown Kosher Market, Two Guys From Harrison* v. *McGinley,* and *Braunfeld* v. *Brown*. On these four cases Justice Frankfurter, joined by Justice Harlan, wrote an 86-page separate (concurring) opinion. On one or another of them three Justices wrote four dissenting opinions (see Nos. 1671, 1672, 1673, 1674).]

1670. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Approves Pennsylvania Law SOURCE: U.S. Supreme Court, opinion of the Court, rendered by Chief Justice [Earl] Warren, in *Braunfeld* v. *Brown*, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 599, at pp. 603–610.

[p. 603] Concededly, appellants [orthodox Jews] and all others persons who wish to work on Sunday will be burdened economically by the State's day of rest mandate; and appellants point out that their religion requires them to refrain from work on Saturday as well. Our inquiry then is whether, in these circumstances, the First and Fourteenth Amendments forbid application of the Sunday Closing Law to appellants.

Certain aspects of religious exercise cannot, in any way, be restricted or burdened by either federal or state legislation. Compulsion by law of the acceptance of any creed or the practice of any form of worship is strictly forbidden. The freedom to hold religious beliefs and opinions is absolute...

However, the freedom to act, even when the action is in accord with one's religious convictions, is not totally free from legislative restriction. *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut, supra,*

at pp. 303–304, 306. As pointed out in *Reynolds* v. *United States, supra,* at p. 164, legislative power over mere opinion is forbidden but it may reach people's actions when they are found to be in violation of important social duties or subversive of good order, even when [p. 604] the actions ar demanded by one's religion...

[p. 605] Thus, is *Reynolds* v. *United States*, this Court upheld the polygamy conviction of a member of the Mormon faith despite the fact that an accepted doctrine of his church then imposed upon its male members the *duty* to practice polygamy. And, in *Prince* v. *Massachusetts*, 321 U. S. 158, this Court upheld a statute making it a crime for a girl under eighteen years of age to sell any newspapers, periodicals or merchandise in public places despite the fact that a child of the Jehovah's Witnesses faith believed that it was her religious *duty* to perform this work.

It is to be noted that, in the two cases just mentioned, the religious practices themselves conflicted with the public interest. In such cases, to make accommodation between the religious action and an exercise of state authority is a particularly delicate task, *id.*, at 165, because resolution in favor of the State results in the choice to the individual of either abandoning his religious principle or facing criminal prosecution.

But, again, this is not the case before us because the statute at bar does not make unlawful any religious practices of appellants; the Sunday law simply regulates a secular activity and, as applied to appellants, operates so as to make the practice of their religious beliefs more expensive. Furthermore, the law's effect does not inconvenience al members of the Orthodox Jewish faith but only those who believe it necessary to work on Sunday. And even these are not faced with as serious a choice as forsaking their religious practices or subjecting themselves to criminal prosecution. Fully recognizing that he alter- [p. 606] natives open to appellants and others similarly situated—retaining their present occupations and incurring economic disadvantage or engaging in some other commercial activity which does not call for either Saturday or Sunday labor—may well result in some financial sacrifice in order to observe their religious beliefs, still the opinion is wholly different than when the legislation attempts to make a religious practice itself unlawful.

To strike down, without the most critical scrutiny, legislation which imposes only an indirect burden on the exercise of religion, *i. e.*, legislation which does not make unlawful the religious practice itself, would radically restrict the operating latitude of the legislature. Statutes which tax income and limit the amount which may be deducted for religious contributions impose an indirect economic burden on the observance of the religion of the citizen whose religion requires him to donate a greater amount to his church; statutes which require the courts to be closed on Saturday and Sunday impose a similar indirect burden on the observance of the religion requires him to rest on a weekday. The list of legislation of this nature is nearly limitless.

Needless to say, when entering the area of religious freedom, we must be fully cognizant of the particular protection that the Constitution has accorded it. Abhorrence of religious persecution and intolerance is a basic part of our heritage. But we are a cosmopolitan nation made up of people of almost every conceivable religious preference. These denominations number almost three hundred. Year Book of present Churches for 1958, 257 *et seq.* Consequently, it cannot be expected, much less required, that legislators enact no law regulating conduct that may in some way result in an economic

disadvantage to some religious sects and not to others because of the special practices of the various religions. We do not believe that such an effect is an absolute test [p. 607] the determining whether the legislation violates the freedom of religion protected by the First Amendment.

Of course, to hold unassailable all legislation regulating conduct which imposes solely indirect burden on the observance of religion would be a gross oversimplification. If the purpose or effect of a law is to impede the observance of one or all religions or is to discriminate invidiously between religions, that law is constitutionally invalid even though the burden may be characterized as being only indirect. But if the State regulates conduct by enacting a general law within its power, the purpose and effect of which is to advance the State's secular goals, the statute is valid despite its indirect burden on religious observance unless the State may accomplish its purpose by means which do not impose such a burden. See *Cantwell* v. *Connecticut, supra,* at pp. 304–305.

As we pointed out in *McGowan* v. *Maryland, supra,* at pp. 444–445, we cannot find a State without power to provide a weekly respite from all labor and, at the same time, to set one day of the week apart from the others as a day of rest, repose, recreation and tranquillity—a day when the hectic tempo of everyday existence ceases and a more pleasant atmosphere is created, a day which all members of the family and community have the opportunity to spend and enjoy together, a day on which people may visit friends and relatives who are not available during working days, a day when the weekly laborer may best regenerate himself...

[p. 608] A number of States provide such an exemption [for observers of another rest day], and this may well be the wiser solution to the problem. But our concern is not with the wisdom of legislation but with its constitutional limitation. Thus, reason and experience teach that to permit the exemption might well undermine the State's goal of providing a day that, as best possible, eliminates the atmosphere of commercial noise and activity. Although not dispositive of the issue, enforcement problems would be more difficult since there would be two or more days to police rather than one and it would be more difficult to observe whether violations were occurring.

Additional problems might also be presented by a regulation of this sort. To allow only people who rest on a day other than Sunday to keep their businesses open on that day might well provide these people with an economic advantage over their competitors who must [p. 609] remain closed on that day; this might cause the Sunday-observers to complain that their religions are being discriminated against. With this competitive advantage existing, there could well be the temptation for some, in order to keep their businesses open on Sunday, to assert that they have religious convictions which compel them to close their businesses on what had formerly been their least profitable day. This might make necessary a state-conducted inquiry into the sincerity of the individual's religious beliefs, a practice which a State might believe would itself run afoul of the spirit of constitutionally protected religious guarantees. Finally, in order to keep the disruption of the day at a minimum, exempted employers would probably have to hire employees who themselves qualified for the exemption because of their own religious beliefs, a practice which a State might feel to be opposed to its general policy prohibiting religious discrimination in hiring. For all of these reasons, we cannot say that the Pennsylvania statute before us is invalid, either on its face or as applied...

[p. 610] Accordingly, the decision is Affirmed.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For dissenting opinions in this case see Nos. 1671, 1672, 1673.]

1671. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Justice Dissents as to "Free Exercise" of Religion

SOURCE: Justice [William J.] Brennan, Concurring and dissenting opinion in *Braunfeld* v. *Brown*, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 599, at pp. 610–616.

[p. 610] I agree with THE CHIEF JUSTICE that there is no merit in appellants' establishment and equal-protection claims. I dissent, however, as to the claim that Pennsylvania has prohibited the free exercise of appellant's religion.

The Court has demonstrated the public need for a weekly surcease from worldly labor, and set forth the considerations of convenience which have led the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to fix Sunday as the time for that respite. I would approach this case differently, from the point of view of the individuals whose liberty is—concededly curtailed by these enactments. For the values of the First Amendment, as embodied in the Fourteenth, look primarily towards the preservation of personal liberty, rather than towards the fulfillment of collective goals.

The appellants are small retail merchants, faithful practitioners of the Orthodox Jewish faith. They allege—and the allegation must be taken as true, since the case comes to us on a motion to dismiss the complaint-that "... one who does not observe the Sabbath [by refraining from labor] ... cannot be an Orthodox Jew." [p. 611] In appellants' business area Friday night and Saturday are busy times; yet appellants, true to their faith, close during the Jewish Sabbath, and make up some, but not all, of the business thus lost by opening on Sunday. "Each of the plaintiffs," the complaint continues, "does a substantial amount of business on Sundays, and the ability of the plaintiffs to earn a livelihood will be greatly impaired by closing their business establishment on Sundays." Consequences even more drastic are alleged: "Plaintiff, Abraham Braunfeld, will be unable to continue in his business if he may not stay open on Sunday and he will thereby lose his capital investment." In other words, the issue in this case—and we do not understand either appellees or the Court to contend otherwise—is whether a State may put an individual to a choice between his business and his religion. The Court today holds that it may. But I dissent, believing that such a law prohibits the free exercise of religion.

The first question to be resolved, however, is somewhat broader than the facts of this case. That question concerns the appropriate standard of constitutional adjudication in cases in which a statute is assertedly in conflict with the First Amendment, whether that limitation applies of its own force, or as absorbed through the less definite words of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Court in such cases is not confined to the narrow inquiry whether the challenged law is rationally related to some legitimate legislative end. Nor is the case decided by a finding that the State's interest is substantial and important, as well as rationally justifiable. This canon of adjudication was clearly stated by Mr. Justice Jackson, speaking for the Court in *West Virginia State Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U. S. 624, 639 (1943):

"In weighing arguments of the parties in its important to distinguish between the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment as an instrument for [p. 612] transmitting the principles of the First Amendment and those cases in which it is applied for its own sake. The test of legislation which collides with the Fourteenth Amendment, because it also collides with the principles of the First, is much more definite than the test when only the Fourteenth is involved. Much of the vagueness of the due process clause disappears when the specific prohibitions of the First become its standard. The right of a State to regulate, for example, a public utility may well include, so far as the due process test is concerned, power to impose all of the restrictions which a legislature may have a 'rational basis' for adopting. But freedoms of speech and of press, of assembly, and of worship may not be infringed on such slender grounds. They are susceptible of restriction only to prevent grave and immediate danger to interests which the State may lawfully protect. It is important to note that while it is the Fourteenth Amendment which bears directly upon the State it is the more specific limiting principles of the First Amendment that finally govern this case."

This exacting standard has been consistently applied by this Court as the test of legislation under all clauses of the First Amendment, not only those specifically dealing with freedom of speech and of the press. For religious freedom-the freedom to believe and to practice strange and, it may be, foreign creeds—has classically been one of the highest values of our society. See, e. g., Murdock v. Pennsylvania, 319 U. S. 105, 115 (1943); Jones v. Citv of Opelicka, 319 U. S. 103 (1943); Martin v. Citv of Struthers, 319 U. S. 141 (1943); Follet v. Town of McCormick, 321 U. S. 573 (1944); Marsh v. Alabama, 326 U. s. 501, 510 (1946). Even the most concentrated and fully articulated attack on this high standard has seemingly admitted its validity in principle, while [p. 613] deploring some incidental phraseology. See Kovacs v. Cooper, 336 U. s. 77, 89, 95-96 (1949) (concurring opinion); but cf. Ullmann v. United States, 350 U.S. 422 (1956). The honored place of religious freedom in our constitutional hierarchy, suggested long ago by the argument of counsel in Permoli v. Municipality No. 1 of the City of New Orleans, 3 How. 589, 600 (1845), and foreshadowed by a prescient footnote in United States v. Carolene Products Co., 304 U. S. 144, 152, n. 4 (1938), must now be taken to be settled. Or at least so it appeared until today. For in this case the Court seems to say, without so much as a deferential nod towards that high place which we have accorded religious freedom in the past, that any substantial state interest will justify encroachments on religious practice, at least if those encroachments are cloaked in the guise of some nonreligious public purpose.

Admittedly, these laws do not compel overt affirmation of a repugnant belief, as in *Barnette*, nor do they prohibit outright any of appellants' religious practices, as did the federal law upheld in *Reynolds* v. *United States*, 98 U. S. 145 (1878), cited by the Court. That is, the laws do not say that appellants must work on Saturday. But their effect is that appellants may not simultaneously practice their religion and their trade, without being hampered by a substantial competitive disadvantage. Their effect is that no one may at one and the same time be an Orthodox Jew and compete effectively with his Sunday-observing fellow tradesmen. This clog upon the exercise of religion, this state-imposed burden on Orthodox Judaism, has exactly the same economic effect as a tax levied upon the sale of religious literature. And yet, such a tax, when applied in the form of an excise or license fee, was held invalid in *Follet* v. *Town of McCormick, supra*. All this the Court, as I read its opinion, concedes.

What, the, is the compelling state interest which impels the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to impede [p. 614] appellants' freedom of worship? What overbalancing need is so weighty in the constitutional scale that it justifies this substantial, though indirect, limitation of appellants' freedom? It is not the desire to stamp out a practice deeply abhorred by society, such as polygamy, as in *Reynolds*, for the custom of resting one day a week is universally honored, as the Court has amply shown. Now is it the State's traditional protection of children, as in *Prince* v. *Massachusetts*, 321 U. S. 158 (1944), for appellants are reasoning and fully autonomous adults. It is not even the interest in seeing that everyone rests one day a week, for appellants' religion requires that they take such a rest. It is the mere convenience of having everyone rest on the same day.

It is to defend this interest that the Court holds that a State need to follow the alternative route of granting an exemption for those who in good faith observe a day of rest other than Sunday.

It is true, I suppose, that the granting of such an exemption would make Sundays a little noisier, and the task of police and prosecutor a little more difficult. It is also true that a majority—21—of the 34 States which have general Sunday regulations have exemptions of this kind. We are not told that those States are significantly noisier, or that their police are significantly more burdened, than [p. 615] Pennsylvania's. Even England, not under the compulsion of a written constitution, but simply influenced by considerations of fairness, has such an exemption for some activities. The Court conjures up several difficulties with such a system which seem to me more fanciful than real. Non-Sunday observers might get an unfair advantage, it is said. A similar contention against the draft exemption for conscientious objectors (another example of the exemption technique) was rejected with the observation that "its unsoundness is too apparent to require" discussion. Selective Draft Law Cases, 245 U. S. 366, 390 (1918). However widespread the complaint, it is legally baseless, and the State's reliance upon it cannot withstand a First Amendment claim. We are told that an official inquiry into the good faith with which religious beliefs are held might be itself unconstitutional. But this Court indicated otherwise in United States v. Ballard, 322 U. S. 78 (1944). Such an inquiry is no more an infringement of religious freedom than the requirement imposed by the Court itself in McGowan v. Marvland, ante, p. 420, decided this day, that a plaintiff show that his good-faith religious beliefs are hampered before he acquires standing to attack a statute under the Free-Exercise Clause of the First Amendment. Finally, I find the Court's mention of a problem under state antidiscrimination statutes almost chimerical. Most such statutes provide that hiring may be made on a religious basis if religion is a *bona* fide occupational qualification. It happens, moreover, that Pennsylvania's statute has such a provision.

In fine, the Court, in my view, has exalted administrative convenience to a constitutional level high enough to [p. 616] justify making one religion economically disadvantageous. The Court would justify this result on the ground that the effect on religion, though substantial, is indirect. The Court forgets, I think, a warning uttered during the congressional discussion of the First Amendment itself: "... the rights of conscience are, in their nature, of peculiar delicacy, and will little bear the gentlest touch of governmental hand..."

I would reverse this judgment and remand for a trial of appellants' allegations, limited to the free-exercise-of-religion issue.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Justice [Potter] Stewart joined in this dissent (see No. 1673).

1672. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Justice Dissents in Four Cases

SOURCE: Justice [William O.] Douglas, Dissenting opinion in *McGowan* v. *Maryland* [see No. 1669] and three other cases, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S., 420, at pp. 561–581.

[p. 561] The question is not whether one day out of seven can be imposed by a State as a day of rest. The question is not whether Sunday can by force of custom and habit be retained as a day of rest. The question is whether a State can impose criminal sanctions on those who, unlike the Christian majority that makes up our society, worship on a different day or do not share the religious scruples of the majority. If the "free exercise" of religion were subject to reasonable regulations, as it is under some constitutions, or if all laws "respecting the establishment of religion" were not proscribed, I could understand how rational men, representing a predominantly Christian civilization, might think these Sunday laws did not unreasonably interfere with anyone's free exercise of religion and took no step toward a burdensome establishment of any religion.

But that is not the premise from which we start, as there is agreement that the fact that a State, and not the Federal Government, has promulgated these Sunday laws does not change the scope of the power asserted. For the classic view is that the First Amendment should be applied to the States with the same firmness as it is enforced against the Federal Government. See *Lovell* v. *Griffin*, 303 U. S. 444, 450; *Minersville District* v. *Gobitis*, 310 U. S. 586, 593; *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania*, 319 U. S. 105, 108; *Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, 319 U. S. 624, 639; *Staub* v. *City of Baxley*, 355 U. S. 313, 321; *Talley* v. [p. 562] *California*, 362 U. S. 60. The most explicit statement perhaps was in *Board of Education* v. *Barnette*, *supra*, 639 [quoted in No. 1671]...

With that as my starting point I do not see how a State can make protesting citizens refrain from doing innocent acts on Sunday because the doing of those acts offends sentiments of their Christian neighbors.

The institutions of our society are founded on the belief that there is an authority higher than the authority of the State; that there is a moral law which the State is powerless to alter; that the individual possesses rights, conferred by the Creator, which government must respect. [p. 563] The Declaration of Independence stated the now familiar theme:

"We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

And the body of the Constitution as well as the Bill of Rights enshrined those principles.

The Puritan influence helped shape our constitutional law and our common law as Dean Pound has said: The Puritan "put individual conscience and individual judgment in the first place." The Spirit of the Common Law (1921), p. 42. For these reasons we stated in *Zorach* v. *Clauson*, 343 U. S. 306, 313, "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being."

But those who fashioned the Constitution decided that if and when God is to be served, His service will not be motivated by coercive measures of government. "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof"—such is the command of the First Amendment made applicable to the State by reason of the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth. This means, as I understand it, that if a religious leaven is to be worked into the affairs of our people, it is to be done by individuals and groups, not by the Government. This necessarily means, *first*, that the dogma, creed, scruples, or practices of no religious group or sect are to be preferred over those of any others; *second*, that no one shall be interfered with by government for practicing the religion of his choice; *third*, that the State may not require anyone to practice a religion or even any religion; and *fourth*, that the State cannot compel one so to conduct himself as not to offend the religious scruples of another. The idea, as I understand it, was to limit the power of government to act in religious matters (*Board of Education* v. [p. 564] *Barnette, supra; McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 333 U. S. 203),

not to limit the freedom of religious men to act religiously nor to restrict the freedom of atheists or agnostics.

The First Amendment commands government to have no interest in theology or ritual; it admonishes government to be interested in allowing religious freedom to flourish—whether the result is to produce Catholics, Jews, or Protestants, or to turn the people toward the path of Buddha, or to end in a predominantly Moslem nation, or to produce in the long run atheists or agnostics. On matters of this kind government must be neutral. This freedom plainly includes freedom *from* religion with the right to believe, speak, write, publish and advocate antireligious programs. Board of Education v. Barnette, supra, 641. Certainly the "free exercise" clause does not require that everyone embrace the theology of some church or of some faith, or observe the religious practices of any majority or minority sect. The First Amendment by its "establishment" clause prevents, of course, the selection by government of an "official" church. Yet the ban plainly extends farther than that. We said in Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1, 16, that it would be an "establishment" of a religion if the Government financed one church or several churches. For what better way to "establish" an institution than to find the fund that will support it? The "establishment" clause protects citizens also against any law which selects any religious custom, practice, or ritual, puts the force of government behind it, and fines, imprisons, or otherwise penalizes a person for not observing it. The Government plainly could not join forces with one religious group and decree a universal and symbolic circumcision. Nor could it require all children to be baptized or give tax exemptions only to those whose children were baptized.

Could it require a fast from sunrise to sunset throughout the Moslem month of Ramadan? I should think not. [p. 565] Yet why then can it make criminal the doing of other acts, as innocent as eating, during the day that Christians revere?

Sunday is a word heavily overlaid with connotations and traditions deriving from the Christian roots of our civilization that color all judgments concerning it. This is what the philosophers call "word magic."

"For most judges, for most lawyers, for most human beings, we are as unconscious of our value patterns as we are of the oxygen that we breathe." Cohen, Legal Conscience (1960), p. 169.

The issue of these cases would therefore be in better focus if we imagined that a state legislature, controlled by orthodox Jews and Seventh Day Adventists, passed a law making it a crime to keep a shop open on Saturdays. Would a Baptist, Catholic, Methodist, or Presbyterian be compelled to obey that law or go to jail or pay a fine? Or suppose Moslems grew in political strength here and got a law through a state legislature making it a crime to keep a shop open on Fridays [see No. 778]. Would the rest of us have to submit under the fear of criminal sanctions?

Dr. John Cogley recently summed up ¹ [Note 1: The Problems of Pluralism, Dansforth Lectures, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio (1960)...] the dominance of the three-religion influence in our affairs:

"For the foreseeable future, it seems, the United States is going to be a three-religion nation. At the present time all three are characteristically 'Amer- [p. 566] ican,' some think flavorlessly so. For religion in America is almost uniformly 'respectable,' bourgeois, and prosperous. In the Protestant world the 'church' mentality has triumphed over the more venturesome spirit of the 'sect.' In the Catholic world, the mystical is muted in favor of booming organization and efficiently administered good works. And in the Jewish world the prophet is too frequently without honor, while the synagogue emphasis is focused on suburban togetherness. There are exceptions to these rules, of course; each of the religious communities continues to cast up its prophets, its rebels and radicals. But a Jeremiah, one fears, would be positively embarrassing to

the present position of the Jews; a Francis of Assisi upsetting the complacency of American Catholics would be rudely dismissed as a fanatic; and a Kierkegaard, speaking with an American accent, would be considerably less welcome than Norman Vincent Peale in most Protestant pulpits."

This religious influence has extended far, far back of the First and Fourteenth Amendments. Every Sunday School student knows the Fourth Commandment:

"Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.

"Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work:

"But the seventh day is the sabbath of the LORD thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy [p. 567] maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates:

"For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth." ... Exodus 20:8-11

This religious mandate for observance of the Seventh Day became, under Emperor Constantine, a mandate for observance of the First Day "in conformity with the practice of the Christian Church." See *Richardson* v. *Goddard*, 23 How. 28, 41. This religious mandate has had a checkered history, but in general its command, enforced now by the ecclesiastical authorities, now by the civil authorities, and now by both, has held good down through the centuries. The general pattern of these laws in the United States was set in the eighteenth century and derives, most directly, from a seventeenth century English statute. 29 Charles II, c. 7. Judicial comment on the [p. 568] Sunday laws has always been a mixed bag. Some judges have asserted that the statutes have a "purely" civil aim, *i. e.*, limitation of work time and provision for a common and universal leisure. But other judges have recognized the religious significance of Sunday and that the laws existed to enforce the maintenance of that significance. In general, both threads of argument have continued to interweave in the case law on the subject. Prior to the time when the First Amendment was held applicable to the States by reason of the Due Process Clause of the

Fourteenth, the Court at least by *obiter dictum* approved State Sunday laws on three occasions: *Soon Hing* v. *Crowley*, 113 U. S. 703, in 1885; *Hennington* v. *Georgia*, 163 U. S. 299, in 1896; *Petit* v. *Minnesota*, 177 U. S. 164, in 1900. And in *Friedman* v. *New York*, 341 U. S. 907, the Court, by a divided vote, dismissed "for want of a substantial federal question" an appeal from a New York decision upholding the validity of a Sunday law against an attack based on the First Amendment.

The Soon Hing, Hennington, and Petit cases all rested on the police power of the State—the right to safeguard the health of the people by requiring the cessation of normal activities one day out of seven. The Court in the Soon Hing case rejected the idea that Sunday laws rested on the power of government "to legislate for the promotion of religious observances." 113 U. S., at 710. The New York Court of Appeals in the *Friedman* case followed the reasoning of the earlier cases, 302 N. Y. 75, 80, 96 N. E. 2d 184, 186.

[p. 569] The Massachusetts Sunday law involved in one of these appeals was once characterized by the Massachusetts court as merely a civil regulation providing for a "fixed period of rest." *Commonwealth* v. *Has*, 122 Mass. 40, 42. That decision was, according to the District Court in the *Gallagher* case, "an *ad hoc* improvisation" made "because of the realization that the Sunday law would be more vulnerable to constitutional attack under the state Constitution if the religious motivation of the statute were more explicitly avowed." 176 F. Supp. 466, 473. Certainly prior to the *Has* case, the Massachusetts courts had indicated that the aim of the Sunday law was religious. See *Pearce* v. *Atwood*, 13 Mass. 324, 345–346; *Bennett* v. *Brooks*, 91 Mass. 118, 121. After

the *Has* case the Massachusetts court construed the Sunday law as a religious measure. In *Davis* v. *Somerville*, 128 Mass. 594, 596, 35 Am. Rep. 399, 400, it was said:

"Our Puritan ancestors intended that the day should be not merely a day of rest from labor, but also a day devoted to public and private worship and to religious meditation and repose, undisturbed by secular cares or amusements. They saw fit to enforce the observance of the day by penal legislation, and the statute regulations which they devised for that purpose have continued in force, without any substantial modification, to the present time."

And see *Commonwealth* v. *Dextra*, 143 Mass. 28, 8 N. E. 756. In *Commonwealth* v. *White*, 190 Mass. 578, 581, 177 N. E. 636, 637, the court refused to liberalize its construction of an exception in its Sunday law for works of "necessity." That word, it said, "was originally inserted to secure the observance of the Lord's day in accordance with [p. 570] the views of our ancestors, and it ever since has stood and still stands for the same purpose." In *Commonwealth* v. *McCarthy*, 244 Mass. 484, 486, 138 N. E. 835, 836, the court reiterated that the aim of the law was "to secure respect and reverence for the Lord's day."

The Pennsylvania Sunday laws before us in Nos. 36 and 67 have received the same construction. "Rest and quiet, on the Sabbath day, with the right and privilege [*sic*] of public and private worship, undisturbed by any mere wor[l]dly employment, are exactly what the statute was passed to protect." *Sparhawk* v. *Union Passenger R. Co.*, 54 Pa. 401, 423. And see *Commonwealth* v. *Nesbit*, 34 Pa. 398, 405, 406–408. A recent pronouncement by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court is found in *Commonwealth* v. *America Baseball Club*, 290 Pa. 136, 143, 138 A. 497, 499: "Christianity is part of the common law of Pennsylvania ... and its people are christian people. Sunday is the holy day among christians."

The Maryland court, in sustaining the challenged law in No. 8, relied on *Judefind* v. *State*, 78 Md. 510, 28 A. 405, and *Levering* v. *Park Commissioner*, 134 Md. 48, 106 A. 176. In the former the court said:

"It is undoubtedly true that rest from secular employment on Sunday does have a tendency to foster and encourage the Christian religion—of all sects and denominations that observe that day—as rest from work and ordinary occupation enables many to engage in public worship who probably would not otherwise do so. But it would scarcely be asked of a Court, in what professes to be a Christian land, to declare a law unconstitutional because it requires rest from bodily labor on Sunday, (except works of necessity and charity.) and *thereby* promotes the [p. 571] cause of Christianity. If the Christian religion is, incidentally or otherwise, benefited or fostered by having this day of rest, as it undoubtedly is, there is all the more reason for the enforcement of laws that help to preserve it." 78 Md., at 515–516, 128 A., at 407. In the *Levering* case the court relied on the excerpt from the *Judefind* decision just quoted. 134 Md., at 54–55, 106 A., at 178.

We have then in each of the four cases Sunday laws that find their source in Exodus, that were brought here by the Virginians and by the Puritans, and that are today maintained, construed, and justified because they respect the views of our dominant religious groups and provide a needed day of rest.

The history was accurately summarized a century ago by Chief Justice Terry of the Supreme Court of California in *Ex parte Newman*, 9 Cal. 502, 509.

⁴Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

"The truth is, however much it may be disguised, that this one day of rest is a purely religious idea. Derived from the Sabbatical institutions of the ancient Hebrew, it has been adopted into all the creeds of succeeding religious sects throughout the civilized world; and whether it be the Friday of the Mohammedan, the Saturday of the Israelite, or the Sunday of the Christian, it is alike fixed in the affections of its followers, beyond the power of eradication, and in most of the States of our Confederacy, the aid of the law to enforce its observance has been given under the pretence of a civil, municipal, or police regulation."

That case involved the validity of a Sunday law under a provision of the California Constitution guaranteeing the "free exercise" of religion. Calif. Const., 1849, Art. 1, § 4. Justice Burnett stated why he concluded that the [p. 572] Sunday law, there sought to be enforced against a man selling clothing on Sunday, infringed California's constitution:

"Had the act made Monday, instead of Sunday, a day of compulsory rest, the constitutional question would have been the same. The fact that the Christian *voluntarily* keeps holy the first day of the week, does not authorize the Legislature to make that observance *compulsory*. The Legislature can not compel the citizen to do that which the Constitution leaves him free to do or omit, at his election. The act violates as much the religious freedom of the Christian as of the Jew. Because the conscientious views of the Christian compel him to keep Sunday as a Sabbath, he has the right to object, when the Legislature invades his freedom of religious worship, and assumes the power to compel him to do that which he has the right to omit if he pleases. The principle is the same, whether the act of the Legislature *compels* us to do that which we wish to do, or not to do...

"Under the Constitution of this State, the Legislature can not pass any act, the legitimate effect of which is *forcibly* to establish any merely religious truth, or enforce any merely religious observances. The Legislature has no power over such a subject. When, therefore, the citizen is sought to be compelled by the Legislature to do any affirmative religious act, or to refrain from doing anything, because it violates simply a religious principle or observance, the act is unconstitutional." *Id.*, at 513–515.

The Court picks and chooses language from various decisions to bolster its conclusion that these Sunday laws in the modern setting are "civil regulations." No matter how much is written, no matter what is said, the parentage of these laws is the Fourth Commandment; and they [p. 573] serve and satisfy the religious predispositions of our Christian communities.⁶ After all, the labels a State places on its laws are not binding on us when we are confronted with a constitutional decision. We reach our own conclusion as to the character, effect, and practical operation of the regulation in determining its constitutionality. *Carpenter* v. *Shaw*, 280 U. S. 363, 367–368; *Dyer* v. *Sims*, 341 U. S. 22, 29; *Memphis Steam Laundry* v. *Stone*, 342 U. S. 389, 392; *Society for Savings* v. *Bowers*, 349 U. S. 143, 151; *Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot*, 364 U. S. 339, 341–342.

[Note 6: Today we retreat from that jealous regard for religious freedom which struck down a statute because it was "a handy implement for disguised religious persecution." *Board of Education* v. *Barnette, supra,* 644 (concurring opinion). It does not do to say, as does the majority, "Sunday is a day apart from all others. The cause is irrelevant; the fact exists." The cause of Sunday's being a day apart is determinative; that cause should not be swept aside by a declaration of parochial experience.

The judgment the Court is called upon to make is a delicate one. But *in the light of our society's religious history* it cannot be avoided by arguing that a hypothetical lawgiver could find nonreligious reasons for fixing Sunday as a day of rest. The effect of that history is, indeed, still with us. Sabbath is no less Sabbath because it is now less severe in its strictures, or because it has come to be expedient for some nonreligious purposes. The Constitution must guard against "sophisticated as well as simple-minded modes" of violation. *Lane v. Wilson*, 307 U. S. 268, 275.]

It seems to me plain that by these laws the States compel one, under sanction of law, to refrain from work or recreation on Sunday because of the majority's religious views about that day. The State by law makes Sunday a symbol of respect or adherence. Refraining from work or recreation in deference to the majority's religious feelings about Sunday is within every person's choice. By what authority can government compel it?

Cases are put where acts that are immoral by our standards but not by the standards of other religious [p. 574] groups are made criminal. That category of cases, until today, has been a very restricted one confined to polygamy (*Reynolds* v. *United States*, 98 U. S. 145) and other extreme situations. The latest example is *Prince* v. *Massachusetts*, 321 U. S. 158, which upheld a statute making it criminal for a child under twelve to sell papers, periodicals, or merchandise on a street or in any public place. It was sustained in spite of the finding that the child thought it was her religious duty to perform the act. But that was a narrow holding which turned on the effect which street solicitation might have on the child-solicitor:

"The state's authority over children's activities is broader than over like actions of adults. This is peculiarly true of public activities and in matters of employment. A democratic society rests, for its continuance, upon the healthy, well-rounded growth of young people into full maturity as citizens, with all that implies. It may secure this against impeding restraints and dangers within a broad range of selection. Among evils most appropriate for such action are the crippling effects of child employment, more especially in public places, and the possible harms arising from other activities subject to all the diverse influences of the street. It is too late now to doubt that legislation appropriately designed to reach such evils is within the state's police power, whether against the parent's claim to control of the child or one that religious scruples dictate contrary action." *Id.*, 168–169.

None of the acts involved here implicates minors. None of the actions made constitutionally criminal today involves the doing of any act that any society has deemed to be immoral.

The conduct held constitutionally criminal today embraces the selling of pure, not impure, food; wholesome, [p. 575] not noxious, articles. Adults, not minors, are involved. The innocent acts, now constitutionally classified as criminal, emphasize the drastic break we make with tradition.

These laws are sustained because, it is said, the First Amendment is concerned with religious convictions or opinion, not with conduct. But it is a strange Bill of Rights that makes it possible for the dominant religious group to bring the minority to heel because the minority, in the doing of acts which intrinsically are wholesome and not antisocial, does not defer to the majority's religious beliefs. Some have religious scruples against eating pork. Those scruples, no matter how bizarre they might seem to some, are within the ambit of the First Amendment. See *United States* v. *Ballard*, 322 U. S. 78, 87. Is it possible that a majority of a state legislatue having those religious scruples could make it criminal for the nonbeliever to sell pork? Some have religious scruples against slaughtering cattle. Could a state legislature, dominated by that group, make it criminal to run an abattoir?

The Court balances the need of the people for rest, recreation, late sleeping, family visiting and the like against the command of the First Amendment that no one need bow to the religious beliefs of another. There is in this realm no room for balancing. I see no place for it in the constitutional scheme. A legislature of Christians can no more make minorities conform to their weekly regime than a legislature of Moslems, or a legislature of Hindus. The religious regime of every group must be respected—unless it crosses the line of criminal conduct. But no one can be forced to come to a halt before it, or refrain from doing things that would offend it. That is my reading of the Establishment Clause and the Free Exercise Clause. Any other reading imports, I fear, an element common in other societies but foreign to us. Thus Nigeria in Article 23 of her Constitution, after [p. 576] guaranteeing religious freedom, adds, "Nothing in this section shall invalidate any law that is reasonably justified in a democratic society in the interest of defence, public

safety, public order, public morality, or public health." And see Article 25 of the Indian Constitution. That may be a desirable provision. But when the Court adds it to our First Amendment, as it does today, we make a sharp break with the American ideal of religious liberty as enshrined in the First Amendment.

The State can of course require one day of rest a week: one day when every shop or factory is closed. Quite a few States make that requirement. Then the "day of rest" becomes purely and simply a health measure. But the Sunday laws operate differently. They force minorities to obey the majority's religious feelings of what is due and proper for a Christian community; they provide a coercive spur to the "weaker brethren," to those who are indifferent to the claims of a Sabbath through apathy or scruple. Can there be any doubt that Christians, now aligned vigorously in favor of these laws, would be as strongly opposed if they were prosecuted under a Moslem law that forbade them from engaging in secular activities on days that violated Moslem scruples?

There is an "establishment" of religion in the constitutional sense if any sense if any practice of any religious group has the sanction of law behind it. There is an interference with the "free exercise" of religion if what in conscience one [p. 577] can do or omit doing is required because of the religious scruples of the community. Hence I would declare each of those laws unconstitutional as applied to the complaining parties, whether or not they are members of a sect which observes as its Sabbath a day other than Sunday.

When these laws are applied to Orthodox Jews, as they are in No. 11 and in No. 67, or to Sabbatarians their vice is accentuated. If the Sunday laws are constitutional, Kosher markets are on a five-day week. Thus those laws put an economic penalty on those who observe Saturday rather than Sunday as the Sabbath. For the economic pressures on these minorities, created by the fact that our communities are predominantly Sunday-minded, there is no recourse. When, however, the State uses its coercive powers—here the criminal law—to compel minorities to observe a second Sabbath, not their own, the State undertakes to aid and "prefer one religion over another"—contrary to the command of the Constitution. See *Everson* v. *Board of Education, supra*, 15.

In large measure the history of the religious clause of the First Amendment was a struggle to be free of economic sanctions for adherence to one's religion. *Everson* v. *Board of Education, supra,* 11–14. A small tax was imposed in Virginia for religious education. Jefferson and Madison led the fight against the tax, Madison writing his famous Memorial and Remonstrance against that law. *Id.,* 12. As a result, the tax measure was defeated and instead Virginia's famous "Bill for Religious Liberty," written by Jefferson, was enacted. *Id.,* 12. That Act provided: ⁸ [Note 8: 12 Hening, Stat. Va. (1823), p. 86.]

"That no man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall other-[p. 578] wise suffer on account of his religious opinion or belief..."

The reverse side of an "establishment" is a burden on the "free exercise" of religion. Receipt of funds from the State benefits the established church directly; laying an extra tax on nonmembers benefits the established church indirectly. Certainly the present Sunday laws place Orthodox Jews and Sabbatarians under extra burdens because of their religious opinions or beliefs. Requiring them to abstain from their trade or business on Sunday reduces their work-week to five days, unless they violate their religious scruples. This places them at a competitive disadvantage and penalizes them for adhering to their religious beliefs. "The sanction imposed by the state for observing a day other than Sunday as holy time is certainly more serious economically than the imposition of a license tax for preaching," ⁹ [Note 9: Pfeffer, Church, State, and Freedom (1953), p. 235] which we struck down in *Murdock* v. *Pennsylvania*, 319 U. S. 105, and in *Follett* v. *McCormick*, 321 U. S. 573. The special protection which Sunday laws give the dominant religious groups and the penalty they place on minorities whose holy day is Saturday constitute in my view state interference with the "free exercise" of religion.

[p. 579] I dissent from applying criminal sanctions against any of these complainants since to do so implicates the States in religious matters contrary to the constitutional mandate. Reverend Allan C. Parker, Jr., Pastor of the [p. 580] South Park Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Washington, has stated my views:

"We forget that, though Sunday-worshiping Christians are in the majority in this country among religious people, we do not have the right to force our practice upon the minority. Only a Church which deems itself without error and intolerant of error can justify its intolerance of the minority.

"A Jewish friend of mine runs a small business establishment. Because my friend is a Jew his business is closed each Saturday. He respects my right to worship on Sunday and I respect his right to worship on Saturday. But there is a difference. As a Jew he closes his store voluntarily so that he will be able to worship his God in his fashion. Fine! But, as a Jew living under Christian inspired Sunday closing laws, he is required to close his store on Sunday so that I will be able to worship my God in my fashion.

⁶Around the corner from my church there is a small Seventh Day Baptist church. I disagree with the Seventh Day Baptists on many points of doctrine. Among the tenets of their faith with which I disagree is the 'seventh day worship.' But they are good neighbors and fellow Christians, and while we disagree we respect one another. The good people of my congregation set aside their jobs on the first of the week and gather in God's house for worship. Of course, it is easy for them to set aside their jobs since Sunday closing laws—inspired by the Church—keep them from their work. At the Seventh Day Baptist church the people set aside their jobs on Saturday to worship God. This takes real sacrifice because Saturday is a good day for business. But that is not all—they are required by law to set aside [p. 581] their jobs on Sunday their jobs on Sunday while more orthodox Christians worship.

"... I do not believe that because I have set aside Sunday as a holy day I have the right to force all men to set aside that day also. Why should my faith be favored by the State over any other man's faith?"¹² [Note 12: 1 Liberty, January–February 1961, No. 56, pp. 21–22.]

With all deference, none of the opinions filed today in support of the Sunday laws has answered that question.

1673. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Justice Dissents; Says Rights Violated

SOURCE: Justice [Potter] Stewart, Dissenting opinion in *Braunfeld* v. *Brown*, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 599, at p. 616.

I agree with substantially all that MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN has written [see No. 1671]. Pennsylvania has passed a law which compels an Orthodox Jew to choose between his religious faith and his economic survival. That is a cruel choice. It is a choice which I think no State can constitutionally demand. For me this is not something that can be swept under the rug and forgotten in the interest of enforced Sunday togetherness. I think the impact of this law upon these appellants grossly violates their constitutional right to the free exercise of their religion.

1674. Sunday Laws—U.S. Supreme Court Justices Join in Dissent SOURCE: Justices [William J.] Brennan and [Potter] Stewart, Dissenting opinion in *Gallagher v. Crown Kosher Market*, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 617, at p. 642.

Mr. JUSTICE BRENNAN and MR. JUSTICE STEWART dissent. They are of the opinion that the Massachusetts statute, as applied to the appellees in this case, prohibits the free

exercise of religion. See their dissenting opinions in *Braunfeld* v. *Brown* [see Nos. 1671, 1673].

1675. Symbolism, in Christian Church, History of

SOURCE: Thomas Albert Stafford, *Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1942), pp. 21, 22. Copyright 1942 by Whitmore & Stone. Used by permission.

[p. 21] SINCE EARLY TIMES, Christian symbolic art and ritual have been very closely connected ... During the past quarter century, in the non-liturgical churches in America, there has been manifest a remarkable movement towards the adoption of enriched forms of worship and a more liberal use of symbolical decorations and equipment.

The various Catholic, Episcopal and Lutheran churches are professedly liturgical and make extensive use of the traditional forms and symbolism inherited from the early Christian Church, or developed in the period of magnificent flowering of medieval religious art which preceded the Reformation. During the early stages of the Calvinistic Reformation, much of this heritage was thrown into the discard by wrathful reformers, who wrought havoc on priceless treasures of religious art in Scotland, England and other parts of Europe. Of three hundred sixty Celtic crosses, said to exist in Scotland prior to the Reformation, only two exist today. John Calvin permitted gratification of the ear through poetry and music, but denied gratification of the eye. Genesis [p. 22] 1:31 was overlooked. In attempting to uproot "superstitious" and "idolatrous" usages, the Calvinists committed many destructive excesses and, for the sake of stark contrast to Roman Catholic custom, kept their churches almost completely bare of everything that might appeal to the imagination and the esthetic sense of the worshipers. Every candid student of history will admit that they had much provocation. Nevertheless, it now appears that the catharsis was too severe.

The iconoclastic spirit was vigorously expressed among the American pioneers and is not yet moribund. It seems that by many of us the loss of goods by fire may be suffered more easily than the cancelation of inherited notions and prejudices. Moreover, only the philosophic few believe in a "golden mean." Human beings quite generally tend to indulge in excess, especially in regard to persons and things to which they are opposed. Puritans, like Richard Braith-white who hanged his cat on Monday because it killed a mouse on Sunday, were capable of great severity in the exercise of what they genuinely conceived to be righteous indignation. Even in our own day genuine piety is sometimes manifested in very queer and fanatical forms, and one does not have to be a cynic to observe that the human mind is capable of extraordinary folly with perfect sincerity.

⁵Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1676. Tabernacle, Parallels to

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, Archeology and the Old Testament, pp. 213, 214. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 213] Modern criticism shows a tendency to deny the historicity of the original tabernacle described in the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua and to make it essentially a reflection of the later allegedly more ornate and complex Davidic tent or a concoction of exilic and post-exilic priestly writers. Modern criticism supposes that the elaborate construction and appurtenance of the Mosaic institution were unsuitable to the life of migrants. However, archeology has shown that the description of the construction of the tabernacle offers nothing which would have been difficult for the craftsmen of the Mosaic era to make, and technical terms employed of the tabernacle and its parts have recently been found in records dating from the fourteenth to the eleventh centuries B.C.²⁶ [Note 26 refers to Albright in *Old Testament Commentary*, p. 143.] The tent which David pitched for the ark accordingly may be safely taken as a faithful replica of the Mosaic tent and not as largely a Davidic innovation.

Moreover, from ancient Arabic tradition and modern Bedouin practice it is well known that it was customary for nomadic desert tribes to carry their sacred tent-shrines with them much [p. 214] in the manner of Israel in the wilderness. From fragments of the Phoenician history of Sanchuniathon (c. 650 B.C.) there is a reference to a portable shrine of much earlier date, which was drawn by oxen. Diodorus, the Greek historian of the first century A.D., tells of a sacred tent pitched in the center of a Carthaginian battle camp with an altar nearby.

Of particular significance in the archeology of the tabernacle is the ancient miniature red leather tent with domed top, called the *qubbah*. In the pre-Islamic period some of these tents were suitable for mounting on camel back. Others were larger. The tent frequently contained the local idols (betyls) and was deemed capable of guiding the tribe in its wanderings, and by virtue of its presence on the battlefield, was regarded as efficacious to protect from the enemy and to give victory. Accordingly, it was commonly set up near the chieftain's tent. As an object of peculiar sacredness the *qubbah* was thus a palladium affording general protection. It was also a place of worship, where priests gave forth oracles.

Since black tents were characteristic from most ancient times, the red leather of which they were made is most extraordinary, especially since the color tended to expose the camp and the station of the chieftain. This strange custom implies a deep-rooted conservative religious practice, and is illustrated by a number of representations of the *qubbah* from Syria and a specific reference to the institution in an Aramaic inscription. The temple of Bel in Palmyra, which dates from the third to the first century B.C., interestingly portrays the *qubbah* in a bas-relief, with remnants of paint still clinging to it.

The qubbah is mentioned in Numbers 25:8 in connection with Phinehas who "went

into the tent" (*qubbah*) and slew the "man of Israel" and the Midianitish woman whom he had married. The passage is usually construed as a reference to the tabernacle or to the sacred enclosure.

1677. Targum, Definition of

SOURCE: "Targum," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959), cols. 1793, 1794. Copyright 1959 by Encyclopedia Publishing Company, Ltd. Used by permission of I. J. Carmin-Karpman, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

[col. 1793] Targum (Aram. from Assyrian targumanu "interpreter", cf. "dragoman"):

The Aramaic translation of the Bible. The Talmud (*Megillah* 3*a*) concludes from Neh. 8:8 that the custom of adding an Aramaic translation to the public reading of the Bible goes back to Ezra; it was certainly well-established in the Second Temple Period. This oral T. was both a translation and an interpretation adding legal and midrashic details to the text and studiously avoiding anthropomorphism. All T.'s are written in a somewhat artificial ARAMAIC, halfway between biblical Aramaic and the spoken language of Palestine.

There are three T.'s to the Pentateuch: *T. Onkelos* (according to some so called after the proselyte AQUILA) showing the most archaic type; *T. Jonathan* (erroneously so called);

and *T. Yerushalmi* (or Palestinian T.), known only in a fragmentary form until 1956 when a complete ms was discovered. The T. to the Former and Latter Prophets is called after Jonathan ben Uzziel; it is mainly a paraphrase emphasizing the teachings of the text. The T.'s to the various books of the Hagiographa are midrashic in character, especially those to the Five Scrolls; they are considerably longer than the text they render and often show little connection with the literal sense. An exception is the T. to Proverbs, which is literal and couched in a language close to Syriac. The T. (especially T. Onkelos) has long enjoyed a sanctity second only to the Hebrew text. The Talmud enjoins the reading of the weekly passage "twice in Hebrew, once in T." (*Berakhot* 8*a*). The T. is cited as an authoritative interpretation by Rashi [col. 1794] and other commentators, and like the

Aramaic T. *Targum* is the word used by the Jews of Kurdistan to denote their spoken Aramaic language.

Hebrew text, has a Masorah and numerous commentaries. There is also a Samaritan

1678. Temple, at Jerusalem (Herod's)—Date of Building

SOURCE: Josephus Antiquities xv. 11. 1, in The Works of Flavius Josephus, trans. by William Whiston (Cincinnati: H. S. & J. Applegate, 1850), p. 321.

And now Herod, in the eighteenth year of his reign, and after the acts already mentioned, undertook a very great work, that is, to build of himself the temple of God.

1679. Temple, at Jerusalem (Herod's), Grandeur of SOURCE: Josephus *War* v. 5. 6; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 269. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

The exterior of the building wanted nothing that could astound either mind or eye. For, being covered on all sides with massive plates of gold, the sun was no sooner up than it radiated so fiery a flash that persons straining to look at it were compelled to avert their eyes, as from the solar rays. To approaching strangers it appeared from a distance like a snow-clad mountain; for all that was not overlaid with gold was of purest white. From its summit protruded sharp golden spikes to prevent birds from settling upon and polluting the roof. Some of the stones in the building were forty-five cubits in length, five in height and six in breadth.

1680. Temple, at Jerusalem, Site of

SOURCE: F. J. Hollis, *The Archaeology of Herod's Temple*, pp. 1–3. Copyright 1934 by J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 1] The historian Josephus relates that Herod the Great rebuilt the Temple at Jerusalem...

It would have been impossible for Herod to select another site without arousing a storm of opposition, however he enlarged and enriched the building...

With regard to this work of rebuilding the Temple, there is a saying of Rabbi Eliezer (c. A.D. 120), preserved in the Mishnah, to the following effect:

I have heard that when the Temple (Hêkhāl) was being built, they made curtains

 $(q^e l\bar{a}^* m)$ for the Temple, and curtains for the court; and then they built the walls of the Temple outside of the curtains, but those for the court inside of the curtains.

It would seem that in this tradition we have a glimpse of the precautions taken to secure that the new Temple should be situated exactly where the old one was. Rabbi Eliezer was not far removed [p. 2] from the occasion to which he refers; he may even have seen Herod's Temple itself, before its destruction in A.D. 70, and may well have conversed with those who received this tradition at first hand from the builders themselves... Early traditions then point to the well-known fact of the rebuilding of the Temple, and indicate that the site of the new was the same as that occupied by the old.

Further there is evidence that the Temple and altar built by Zerubbabel occupied the same positions, and were erected on the same sites, as the Temple and altar of Solomon. For although Nebuchadrezzar had sacked the city and burnt the Temple, yet all trace of Temple and altar had certainly not quite disappeared, for Jeremiah tells of men bringing offerings to the House of the Lord after its destruction; and after the Exile it is clear that the first step was to reconstruct the broken-down altar. Doubtless this had earlier been erected 'in the middle of the court that was before the House of the Lord', the place which had been hallowed to receive the burnt offerings, instead of the brazen altar of Solomon. Furthermore it is to be noted that the historian was careful to point out that David had erected his altar on the spot occupied by the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite, and there seems no reason to doubt that the altar of Solomon's Temple was on the same spot. It is therefore highly probable that the altar of Herod's [p. 3] Temple was erected on the very site of Araunah's threshing-floor. With regard to the work of Zerubbabel, it is clear that the buildings completed by him were not on such a magnificent scale as those of Solomon, for 'in comparison it was as nothing', yet this Temple at the time of Herod was reputed to be sixty cubits high and sixty cubits wide, and reared on the same spot as Solomon's Temple.

1681. Ten Commandments—Abiding and Universal

SOURCE: Wilbur M. Smith, ed., *Peloubet's Select Notes* for 1946, p. 35. Copyright 1945 by W. A. Wilde Company, Boston. Used by permission.

These laws are what we might call *universal*... These Ten Commandments are only the codification of what man's own moral nature approves as right; and they are right, and true, and abiding in every age for every race.

1682. Ten Commandments, Binding—Christian Obligation to Obey (Methodist View)

SOURCE: Catechism No. 1 ... of the Methodist Episcopal Church (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1884), pp. 18, 21.

[p. 18] 85. What does God require of man?

Obedience to his revealed will.

86. What is the rule of our obedience?

The moral law.

87. Where is the moral law given?

In the ten commandments.—Exod. xx...

[p. 21] 103. Are all Christians under obligation to keep the law?

Yes; they are "not without law to God, but under the law to Christ."—1 Cor. ix, 21.

1683. Ten Commandments, Binding Permanently Upon All Mankind SOURCE: John Wesley, Sermon 25, "Upon Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount," in his *Works* (reprint of 1872 ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, [n.d.]), Vol. 5, pp. 311, 312.

[p. 311] The Ritual or ceremonial law, delivered by Moses to the children of Israel, containing all the injunctions and ordinances which related to the old sacrifices and service of the Temple, our Lord indeed did come to destroy...

The moral law, contained in the Ten Commandments, and enforced by the Prophets, he did not take away... This is a law which never can be broken, which "stands fast as the faithful witness in heaven." The moral stands on an entirely different foundation from the ceremonial or ritual law, which was only designed for a temporary restraint upon a disobedient and stiff-necked people; whereas this was from the beginning of the world, being "written not on tables of stone," but on the hearts of all the children of men, when they came out of the hands of the Creator... [p. 312] Every part of this law must remain in force upon all mankind, and in all ages; as not depending either on time or place, or any other circumstances liable to change, but on the nature of God, and the nature of man, and their unchangeable relation to each other.

1684. Ten Commandments, Binding Still, Under Penalty (Moody on) SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, *Weighed and Wanting* (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 16.

The people must be made to understand that the Ten Commandments are still binding, and that there is a penalty attached to their violation.

1685. Ten Commandments, Binding Today

SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, Weighed and Wanting (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 15.

The commandments of God given to Moses in the Mount at Horeb are as binding today as ever they have been since the time when they were proclaimed in the hearing of the people. The Jews said the law was not given in Palestine, (which belonged to Israel), but in the wilderness, because the law was for all nations.

Jesus never condemned the law and the prophets, but He did condemn those who did not obey them. Because He gave new commandments it does not follow that He abolished the old. Christ's explanation of them made them all the more searching. In His Sermon on the Mount He carried the principles of the commandments beyond the mere letter. He unfolded them and showed that they embraced more, that they are positive as well as prohibitive.

1686. Ten Commandments, Binding Upon Christian People

SOURCE: The Episcopal Church Sunday School Magazine, 105 (June–July, 1942), 183, 184.

[p. 183] We must understand that the Ten Commandments are just as binding upon Christian people as they were upon the Children of Israel...

The Moral Law is a part of the natural law of the universe... Just as a natural law broken in the material world brings its inevitable consequences, so the Moral Law broken brings its inevitable consequences in the spiritual and mental worlds.

The Lord Jesus knew this. He knew it much better than anyone else who ever lived. Therefore He built His Gospel upon a firm foundation of Moral Law, knowing that such a foundation [p. 184] can never be upset... Christ's teaching goes beyond the Ten Commandments, but does not thereby make the Commandments of non-effect. Quite the contrary! Christianity strengthens the authority of the Commandments.

1687. Ten Commandments, Catholic Catechism Abridges

SOURCE: Peter Geiermann, *The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine* (1957 ed.), pp. 37, 38. Copyright 1930 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

[p. 37] Q. Which are the Ten Commandments?

A. The Ten Commandments are:

- (1.) I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt not have strange gods before me.
- (2.) Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
- [p. 38] (3.) Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day.
- (4.) Honor thy father and thy mother.
- (5.) Thou shalt not kill.
- (6.) Thou shalt not commit adultery.
- (7.) Thou shalt not steal.
- (8.) Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.
- (9.) Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.
- (10.) Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods.

1688. Ten Commandments—Catholic Catechism Enlarges on Third

[i.e., Fourth]

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), pp. 41, 42.

[p. 41] Third Commandment of God. Thou shalt keep holy the Lord's day.

209. Which is the Lord's day?

Sunday, the first day of the week, is the Lord's day.

On Sunday, God the Father began the creation, God the Son arose from the dead, and the Holy Ghost descended from Heaven.—The Jews observed the last day of the week, the Sabbath, and the apostles, commissioned by our Lord Jesus Christ, substituted for it the first day, the Sunday.

210. Which days must we keep holy like the Sunday?

We must keep the Holydays of obligation holy like the Sunday.

211. Which are the Holydays of obligation in the United States?

The Holydays of obligation in the U.S. are:

- 1) The Immaculate Conception. December 8.
- 2) Christmas. December 25.
- 3) The Circumcision of our Lord. New Year's day.
- 4) The Ascension of our Lord. 40 days after Easter.
- 5) The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. August 15.
- 6) All Saints' Day. November 1.
 - 212. How must we keep holy the Sundays and Holydays of obligation? We must keep holy the Sundays and Holydays of obligation
- 1) by not doing any servile work,
- 2) by hearing Mass.

[p. 42] "Six days shalt thou labor, and shalt do all thy works. But on the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord, thy God: Thou shalt do no work on it (neither) thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy beast" (Exod. 20:9, 10).

Servile works = such as are usually done by servants and laborers. Permitted in case of *necessity*. Dispensation.

Application.

If you desire to have God's blessing, observe the Sunday. Do no unnecessary work. If possible, enter no service where you cannot observe the Sunday as you should. Remember: All depends on God's blessing.

1689. Ten Commandments, Divisions and Numbering of

SOURCE: A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture, on Exodus 20, p. 218. Copyright 1953 by Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York. Used by permission.

Two divisions of the commandments into ten are still found among Christians, q both derived from different Jewish divisions, one preferred by the Greeks and the other by the Latins. At the Reformation the Lutherans kept the Latin, the Calvinists adopted the Greek division. English Protestants took the Greek division from the Calvinists while Catholics retained the Latin one. The Hellenist Jews, Philo, Josephus, etc., so divided the commandments as to make the prohibition of images a distinct precept and combined the two prohibitions of evil desires into one precept. Origen who introduced this view into the Church attests the previous existence of a different one in which two precepts forbidding evil desires were recognized and one and the same precept forbade the worship of images and of strange gods. The Palestinian Jews, on the other hand, whose view is clearly defined in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, regarded Ex. 20:2 'I am Yahweh thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt and out of the house of bondage' as the first precept, the prohibition of the worship of strange gods and images as the second and the two prohibitions of evil desires as the tenth. The Christians therefore rightly rejected their first precept as an introduction to, not a part of the decalogue, retained their second as the first and divided their tenth into two forbidding two kinds of evil desires. St Augustine's exposition of this division secured its universal acceptance in the Latin Church.

The exceptical determination of the original division is complicated by a problem h in textual criticism. In Ex. 20:17 we read: Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house: Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife; in Deut 5:21: Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife: Thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's house. Sam. has the reading of Ex, LXX that of Deut in both passages. But Pap. Nash, though generally agreeing with Ex against Deut, has the reading of Deut in this passage. The intrinsic reasons in favour of Deut and two precepts of desire are still stronger. As two acts of adultery and theft are forbidden in two separate precepts and as adultery precedes theft in all texts, versions and NT allusions, so we expect the two corresponding desires to be mentioned in the same order and to be forbidden in two distinct precepts. The argument is strengthened by the fact that the indulgence of two distinct evil passions, licentiousness and covetousness, is proscribed and that *thou shalt not covet* appears twice in both texts. The passage in Ex moreover contains further evidence of textual corruption in the omission of his field, found in Deut and Pap. Nash and required by the parallelism of pairs: house and field, man-servant and maidservant, ox and ass.

i The case of *the first precept* is very different. Only images of strange gods were prohibited as appears not only from the words: *Thou shalt not adore them; thou shalt not serve them* (Ex 20:5*a*; Deut 5:7) but also from the cherubim (Ex 25:18) and the brazen serpent (Num 21:8) which Yahweh ordered to be made and from the mural decorations of the Jewish synagogues in the early Christian period as excavations abundantly attest.

There is question therefore not of a separate commandment which forbids the worship of all images but of an application of the precept forbidding the worship of strange gods. The prohibition of idols is found in the Book of the Covenant (20:23). It appears here in an amplified form (20:4–6) most probably as a later addition to the decalogue to illustrate and safeguard the first commandment. The Latin division of the commandments is thus the more reasonable one and the more likely to be original.

1690. Ten Commandments—First Four Applicable Today SOURCE: B. Davie Napier, "Jesus, and the Ten Commandments," The New Century Leader, 57 (October, 1956), 15.

The first four Commandments define the *minimum* requirements of a man's relationship with God: Thou shalt have no other gods ... no images ... Like all of the Commandments, these are not-as some in our own generation would have itapplicable only in the time of Moses, or the Biblical period. And Jesus knew this, and understood the subtle ways in all time by which men set up for themselves other gods.

1691. Ten Commandments—Foundation of New Testament Religion SOURCE: Earl L. Douglass, The Snowden-Douglass Sunday School Lessons; 1946, p. 279. Copyright 1945 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission of the author.

The basic laws of morality, and particularly the Ten Commandments, remain until the end of time as the moral and spiritual foundation upon which New Testament religion is built.

1692. Ten Commandments. Importance of. Alexander Campbell on SOURCE Alexander Campbell, in A Debate ... Between Alexander Campbell and John B. Purcell (Cincinnati: J. A. James & Co., 1837), p. 214.

God's ten WORDS ... not only in the Old Testament, but in all revelation, are the most emphatically regarded as the synopsis of all religion and morality.

1693. Ten Commandments. in New Testament

SOURCE: "Jesus and the Commandments," The New Century Leader, 59 (May, 1958), 21.

Because Jesus was so often in conflict with the religious teachers of his time, some have assumed that he disagreed with the Old Testament. He did say, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time... But I say unto you" (Matthew 5:27, 28). When, however, one takes a closer look at the old law and then compares it with the teachings of Jesus, he discovers that Jesus does not contradict the law but shows the deepest meaning and then converts the principle, given first as a prohibition to curb human sin, into a positive program of creative Christian action. Note the following comparisons:

- (1) No other gods
- Our Father (Matt. 6:9).
- (2)No images

God is a Spirit (John 4:24).

(3) No blasphemy

Hallowed be thy name (Matt. 6:9).

Keep the Sabbath (4)

The Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27).

Honor parents (5)

Treat all godly as parents (Matt. 12:50).

- No killing (6)
 - Be not angry (Matt. 5:22).
- (7) No adultery

Allow no lustful thoughts (Matt. 5:28).

(8) No stealing

Give to him that asks (Matt. 5:42).

(9) No false swearing

Speak simple truth (Matt. 5:37).

(10) No coveting

Covet righteousness (Matt. 5:6).

1694. Ten Commandments—Infidels and Skeptics Must Admit as Right SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, *Weighed and Wanting* (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 11.

Now men may cavil as much as they like about other parts of the Bible, but I have never met an honest man that found fault with the Ten Commandments. Infidels may mock the Lawgiver and reject Him who has delivered us from the curse of the law, but they can't help admitting that the commandments are right. Renan said that they are for all nations, and will remain the commandments of God during all the centuries.

If God created this world, He must make some laws to govern it. In order to make life safe we must have good laws; there is not a country the sun shines upon that does not possess laws. Now this is God's law. It has come from on high, and infidels and skeptics have to admit that it is pure.

1695. Ten Commandments, Luther Denies Rejecting

SOURCE: Martin Luther, "Wider die Antinomer ("Against the Antinomians")," secs. 6, 8, in his

Sämmtliche Schriften, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, Vol. 20 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), cols. 1613, 1614. German.

[col. 1613] I wonder exceedingly how it came to be imputed to me that I should reject the law or the ten commandments... [col. 1614] Can anyone think that sin exists where there is no law? Whoever abrogates the law, must of necessity abrogate sin also.

1696. Ten Commandments, Luther on

SOURCE: Martin Luther, "Wider die Sabbather ("Against the Sabbatarians")," in his Sämmtliche

Schriften, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, Vol. 20 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), col. 1852. German.

58. Lastly we want to speak also on the Ten Commandments, for the Jews perhaps too will call the Ten Commandments Moses' law because it is given on Mount Sinai, where there were then only Jews or Abraham's children, et cetera. Here you should answer: "If the Ten Commandments are to be called Moses' law, Moses came much too late; besides, he had far too few people before him. For the Ten Commandments were not only before Moses but also before Abraham and all the patriarchs, also they have gone over the whole world. Even if no Moses had ever come, and Abraham had not been born, still in all mankind the Ten Commandments would have had to reign from the beginning, as they have done and still do.

1697. Ten Commandments, Luther's Catechism on

SOURCE: Luther's Small Catechism (A.D. 1529), trans. in Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 77.

God threatens to punish all who transgress these Commandments [the Ten Commandments]: we should, therefore, fear his anger, and do nothing against such Commandments. But he promises grace and every blessing to all who keep them: we should, therefore, love and trust in him, and gladly obey his Commandments.

1698. Ten Commandments—Man's Duty Summarized

SOURCE: Earl L. Douglass, *The Snowden-Douglass Sunday School Lessons:* 1946, p. 17. Copyright 1945 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission of the author.

The Ten Commandments constitute a summary of the duties God requires of men. These commandments are the foundation which lies beneath the ethical life of humanity. They are as binding upon Christians today as they were upon the Hebrews who first received them.

1699. Ten Commandments, a Mirror to Show Our Need of Grace SOURCE: Billy Graham, in sermons on the Ten Commandments, quoted in George Burnham and Lee Fisher, *Billy Graham and the New York Crusade*, pp. 108, 109. Copyright 1957 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 108] Like Wesley, I find that I must preach the law and judgment before I can preach grace and love...

The Ten Commandments ... are the moral laws of God for the conduct of people. Some think they have been revoked. That is not true. Christ taught the law. They are still in effect today. God has not changed. People have changed...

Every person who ever lived, with the exception of Jesus Christ, has broken the Ten Commandments. Sin is a transgression of the law. The Bible says all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. The Ten Commandments are a mirror to show us how far short we fall in [p. 109] meeting God's standards. And the mirror of our shortcomings drives us to the Cross, where Christ paid the debt for sin. Forgiveness is found at the Cross, and no other place, according to the Bible...

God says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." You may not have any idols set up in your back yard, but there are idols in your life. Anything that comes before God is your idol. You spend more time reading the newspaper than you spend reading the Bible. You spend more time in front of the television set than you spend in church. Idols have crowded God out of your life. You just don't have time for Him any more.

Another Commandment says, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not which old him guiltless that taketh His name in vain." You may not curse God, but you take His name in vain when you profess to be a Christian and don't live like one. You take His name in vain when you defile your bodies, when you make vows and don't keep them, when you pray and don't believe God.

The Bible says, "Honor thy father and thy mother." Young people today think this is old-fashioned. God doesn't think it is old-fashioned. He commands that such respect be given.

The Scriptures say, "Thou shalt not kill." You may not have broken this Commandment with a gun or a knife, but you have broken it. If you have ever had hate in your heart, you are guilty. You can murder your own soul by denying or neglecting God. You can murder others by setting a bad example.

1700. Ten Commandments—Moral Law of God (Billy Graham on) SOURCE: Billy Graham, sermon in Times Square, quoted in George Burnham and Lee Fisher, *Billy Graham and the New York Crusade*, p. 191. Copyright 1957 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

This [the Ten Commandments] is God's moral law given through Moses. These Commandments express the requirements of a righteous God. To transgress even one of these Commandments is sin, the result of which is eternal separation from God. The whole human race has broken God's Law. That is why nations war and fight. Individuals who make up the nations are rebellious lawbreakers having no peace in their own lives and none in the world. Men for generations have fought, bled and died on thousands of battlefields simply because we refuse to keep God's Law.

I warn you tonight, there can be no peace until the Law is kept and there is no power within us to keep the Law. Human nature is bankrupt. That is why Christ came to give us a new nature and to set in motion forces that would bring about a new world order.

1701. Ten Commandments, Moral, Perpetual and Universal SOURCE: Timothy Dwight, *Theology: Explained and Defended* (Middletown, Conn.: Printed by Clark and Lyman, for Timothy Dwight, 1818), Vol. 4, pp. 2, 3.

[p. 2] The Moral Law is, in the most universal sense, binding on men of every age, and every country...

[p. 3] Is it not clear beyond every rational debate, that God designed to distinguish these precepts [the Ten Commandments] from every other part of the Mosaic *law*, both as to their superior importance, and their perpetuity? Is it not incredible, ... unless he intended, that all, to whom these precepts should come, that is, all Jews and Christians, or all who should afterwards read the Scriptures, should regard these Commands as possessing that very importance, which he thus significantly gave them; should consider them as being, in a peculiar sense, his law; and hold them as being perpetually, and universally, obligatory?

1702. Ten Commandments, Morality of, Defined

SOURCE: Earl L. Douglass, *Snowden's Sunday School Lessons: 1943*, p. 290. Copyright 1942 by the Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission of the author.

The Ten Commandments constitute the basis of all morality. They did not originate morality; they defined it. They can really be said to constitute ten sides of God's great moral system.

1703. Ten Commandments, the Most Perfect Moral Code

SOURCE: The Augsburg Sunday School Teacher, 63 (August, 1937), 483.

God gave the Ten Commandments, first by word of mouth and then on tables of stone. They are not discoveries that men made. They are from heaven, and indicate the nature and purpose of God Himself. "The Decalogue is the most perfect code of laws existing. Its simplicity, comprehensiveness, ethical depths, and universal character stamp it as divine; and in its majestic simplicity, supplying the highest and best demands of the human heart, it may well be placed beside that other divine production, the Lord's Prayer."

1704. Ten Commandments, Not Abolished With Ritual System SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, *Weighed and Wanting* (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 14.

The commandments did not originate with Moses, nor were they done away with when the Mosaic Law was fulfilled in Christ, and many of its ceremonies and regulations abolished.

1705. Ten Commandments—Obedience to All Ten Required

SOURCE: G. Campbell Morgan, The Ten Commandments (New York: Revell, 1901), p. 11.

In the Epistle of James is found a word of deep significance. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all," (ii.10)... Herein lies the explanation of the apparent severity of Jame's utterance. Men are apt to think that if there be ten commandments, of which they obey nine, such obedience will be put to their credit, even though they break the tenth.

1706. Ten Commandments, One Law

SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, Weighed and Wanting (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 119.

These ten commandments are not ten different laws; they are one law. If I am being held up in the air by a chain with ten links and I break one of them, down I come, just as surely as if I break the whole ten. If I am forbidden to go out of an enclosure, it makes no difference at what point I break through the fence. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." "The golden chain of obedience is broken if one link is missing."

1707. Ten Commandments—Why Negative

SOURCE: B. Davie Napier, "Jesus, and the Ten Commandments," *The New Century Leader*, 57 (October, 1956), 15.

The cold facts are that we cannot—and should not—totally eliminate the negative...

There seems no way on earth by which we can avoid imposing certain absolute prohibitions on our children. There are certain "commandments of the household" which can only be stated negatively and which *are* absolutes—that is, under *no* circumstances are they subject to change or waiver. They apply at all times, in every home. Thou shalt not play with fire ... razor blades ... medicines. Thou shalt not strike a playmate with any object that could inflict injury. Thou shalt not use thy brother's or thy sister's or thy father's or thy mother's things without permission. And any parent could extend the list, with full agreement from all other parents. To be sure, these commandments may on occasion be broken, always to the parents' consternation, and sometimes to the injury of persons or property. But they are known as absolutes, as unalterable laws, and the consequences of their violation are seldom regarded as unjust...

Suppose we look for a moment at the Ten Commandments. They are, for the most part, negative statements. But like our commandments of the household, these are all fundamental, all in the nature of absolutes, all universally applicable and unmodifiable in any "household of faith"! This is to say that there is nothing *relative* about them, that is, there are *no* circumstances under which they can be disregarded. And they are Godgiven.

1708. Thomas Aquinas—Nature of Teaching

SOURCE: *Henry Bettenson*, Introductory note on Aquinas, in *Documents of the Christian Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 199. Used by permission.

Scholasticism reached its height in the writings of the Dominican friar, Thomas of Aquino, 'The Angelic Doctor.' His systematic exposition of the Catholic Faith in terms of Aristotelian philosophy produced a revolution in Christian thought, for Augustine and Anselm, the Christian thinkers in general before Aquinas, had regarded Platonism as the specifically Christian philosophy. In the thirteenth century the works of Aristotle became known through the writings of the Arabian philosophers, Avicenna and Averrhoës, and the Jew Maimonides, and the translations and commentaries of such men as Albert of Cologne and Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln. At first the students of Aristotle were suspected of 'Averrhoist' heresy (the chief error of which was the reduction of God to a mere First Cause, latent in the uncreated and eternal universe), but the modified

Aristotelianism which was the foundation of the monumental *Summa Theologica* of Aquinas soon won acceptance, and the teaching of Aquinas was set up by Leo XIII as the

classical exposition of Catholic Doctrine.

1709. Tillich, Views of, Summarized

SOURCE: Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-day Theologians are Thinking* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1959), pp. 67–69. Copyright 1959 by Daniel Day Williams. Used by permission.

[p. 67] If one takes up the first volume of Tillich's *Systematic Theology* and looks at it side by side with Barth or with Brunner's *Dogmatic*, they appear as different as night from day. Where Barth and Brunner depend upon continued reference to Biblical sources and work out theology in closest relation to a systematic Biblical exegesis, Tillich's work seems filled with philosophical terms. He discusses God only after he has clarified the metaphysical meaning of being and nonbeing. He discusses sin in relation to an existential analysis of anxiety. Anxiety is interpreted in relation to the metaphysical structures of space, time, causality and substance. This weaving together of theology and philosophy is the key to Tillich's method. His aim is to produce an apologetic theology [p. 68] which will bring the Christian message into specific relation with the ways in which contemporary man understands his experience.

Tillich's solution of the problem of apologetics is to develop what he calls the method of "correlation." This means that the Gospel is to be shown to give answers to the questions which man asks in his attempt to find the meaning of life. We cannot look to philosophy for the real truth about God or the way of salvation.

"The problem of correlation cannot be solved by another attempt to build a natural theology. Human existence does not involve answers to the question of man's relation to God; it involves the question."

What the theologian has to do is to show how man's existence as a finite creature drives him to the question of ultimate being, that is to the question of God. Man's existence in anxiety raises the question of a courage which can overcome anxiety. Man's ultimate concern to know the infinite reality beyond his finite existence raises the question of a final revelation which judges all preliminary grasp of the divine.

The norm for Christian thought then cannot be found in philosophy or in any other kind of human resource. It is given to the Christian in the final revelation in Jesus Christ. But we see how the method of correlation puts the problem of the norm in a new way. The meaning of Jesus Christ cannot be stated in Biblical terms alone. It must be stated as the answer to the questions raised by human philosophical and religious searching. Both the form of the question and the form of the Christian answer are determined in part by the form in which the question is asked. This is why Tillich's systematic theology is so heavily freighted with a philosophical analysis of the structure of being. As theologian he interprets man's life philosophically in order to show how the Christian message overcomes that separation between man and God which all philosophy reveals. The one literal state- [p. 69] ment man can make about God takes a philosophical form. God is "being itself."

1710. Tithing, Recognition of God's Ownership of All SOURCE: Charles A. Cook, *Stewardship and Missions* (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1908), p. 118. Copyright 1908 by A. J. Rowland. Used by permission.

Tithing is an expression of our stewardship in giving. We tithe in recognition of God's ownership of the whole, just as a tenant pays rent in recognition of the landlord's ownership of, or rights in, the house or farm. Paying rent entitles the tenant to use the house or farm, but it does not constitute him the owner of it. The tithe is paid not simply because it is the Lord's, but because all one has, or acquires, is his. Paying tithes does not constitute a man the owner of the nine-tenths that are left. God's rights in the remainder are just the same as before the tenth is paid. He owns it. It is written, "The tithe is the Lord's." It is also written, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," and "the silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts."

1711. Tobacco, and Athletics

SOURCE: Gene Tunney, "Nicotine Knockout, or the Slow Count," *Reader's Digest*, 39 (December, 1941), 21. Copyright 1941 by The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, New York. Used by permission.

It's over 13 years since I retired from the Heavyweight Championship. But here's a challenge: If Joe Louis will start smoking, and promise to inhale a couple of packages of cigarettes every day for six months, I'll engage to lick him in 15 rounds Of course, Joe wouldn't be foolish enough to meet my terms. No boxer, no athlete in training smokes. He knows that whenever nerves, muscles, heart and brain are called upon for a supreme effort, the tobacco-user is the first to fold.

1712. Tobacco, and Coronary Thrombosis

SOURCE: *Report of the Study Group on Atherosclerosis and Ischaemic Heart Disease* (World Health Organization Technical Report Series, No. 117. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1957), p. 21. Used by permission.

Two independent large-scale studies on the role of tobacco in cancer of the lung state as an incidental finding that heavy smokers have higher death-rates from coronary thrombosis.

1713. Tobacco, and Lung Cancer

SOURCE: Leroy E. Burney, "Smoking and Lung Cancer," *JAMA*, 171 (Nov. 28, 1959), 1835, 1836. Copyright 1959 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

[p. 1835] 1. The weight of evidence at present implicates smoking as the principal etiological [causative] factor in the increased incidence of lung cancer. 2. Cigarette [p. 1836] smoking particularly is associated with an increased chance of developing lung cancer. 3. Stopping cigarette smoking even after long exposure is beneficial. 4. No method of treating tobacco or filtering the smoke has been demonstrated to be effective in materially reducing or eliminating the hazard of lung cancer. 5. The nonsmoker has a lower incidence of lung cancer than the smoker in all controlled studies, whether analyzed in terms of rural areas, urban regions, industrial occupations, or sex. 6. Persons who have never smoked at all (cigarettes, cigars, or pipe) have the best chance of escaping lung cancer. 7. Unless the use of tobacco can be made safe, the individual person's risk of lung cancer can best be reduced by the elimination of smoking.

1714. Tobacco, and Lung Cancer

SOURCE: "What We Know Now About Smoking and Health," *Consumer Reports*, 63 (December, 1958), 635. Copyright 1958 by Consumer Union of U.S., Inc., Mount Vernon, N.Y. Used by permission.

If no special commercial interests were at stake, there probably would be little disagreement that heavy cigarette smoking is *one of the factors* responsible for lung cancer and that every effort should be made to identify and eliminate from cigarettes all substances carcinogenic to any animal and to persuade cigarette smokers to practice moderation or abstinence.

1715. Tobacco, Causes Disease and Shortens Life

SOURCE: Richard H. Overholt, M.D., "Filters—the 'Inside' Story," *Smoke Signals*, 6 (April–June, 1960), 2.

Smokers (1) find it necessary to consult doctors more often, (2) require hospitalization with greater frequency, and (3) fail to respond to treatment of such diseases as bronchitis, tuberculosis, diabetes, and heart trouble as promptly as nonsmokers. Finally, there is a differential in the life expectancy for smokers and nonsmokers. In men over fifty the latter group lives longer by approximately nine years.

1716. Tobacco—Cigarettes—Effect on Heart Patients

SOURCE: Paul Dudley White and others, *Rehabilitation of the Cardiovascular Patient*, p. 120. Copyright © 1958 by McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

It is well known that smoking may cause peripheral vasoconstriction, increase the pulse rate, and elevate the blood pressure. In the presence of coronary disease, abnormal ballistocardiograms may be observed in over 60 per cent of patients following smoking. Fewer patients, however, have abnormal ballistocardiograms after exercise comparable to the double Master's test. It seems reasonable, therefore, to assume that smoking a package of cigarettes may cause considerable circulatory distress, perhaps as much as that caused by climbing as many as 20 flights of stairs.

1717. Tobacco—Cigarettes Raise Death Rate

SOURCE: E. Cuyler Hammond and Daniel Horn, "The Relationship Between Human Smoking Habits and Death Rates," *JAMA*, 155 (Aug. 7, 1954), 1328. Copyright 1954 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

It was found [in a study of 187,766 men] that men with a history of regular cigarette smoking have a considerably higher death rate than men who have never smoked or men who have smoked only cigars or pipes...

Disease of the coronary arteries was indicated as the primary cause of death...

1718. Tobacco—Coronary Thrombosis and Smoking

SOURCE: Richard Doll and A. Bradford Hill, "Lung Cancer and Other Causes of Death in Relation to Smoking," *British Medical Journal* (Nov. 10, 1956), p. 1081. Used by permission.

If the causes of death as certified are accepted at their face value, mortality from coronary thrombosis reveals a ... significant relationship with smoking.

1719. Tobacco—Death Rate in Cardiovascular Disease

SOURCE: "Smoking and Health" (joint report), *Science*, 125 (June 7, 1957), 1129. Reprinted from *Science* by permission.

At least three statistical investigations show an association of tobacco smoking with a decrease in longevity, probably referable to a higher risk, for male smokers, of dying from cardiovascular disease. The mortality among smokers in certain age groups is reported to be approximately double that of the non-smokers...

Cardiovascular diseases account for well over half of all adult male deaths. Even a relatively small proportionate excess in the cardiovascular death rate could, therefore, contribute a larger number of deaths than a much larger excess in the lung cancer death rate.

1720. Tobacco—Effect on Cardiovascular System

SOURCE: Ellen McDevitt and Irving S. Wright, "The Cardiovascular System," in *The Biologic Effects of Tobacco*, ed. by Ernest L. Wynder, p. 94. Copyright 1955 by Little, Brown and Company, Boston.

Nicotine is the most noxious agent affecting the cardiovascular system in man thus far isolated from tobacco. It is present in varying amounts in all forms of tobacco. Neither protective filters nor denicotinization to the degree now practiced have eliminated the deleterious effect of tobacco on the cardiovascular system.

1721. Tobacco—Filters

SOURCE: Richard H. Overholt, M.D., "Filters—the 'Inside' Story," *Smoke Signals*, 6 (April–June, 1960), 1, 2.

[p. 1] For a filter to be truly protective, all the tar and the nicotine would have to be removed, leaving nothing but clean hot air to inhale. It is obvious, however, that if the smoker is to get some taste and pleasure, the filter must let some smoke through. Much research, money, time, and effort have been spent on reducing the nicotine and tar content without detracting from the pleasure of smoking...

[p. 2] While nature's filter, the lung, is attempting to take out the tars and nicotine which escape the filter in the cigarette, there are disturbances locally and generally. These are effects of wear and tear at the point of entry and at the point of exit. These might be termed local troubles. After years of smoke inhalation, there often is an aggravation of emphysema (loss of absorptive membranes), and certainly there is an acceleration of cancer. With the former, oxygen absorption is impaired. Shortness of breath, wheezing, easy fatigue, and dizziness are common manifestations. Both conditions occur with ten times the frequency in smokers as in non-smokers.

1722. Tobacco—Smoker a Victim of Drug Addiction SOURCE: Richard H. Overholt, M.D., "Filters—the 'Inside' Story," *Smoke Signals*, 6 (April–June, 1960), 1,

[p. 1] The basis of the physical joy in smoking is a drug effect. There is a specific pharmacologic action. The body of the long-term smoker requires a replenished supply for a feeling of well-being. He is the victim of a drug addiction. The smoker who shifts from regular cigarettes to filters actually, in most cases, increases his daily consumption of cigarettes by [p. 2] the same percentage that the filter has extracted nicotine from each cigarette smoked. The addiction is then kept smoldering, and satisfaction comes only by increasing the number of the cigarettes smoked so that the total daily nicotine requirement will be satisfied. The filter was, therefore, a wise choice as far as the industry is concerned. It has resulted in a higher consumption of cigarettes by those who have continued to smoke. This, together with the intensified advertising campaign among young people, has more than offset losses of sales to those who quit smoking.

1723. Tobacco—Smoking and Death Rate

SOURCE: E. Cuyler Hammond and Daniel Horn, "Smoking and Death Rates—Report on Forty-four Months of Follow-up of 187,783 Men," *JAMA*, 166 (March 8, 1958), 1159. Copyright 1958 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

This report gives an analysis of death rates in relation to the smoking habits of 187,783 men who have been traced for an average of 44 months. The first results of the study were presented when the subjects had been traced for 20 months. The major findings at that time were that (1) the death rate of cigarette smokers was far higher than the death rate of men who had never smoked cigarettes, and (2) deaths ascribes to cancer accounted for about one-quarter of the excess deaths ascribed to coronary artery disease accounted for over one-half the excess.

1724. Tradition, as Defined by Roman Catholics

SOURCE: Joseph Faà di Bruno, *Catholic Belief*, rev. by Louis A. Lambert (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884), pp. 39, 40.

[p. 39] By TRADITION we do not mean a mere report, a hearsay, wanting sufficient evidence to deserve belief; or a local tradition started by men, and therefore merely human, as were those traditions of the Pharisees condemned by our [p. 40] Lord; but we mean a Tradition first coming from God, continually taught, recorded, and in all desirable ways kept alive by a body of trustworthy men successively chosen in a divine, or divinely appointed manner, well instructed, and who are, as a body, protected by God from

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

teaching what is wrong, or handing down unfaithfully to others the doctrine committed to them.

1725. Tradition, as Held in the Catholic Church

SOURCE: Francis J. Butler, *Holy Family Series of Catholic Catechisms* (Boston: Thomas J. Flynn & Co., 1904), p. 63 [FRS No. 2.]

Some of the truths which God has revealed and which have always been taught by the Catholic Church, are not contained in the Bible. These truths have come down to us by what is called oral tradition; that is, they have been handed down by word of mouth. By Catholic Tradition, therefore, we understand all those truths which the Church received from Jesus Christ and the Apostles, but which are not found in the Bible. These truths we firmly believe, because they were revealed by God and are proposed to us by the Church.

Some of the truths that have been handed down to us by Tradition and are not recorded in the Sacred Scripture, are the following: that there are just seven Sacraments; that there is a Purgatory; that, in the New Law, Sunday should be kept holy instead of the Sabbath; that infants should be baptized, and that there are precisely seventy-two books in the Bible.

The truths of Catholic Tradition have been handed down in the Church by means of the writings of the "Fathers of the Church," as well as by the decrees of Councils, by approved Creeds and by the prayers and ceremonies of the Church. These ancient writings and institutions show plainly what has been the faith of the Church from the earliest times.

However, it is only the infallible teaching of the Church that secures us against error as to the truths contained in Tradition as well as in Holy Scripture. The voice of the Church is the voice of God.

1726. Tradition, Bible and

SOURCE: John Milton, "Of Prelatical Episcopacy," in *The Prose Works of John Milton*, Vol. 2 (London: George Bell and Sons, 1888), p. 424.

Thus while we leave the Bible to gad after the traditions of the ancients, we hear the ancients themselves confessing, that what knowledge they had in this point was such as they had gathered from the Bible.

Since therefore antiquity itself hath turned over the controversy to that sovereign book which we had fondly straggled from, we shall do better not to detain this venerable apparition of Leontius [the representative of apostolical tradition] any longer.

1727. Tradition, Bible and, Regarded by Catholics as of Equal Value SOURCE: John Laux, *A Course in Religion for Catholic High Schools and Academies*, part 1, pp. 50, 51. Copyright 1936 by Benziger Brothers, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 43.]

[p. 50] Since the truths contained in Scripture and those handed down by Tradition both come from God, Scripture and Tradition are of equal value as sources of faith. Both deserve the same reverence and respect. Each alone is sufficient to establish a truth of our holy faith...

[p. 51] Scripture and Tradition are called the *remote rule of faith*, because the Catholic does not base his faith *directly* on these sources. The *proximate rule of faith* is for him the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, which alone has received from God the authority to interpret infallibly the doctrines He has revealed, whether these be contained in Scripture or in Tradition.

1728. Tradition, Bible and, Regarded by Catholics as of Same Authority

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session IV (April 8, 1546), Decree Concerning the Canonical Scriptures, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 79, 80.

[p. 79] The sacred and holy, oecumenical, and general Synod of Trent,—lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost,—... [p. 80] seeing clearly that this truth and discipline [of the gospel] are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand: [the Synod] following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ's own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession.

1729. Tradition, Catholic Dependence Upon

SOURCE: Joseph Faà di Bruno, *Catholic Belief*, rev. by Louis A. Lambert (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884), p. 45. [FRS No. 55.]

Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine Tradition contain the Word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths.

Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two, TRADITION is to us more clear and safe.

1730. Tradition, Early Development of, in Christianity

SOURCE: Tertullian, *The Chaplet* (Latin, *De Corona*), chaps. 3, 4, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, pp. 94, 95. [p. 94] CHAP. III...

Let us inquire, therefore, whether tradition, unless it be written [see No. 1725] should not be admitted. Certainly we shall say that it ought not to be admitted, if no cases of other practices which, without any written instrument, we maintain on the ground of tradition alone, and the countenance thereafter of custom, affords us any precedent. To deal with this matter briefly, I shall begin with baptism. When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the president, we solemnly profess that we disown the devil, and his pomp, and his angels. Hereupon we are thrice immersed, making a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the Gospel. Then, when we are taken up (as newborn children), we taste first of all a mixture of milk and honey, and from that day we refrain from the daily bath for a whole week. We take also, in congregations before daybreak, and from the hand of none but the presidents, the sacrament of the Eucharist, which the Lord both commanded to be eaten at meal-times, and enjoined to be taken by all alike. As often as the anniversary comes round, we make offerings for the dead as birthday honours. We count fasting or kneeling in worship on the Lord's day to be unlawful. We rejoice in the same privilege also from Easter to Whitsunday. We feel pained should any wine or bread, even though our own, be cast upon the ground. At every forward step and movement, at every going in and out, when we put on our clothes and shoes, when we bathe, when we sit at table, when we light the lamps, on couch, on [p. 95] seat, in all the ordinary actions of daily life, we trace upon the forehead the sign [of the cross].

CHAP. iv.

If, for these and other such rules, you insist upon having positive Scripture injunction, you will find none. Tradition will be held forth to you as the originator of them, custom as their strengthener, and faith as their observer.

1731. Tradition, Protestants Accused of Following

SOURCE: Bertrand L. Conway, *The Question-Box Answers* (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 75, 76. Issued earlier by "The Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle in the State of New York." [FRS No. 6.]

[p. 75] Because the origin of our faith is not the Bible alone, but the Church which gives us both the written and the unwritten word...

So in the New Law, Catholics believe some things not in the Scriptures, although wholly in accord with them, because of the infallible witness of the Church as to their divine or apostolic origin. Why do Protestants accept the Scriptures as inspired? Why do they honor the first day of the week instead of the seventh? Why do they baptize children? Contrary to their principles, they must look outside the Bible to the voice of tradition, [p. 76] which is not human, but divine, because guaranteed by the divine, infallible witness of the Catholic Church.

1732. Transubstantiation, as Defined by Council of Trent

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIII (Oct. 11, 1551), Decree Concerning the Eucharist, chap. 4, trans. in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 74. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

And because that Christ our Redeemer declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own Body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy synod doth now declare it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and of the wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood; which conversion is by the holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation.

1733. Transubstantiation, as Defined by Medieval Monk

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History (1st ed.), pp. 146, 147. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 146] The doctrine of transubstantiation was first rather clearly stated by the monk Radbertus in the ninth century, and the word was coined in the twelfth. It meant that the real substance of the bread and wine was changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ while their qualities (or "accidents") as known to the senses, remained unchanged. Ever since Plato and Aristotle there has been philosophical argument about the nature of the "substance" or "essence" of existing reality in general and of particular things. It is, indeed, one of the fundamental problems of philosophy. One way of looking at it was to say that every material object as known consists of an inner "substance," which constitutes its reality or essence, and certain "qualities" which alone can be known by the senses. The "substance," as that which "stands under" the qualities and holds them together so that they form a knowable object, cannot itself be observed by the senses. It was therefore conceivable that, by pure miracle, one "substance" could be substituted for another while the sensible qualities remained as they had been. Belief that such a "transubstantiation" has actually occurred is an act of pure faith, for it can be neither proved nor disproved by observation, since, by defini- [p. 147] tion, it is only the unchanged "qualities" of the bread and wine that can be observed.

With this sharper definition of the doctrine and with greater emphasis on the concept of the Mass as a continuation of the sacrifice on Calvary-that is, the continued offering of the flesh of the victim that had been slain once for all—came the more extensive use of the Mass as a means of conferring spiritual benefits upon any to whom they were directed by the officiating priest, and as a meritorious offering to God having a definite value whether or not any communicants received the elements. Three results of this view were: infrequent communion: the giving of only the bread to the laity, since the entire substance of the body and blood was declared to be present in the smallest particle of either the bread or wine when duly consecrated, and the reservation of the consecrated bread and wine for worship in the "adoration of the Host."

1734. Transubstantiation, as It Is Explained by Catholic Catechism SOURCE: W. Faerber, Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), p. 72.

343. What power did Jesus give His Apostles when He said: "Do this for a commemoration of Me?"

By the words: "Do this for a commemoration of Me," Jesus gave His Apostles the power to do what He had done, namely; to change bread and wine into His Body and Blood.

344. Who received from the Apostles the power of changing bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ?

The bishops and priests received from the Apostles the power of changing bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ.

345. When do the bishops and priests change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ?

The bishops and priests change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ in the holy sacrifice of Mass.

After the consecration, what is on the altar in the place of bread and wine? 346. After the consecration there is on the altar in the place of bread and wine the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

347 What remains of the bread and wine after consecration?

Only the appearance of the bread and wine remain after consecration...

At all times and in all places there have been sacrifices. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel, of Noah, of Abraham. The pagans also have sacrifices. In the old law, God prescribed in detail the sacrifices of clean animals. These were figures of the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; therefore imperfect sacrifices. Which is the perfect sacrifice? *358*.

The perfect sacrifice is the sacrifice on the Cross, in which Jesus Christ offered Himself to His heavenly Father.

The visible gift was Jesus Himself. He was also the priest. The Cross was the altar.

Is the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross still offered? 359.

The sacrifice of Christ on the Cross is still offered in every Mass.

Transubstantiation, Catechism of Trent on 1735.

SOURCE: Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 228, 229. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 228] Pastors, aware of the warning of the Apostle that those who discern not the body of the Lord are guilty of a most grave crime, should first of all impress on the minds of the faithful the necessity of detaching, as much as possible, their mind and understanding from the dominion of the senses; for if they believe that this Sacrament

contains only what the senses disclose, they will of necessity fall into enormous impiety. Consulting the sight, the touch, the smell, the taste and finding nothing but the appearances of bread and wine, they will naturally judge that this Sacrament contains nothing more than bread and wine. Their minds, therefore, are as much as possible to be withdrawn from subjection to the senses and excited to the contemplation of the stupendous might and power of God.

The Catholic Church firmly believes and professes that in this Sacrament the words of consecration accomplish three wondrous and admirable effects.

The first is that the true body of Christ the Lord, the same that was born of the Virgin, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is contained in this Sacrament.

The second, however repugnant it may appear to the senses, is that none of the substance of the elements remains in the Sacrament.

The third, which may be deduced from the two preceding, although the words of consecration themselves clearly express [p. 229] it, is that the accidents which present themselves to the eyes or other senses exist in a wonderful and ineffable manner without a subject. All the accidents of bread and wine we can see, but they inhere in no substance, and exist independently of any; for the substance of the bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord that they altogether cease to be the substance of bread and wine.

1736. Transubstantiation, Council of Trent of Meaning of SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIII (Oct. 11, 1551), On the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, canons 1–4, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 136, 137.

[p. 136] CANON I.—If any one denieth, that, in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but saith that he is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or virtue: let him be anathema.

CANON II.—If any one saith, that, in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood—the species only of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion indeed the Catholic [p. 137] Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation: let him be anathema.

CANON III.—If any one denieth, that, in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated: let him be anathema.

CANON IV.—If any one saith, that, after the consecration is completed, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable sacrament of the Eucharist, but [are there] only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after; and that, in the hosts, or consecrated particles, which are reserved or which remain after communion, the true body of the Lord remaineth not: let him be anathema. [Brackets in the translation.]

1737. Transubstantiation — Development of Theory

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929), Vol. I, pp. 102–104. Used by permission.

[p. 102] The earliest records are too vague to enable us to affirm clearly how far *This is my body, This is my blood,* were at first taken figuratively, and how far they were taken literally. Justin Martyr and Ignatius use language which is claimed by one party as implying the literal, by another the figurative, sense of the words. St. Augustine, often as he recurs to the subject, leaves us in still worse doubt—or, rather, inclines distinctly in favour of the figurative interpretation².

[Note 2: Harnack maintains that his doctrine was essentially that of the Swiss reformer Zwingli, and therefore more Protestant than Luther's. *The Catholic Encyclopedia* can only plead that this is a "rather hasty conclusion"; and the long and disjointed argument which it opposes to Harnack will hardly carry conviction to unbiassed readers. Moreover, the writer has not verified his references, which are very confused; and one, which he quotes as conclusive in favour of his own view, is followed a few lines later by words which flatly contradict it:

Definition of *Cath. Encyc.* (v, 575 a). "The Body given to the Apostles [at the Last Supper] was the self-same Body that was crucified on Good Friday; and the Chalice drunk by them, the self-same Blood that was shed on the Cross for our sins."

Augustine, *Enarr. in Psalmum* XCVIII, § 9 (following the words appealed to in *Cath. Encyc.* p. 577). Christ at the Last Supper instructed His Apostles, saying, "Understand spiritually that which I have spoken; ye are not about to eat this Body which ye see, nor are ye about to drink this Blood which those men shall shed who will crucify Me."]...

[p. 103] That doctrine crystallized very slowly. Not until 787 did the Eastern Church commit itself to a clear conciliar decision, [p. 104] at Nicaea, in favour of the Real Presence; and the West was tardier still. Western bishops had attended this Ecumenical Council of Nicaea; yet, about 855 A.D., it was possible for one of the most distinguished western theologians, the Benedictine Ratramnus, to deny the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, resting mainly upon St Augustine; and a series of Benedictine theologians, during the next 80 years, agreed more or less definitely with Ratramnus. As late as 1050, the well-known Berengar of Tours combated the theory of Transubstantiation; but it was definitely consecrated by the scholastic theology of the twelfth century; and at last it was dogmatically proclaimed by Innocent III at the great Lateran Council of 1215. The first decree of that Council asserts that "Christ's body and blood is truly contained in the Sacrament of the Altar under the appearance of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into His body, and the wine into His blood by God's power." The Council of Trent defined further, that not only the bread became Christ's body and the wine His blood, but that every particle of the consecrated wafer, when broken, contained the whole God-man, body, blood and soul: "really and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ"; from which it necessarily follows (as the Middle Ages had decided from the thirteenth century onwards), that the Consecrated Host must be adored with exactly the same adoration which would be given to the God-Christ if He appeared visibly before His worshippers.

1738. Transubstantiation—Worship of Christ in the Host, as God SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIII (Oct. 11, 1551), On the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, can. 6, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 137, 138.

[p. 137] If any one saith, that, in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the onlybegotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external of latria [worship due to God alone]; and is, consequently, neither to be venerated with a special festive solemnity, nor to be solemnly borne about in procession, accord- [p. 138] ing to the laudable and universal rite and custom of holy Church; or, is not to be proposed publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters: let him be anathema.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This doctrine of transubstantiation is presented to the people in its most literal sense. The Catholic believes as firmly as the Protestant that worshiping a piece of bread is idolatry, but he believes that the host is not bread but has been changed to the actual body of Christ. Hence he speaks of worshiping "Christ in the tabernacle" (that is, in the container in which the sacramental wafer is kept on the altar), and he genuflects toward the altar and bows as the host is carried past in processions, because he believes that he is thus paying homage to Christ Himself.]

1739. Trent, Council of, Catechism of—Original and Authority SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests,* trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), Introduction, pp. xxxiii, xxxv, xxxvi. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. xxxiii] The Roman Catechism is unlike any other summary of Christian doctrine, not only because it is intended for the use of priests in their preaching, but also because it enjoys a unique authority among manuals. In the first place, as already explained, it was issued by the express command of the Ecumenical Council of Trent, which also ordered that it be translated into the vernacular of different nations to be used as a standard source for preaching. Moreover it subsequently received the unqualified approval of many Sovereign Pontiffs...

[p. xxxv] Salmanticenses, the great Carmelite commentators on St. Thomas, paid the following high tribute to the Catechism: "The authority of this Catechism has always been of the greatest in the Church, because it was composed by the command of the Council of Trent, because its authors were men of highest learning, and because it was approved only after the severest scrutiny by Popes Pius V and Gregory XIII, and has been recommended in nearly all the Councils that have been held since the Council of Trent."

[p. xxxvi] Doctor John Hagan, the present Rector of the Irish College in Rome, writes thus: "The Roman Catechism is a work of exceptional authority. At the very least it has the same authority as a dogmatic Encyclical,—it is an authoritative exposition of Catholic doctrine given forth, and guaranteed to be orthodox by the Catholic Church and her supreme head on earth...

Its teaching is not infallible; but it holds a place between approved catechisms and what is *de fide*."

1740. Tribulation, of Last Days

SOURCE: George L. Murray, *Millennial Studies*, p. 130. Copyright 1948 by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

For the sake of better understanding, it might be plainly stated that we do not deny that there shall be great tribulation toward the end of the Gospel age. Those who have spiritual discernment can already hear the rumblings which betoken the loosening of an avalanche of apostasy. As it gains momentum, life will become increasingly difficult for those who remain steadfast in the faith, and loyal to Jesus Christ. Some of them are already paying a price for their devotion to Him.

The professing church is gradually, but surely, concentrating its endeavors on carnal organization which shall presumably embrace all of Christendom. The indications of ecclesiastical regimentation are everywhere in evidence. The question of questions is whether the world organization shall be under the direction of Christ, or of Antichrist. The history of ecclesiastical mergers does not justify the hope of world revival under a world church. The alternative is worldwide apostasy.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The view that there will be a time of tribulation preceding the Second Advent has been generally held, though not necessarily the specific form of the view that sees the great tribulation of 31/2 times caused by the Antichrist as applying to this time. This latter theory is held today by premillennialists of the futurist school, who are divided, however, as to whether the church is to be bodily removed from this tribulation by the "pretribulation rapture" or is to remain on earth through it (the post-tribulationist view). See Nos. 1524, 1526n.]

1741. Tyre, Ancient and Modern

SOURCE: Wallace B. Fleming, *The History of Tyre* (Vol. 10 of Columbia University Oriental Studies), p. x. Copyright © 1915 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

Allusions to Tyre are to be found in the writings of the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Persians, the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans of the ancient times, and in a few meager fragments of their own writing. In the medieval period to the close of the Crusades, the sources of information are the Latin, the Greek, the Arabic, the French and the Hebrew. The Crusaders left their principal records in Latin and French. From the close of the Crusades there is scarcely any story to tell, for Tyre lay in utter ruins. For this period we have the notes of pilgrims and travelers. The present petty town of Sur has arisen since the Mutowalis occupied the district in 1766 A.D. Its humble story presents little difficulty, but it is connected with the Tyre of history in location and name only.

[EDITORS' NOTE: A footnote on the same page quotes Renan, *Mission de Ph,nicie* (IV, 1). He says (translated): "I do not think that any great city that played, through the centuries, a role of the first order has left fewer traces than Tyre."]

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1742. Unitarian Universalist Association (Formed in 1961 by the Merger of the American Unitarian Association and the Universalist Church of America)

a. Unitarian Churches

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1622, 1623.

[p. 1622] *History*. Unitarianism may be defined in the most general terms as the religious doctrine of those holding belief in one God in one person (as distinguished from the Trinitarian belief in one God in three persons) and the related belief in the strict humanity of Jesus (as contrasted with the belief in His deity). While Unitarians assert that these beliefs were held in the first Christian centuries, before ever the Trinitarian dogmas were developed, yet the Unitarianism of today originated historically in the first half century of the Protestant Reformation. In one form or another it was espoused in the sixteenth century by a number of Anabaptist leaders and by numerous independent thinkers in Italy or Switzerland. Its most influential leaders on the Continent, where it was variously known as Arianism, Socinianism, or Unitarianism, were Michael Servetus in Switzerland, Faustus Socinus in Poland, and Francis David in Transylvania.

In England Unitarianism gradually developed during the eighteenth century, largely under Socinian influences, and chiefly among the Presbyterian churches, though there were also important accessions from other religious bodies. While such men as Newton, Locke, Milton, and Penn in the seventeenth century are known to have held Unitarian views, no movement toward a distinct denomination began till late in the eighteenth century; and the most distinguished leaders of Unitarianism since its separate organization have been Joseph Priestly, Theophilus Lindsey, and James Martineau.

In America Unitarianism developed out of New England Congregationalism, whose churches had, as a rule, unwittingly left the way open for doctrinal changes, by requiring members upon joining the church simply to join in a covenant, rather than to subscribe to a creed. Thus many of the Congregational churches of eastern Massachusetts, including nearly all the oldest and most important ones, gradually moved far toward Unitarian beliefs in the second half of the eighteenth century, though the first church distinctly to avow such beliefs was the Episcopal King's Chapel at Boston, in 1785. These churches preferred to call themselves simply Liberal Christians, and the name Unitarian was only slowly and reluctantly accepted. The first church to take the name "Unitarian" was the First Church in Philadelphia, founded in 1796.

The formation of a new denomination out of the liberal wing of the Congregational Church was a gradual process, which went on in one congregation after another. The cleavage was hastened by the election of Henry Ware, a liberal, as professor of theology at Harvard University in 1805, in spite of orthodox protests, and by the fastening of the name Unitarian upon the liberals by the conservatives in 1815, after which the former were more and more refused religious fellowship by the latter, who desired thus to exclude them from the denomination. At length, in 1819, William Ellery Channing, of Boston, acknowledged leader of the liberals, preached at Baltimore an ordination sermon which defined and defended the views held by Unitarians and was thenceforth accepted by them as their platform.

In 1825 the American Unitarian Association was formed to do aggressive missionary work and to promote the interests of the churches concerned, and thus the new denomination became organized separately. The Unitarians of this period were much averse to fostering sectarian spirit. They had been only loosely welded together, and their own fundamental principles were not clearly settled; so that for nearly 40 years the denomination was stagnant and was divided and weakened by internal controversy centering mainly about the question of miracles. But by the end of the Civil War this controversy had been largely outgrown; a national conference was organized in 1865, and a period of rapid extension and of aggressive denominational life ensued, which has continued down to the present time. For a generation past emphasis has been laid much less upon doctrinal points than upon personal religion, moral advancement, and civic and social reform.

Doctrine. The Unitarians have never adopted a creed and do not require of members or ministers profession of a particular doctrine.

[p. 1623] In general, Unitarians accept the religion of Jesus. The declared purpose of the American Unitarian Association, as stated in its bylaws, is "to diffuse the knowledge and promote the interests of pure religion which, in accordance with the teachings of Jesus, is summed up in love to God and love to man." The covenant most generally used in local churches reads: "In the love of truth, and in the spirit of Jesus, we unite for the worship of God and the service of man."

The most distinguishing marks of Unitarianism today are its insistence upon absolute freedom in belief, its reliance upon the supreme guidance of reason, its tolerance of difference in religious opinion, its devotion to education and philanthropy, and its emphasis upon character, as the principles of fundamental importance in religion. There is, however, a general consensus upon the unipersonality of God, the strict humanity of Jesus, the essential dignity and perfectibility of human nature, the natural character of the Bible, and the hope for the ultimate salvation of all souls, in distinction from the views traditionally taught on these points.

Organization. The Unitarians are congregational in polity, each congregation being entirely independent of all the others. But for purposes of fellowship, mutual counsel, and the promotion of common ends, they unite in district, State, and regional conferences, in the American Unitarian Association and in an international association.

b. Universalist Church of America SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1656–1659.

[p. 1656] *History*. A distinction should be made between Universalism and the Universalist denomination.

Universalism has been defined as the doctrine or belief that it is the purpose of God through the grace revealed in our Lord Jesus Christ to save every member of the human race from sin. In a more general way, it has been described as the belief that what ought to be will be; that in a sane and beneficent universe the primacy belongs to Truth, Right, Love—the supreme powers; that the logic of this conception of the natural and moral order imperiously compels the conclusion that although all things are not yet under the sway of the Prince of Peace, the definite plan set forth in Him is evident, and the consummation which He embodies and predicts cannot be doubted.

Universalism, it is claimed, is thus as old as Christianity; it was taught in the schools of the second and third centuries at Alexandria, Nisibis, Edessa, and Antioch; and it was accepted by many of the apostolic and church fathers, as Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, Origen, and probably Chrysostom and Jerome.

[p. 1657] Those members of the Christian family in whom this thought has become predominant and who hold to the idea that there is a divine order and that it contemplates

the final triumph of good over evil in human society, as a whole, and in the history of each individual, are considered Universalists.

The Universalist denomination, however, is of modern origin, is confined mostly to the American continent, and it embraces but a portion of those who hold the Universalist belief. It dates from the arrival of Rev. John Murray, of London, in Good Luck, N. J., in September 1770, although there were some preachers of the doctrine in the country before that time. Mr. Murray preached at various places in New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts, and societies sprang up in all these States as a result of his ministry. His first regular settlement was at Gloucester, Mass., where a church was built in 1780, but he afterwards removed to Boston.

The earliest movement for denominational organization was made at Oxford, Mass., in 1785, but accomplished little more than to emphasize the need and value of fellowship, although it approved the name selected by the Universalists of Gloucester for their church, "The Independent Christian Society, commonly called 'Universalists," and approved also the Charter of Compact as the form of organization for all societies. The second convention, held at Philadelphia in 1790, drew up and published the first Universalist profession of faith, consisting of five articles, outlined a plan of church organization, and declared itself to be in favor of the congregational form of polity. Another convention, at Oxford in 1793, subsequently developed into the Convention of the New England States, then into the Convention of New England and New York, and finally into the present organization, the General Convention.

Among the younger men at the second Oxford convention was Hosea Ballou, who soon became the recognized leader of the movement, and for half a century was its most honored and influential exponent. During his ministry, extending from 1796 to 1852, the 20 or 30 churches increased to 500, distributed over New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, although the greater part were found in New England. It was, however, the era of the propagation of the doctrine and of the controversies to which that gave rise, and little attention was paid to organization.

The same antagonistic tendencies are noticeable, in the history of the Universalist churches, that appear in others holding to the congregational principle; on the one hand, an impulse toward liberty, opposition to ecclesiastical tyranny, jealousy of freedom, and suspicion of authority; on the other hand, appreciation of the value of centralized authority as against a crude, chaotic condition, and the realization that in order to efficiently carry out important ends in the denomination there must be some definite church organization with powers that are restricted, indeed, but still real.

About 1860 agitation began for a more coherent organization and a polity better correlated than the spontaneous congregationalism which had developed during the earlier period, and the result was that at the centennial convention of 1870 a plan of organization and a manual of administration and a manual of administration were adopted under which the denomination has since been conducted.

Doctrine. The historic doctrinal symbol of the Universalist denomination is the Winchester Profession, adopted at the annual meeting of the General Convention held in Winchester, N. H., in September 1803, and is essentially the same as the first profession of faith in the five articles formulated and published by the Philadelphia convention in 1790. The convention adopting it was simply a yearly gathering of Universalists without ecclesiastical authority, and the articles were merely set forth as expressing the general

belief of the churches. They have ever since been acknowledged by the denomination at large, however, as expressing its faith. They are as follows:

We believe that the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments contain a revelation of the character of God and of the duty, interest, and final destination of mankind.

We believe that there is one God, whose nature is Love, revealed in one Lord Jesus Christ, by one Holy Spirit of Grace, who will finally restore the whole family of mankind to holiness and happiness.

We believe that holiness and true happiness are inseparably connected, and that believers ought to be careful to maintain order and practice good works; for these things are good and profitable unto men.

[p. 1658] At the session of the General Convention in Boston, October 1899, a still briefer Statement of Essential Principles was adopted and made the condition of fellowship, in the following terms: "The Universal Fatherhood of God; the spiritual authority and leadership of His Son, Jesus Christ; the trustworthiness of the Bible as containing a revelation from God; the certainty of just retribution for sin; the final harmony of all souls with God." However, to this statement of principles was added the so-called Liberty Clause, as follows: "The Winchester Profession is commended as containing these principles, but neither this, nor any other precise form of words, is required as a condition of fellowship provided always that the principles above stated be expressed."

At the General Convention held in Worcester, Mass., in 1933, a bond of fellowship was adopted as follows:

The bond of fellowship in this Convention shall be a common purpose to do the will of God as Jesus revealed it and to cooperate in establishing the kingdom for which He lived and died.

To that end we avow our faith in God as Eternal and All-Conquering Love, in the spiritual leadership of Jesus, in the supreme worth of every human personality, in the authority of truth known or to be known, and in the power of men of good will and sacrificial spirit to overcome all evil and progressively establish the kingdom of God. Neither this nor any other statement shall be imposed as a creedal test, provided that the faith thus indicated be professed.

The theology of Universalism, while setting forth the predicates of its conclusion, that all souls are included in the gracious purpose of God to make at last a complete moral harmony, discriminates between belief in a result and faith in the forces by which the result is to be achieved. It points out and emphasizes the fact that effective faith in final universal salvation must rest on implicit belief in the value and potency of truth, righteousness, and love, witnessed by the free and steadfast use of these great and only means to the desired end. The teaching of Jesus, with which His life and works accord, is interpreted as a distinct revelation of these facts and principles, to wit, that God is the Father of all men; that all men are brethren; that life at the root is spiritual and therefore eternal; that the law of life is righteousness and its motive force is love; that human society, properly conceived, is a natural social and moral unity, or kingdom of heaven; that this life is "the suburb of the life elysian"; and that physical death is the necessary prelude to immortal life. Universalism avers that the sinner—"and no man liveth that sinneth not"-cannot escape punishment; but this is remedial and is meant both to vindicate the inflexible righteousness of God and to induce repentance and reformation in His wayward children. Throughout the history of the Universalist Church there has been a growing emphasis upon the responsibility of men as free moral agents to cooperate with God in the creation of His world. A favorite Universalist statement of today is "If all men are to be saved, then we are to save them."

The Universalist position as to the nature and place of the Christ has been stated as follows:

It is necessary to say, in view of opinions long and generally held among Christians, that Universalists are not Trinitarians. The position taken by the Unitarians of Channing's day, and held for a generation or more subsequently, would fairly represent the view that has been consistently set forth in Universalist literature and teaching. That view is that Jesus (the Christ) had the same essential spiritual and human nature as other men; but that he was chosen of God to sustain a certain unique relation, on the one hand toward God and on the other toward men, by virtue of which he was a revelation of the divine will and character and a sample of the perfected or "full-grown" man. There is, therefore, propriety and accuracy in describing this unique man as a God-man, a divine Son of God, the mediator, or way, between God and men.

Universalists, as a body, are now practically Unitarians, so far as the person, nature, and work of Christ are concerned.

As to the mode of baptism, both immersion and sprinkling are practiced, but usually in Universalist churches the candidate, whether adult or infant, is baptized by the minister placing his hand, which has been previously dipped in the font, on the head of the candidate, and repeating the baptismal formula. In Universalist parishes where a church has been organized the Lord's Supper is regularly observed, usually four times a year, and all members are expected to participate; but all others who would like thus to show their loyalty to their Master and cultivate Christian graces are cordially invited to join in the memorial.

[p. 1659] According to the laws of organization for the Universalist Church there is the General Convention having jurisdiction over all Universalist clergymen and denominational organizations, State conventions, exercising within State or provincial limits a similar jurisdiction subject to the General Convention, and parishes composed of persons organized for religious improvement and the support of public worship. In practice the local parish or society is independent in the management of its affairs.

c. Unitarian Universalist Association

SOURCE: Constitution, art. 2, in *The Plan to Consolidate* (Wellesley Hills, Mass.: The Joint Merger Committee, 1959), pp. 4, 5.

[p. 4] Section 1. The Unitarian Universalist Association is an incorporated organization which by consolidation has succeeded to the charter powers of the American Unitarian Association, incorporated in 1847, and The Universalist Church of America, incorporated in 1866, by virtue of legislation enacted by The Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of New York, respectively.

The Unitarian Universalist Association is empowered to, and shall devote its resources to and exercise its corporate powers for, religious, educational and charitable purposes. It is further empowered: to solicit and receive funds separately or with others to support its work; to make appropriations to carry on its work including appropriations to its associate members and to other organizations to enable them to assist the Unitarian Universalist Association in carrying on its work; and without limitation as to amount, to receive, hold, manage, invest and reinvest and distribute any real and personal property for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. In accordance with these corporate purposes, the members of the Unitarian Universalist Association, dedicated to the principles of a free faith, unite in seeking:

(1) To strengthen one another in a free and disciplined search for truth as the foundation of our religious fellowship;

- (2) To cherish and spread the universal truths taught by the great prophets and teachers of humanity in every age and tradition, immemorially summarized in the Judeo-Christian heritage as love to God and love to man;
- [p. 5] (3) To affirm, defend and promote the supreme worth of every human personality, the dignity of man, and the use of the democratic method in human relationships;
- (4) To implement our vision of one world by striving for a world community founded on ideals of brotherhood, justice and peace;
- (5) To serve the needs of member churches and fellowships, to organize new churches and fellowships, and to extend and strengthen liberal religion;
- (6) To encourage cooperation with men of good will in every land.

Section 3. The Unitarian Universalist Association hereby declares and affirms the independence and autonomy of local churches, fellowships and associate members; and nothing in this Constitution or in the By-Laws of the Association shall be deemed to infringe upon the congregational polity of churches and fellowships, nor upon the exercise of direct control by their memberships of associate member organizations, nor upon the individual freedom of belief which is inherent in the Universalist and Unitarian heritages. No minister shall be required to subscribe to any particular interpretation of religion, or to any particular religious belief or creed to obtain and hold Fellowship with the Unitarian Universalist Association.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership: Unitarian churches (1959), 109,508; Universalist Church of America (1958), 68,949 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257).]

1743. United Church of Christ (Formed by Merger, 1957–61, of the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church)

a. Congregational Christian Churches

SOURCE: CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 519-525, 614-616.

[p. 519] In 1931 the National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States and the General Convention of the Christian Church (headquarters, Dayton, Ohio) united to form the General Council of the Congregational and Christian Churches. This national merger was followed by combinations in States and districts and as occasion called for it and congregations desired it local churches united to form "Congregational Christian" churches.

Both bodies having been wholly democratic it was not difficult to come together on that basis. Each church is free in its own life. It is a part of a group of churches which is also free in its sphere. These groups, or the churches in them, unite in State or district organizations which again are self-determining. Finally these groups join together to form the democratically constituted national body which exercises no authority but furnishes mutual counsel, inspiration, and instrumentalities for common Christian work.

A church may continue to be known as a "Christian" church or a "Congregational" church. A local group may continue as a "Congregational" association or a "Christian" conference, and in either case be part and parcel of the fellowship bodies of the "Congregational and Christian Churches."

Something of the history and doctrine of the separate bodies is given, followed by a statement of the organization and work of the united body. In the latter it will be seen that the national missionary work has been completely combined...

[i. The Congregational Church]

History. The Reformation in England developed along three lines: Anglicanism, Puritanism, and Separatism. The Anglicans held to the old English Church, minus the papacy and the distinctively papal features. The Puritans, including the Presbyterians and some Anglicans, held to a National Church but called for a thoroughgoing reformation which would provide an educated, spiritually minded ministry and would recognize the right of the members to a voice in the selection of their ministers, the management of the local church, and the adoption of its creed or confession. They believed, however, that they should remain within the church and thus secure its reformation. The Separatists held that the whole system of the establishment was an anti-Christian imitation of the true church and could not be reformed, and that the only proper thing for a Christian to do was to withdraw himself from it.

Such sentiments could scarcely be tolerated in that age, especially after the Act of Uniformity, passed in 1559, the year after the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the throne, and church after church which professed them was broken up. One pastor, Robert Browne, with his congregation, emigrated to Holland in 1581, whence he issued pamphlets so bitter in their attack upon the ecclesiastical government of the realm, that two men charged with distributing them were hanged, and the books were burned. In 1593 three others, Barrowe, Greenwood, and Penry, paid for their treasonable sentiments with their lives.

The movement, however, could not be suppressed, and in 1604 (the first year in the reign of James I) the man to whose influence is chiefly due the development of Separatism into Congregationalism came to a little congregation already organized at Scrooby. John Robinson was ordained in the Church of England, but he became acquainted with Browne's writings and accepted their principles without their virulence. For him, too, exile became inevitable, and, together with a number of friends and followers, he went first to Amsterdam and then to Leyden. Here they met with a friendly reception, but, after a few years, decided to remove to America, where they could practice their religion unmolested and at the same time live and rear their children as Englishmen. After many delays and discouragements, the first band of Pilgrim Separatists, 102 persons, under the leadership of Brewster, Bradford, and Winslow, landed at Plymouth, Mass., in 1620, and founded there the first Congregational Church upon American soil, Robinson remaining in Leyden. They were followed after a few vears by the [p. 520] Puritans of Massachusetts Bay. So long as they were in England the differences between the two bodies were accentuated, but after their arrival in America the many points on which they agreed became more apparent, and the essential elements of both Separatism and Puritanism were combined in Congregationalism. This, indeed, was not accomplished at once. The modern conception of religious liberty was not yet realized. Certain members of the Salem Church, who preferred to use the prayer book and withdrew from the Puritan service for that purpose, were promptly sent to England as nonconformists, and an extreme Separatist, Ralph Smith, was dismissed to find a welcome farther south. Little by little, however, the two united, and it is significant that the strongest influence for such union appears to have been that of two laymen, Governor Endicott, of Salem, and Dr. Fuller, of Plymouth.

During the decade from 1630 to 1640, the Puritan immigration increased rapidly, and with each accession new churches were formed, as the companies not infrequently brought their own pastors with them, and in two cases a full church organization. By

1640 there were 33 churches in New England, all but 2 being of pronounced Congregational type. These two at first preferred the Presbyterian system, but did not retain it long. A notable result was that Congregationalism soon became practically a State religion, and church influence was everywhere supreme, although it did not find expression in ecclesiastical courts. In two colonies, Massachusetts Bay and New Haven, the franchise was limited, until 1664 and 1665, to church members, and throughout the older Congregational colonies of New England, sooner or later, the salaries of pastors were secured by public tax, until into the nineteenth century. Any action affecting the general religious as well as the social or civil life of the community was taken by the civil legislature, such as the calling of the Cambridge Synod, in 1646, to draw up a plan of ecclesiastical polity, and the expulsion of the Salem "nonconformists" and of Roger Williams; Williams was expelled not so much for his religious opinions, however, as for his attacks on the government.

The withdrawal of the Massachusetts charter in 1684 replaced Congregationalism by Episcopacy, but a new charter in 1691 restored the former conditions to a considerable degree. The old ecclesiastical tests once abolished, however, were not renewed, and, while Congregationalism was still dominant, it was not supreme.

With the beginning of the eighteenth century other forms of church life developed in New England. Episcopalians, Baptists, and Quakers protested against being taxed for the support of Congregational churches, and little by little there ceased to be a state church. Thus the voluntary, democratic system of Separatist Plymouth overcame the ecclesiasticism of Puritan Massachusetts Bay and Connecticut, although this result was not attained until after the Revolutionary War.

In this development of their early history, however, it was manifest that the churches considered fellowship fully as important as autonomy, and that the strict separatism, which in England developed into independency, found little favor. Separatist Plymouth was represented, unofficially indeed, at the formation of the first Puritan Church at Salem; and, as the different communities grew, they formed associations or consociations for mutual conference, and in 1648 the "Cambridge Platform" was drawn up, a general summary of doctrine and of the relation of the churches, which, while having no absolute authority, was recognized as substantially expressing the views of the churches.

The Congregationalists took the initiative in the remarkable revival known as "The Great Awakening," which was started in 1734 by the preaching of Jonathan Edwards and was developed under the eloquence of Whitefield. They had a prominent share in the political discussions preceding the Revolution, in its inception and conduct, and in the subsequent national development, sending such men as John Hancock and the Adamses to take part in the councils of the new nation, although they were not considered to represent the Congregational churches as a religious body.

The history of Congregationalism during the century succeeding the Revolutionary War centers about certain movements: A plan of union with the Presbyterians, the rise of missionary enterprise, the Unitarian separation, and what may be termed the development of denominational consciousness, manifesting itself in the extension of Congregational churches toward the West, the organization of a National Council, and efforts to secure some harmonious, if not uniform, statement of Congregational belief.

As the Congregationalists of New England gradually extended westward, they came into intimate relations with the Presbyterians of the Middle States, [p. 521] and these

relations were all the closer because of the doctrinal affinity between the teaching of the Edwardses, father and son, and the type of theology represented by Princeton College, of which Jonathan Edwards, Sr., was president. Furthermore, the Congregational churches in Connecticut were in many respects in harmony with the Presbyterian idea, with the result that, before the close of the eighteenth century, delegates were interchanged between the Presbyterian General Assembly and several Congregational associations. These relations were still further strengthened by the call of Jonathan Edwards, Jr., to the Presidency of Union College, and his taking a seat in the Presbyterian General Assembly. It was natural that this intermingling of the two denominations should result in more or less confusion, and, in some cases, in friction between churches in the same region, especially in the newer communities where churches were being formed. In order to avoid this a "Plan of Union" was adopted by the Presbyterian General Assembly and by the Connecticut Association, in 1801, and accepted later by other associations, providing that "missionaries should be directed to 'promote mutual forbearance' between the adherents of the respective polities where they should labor; that churches of Congregational or Presbyterian preferences should continue to conduct their discipline in accordance with their chosen polity, even where mutual councils were provided for; and in mixed churches a standing committee might be chosen, one member of which should have the privilege of sitting in a presbytery, while another should have a vote in a Congregational association."

While the plan was, in its inception, eminently fair to both parties, and worked out advantageously for each along certain lines, one result was the practical elimination of Presbyterianism from New England, and of Congregationalism from the new communities to the West, except as various Congregational settlements were established, as in the Western Reserve, in Ohio. On the other hand, the plan assisted materially in the development of the Congregational missionary movement. When the division into Old School and New School in the Presbyterian Church was accomplished in 1837, the Old School Assembly dropped the plan, while the New School continued it for 15 years, until the Congregationalists withdrew...

[p. 522] The influences which resulted in the separation between the Trinitarian and the Unitarian wings of the Congregational body became manifest early in the eighteenth century, with the development of opposition to, or dissatisfaction with, the sterner tenets of Calvinism. The excesses connected with The Great Awakening, and the rigid theology of the Edwardses, and particularly of their successors, Hopkins and Emmons, contributed to this divergence. The selection in 1805 of Henry Ware, a liberal, as professor of divinity in Harvard College, drew the lines between the two parties more clearly, and the college was now classed as avowedly Unitarian. Mutual exchange of pulpits still continued to a greater or less extent, and, while there was much discussion, there was no separate organization.

In 1819 William Ellery Channing, in a famous sermon in Baltimore, set forth the Unitarian conception so forcibly that separation became inevitable. Then a difficulty arose, occasioned by the distinction between the church as an ecclesiastical body, and the society, in which the ownership of the property was vested. In some cases the church and the society were in agreement in their theological views; but in others, the society differed from the church, and, according to the courts, was entitled to the property. A period of confusion and of legal strife existed until about 1840, when the line of

demarcation became complete. The section most affected was eastern Massachusetts, all but two of the Boston churches going over to the Unitarians. Congregational authorities give the total number of churches lost to them as less than 100, while Unitarians claim an accession of 150. Both are probably correct, as in many cases the churches were split, so that, while one side gained, the other did not lose. For many years the bitterness of the conflict continued, but of late years it has been steadily diminishing.

With the increase in the number of Congregational churches and the new conditions in the recently settled sections of the West, it became evident that some form of mutual fellowship more comprehensive than the local or State associations was needed. Under the leadership of Leonard Bacon, of New Haven, J. P. Thompson, of New York, and others, a council or convention met at Albany in 1852, this being the first gathering representative of American Congregationalism since the Cambridge Synod of 1648. At this council 463 pastors and messengers from 17 States considered the general situation, and their deliberations resulted in the abrogation of the "Plan of Union," hearty endorsement of the missionary work, a call for aid for the churches in the West, and the inauguration of a denominational literature. Under the fostering care of such men as H. M. Dexter and A. H. Quint, the development of a denominational life went on, and the next step was the calling of a National Council at Boston in 1865, whose principal work was the drawing up of a statement as to "the system of truths which is commonly known among us as Calvinism." So advantageous was this gathering considered that a sentiment arose in favor of a regular system of councils, and after conference between the different associations, there was called at Oberlin, Ohio, in 1871, the first of the National Councils, at first triennial, now biennial, which have done much to consolidate denominational life.

Of these councils the one held at Kansas City, Mo., in 1913, was particularly important as marking the definite recognition of the Congregational Churches as an organized religious body with specific purposes and definite methods. The purposes were set forth in what has been known as a Congregational platform, including a preamble and statements of faith, polity, and wider fellowship. This platform did not in any respect modify the essential autonomy of the individual church in its expression of faith or in its method of action. It did, however, associate more fully than had been done at any previous time these individual churches in what may be termed an organic unity based upon a fundamental union in faith, common purpose in action, and mutual fellowship.

The same spirit has been manifest in various lines of development, especially those looking toward coordinated action of different religious bodies. Congregationalists have been prominent in the organization and development of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, have cooperated most cordially and effectively in the preparations for a World Conference on Faith and Order, and have entered most heartily into the various movements for interdenominational cooperation.

Through its Commission on Interchurch Relations, the denomination endeavors to promote the idea of church unity in every feasible way, particularly by cultivating the closest possible relations with other Christian groups with which Congregationalists have a normal affiliation.

[p. 523] During the year 1924 the Evangelical Protestant Church of North America, a body of independent and congregationally administered churches, voted to become Congregational, and in 1925 this body was received into the National Council of

Congregational Churches as the Evangelical Protestant Conference of Congregational Churches.

Doctrine. The principle of autonomy in the Congregational Churches involves the right of each church to frame its own statement of doctrinal belief; the principle of fellowship of the churches assumes that a general consensus of such beliefs is both possible and essential to mutual cooperation in such work as may belong to the churches as a body. As a result, although there is no authoritative Congregational creed, acceptance of which is a condition of ecclesiastical fellowship, there have been several statements of this consensus, which, while receiving no formal ecclesiastical endorsement, have been widely accepted as fair presentations of the doctrinal position of the Congregational Churches, ... [such as] the "Cambridge Platform," ... the Massachusetts revision, in 1680, of the Savoy Confession, ... the Saybrook Platform of 1708, ... the "Burial Hill Declaration," [and the creed of 1883]...

With the development of denominational life, there came a demand for a somewhat more definite platform, and the platform adopted by the National Council of 1913 has served this purpose, and has been accepted with practical unanimity by the denomination. It is as follows:

"Preamble.—The Congregational Churches of the United States, by delegates in National Council assembled, reserving all the rights and cherished memories belonging to this organization under its former constitution, and declaring the steadfast allegiance of the churches composing the council to the faith which our fathers confessed, which from age to age has found its expression in the historic creeds of the church universal and of this communion, and affirming our loyalty to the basic principles of our representative democracy, hereby set forth the things most surely believed among us concerning faith, polity, and fellowship.

"Faith.—We believe in God the Father, infinite in wisdom, goodness, and love; and in Jesus Christ, His Son, our Lord and Savior, who for us and our salvation lived and died and rose again and liveth evermore; and in the Holy Spirit, who taketh of the things of Christ and revealeth them to us, renewing, comforting, and inspiring the souls of men. We are united in striving to know the will of God, as taught in the Holy Scriptures, and in our purpose to walk in the ways of the Lord, made known or to be made known to us. We hold it to be the mission of the Church of Christ to proclaim the Gospel to all mankind, exalting the worship of the true God, and laboring for the progress of knowledge, the promotion of justice, the reign of peace, and the realization of human brotherhood. Depending, as did our fathers, upon the continued guidance of the Holy Spirit to lead us into all truth, we work and pray for the transformation of the world into the kingdom of God; and we look with faith for the triumph of righteousness and the life everlasting.

"Polity.—We believe in the freedom and responsibility of the individual soul and the right of private judgment. We hold to the autonomy of the local church and its independence of all ecclesiastical control. We cherish the fellowship of the churches united in district, State, and national bodies, for counsel and cooperation in matters of common concern.

"The wider fellowship.—While affirming the liberty of our churches, and the validity of our ministry, we hold to the unity and catholicity of the Church of Christ, and will unite with all its branches in hearty cooperation; and will earnestly seek, so far as in us

lies, that the prayer of our Lord for His disciples may be answered, that they all may be one."

[p. 524] [ii. The Christian Church]

History. The period following the War of the Revolution was characterized by a general spiritual declension. This again was succeeded by a revival period during which, especially in what were then the western and southern sections, denominational lines were frequently ignored, and members of different churches united both in evangelistic and sacramental services. In some cases there were efforts to enforce ecclesiastical discipline, which resulted in revolt, while in others entirely independent movements were started, not so much antagonistic to, as independent of, ecclesiastical organization.

The pioneer in this movement was Rev. James O'Kelley, a Methodist minister in Virginia. He opposed very earnestly the development of the superintendency into an episcopacy, especially so far as it gave the bishops absolute power in the matter of appointments to charges. He presented his cause in the general conference and elsewhere, but failed to bring about the change he desired, and in 1792, with a number of others, withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church. A little later they organized under the name of "Republican Methodists," but in 1794 resolved to be known as "Christians" only, taking the Bible as their guide and discipline, and accepting no test of church fellowship other than Christian character.

A little later a similar movement arose among the Baptists of New England. Dr. Abner Jones, of Vermont, became convinced that "sectarian names and human creeds should be abandoned, and that true piety alone, and not the externals of it, should be made the test of Christian fellowship and communion." On this basis he organized a church at Lyndon, Vt., in 1800. He was soon joined by Elias Smith, a Baptist minister of Portsmouth, N. H., and by many others.

In 1800 the "Great Revival," as it came to be known, was started in the Cumberland Valley of Tennessee and Kentucky. It was confined to no denomination and in the preaching no attention was given to the doctrines which had divided the churches. In the Presbyterian Church, especially, this seeming neglect of fundamental doctrines was viewed with concern, and resulted in charges being preferred against two ministers, Richard McNemar and John Thompson, for preaching doctrines contrary to the confession of faith. As a consequence, these men, with a number of others, among whom were John Dunlavy, Robert Marshall, and Barton W. Stone, withdrew from the Synod of Kentucky and, in 1803, organized the Springfield Presbytery. Shortly afterwards this body was dissolved, and its members adopted practically the same position as that held by James O'Kelley in the South and by Abner Jones in New England.

General meetings, the first step toward organization, were held in New England as early as 1809, but it was not until 1819 that the first general conference met at Portsmouth, N. H., on the call of Frederick Plummer, of Pennsylvania, and Edward B. Rollings, of New Hampshire. The conference met again at Windham, Conn., in 1820, and regularly until 1832, when it was dissolved; but the following year, by the action of several conferences, a general convention was organized. In 1834, by direction of the convention, the Christian General Book Association was formed, and thereafter met once in 4 years in connection with the convention, the same persons being delegates to both bodies. This form of organization continued until after 1860, when the two bodies became entirely separated. In 1886 the general convention, then called the "American Christian Convention," and the publication board, then called the "Christian Publishing Association," were again made identical in membership.

In the year 1829 Alexander Campbell and his followers separated from the Baptists of Pennsylvania and Ohio. Their teaching spread rapidly to Kentucky, and in 1832 Barton W. Stone, one of the most prominent of the original leaders of the Christians in that section, united with them, on the condition that the Bible alone should be the basis of the union. A large number of the Christians in Kentucky and Ohio followed Mr. Stone in this action, but even in these States the greater part remained with the original body, while the eastern and southern churches were not affected. Out of this movement, however, some confusion of names has arisen, since many of the churches of the Disciples are still known as "Christian" churches.

In the report for 1890 the denomination was listed as "Christians (Christian Connection) [see No. 413]," and the same name was used in 1906. This did not prove entirely satisfactory, and after some conference the name "Christian Church (American [p. 525] Christian Convention)" the title already officially chosen by the church, was adopted for the 1916 report, as identifying the denomination with its general business organization. This title was in 1922 changed to "Christian Church (General Convention of the Christian Church)."

In 1854, on account of the adoption of resolutions condemning slavery, the southern delegates to the general convention withdrew and formed a separate organization, which continued until 1890, when the delegates from the South resumed their seats in the convention.

Doctrine. The principles upon which its first churches were organized continue to characterize the denomination. No general organization has ventured to set forth any "creed" or statement of doctrine other than the Bible itself. Christian character is the only test of church fellowship, and while their interpretation of the teachings of the Bible is generally in accord with that of most evangelical denominations, they do not bar any follower of Christ from membership because of difference in theological belief. This same liberty extends to the ordinances of the church. Baptism is not made a requisite to membership, although it is often urged upon believers as a duty. While immersion is generally practiced, no one mode is insisted upon. The churches practice open communion and labor to promote the spirit of unity among all Christians.

Organization ... of the Congregational and Christian Churches... While the polity of the Congregational and Christian Churches is based upon certain definite principles, as set forth in its historical development it represents adaptation to conditions rather than accord to a theory of church government. The local church is the unit...

For fellowship, mutual assistance, and common Christian work, the churches gather in local associations or conferences, and in State conferences... Membership in the General Council includes ministerial and lay delegates elected by the State conferences. [b. The Evangelical and Reformed Church]

[p. 614] *History*. The Evangelical and Reformed Church was established on June 26, 1934, at Cleveland, Ohio. As such it has a very brief history, but since it was formed by the union of two denominations, each of which had a long and honored history, we must briefly trace these two streams as they moved on their separate ways prior to the union.

The older of these two bodies is the Reformed Church in the United States. It dates back to October 15, 1725, when the first communion was celebrated at Falkner Swamp,

about 40 miles north of Philadelphia, Pa. Prior to that date, however, scattered congregations existed in eastern Pennsylvania and even as far south as Virginia. Ministers were scarce and these groups of Reformed people sometimes engaged the services of school teachers to conduct religious services. There was as yet no organization to hold the widely scattered congregations together. In September 1747 Michael Schlatter, who had been sent to America by the Synod of South and North Holland, organized the *Coetus* in Philadelphia. This is a Latin term and means practically the same as the word Synod. It was, however, subject to the Synod in Holland and made regular reports to that body, from which it also received periodical aid. In 1793 the Coetus declared its independence from Holland and reorganized itself under the name of The Synod of the German Reformed Church...

The first missionary ... had been sent west of the Allegheny Mountains in 1783. Early in the nineteenth century missionaries were sent to North Carolina and to Ohio. People began to settle in new parts of the country which had been offered for occupancy and the church sent pastors to minister to these new settlements on the frontier. In 1819 the Synod divided itself into eight districts known as Classes. In 1824 [p. 615] the Ohio Classis organized itself into the Ohio Synod, with powers similar to those belonging to the mother Synod in the East... In 1863 the mother Synod and the Ohio Synod united in forming the General Synod, which, after an honored history of 70 years, ceased to function when the union of the Reformed Church in the United States and the Evangelical Synod of North America took place...

The Evangelical Synod of North America has also an interesting history to its credit. It traces its origin in this country to a group of six ministers who met at Gravois Settlement near St. Louis, Mo., on October 15, 1840, and formed the Evangelical Union of the West. It will be observed that both the Reformed Church and the Evangelical Synod have the same birthday, October 15, although the former is 115 years older than the latter.

At first, the Evangelical Union partook largely of the nature of a ministerial association, and it was not until 1849 that the first congregation affiliated itself with the same. Similar associations had sprung up in Ohio and further east, as also in the northwest. All of these eventually, by 1872, joined themselves to the original union with its center in St. Louis, and in 1877 adopted the name of the German Evangelical Synod of North America. Many independent congregations of German-speaking people, of either Lutheran or Reformed backgrounds, identified themselves with the denomination, and thus during the course of a century, the Evangelical Synod developed into a strong and virile body... During the hundred years of its separate history it extended its borders into many States of the Union, and came to occupy an honorable place among the denominations in America.

These two historic churches, in June 1934, after several years of friendly negotiations, formed a new denomination under the name of Evangelical and Reformed Church, each bringing into the union the rich heritage of the history of the past, with the conviction that by so doing they were following the leadings of Providence and were answering the prayer of Christ that "they may all be one," and thus would be equipped to render a greater service in the interests of the kingdom of God…

[p. 616] *Doctrine*. The Evangelical and Reformed Church, true to its name, believes in the Bible. It believes that the Bible is the Word of God, that God hath spoken and

revealed Himself in His word, and in Jesus Christ the Word made flesh. Early in Protestantism certain doctrinal statements were formulated to express what the respective churches which emerged through the Reformation believed. One of these was the Augsburg Confession, formulated in 1530 at Augsburg, Germany. Later on this was somewhat modified under the influence of Melanchthon, and John Calvin himself subscribed to this altered form of the Augsburg Confession. The Lutherans generally accepted this Confession either in its original or altered form. Martin Luther wrote a brief catechism in which some of these Protestant doctrines were set forth in the form of question and answer.

In 1563 the Heidelberg Catechism was issued at Heidelberg, Germany. It was prepared by two young theologians named Olevianus and Ursinus. This, too, was influenced by John Calvin and Melanchthon. It became the standard of doctrine for the reformed branch of the Reformation. When in 1817 the Evangelical Union in Prussia under Frederick William III was formed, which sought to bring together the Lutheran and Reformed groups, the matter of the doctrinal standards of the two bodies was not raised. It was presumed that each group might continue to believe in its own confessions and to use the same catechisms it had formerly used.

Those who came to America and represented the Reformed Church naturally held to the doctrines set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism, while those who came to America at a later date and organized the Evangelical Synod of North America adhered not only to the Heidelberg Catechism, but also to the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Catechism, as interpretations of the essential truths of the Bible. They accepted all of them so far as they agreed, but wherein they differed they reserved the right to go to the Bible and find the final and ultimate truth.

When the Evangelical and Reformed Church was formed, these three standards of faith were thus brought into the union. Consequently, in formulating the doctrinal statement of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, there were written into the constitution these words:

The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are recognized as the Word of God and the ultimate rule of Christian faith and practice.

The doctrinal standards of the Evangelical and Reformed Church are the Heidelberg Catechism, Luther's Catechism, and the Augsburg Confession. They are accepted as an authoritative interpretation of the essential truth taught in the Holy Scriptures.

Wherever these doctrinal standards differ, ministers, members, and congregations, in accordance with the liberty of conscience inherent in the Gospel, are allowed to adhere to the interpretation of one of these confessions. However, in each case the final norm is the Word of God.

The Evangelical and Reformed Church, therefore, continues as the church of the Word. On this rock it has built its house. And in so doing it is true to its traditions and to the spirit of Luther, Zwingli, Melanchthon, Calvin, and all of the reformers.

Like all Protestant churches it accepts the two sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper and adheres to the rites of confirmation, ordination, consecration, marriage, and burial. It allows freedom of worship, but in the interest of unity and harmony, it prescribes forms of worship and hymns for common use.

Organization. The Evangelical and Reformed Church has a presbyterial form of government.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership of the Congregational Christian Churches (1959) was 1,414, 595, of the Evangelical and Reformed Church (1959), 809,137 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 254), thus totaling 2,223,732 for the combined United Church of Christ. The new denomination was formed in 1957, but the former

organizations were left unaltered pending approval by the constituent churches of a new constitution. A Statement of Faith was adopted July 8, 1959 (Frank S. Mead, *Handbook of Denominations in the United States*, 2d rev. ed., p. 221). The new constitution, which went into effect July 4, 1961, combines congregationalism for the local congregation and presbyterian form of connectional organization, headed by a General Synod. For a Presbyterian proposal (1960, 1961) that the United Church of Christ enter a further interdenominational merger, see Nos. 664, 665.]

1744. Ur, Civilization of, Shown by Records

SOURCE: C. Leonard Woolley, *Ur of the Chaldees* (New York: Scribner, 1930), pp. 168, 169, 171, 172, 208. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, and Ernest Benn Ltd., London.

[p. 168] We must revise considerably our ideas of the Hebrew patriarch [Abraham] when we learn that his earlier years were spent in such sophisticated surroundings; he was the citizen of a great city and inherited the [p. 169] traditions of an ancient and highly organised civilisation. The houses themselves bespoke comfort and even luxury. Apart from the actual fabric there was little left to throw light on the daily life of the inhabitants, but one or two stores of tablets did bear witness to their intellectual interests. We found copies of the hymns which were used in the service of the temples, and with them mathematical tables ranging from plain sums in addition to formulae for the extraction of square and cube roots, and other texts in which the writers had copied out the old building inscriptions extant in the city and had compiled in this way an abbreviated history of the principal temples...

[p. 171] One other aspect of life in the City of Abraham is brought into relief by our excavations. In the temple of Dublal-makh, about which more will be said later, there was found a hoard of many hundreds of tablets belonging to the business archives of the building. As king and landowner the god received rent and tithes and offerings of all sorts, and since there was no coined money, all these dues were paid in kind and required storage-room in the temple; hence the need of the magazines which surround every sanctuary. The Sumerians were essentially business-like, and no transaction was recognised in law unless it was witnessed to by a written document, and so for all incomings the priests drew up formal receipts of which copies were filed in the temple archives; whether it were a herd of sheep or a single cheese, a bale of wool or copper ore from foreign parts, the receipt was duly made out and entered. As the stores were drawn upon for the use of the temple, animals required for sacrifice, oil for squeaking doorhinges, wood for making a statue or gold for adorning it, the responsible official drew out an issue voucher giving the name of the recipient and his authority for the demand, and copies of these too were filed; a great [p. 172] hoard of these such as we found in Dublalmakh throws no little light on the secular activities of a religious house.

Further there were on the temple premises regular factories where the raw materials paid as tribute were manufactured into finished goods, and we have elaborate balance-sheets of such a factory in which women attached to the service of the god were employed in spinning wool and weaving cloth, balance-sheets drawn up every month and three months with a nominal roll of the workers, and, in parallel columns, the amount of raw wool each had received, the tally of her work and its cost reckoned by the issues made to her of food and supplies. It is all very practical and curiously modern, and again we see how very different from what we might have thought were the antecedents of the Hebrew people...

[p. 208] Here and there in the remains of Persian houses dated tablets have been found which carry on the history of the inhabited town to about the middle of the fifth century before Christ, and hereafter there is silence...

The populous city became a heap, its very name was forgotten; in the holes of the Ziggurat owls made their nests and jackals found a hiding-place, and the Bedouin pitched their camps under the shelter of the 'Mound of Pitch,' little guessing that here had lived Abraham, the founder of the Jewish nation and of their own race, Ibrahim Khalil Abdurrahman, the Friend of God.

1745. Ur—Houses of Abraham's Time

SOURCE: C. Leonard Woolley, *Ur of the Chaldees* (New York: Scribner, 1930), pp. 162, 164, 165. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, and Ernest Benn Ltd., London.

[p. 162] Just outside the limits of the Sacred Area we excavated a section of the town proper, the residential quarter [of Ur]... The houses of the time of Abraham stood on varying levels stepped down from the mound's summit to the flat ground below; when they were destroyed the uppermost might suffer severely, but those on the lower terraces were deeply buried by the rubbish fallen from above, and many were so well preserved that it was easy to picture them as having been deserted but yesterday instead of thirty-eight centuries ago...

[p. 164] The houses excavated were private houses of middle-class rather than of wealthy citizens; they were of different sizes, and their ground-plan varied according to the exigencies of the available space and the means of the owner; but on the whole they conformed to one general plan. They had been plundered and burnt in 1885 B.C., and they had been built at any time between that date and 2100 B.C., most of them having been more than once restored or reconstructed, so that they gave quite definitely the type of dwelling belonging to a representative class during a fixed period...

Judging from the private houses of the age of Nebuchadnezzar which had been excavated by the Germans at Babylon, we had expected to find very modest dwellings one storey high and built of mud brick consisting of three or four rooms opening on to a court: instead of this we discovered that in Abraham's time men lived in houses built with walls of burnt brick below, rising in mud brick above, plaster and whitewash hiding the change in material, [p. 165] two storeys high, and containing as many as thirteen or fourteen rooms round a central paved court which supplied light and air to the house. The streets were narrow, winding, and unpaved, with on either side blank walls unbroken by any windows, streets such as one sees in any modern native town, impossible for wheeled traffic. Against one house a mounting-block showed that donkeys would be used for riding or for freight, and the corners of the narrow lanes were carefully rounded off to prevent injury to goods or riders.

Through the front door of a house one passed into a tiny lobby with a drain in its floor where the visitor might wash his hands or feet, and from that into the central court. On one side rose the brick stairs leading to the upper floor, and behind the stairs was a lavatory with its terra-cotta drain; then came the kitchen, distinguished by its fireplace and the stone grinders left on the ground; a reception-room with two doors or one door unusually wide was for guests, another room might be for the servants, and yet another the domestic chapel. Though the walls stood in some places as much as 10 feet high, there was no sign of ceiling-beams, so the groundfloor rooms must have been lofty, a great advantage in this hot climate. Of the upper floor nothing remained.

1746. Ur, Location

SOURCE: Leonard Woolley, *Excavations at Ur*, pp. 11, 12. Copyright 1954 by Ernest Benn Ltd., London. Used by permission.

[p. 11] Ur lies about half-way between Baghdad and the head of the Persian Gulf, some ten miles west of the present course of the Euphrates. A mile and a half to the east of the ruins runs the single line of railway which joins Basra to the capital of Iraq, and between the rail and the river there is sparse cultivation and little villages of mud huts or reed-mat shelters are dotted here and there; but westwards of the line is desert blank and unredeemed. Out of this waste rise the mounds which were Ur, called by the Arabs after the highest of them all, the Ziggurat hill, 'Tal al Muqayyar', the Mound of Pitch.

Standing on the summit of this mound one can distinguish along the eastern skyline the dark tasselled fringe of the palm-gardens on the river's bank, but to north and west and south as far as the eye can see stretches a waste of unprofitable sand. To the southwest the flat line of the horizon is broken by a grey upstanding pinnacle, the ruins of the staged tower of the sacred city of Eridu which the Sumerians believed to be the oldest city upon earth, and to the northwest a shadow thrown by the low sun may tell the whereabouts of the low mound of al 'Ubaid; but otherwise nothing relieves the

monotony of the vast plain over which the shimmering heat-waves dance and the mirage spreads its mockery of placid waters. It seems incredible that such a wilderness should ever have been habitable for man, and yet the weathered hillocks at one's feet cover the temples and houses of a very great city.

As long ago as 1854 Mr. J. E. Taylor, British Consul at Basra, was employed by the British Museum to investigate some of the southern sites of Mesopotamia, and chose for his chief work the Mound of Pitch. Here he unearthed inscriptions which for the first time revealed that the nameless ruin was none other than Ur, so-called 'of the Chaldees', the home [p. 12] of Abraham. Taylor's discoveries were not at the time apprised at their true worth and his excavations closed down after two seasons; but more and more the importance of the site came to be recognized.

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1747. Vatican Council (1870), Importance of

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, p. 146.

The chief importance of the Council of the Vatican lies in its decree on Papal supremacy and Infallibility. It settled the internal dissensions between Ultramontanism and Gallicanism, which struck at the root of the fundamental principle of authority; it destroyed the independence of the Episcopate, and made it a tool of the Primacy; it crushed liberal Catholicism; it completed the system of Papal absolutism; it raised the hitherto disputed opinion of Papal infallibility to the dignity of a binding article of faith, which no Catholic can deny without loss of salvation. The Pope may now say not only, "I

am the tradition" (La tradizione son' io), but also "I am the Church" (L'église c'est moi)!

1748. Vatican Council (1870), Lord Acton on

SOURCE: John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, *The History of Freedom and Other Essays* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909), pp. 493, 494, 531, 532, 545, 546, 549, 550.

[p. 493] The Council of Trent impressed on the Church the stamp of an intolerant age, and perpetuated by its decrees [p. 494] the spirit of an austere immorality. The ideas embodied in the Roman Inquisition became characteristic of a system which obeyed expediency by submitting to indefinite modification, but underwent no change of principle. Three centuries have so changed the world that the maxims with which the Church resisted the Reformation have become her weakness and her reproach, and that which arrested her decline now arrests her progress. To break effectually with that tradition and eradicate its influence, nothing less is required than an authority equal to that by which it was imposed. The Vatican Council was the first sufficient occasion which Catholicism had enjoyed to reform, remodel, and adapt the work of Trent. This idea was present among the motives which caused it to be summoned...

[p. 531] Before the Council had been assembled a fortnight, a store of discontent had accumulated which it would have been easy to avoid. Every act of the Pope, the Bull *Multiplices*, the declaration of censures, the text of the proposed decree, even the announcement that the Council should be dissolved in case of his death, had seemed an injury or an insult to the episcopate. These measures undid the favourable effect of the caution with which the bishops had been received. They did what the dislike of infallibility alone would not have done. They broke the spell of veneration for Pius IX. which fascinated [p. 532] the Catholic Episcopate. The jealousy with which he guarded his prerogative in the appointment of officers, and of the great Commission, the pressure during the elections, the prohibition of national meetings, the refusal to hold the debates in a hall where they could be heard, irritated and alarmed many bishops. They suspected that they had been summoned for the very purpose they had indignantly denied, to make the papacy more absolute by abdicating in favour of the official prelature of Rome. Confidence gave way to a great despondency, and a state of feeling was aroused which prepared the way for actual opposition when the time should come...

[p. 545] When the observations on infallibility which the bishops had sent in to the Commission appeared in print it seemed that the minority had burnt their ships. They affirmed that the dogma would put an end to the conversion of Protestants, that it would drive devout men out of the Church and make Catholicism indefensible in controversy, [p. 546] that it would give governments apparent reason to doubt the fidelity of Catholics, and would give new authority to the theory of persecution and of the deposing power. They testified that it was unknown in many parts of the Church, and was denied by the

Fathers, so that neither perpetuity nor universality could be pleaded in its favour; and they declared it an absurd contradiction, founded on ignoble deceit, and incapable of being made an article of faith by Pope or Council. One bishop protested that he would die rather than proclaim it...

[p. 549] The debate on the several paragraphs lasted till the beginning of July, and the decree passed at length with eighty-eight dissentient votes. It was made known that the infallibility of the Pope would be promulgated in solemn session on the 18th, and that all who were present would be required to sign an act of submission... It was resolved by a small majority that the opposition should renew its negative vote in writing, and should leave Rome in a body before the session. Some of the most conscientious and resolute adversaries of the dogma advised this course. Looking to the immediate future, they were persuaded that an irresistible reaction was at hand, and that the decrees of the Vatican Council would fade away and be dissolved by a power mightier than the Episcopate and a process less perilous than schism. Their disbelief in the validity of its work was so profound that they were convinced that it would perish without violence, and they resolved to spare the Pope and themselves the indignity [p. 550] of a rupture. Their last manifesto, *La dernière Heure*, is an appeal for patience, an exhortation to rely on the

guiding, healing hand of God. They deemed that they had assigned the course which was to save the Church, by teaching the Catholics to reject a Council which was neither legitimate in constitution, free in action, nor unanimous in doctrine, but to observe moderation in contesting an authority over which great catastrophes impend.

1749. Vatican Council (1870), Submission of Dissenting Bishops Explained

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, p. 162. The following considerations sufficiently explain the fact of submission.

- 1. Many of the dissenting Bishops were professedly anti-Infallibilists, not from principle, but only from subordinate considerations of expediency, because they apprehended that the definition would provoke the hostility of secular governments, and inflict great injury on Catholic interests, especially in Protestant countries. Events have since proved that their apprehension was well founded.
- 2. All Roman bishops are under an oath of allegiance to the Pope, which binds them "to preserve, defend, *increase*, and *advance* the rights, honors, privileges, and authority of the holy Roman Church, of our lord the Pope, and his successors."
- 3. The minority Bishops defended Episcopal infallibility against Papal infallibility. They claimed for themselves what they denied to the Pope. Admitting the infallibility of an oecumenical Council, and forfeiting by their voluntary absence on the day of voting the right of their protest, they must either on their own theory accept the decision of the Council, or give up their theory, cease to be Roman Catholics, and run the risk of a new schism.

At the same time this submission is an instructive lesson of the fearful spiritual despotism of the Papacy, which overrules the stubborn facts of history and the sacred claims of individual conscience. For the facts so clearly and forcibly brought out before and during the Council by such men as Kenrick, Hefele, Rauscher, Maret, Schwarzenberg, and Dupanloup, have not changed, and can never be undone. On the one

hand we find the results of a life-long, conscientious, and thorough study of the most learned divines of the Roman Church, on the other ignorance, prejudice, perversion, and defiance of Scripture and tradition; on the one hand we have history shaping theology, on the other theology ignoring or changing history; on the one hand the just exercise of reason, on the other blind submission, which destroys reason and conscience.

1750. Vicarius Filii Dei, Catholic Discussions of

SOURCE: Answers to readers' questions in *Our Sunday Visitor*. Volumes and pages as indicated. [FRS Nos. 16–18.]

a. Number of the Beast

3 (Nov. 15, 1914), 3

Is it true that the words of the Apocalypse in the 13th chapter, 18th verse refer to the *Pope*?

The words referred to are these: "Here is wisdom. He that hath understanding, let him count the number of the beast. For it is the number of a man; and the number of him is six hundred sixty-six." The title of the Pope of Rome is Vicarius Filii Dei. This is inscribed on his mitre; and if you take the letters of his title which represent Latin

numerals (printed large) and add them together they come to 666:

qc	x825	qc	x1050	qc	x1275	qc	x1500	qc	x1725	qc	x1950
qc	x2175	qc	x2400	qc	x2750	qc	x2975	qc	x3200	qc	x3425
qc	x3650	qc	x3875	qc	x4100	qc	x4325				
V	I C	а	r I	V s	f	ΙI	L I I		D e 1	I	
qc	x825	qc	x1050	qc	x1275	qc	x1500	qc	x1725	qc	x1950
qc	x2175	qc	x2400	qc	x2750	qc	x2975	qc	x3200	qc	x3425
qc	x3650	qc	x3875	qc	x4100	qc	x4325				
5	1 100)	1 5		1	50	1 1	500	0 1		
۸	Add those together and the result will be 666										

Add these together and the result will be 666.

This "argument" was submitted to Rev. Ernest R. Hull, and answered in the following manner: "Almost every eminent man in Christendom, who has enjoyed the privilege of possessing enemies, has had his name turned and twisted till they could get the number 666 out of it. In past history there have been numberless beasts or Anti-Christs, all of whose names counted up to 666. I fancy that *my own name*, especially in Latin form, might give the number of the beast:

qc x82	5 qc x1050 d	c x1275 qc	x1500 qc	x1725	qc	x1950
qc x217:	5 qc x2400 q	c x2750 qc	x2975 qc	x3200	qc	x3425
qc x3650	qc x3875 q	x4100 qc	x4325			
e r r	est V	s r e g	I n a	L D	V	s h
V L L						
qc x82	5 qc x1050 d	c x1275 qc	x1500 qc	x1725	qc	x1950
qc x217:	5 qc x2400 q	c x2750 qc	x2975 qc	x3200	qc	x3425
qc x3650	qc x3875 q	x4100 qc	x4325			
	5	1	50 500 5	5	5	50 50

—666*Quod erat demonstrandum*, namely, that Rev. Ernest R. Hull is Anti-christ, or the Beast of the Apocalypse!"

Perhaps a little ingenuity with *your* name will show that you are the beast of the Apocalypse too.

b. Inscription of Pope's Miter 4 (April 18, 1915), 3 What are the letters supposed to be in the Pope's crown, and what do they signify, if anything?

The letters inscribed in the Pope's mitre are these: *Vicarius Filii Dei*, which is the Latin for Vicar of the Son of God. Catholics hold that the Church which is a visible society must have a visible head. Christ, before His ascension into heaven, appointed St. Peter to act as His representative. Upon the death of Peter the man who succeeded to the office of Peter as Bishop of Rome, was recognized as the head of the Church. Hence to the Bishop of Rome, as head of the Church, was given the title "Vicar of Christ."

Enemies of the papacy denounce this title as a malicious assumption. But the Bible informs us that Christ did not only give His Church authority to teach, but also to rule. Laying claim to the authority to rule in Christ's spiritual kingdom, in Christ's stead, is not a whit more malicious than laying claim to the authority to teach in Christ's name. And this every Christian minister does.

c. Pope's Tiara Not Inscribed

30 (Aug. 3, 1941), 7

A pamphlet has come to me entitled "The Mark of the Beast." It identifies the Pope with this "mark" referred to in Revelations XIII, 17, 18.

It is too bad that the Seventh Day Adventists, who are so sensitive of criticism themselves, should circulate a pamphlet so antagonistic to the Catholic Church.

The question you ask has been answered many times, although not in recent years, in this paper. If we have recourse to the best Biblical scholars or exegetes, we find them applying the text from Revelations to Nero, the arch-persecutor of Christianity in the first century. To give color to their accusation enemies of the Church publicize something that is not at all true, namely that the Pope's tiara is inscribed with the words "VICARIUS FILII DEI", and that if letters in that title were translated into Roman numerals, the sum would equal 666.

As a matter of fact the tiara of the Pope bears no inscription whatsoever.

Sometime ago a clergyman by the name of Reginald Ernest Hull gave a Latin ending to his two Christian names and then figured out what the sum total would be if he translated the letters into Roman numerals, and 666 eventuated. Your own name might spell that number.

Here is the manner in which it was done: Reginal[d]us Ernestus Hull: From his first name four numerals were drawn I L D V; from his second name only the letter V was extracted; from his surname the three Roman numerals, namely V L L.

Now the Roman numeral "D" stands for 500; the L stands for fifty and since there are three "L's" they would effect 150; the three "U's", which are identified with a "V" would mean 15 more, and the letter "I" would signify one—the total 666.

The first thirty Popes lived in the golden age of Christianity and twenty-nine of them died martyrs for Christ. Imagine any one of them being designated the "beast" of the Apocalypse. Among the 262 Popes who ruled over the Catholic Church from the time of Christ, all but four or five, even according to the unwilling admission of unfriendly historians, were among the holiest men of their times. The few unworthy ones, who were placed on the throne of Peter reached that position through the intrigue of civil rulers. Only five Popes have ruled over the Church during the greater part of the last century and every person, unless he be absolutely uninformed or ignorant, would rate them among the

saintliest people. We say "unless the person were uninformed or ignorant," designedly, because the lives of these Popes have been written by Protestants as well as Catholics.

It is very strange that people can regard themselves as religious and still engaged in an apostolate of vituperation and slander.

[EDITORS' NOTE: These three extracts are confusing. In the first it is not clear whether the reference to

Vicarius Filii Dei as inscribed on the pope's miter is the writer's statement, or merely a part of the "argument" in which it occurs, and which may or may not be the opinion of the writer. In the second the writer does say, without qualification, that the miter bears these words, but he does not give the source of his information. The third, some years later, denies that there is any inscription on the pope's tiara, a headdress differing from the miter. Is this meant as a refutation of the second answer, or does it merely ignore the question of the miter? Or was the inscription formerly used and later abandoned? There is no proof of its use at the present time.]

1751. Vicarius Filii Dei—Peter Called "Vicar of the Son of God" in Forged Donation of Constantine

SOURCE: Donation of Constantine, quoted in Christopher B. Coleman, *The Treatise of Lorenzo Valla on the Donation of Constantine*, pp. 12, 13. Copyright 1922 by Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission. [FRS No. 14.]

[p. 12] Sicut B. Petrus in terris vicarius Filii Dei esse videtur constitutus, ita et Pontifices, qui ipsius principis apostolorum gerunt vices, principatus potestatem amplius quam terrena imperialis nostrae serenitatis mansuetudo habere videtur, consessam a nobis nostroque imperio obtineant...

[p. 13] As the Blessed Peter is seen to have been constituted vicar of the Son of God on the earth, so the Pontiffs who are the representatives of that same chief of the apostles, should obtain from us and our empire the power of a supremacy greater than the clemency of our earthly imperial serenity is seen to have conceded to it.

1752. Virgin Birth, Koran on

SOURCE: Koran, Sūra xix. 19–21, preceded by Comment 139 (on Sura xix. 16–40), in *The Holy Qur–an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 2, pp. 770–772. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 770] C[omment] 139 [on Sūra xix. 16–40] Next comes the story of Jesus and his mother Mary. She gave birth, as a virgin, to Jesus, But her people slandered and abused her As a disgrace to her lineage. Her son Did defend her and was kind to her. He Was a servant of God, a true Prophet, Blessed in the gifts of Prayer and Charity, But no more than a man: to call him The son of God is to derogate from God's Majesty, for God is High above all His Creatures, the Judge of the Last Day.

[p. 771] 19. He said: "Nay, I am only a messenger from thy Lord, (To announce) to thee The gift of a holy son."

20. She said: "How shall I Have a son, Have seeing that No man has touched me, And I am not unchaste?"

21. He said: "So (it will be):

Thy Lord saith, 'That is Easy for Me: and (We Wish) to appoint him As a Sign unto men And a Mercy from Us':

[p. 772] It is a matter

(So) decreed."

[EDITORS' NOTE: Commentary is not any part of the Koran; it represents simply the view of the author of the comment.]

1753. Virgin Earth-goddess, Queen of Heaven

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic [Mythology]* (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, 1931), pp. 108, 109. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Co., New York.

[p. 108] In religion and mythology, of even greater importance than these three heads of the trinity, Anu, Enlil, and Enki, is the Sumerian Mother-goddess, whose character was so manifold that she became many distinct goddesses... The great and ubiquitous cult of the virgin Earth-goddess in Canaan, Phoenicia, and Syria seems to have been entirely borrowed from Babylonia. As already suggested, the primitive name of this Sumerian goddess seems to have been Ninanna, Innini, "Queen of Heaven." ... [p. 109] Three main types of the Earth-goddess, together with their minor manifestations, are clearly recognizable, Innini, the Semitic Ishtar, Mah, "the mighty goddess," Accadian Bêlit-ilî, "Queen of the gods," and the underworld goddess Ereshkigal.

1754. Virgin Mother-goddesses—The Virgin Goddess Innini as the "Weeping Mother"

SOURCE: Stephen Herbert Langdon, "Babylonian and Assyrian Religion," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1961 ed., Vol. 2, p. 858. Copyright 1960 by Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago. Used by permission.

Innini, the virgin heaven goddess, is only a specialized aspect of the earth mother... To understand the deeper aspects of this religion a complete study of the character of the mother goddess under her various titles is necessary. She consistently represents divine mercy and compassion as opposed to the severe and wrathful characters of the male deities. When men sin the gods punish with terrible vengeance, but the mother goddess ever intercedes for them. The religious scenes on seals in all periods represent her standing in prayer beside humans, and interceding with a god on their behalf. To the very end of Babylonian religion, Nintud, Aruru, Innini, Ishtar may be correctly described as the *mater dolorosa*, the "Weeping Mother."

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

1755. Waldenses, Beliefs and Practices, as Summarized and Interpreted by Their Enemies

SOURCE: Emilio Comba, *History of the Waldenses of Italy* (London: Truslove & Shirley, 1889), pp. 284, 285.

[p. 284] Concerning the Waldenses of Freyssinières, a Barbe named Martin, arrested at Oulx, and a woman belonging to the diocese of Valence [the trial records are extant]. If we examine them with attention, this is what we find: ...

Purgatory is rejected because it does not exist, except in this life, inasmuch as it was invented by the avarice of the Priest. Our fate is decided here below: after death, devotions will in no way change it. Worship belongs to God alone, as to the Creator; the Virgin Mary and the Saints being but creatures, have no share in it; besides, is it not doubtful whether they hear our prayers? At any rate help can come from God alone. What is to become of the Ave Maria? Should it be repeated as a penance? No: it is not a prayer like the Lord's Prayer, which being taught us of God, should suffice. Images are vain; as to festivals we must make a distinction. There are the festivals, properly so-called, which God has ordained, namely, Sunday [see No. 1469] and the festivals of Christmas, Easter, Ascension, and Pentecost. Of course we are bound to observe those; the others cannot be obligatory nor do they exclude work. Everyone is free to act according to his own cons[c]ience, but above all, let Sunday be observed; whilst the memory of the Apostles or of any who are among the Saints may also be honoured. However, God is not in the Church more than elsewhere. He may be equally well praved to at home, nay, even in a stable; he is present everywhere. The Romish Church has become a Babel, a Synagogue of Satan; it is the Church of the wicked. The Prelates are worldly and lead scandalous lives, hence they are unsuited to their office; for legitimate power in the Church of Christ is always in proportion to the holiness of those who exercise it. The office of the Romish clergy is therefore an empty for- [p. 285] mality; its practices are worthless, and its holy water very harmless. God blessed the waters from the beginning of creation, and He blesses them every year on Ascension Day, together with every one of His creatures. Rain water is just as good. Aspersions are, therefore, matters of indifference, as well as the singing that accompanies them. If this be so, has the Church a right to tithes and offerings? Certainly not. As for alms, we shall give them to the poor instead of handling them over to the curates. What matters it to us if these latter remonstrate? Clerical censures affect us but little; we are not bound to obey either the Church or her Prelates; not even her Pope, for he is very far from being holy. It is a long while since he usurped the power he is wielding; since Sylvester, of blessed memory, there has been no true Pope. Once we had the same ordinances: but the Priests having given themselves up to avarice and worldly vanities, we have been obliged to separate, in order to hold fast the rule of poverty. As we are not numerous, we live concealed, and for very good reasons; but, whatever may be said, we are the Church of God, and those who are not with us will go to perdition. We are but a handful of people; but it may be on our account that the world has not perished. Our rule forbids all swearing, even mitigated oaths; it also condemns the death penalty, except for the crime of killing a man. We recognize in our Barbes the power to bind and loose; it is to them that we are bound to confess our sins; that is to say, mortal sins. In pronouncing absolution, the confessor lays his hand on the penitent's head. Penance consists in repeating the Lord's Prayer a certain number of times, without the Ave Maria, in fasting-not on Saints' days, nor after the Lenten rulebut on the eve of the four great festivals and of Sunday, and at any rate on Friday. The Barbes do not receive the communion at Church any more than their flocks. They bless the bread, and that serves us as Eucharist. Their benediction is more effectual than ecclesiastic consecration. This latter is null and void; hence we desire no communion with Catholics. We avoid also uniting ourselves with them in the holy bonds of matrimony, were it only out of respect for this last Sacrament, which is not badly kept in the nest of the Alps.

1756. Waldenses, Beliefs and Practices at Beginning of the Reformation SOURCE: Statement of Morel, a Waldensian Pastor, quoted in Emilio Comba, *History of the Waldenses of Italy* (London: Truslove & Shirley, 1889), pp. 291–293.

[p. 291] With regard to our articles of beliefs, we teach our people, as well as we can, the contents of the twelve articles of the Symbol, called the Apostle's Creed, and every doctrine deviating from it is looked upon by us as heresy. We believe in a God in three persons; we hold that the humanity of Christ is created and inferior to the Father, who wished by means of it to redeem mankind; but we admit at the same time that Christ is both very God and very man. We hold also that there is no other mediator and intercessor with God than Jesus Christ. The Virgin Mary is holy, humble, and full of grace; the same with the other saints; and they await with her in heaven the glorification of their bodies at the resurrection. We believe that, after this life, there is only the place of abode of the elect, called paradise, and that of the rejected, called hell. As for purgatory it was invented by anti-Christ, contrary to truth, therefore we reject it. All that are of human invention—such as Saints' days, vigils, holy water, fasts on fixed days, and the like, especially the mass-are, as we think, an abomination in the sight of God. We believe the sacraments to be the signs of a sacred thing, or a visible figure of an invisible grace, and that it is good and useful for the faithful sometimes to partake of them, if possible; but we believe that, if the opportunity to do so be lacking, a man may be saved nevertheless. As I understand it, we have erred in admitting more than two sacraments. We also hold that oral confession is useful, if it be observed without distinction of time and for the purpose of comforting the sick, the ignorant, and those who seek our advice, according to the Scriptures, According to our rule, charity ought to proceed as follows:—First, everyone must love God, above all creatures, even more than his own soul; then his soul more than all else; then his neighbour's soul more than his own life; then [p. 292] his own life more than that of his neighbour; finally, the life of his neighbour more than his own property...

We ourselves do not administer the sacraments to the people—they are Papists [Latin, "members of Antichrist"] who do this; but we explain to them as well as we can the spiritual meaning of the sacraments. We exhort them not to put their trust in anti-Christian ceremonies, and to pray that if they be compelled to see and hear the abominations of anti-Christ, it may not be imputed to them as a sin, but that such sort of abominations may soon be confounded to make room for truth, and that the Word of God may be spread abroad. Besides, we absolutely forbid our people to swear. All dancing is prohibited, and, generally speaking, all kinds of games, except the practice of the bow or other arms. Neither do we tolerate vain and lascivious songs, delicate clothing, whether striped or checked, or [p. 293] cut after the latest fashion. Our people are generally simple folk, peasants, having no other resource but agriculture, dispersed by persecution in numbers of places very distant from each other.

1757. Waldenses—Missionaries Disguised as Peddlers SOURCE: Emilio Comba, *History of the Waldenses of Italy* (London: Truslove & Shirley, 1889), p. 278. The object of the Waldenses in thus disguising themselves was not merely to escape danger; they frequently only desired to disarm prejudice and gain a more ready access as missionaries; in such cases they assumed the $r\hat{o}le$ of pedlars. An Inquisitor [see editors' note] has given us such a faithful description of one of their visits, that we can almost imagine ourselves to be present. The scene is laid on the confines of Austria and Bavaria.

"They endeavour to insinuate themselves into the intimacy of noble families, and their cunning is to be admired. At first they offer some attractive merchandise to the gentlemen and ladies—some rings, for instance, or veils. After the purchase, if one ask the merchant: Have you anything else left to offer us? The latter will reply: I have stones more precious than those gems; I should be very willing to give them to you, if you will promise that I shall not be betrayed to the clergy. Being assured on this point he will add: I have one pearl so brilliant, that with it any man may learn to know God; I have another so resplendent that it kindles the love of God in the heart of whoever possesses it. And so on; of course he speaks of pearls in a figurative sense. After that he will recite some passage of Scripture."

[EDITORS' NOTE: The "Passau Inquisitor," a designation of either the monk Reiner (Reinerus or Reinerius Saccho) or an anonymous colleague in the Inquisition at Passau whose writings are attributed to him.]

1758. Waldenses—Multiple Origin

SOURCE: Ellen Scott Davison, *Forerunners of Saint Francis and Other Studies*, ed. by Gertrude R. B. Richards (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1927), pp. 237, 252, 253.

[p. 237] He [Peter Waldo] and his followers [from France] formed a centre around which gathered the Arnoldisti and the Humiliati of Italy, the Petrobrusians and Albigensians of France, and perhaps the Apostolics of the Rhine Valley. The sect resulting from the fusion of these elements, so strong that the whole force of the Church did not avail to crush it, mirrors the trend of the twelfth-century movement for evangelical poverty. From the beginning the Waldensians were better known than were most of their contemporaries...

[p. 252] Some claimed Claude, Bishop of Turin (822–39), as their founder; others held [p. 253] that they were the successors of a small group of good men who had protested against the degradation of the Church in the days of Sylvester and Constantine. Later historians think the nucleus of the Italian Waldensians was the False Humiliati, while still others have connected them with the followers of Arnold of Brescia. It is certain, at all events, that the later Waldensians of Piedmont were a fusion of various sects and that they were a formidable group.

1759. Waldenses, Orthodoxy of, Admitted by Enemies

SOURCE: Reiner [see No. 1757n], *Contra Waldenses Haereticos* (Against the Waldensian Heretics), chap. 4, in *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, ed. by Marguerin de la Bigne, Vol. 25 (Lugdunum [Lyons]: Anissonii, 1677), p. 264. Latin.

They [the "Leonists," or the "Poor Men of Lyons," i.e., Waldenses] live righteously before men, they believe well everything concerning God and all the articles which are contained in the creed; only they blaspheme the Roman Church and the clergy.

1760. Waldenses, Spread of, Before the Reformation

SOURCE: Emilio Comba, *History of the Waldenses of Italy* (London: Truslove & Shirley, 1889), pp. 80, 159. [p. 80] The mission of the Waldenses has been fruitful for Germany; it there sowed

the first seeds of the Reformation—the Bible—long before Luther's time. This is now being recognised. "We acknowledge," exclaims a learned man, "that the Waldenses exercised a more vigorous and wide-spread influence in Germany before the Reformation than has been hitherto believed." ...

The traces of the dispersion of the Waldenses ... cannot be followed ... Less than a century after their first banishment, one of their persecutors confessed that they had spread everywhere. "Where is," he exclaimed, "the country to be found, in which their sect does not exist?" Unfortunately, the Inquisition also was spreading everywhere on their track, putting out, one by one, the torches that were gleaming in the darkness... With all that a light does still hold on to burn upon yonder "Alpine-altar." ...

[p. 159] When the sun of the Reformation arose, the Waldensian light was shining still, if not as brightly, at least as purely as in the past; but in the presence of the new sun, it might well appear to have grown paler. Morel testifies to this with childlike simplicity, and an ingenuous joyful expectation, which recalls that of the prophets of old: "Welcome! blessed be thou, my Lord," he writes to the Basle reformer; "we come to thee from a far off country, with hearts full of joy, in the hope and assurance that, through thee, the Spirit of the Almighty will enlighten us."

1761. Wedding Customs—Pagan Roman Origin

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 29–33. [p. 29] While civil marriage was an old institution among the Romans, the most

ancient marriage rite of the patricians (*confarreatio*) involved the participation of religious functionaries. Sacrifice and prayer were part of the ceremony, and there was a procession to the bridegroom's house in the course of which appeals were made to the gods of marriage. Even after the confarreate marriage rite had become obsolete many of its characteristics survived in the form of wedding most frequently practiced by the Romans of the republican and imperial periods.

There was a ceremony of betrothal, which sometimes took place long before the wedding. On this occasion the prospective bridegroom gave his fiancée a ring which she wore on the third finger of her left hand. Sometimes guests were invited, and the bride-to-be received presents.

Great care was taken in the choice of the day [p. 30] for the wedding. Certain seasons, on account of the nature of the religious rites that fell within them, were regarded as distinctly inauspicious, namely the month of May, the first half of June, the third week in February, and the first half of March, and some other single days, including all Kalends, None, and Ides. Moreover festival days in general were avoided.

The bride wore a veil over her head and was crowned with a wreath of flowers. In the later period it was usual for the bridegroom also to wear a garland. The ceremony included prayer, sacrifice, and the clasping of the right hands of bride and groom. In the rite of *confarreatio* the bride formally renounced her own family name and took that of her husband, and they both partook of the sacred cake, *libum farreum*, so named because

it was made of the coarse wheat called far.

After the ceremony and the wedding feast, both of which generally took place in the bride's [p. 31] father's house, there was a procession to the new home, in which not only the bridal party but the general public took part. On reaching her husband's house the bride smeared the door-posts with fat or oil and bound them with woolen fillets. She was

then lifted over the threshold and taken into the *atrium* of the house, where she prayed for a happy married life and made her first offering to the gods of the household...

The Church maintained the pagan contact of marriage with religion, and though in the process of adaptation the content of the service was materially changed, many of the old customs were retained. Among the survivals may be mentioned the engagement-ring, still worn on the third finger of the left hand, the choice of the wedding-day, the bridal veil, the wed- [p. 32] ding feast and in some countries the wearing of garlands by both bride and groom, the procession to the bridegroom's house and the carrying of the bride over the threshold.

In regard to the giving of a ring it seems probable, in spite of Tertullian's comment [see No. 1322n] on the pagan character of the custom, that it was usual among most of the Christians even in his time (about A.D. 200), and it is quite clear that it was a universal practice from the fourth century...

While the ultimate origin of the veiling of the bride is uncertain, it is probably of religious significance. Perhaps the belief was that on so important and critical an event as marriage every precaution must be taken to ward off evil influences. Whatever its origin, it has come down to us not only in connection with weddings but also in the ceremony of "taking the veil" by Christian nuns. Their [p. 33] dedication to a life of devotion is regarded as a mystical marriage with Christ.

Tertullian denounced the wearing of garlands by bride and groom as a heathen practice, but none the less they were worn both in his day and afterwards. The custom still obtains in parts of Germany and Switzerland, and has never been abandoned in the countries whose religion is under the control of the eastern Church. It is possible, however, that in this matter the early Christians may have been influenced by Jewish as well as by Roman precedent. Jewish practice may also have been contributory to the continuance of the wedding feast. Wedding-processions that reproduce produce many of the features of those of pagan times—including the unrestrained raillery and uncensored jokes—may be seen in some parts of Italy today.

The custom of carrying the bride across the threshold has continued in parts of England and Scotland.

1762. Week, Came From Creation

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, pp. 32–35. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

[p. 32] The week has [p. 33] no connection with any fact of nature or any explainable material and secular experience of man. It is uniquely and exclusively an artificial creation...

For this difference we must seek some rational explanation. "The succession of the weeks is invariable and unbroken. No other time period larger than the day in common use has been without occasional hiatus, variation, or adjustment," requiring modification to make any recurring number of days coincide with lunar and solar changes...

Divisions of the year and the month are found in various civilizations, but they never consist of an unvarying number of days. Consequently, these divisions were not used as definite series. History reveals no invariable time period other than the day and the seven day week. Yet, "for thousands of years this sequence has been perfectly maintained," even from the beginning of our knowledge of any definite time reckoning...

[p. 34] The explanation given in Genesis 2:2, 3 must be the starting point for any effort to explain the origin, the continuance and the growing extension of this unique time division...

So far as our knowledge goes the week was used only by the progenitors of the Hebrews, by them and related Semetic [Semitic] peoples, and where their influence extended. Since Jesus the extension of Christianity, especially in the last two centuries, has carried with it increasingly the use of the week for time reckoning...

From the anthropological approach we would say that this rational time construction, having no relation to any natural phenomenon from which it could have been derived, was an invention of man's ingenuity. But anthropology finds no data in its own field bearing on this subject. The week, with its Sabbath, is an artificial device. The reason for it is found only in the Old Testament Scriptures...

[p. 35] In connection only with the week is religion obviously the explanation of its origin, and the week only is uniformly attributed to command of God. The week exists because of the sabbath. It is historically and scientifically true that the Sabbath was made by God.

1763. Week, Continuity of, From Dawn of History

SOURCE: "Our Astronomical Column," Nature (London), 127 (June 6, 1931), 869. Used by permission.

Some of these (the Jews, and also many Christians) accept the week as of divine institution, with which it is unlawful to tamper; others, without these scruples, still feel that it is useful to maintain a time-unit that, unlike all others, has proceeded in an absolutely invariable manner since what may be called the dawn of history.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Two letters from national observatories in reply to inquiries from F. D. Nichol are reproduced in facsimile in Nichol's *Answers to Objections* (Washington: Review and Herald, 1952), pp. 560, 562. One, from the U.S. Naval Observatory, states that chronological specialists have no doubt of the continuity of the week since long before the Christian Era and that no calendar changes in past centuries have disrupted the weekly cycle. The other, from the Astronomer Royal of Greenwich Observatory, says that he knows of no change in the seven-day cycle, which comes down from a very early period; further, that it has run independently of the month and of all astronomical periods, and therefore no astronomical evidence can be furnished in connection with the week.]

1764. Week, Continuity of, From Immemorial Antiquity, According to Astronomers

SOURCE: Anders Donner and Edouard Baillaud, quoted in League of Nations, *Report on the Reform of the Calendar*, Aug. 17, 1926, statements from astronomers, pp. 51, 52. (VIII. Transit, 1926. VIII. 6.) Used by permission of the United Nations.

[a. Anders Donner (Sweden)]

[p. 51] The week ... has been followed for thousands of years and therefore has been hallowed by immemorial use.

[b. Edouard Baillaud (France)]

[p. 52] I have always hesitated to suggest breaking the continuity of the week, which is without a doubt the most ancient scientific institution bequeathed to us by antiquity.

1765. Week, Names of Days, Decreed Changed by Pope Sylvester (314–335) From Name of Gods

SOURCE: Rabanus Maurus, *De Clericorum Institutione* (On the Institution of the Clergy), bk. 2, chap. 46, in *MPL*, Vol. 107, col. 361. Trans. from the Latin by Frank H. Yost. Used by permission of Mrs. Frank H. Yost.

Sylvester the pope first among the Romans ordered that the names of the days, which before they called according to the names of their own gods, that is (the day) of the sun,

of the moon, of Mars, of Mercury, of Venus, of Saturn, they should call *feria* (day of celebration), that is, first feria, second feria, third feria, fourth feria, fifth feria, sixth feria, because in the beginning of Genesis it is written that God had said for each day: first, "Let there be light"; second, "Let there be the firmament"; third, "Let the earth produce living plants", etc. But the Sabbath he commanded they call by the ancient name of the law, and the first feria the Lord's day, because the Lord rose on that day. Moreover the same pope ordered that the rest (*otium*) of the Sabbath would better be transferred to the Lord's day, so that we should leave that day free of worldly works in order to praise God.

1766. Week, Only One Origin of

SOURCE: W. O. Carver, *Sabbath Observance*, pp. 34, 35. Copyright 1940 by Broadman Press, Nashville, Tenn. Used by permission.

[p. 34] The week, with its Sabbath, is an artificial device. The reason for it is found only in the Old Testament Scriptures. Here it is always associated with revelation from God...

[p. 35] In connection only with the week is religion obviously the explanation of its origin, and the week only is uniformly attributed to command of God.

1767. Week, Planetary (Astrological), Developed in Hellenistic Period SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (2d ed.; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1957), pp. 168–170.

[p. 168] In the cuneiform texts of the Seleucid period the standard arrangement is [169] Jupiter—Venus—Mercury—Saturn—Mars.

The reason for this arrangement is unknown... The ordinary arrangement in the Greek horoscopes is

Sun-Moon-Saturn-Jupiter-Mars-Venus-Mercury...

The Babylonian system has nothing to do with the arrangement in space. The Greek system, however, obviously follows the model which arranges the planets in depth according to their periods of sidereal rotation. This is reflected even in the arrangement [of the "seven planets" that results in the order] of the days of the planetary week which we still use today. Here the Sun is placed between Mars and Venus, and the Moon below Mercury. Every one of the 24 hours of a day is given a "ruler" following this sequence. Beginning, e. g., with the Sun for the first hour one obtains

day	ì í	hour	1	2	3 Mercury	4	5	 24
uay 1	î		Sun	Venus	-	Moon	Saturn	 Mercury

day	i í	hour	1	2	3	 24
2	î		Moon	Saturn	Jupiter	 Jupiter

day	ì í	hour	1		etc.	
3	î		Mars			
			~ .	 		

The "ruler" of the first hour ... [is] then considered to be the ruler of the day and thus one obtains for seven consecutive days the following rulers

Sun	Moon	Mars	Mercury
Jupiter	Venus	Saturn	

which is our sequence of the days of the week and also the arrangement of the planets in Hindu astronomy.

Here we have a system which is obviously Greek in origin not only because it is based on the arrangement of the celestial [p. 170] bodies according to their distance from the earth but also because it supposes a division of the day into 24 hours... It is totally misleading when this order is called "Chaldean" in modern literature.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This planetary week is not Chaldean in the sense of originating in the time of the Chaldean Empire (Nebuchadnezzar and his successors), since it dates from the Hellenistic period—after Alexander. But it is of "Chaldean" origin in the sense of the classical definition of a "Chaldean" being an Oriental astrologer. The days of the astrological week were not numbered, but the order of the planets from which the days are derived was regarded as beginning with Saturn. It is merely a coincidence that Saturn's day coincided with the last day of the Jewish week and the Sun's day with the first.]

1768. Week, Planetary, in 1st Century of Our Era

SOURCE: Philostratus *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana* iii. 41; translated by F[rederick] C. Conybeare, Vol. 1 (London: William Heinemann, 1912), pp. 321, 323. Reprinted by permission of Harvard University Press and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 321] Damis says that [p. 323] Iarchas gave seven rings to Apollonius [of Tyana, 1st cent. A.D.] named after the seven stars, and that Apollonius wore each of these in turn on the day of the week which bore its name.

1769. Week, Planetary — Names of Days, Derivation

SOURCE: "Calendar," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1961 ed., Vol. 4, p. 568. Copyright 1961 by Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago. Used by permission.

The English names of the days are derived from the Saxon. The ancient Saxons had borrowed the week from some Eastern nation, and substituted the names of their own divinities for those of the gods of the East.

Latin	English	Saxon
Dies Solis.	Sunday.	Sun's day.
Dies Lunae.	Monday.	Moon's day
Dies Martis.	Tuesday.	Tiw's day.
Dies Mercurii.	Wednesday.	Woden's day.
Dies Jovis.	Thursday.	Thor's day.
Dies Veneris.	Friday.	Frigg's day.
Dies Saturni.	Saturday.	Seterne's day.

1770. Week, Planetary — Names of Days—Sabbath Called Day of Saturn (38 B.C.)

SOURCE: Dio Cassius *Roman History* xlix. 22. 4; translated by Earnest Cary, Vol. 5 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 387. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [FRS No. 109.]

The first of them [the Jews] to be captured were those who were fighting for the precinct of their god, and then the rest on the day even then called the day of Saturn. And so excessive were they in their devotion to religion that the first set of prisoners, those who had been captured along with the temple, obtained leave from Sosius, when the day of Saturn came round again, and went up into the temple and there performed all the

customary rites, together with the rest of the people. These people Antony entrusted to a certain Herod to govern.

1771. Week, Planetary — Names of Days—Saturn's Day Coincided With Jews' Sabbath

SOURCE: Dio Cassius *Roman History* xxxvii. 16. 2–4; translated by Earnest Cary, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 125, 127. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library. [FRS No. 108.]

[p. 125] They [the Jews] made an exception of what are called the days of Saturn, and by doing [p. 127] no work at all on those days afforded the Romans an opportunity in this interval to batter down the wall. The latter, on learning of this superstitious awe of theirs, made no serious attempts the rest of the time, but on those days, when they came round in succession, assaulted most vigorously. Thus the defenders were captured on the day of Saturn, without making any defence, and all the wealth was plundered. The kingdom was given to Hyrcanus, and Aristobulus was carried away.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Josephus makes it clear that the day used by the Romans to prepare for the next attack (63 B.C.), the day called by Dio (A.D. 150–235) "day of Saturn," is the same day known to the Jews as the Sabbath: [p. 67] "Pompey himself was on the north side, engaged in banking up the fosse and the whole of the ravine with materials collected by the troops. The tremendous depth to be filled, and the impediments of every sort to which the work was exposed by the Jews above, rendered this a difficult task. Indeed, the labours of the Romans would have been endless, had not Pompey taken advantage of the seventh day of the week, on which the Jews, from religious scruples, refrain from all manual work, and then proceeded to raise the earthworks, while forbidding [p. 69] his troops to engage in hostilities; for on the sabbaths the Jews fight only in self-defence" (Josephus *War* i. 7. 3; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 2 [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956], pp. 67, 69; reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library).]

1772. Week, Planetary — Names of Days—Saturn's Day Mentioned by Tibullus (*c*. 54 B.C.–*c*. A.D. 18)

SOURCE: Tibullus [Poems] i. 3. 11. 13-22; translated by J. P. Postgate in Catullus, Tibullus, and

Pervigilium Veneris (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939), pp. 205, 207. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 205] All promised a return; yet did nothing stay her from looking back in tears and terror on my journey. Yea, even I her comforter, after I had given my parting charge, sought still in my disquiet [p. 207] for reasons to linger and delay. Either birds or words of evil omen were my pretexts, or there was the holy-day of Saturn to detain me. How often, when my foot was on the road, said I that, stumbling at the gate, it had warned me of disaster! Let no man venture to depart when Love says nay; else shall he learn that a god forbade his going.

1773. Westminster Confession, Dogmatism of

SOURCE: George S. Hendry, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960), p. 15. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

The authors of the [Westminster] Confession, in common with most of the men of their age, thought it was incumbent upon them to deliver categorical answers to all questions that could be raised concerning the faith, and not only so, but they held the attitude that to every question there is one right answer, and all the others are wrong. They seem to have forgotten that "we walk by faith, not by sight" (II Cor. 5:7), and "we see through a glass, darkly" (I Cor. 13:12). Only once do they hint at mystery (CF III, 8); for the rest, they know all the answers, and can explain everything. This is particularly evident in the two final chapters, in which the Confession takes us, so to speak, on a

conducted tour of the shadowy region beyond death, and not only does it know how to distinguish the stages of the journey we shall have to take there, but it predicts the issue of the final judgment with a confidence hardly befitting those who will be neither judge nor jury, but judged.

1774. Westminster Confession, Original, Not Now Accepted in Entirety by Presbyterian Churches

SOURCE: George S. Hendry, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 11, 12. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 11] The propriety of using the Confession as the basis of an exposition of the church's faith at the present day, however, raises a number of questions which demand further consideration. The fact cannot be ignored that the Confession no longer holds the same place in the mind of the church as it did in the past. While most Presbyterian Churches on both sides of the Atlantic continue formally to accept the Confession, they do so with certain expressed and unexpressed qualifications and reservations. Some have introduced changes in the text of the Confession itself, by altering certain passages or to preclude certain inferences that might be drawn from them. Several Churches have adopted brief statements of faith, which, while "they are not to be regarded as substitutes for, but rather as interpretations of, and supplements to, the Westminster Confession," do in fact constitute implicit revisions of it. Individual members of the Churches have called for a thorough revision of the Confession, and some have proposed the preparation of an entirely new Confession which would in effect supersede the old, but no Presbyterian Church has thus far committed itself to such a step.

The attitude of the Presbyterian Churches toward their Confession of Faith, which they accept and at the same time criticize, may appear to be anomalous, but it is in accordance with the Confession itself. For the central principle of the Reformed faith, which it asserts, is that the Word of God is the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and that no other document-not even one produced under the best ecclesiastical auspices—can be regarded in the same light. One of the main reasons why the Re- [p. 12] formers were constrained to break with the Roman Church was that their doctrines, which were the products of the mind of the church, were propounded as "dogmas divinely revealed" and therefore "infallible and irreformable." The Confession of Faith affirms explicitly and emphatically that "all decrees of councils" and "doctrines of men" are subject to the judgment of "the Supreme Judge," who "can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture" (CF I, 10), and are therefore open to correction; and in saying this it does not intend to exempt itself, for it also states that "All synods or councils since the apostles' times, whether general or particular [and the Westminster Assembly comes under this category], may err" (CF XXXIII, 3). Immunity from criticism is the last thing its authors would claim for the Confession. Their main endeavor is to refer us to the Word of God; if continued study of the Word of God (and it has been under continuous study in the church during the three centuries that have elapsed since the Confession was drawn up) leads us to take exception to some statements in the Confession, this is not to show disrespect for it; on the contrary, it is to treat it with the highest degree of respect.

1775. White, Ellen G., Eulogy of

SOURCE: Edith Deen, *Great Women of the Christian Faith* (New York: Harper, 1959), pp. 230, 231. Copyright 1959 by Edith Deen. Used by permission.

[p. 230] They believed Ellen White to be a prophetess, like Deborah, Huldah and Anna. Not only did she foretell the future, but she also gave wise [p. 231] counsel in the

present. Certainly she was a spokesman for God. Like the prophets of old, her life was marked by humility, simplicity, austerity, divine learning and devotion. And like them, she turned to God for healing and help. So firm did her faith become that she accomplished the miraculous for Adventists.

1776. White, Ellen G., on Diet—A Nutritionist's Opinion

SOURCE: Paul Harvey, "Nutritionist White Ahead of Her Time," *The Lima* (Ohio) *News*, Aug. 11, 1960. Reprinted from Paul Harvey's three-times-per-week syndicated newspaper column. Copyright 1960, General Features Corporation. Used by permission.

Once upon a time, a hundred years ago, there lived a young lady named Ellen White. She was frail as a child, completed only grammar school, and had no technical training, yet she lived to write scores of articles and many books on the subject of healthful living.

Remember, this was in the days when doctors were still blood-letting and performing surgery with unwashed hands. This was in an era of medical ignorance bordering on barbarism. Yet Ellen White wrote with such profound understanding on the subject of nutrition that all but two of the many principles she espoused have been scientifically established.

Professor of Nutrition, Dr. Clive McCay of Cornell said, "How much better health the average American might enjoy if he but followed the teachings of Mrs. White."

Perhaps we should reread what she has taught: "The oil, as eaten in the olive, is far preferable to animal oil or fat." Today we know about cholesterol.

She knew: "Fine flour white bread is lacking in nutritive elements to be found in bread made from whole wheat." Today we have re-enriched our bread.

She wrote: "Do not eat largely of salt." Now we know we should keep the sodium intake low.

She wrote whole articles on the importance of not overeating; of not becoming overweight; of eating "at each meal two or three kinds of simple food"; and "eat not more than is required to satisfy hunger."

We have come to accept the wisdom of such advice so completely that it is difficult for us to realize how revolutionary her theories were almost a century ago. (Seventh-day Adventists consider her knowledge divinely inspired.)

A long time before we learned about TV snacks, Mrs. White wrote: "After irregular eating, when children come to the table, they do not relish wholesome food; their appetites crave that which is hurtful to them."

She urged: "Pure air, sunlight, abstemiousness, rest, exercise."

She wrote: "Tobacco is a slow, insidious, but most malignant poison. It is all the more dangerous because its effects are slow and at first hardly perceptible." "Divinely inspired" or not, Ellen White was, indeed, ahead of her time.

Are there additional recommendations which this remarkable woman urged upon us which we have, so far, ignored?

Two of her teachings haunt the more progressive nutritionists because if she is right about these also, most of us are wrong and have yet to "catch up" to her advanced knowledge of nutrition.

Mrs. White wrote: "All-wheat flour is not best for continuous diet. A mixture of wheat, oatmeal and rye would be more nutritious."

Also, Mrs. White was essentially a vegetarian. She wrote: "The life that was in the grains and vegetables passes into the eater. We receive it by eating the flesh of the animal. How much better to get it direct."

Do you suppose we'll discover she was right about these things, too?

1777. White, Ellen G., Teaching and Work

SOURCE: Editorial, "An American Prophetess" (a notice of the death of Mrs. White), *The Independent*, 83 (Aug. 23, 1915), 250.

Of course, these teachings [of the founders of the denomination] were based on the strictest doctrine of inspiration of the Scriptures. Seventh Day Adventism could be got in no other way. And the gift of prophecy was to be expected as promised to the "remnant church," who had held fast to the truth. This faith gave great purity of life and incessant zeal. No body of Christians excels them in moral character and religious earnestness. Their work began in 1853 in Battle Creek, and it has grown until now they have thirty-seven publishing houses thruout the world, with literature in eighty different languages, and an annual output of \$2,000,000. They have now seventy colleges and academies, and about forty sanitariums; and in all this Ellen G. White has been the inspiration and guide. Here is a noble record, and she deserves great honor.

Did she really receive divine visions, and was she really chosen by the Holy Spirit to be endued with the charism of prophecy? Or was she the victim of an excited imagination? Why should we answer? One's doctrine of the Bible may affect the conclusion. At any rate she was absolutely honest in her belief in her revelations. Her life was worthy of them. She showed no spiritual pride and she sought no filthy lucre. She lived the life and did the work of a worthy prophetess, the most admirable of the American succession.

1778. World Conditions—Causes of World Tensions SOURCE: Daniel A. Chapman, "We, the Peacemakers," *Presbyterian Life*, 11 (September 1, 1958), 19, 20. Copyright 1958 by Presbyterian Life, Inc., Dayton, Ohio. Used by permission.

[p. 19] The danger signs in our present situation are clear for all to see... Opposing ideologies compete for the minds and souls of men; rival power blocs and systems of alliances imperil the peace of nations, large and small... An arms race of unprecedented dimensions casts its [p. 20] heavy shadow on the life of every single soul...

What are some of the root causes of world tensions? ... Above all, there are the basic human frailties. We are made in the image of God, and yet we disobey his will. We are overwhelmed by man's apparently insatiable lust for power, prestige, and possession. Pride, greed, conceit, and narrow-mindedness claim a heavy toll. Misunderstanding and racism poison the atmosphere and sow seeds of destruction in the lives of great and powerful countries, as well as of small and weak ones. These failings in man ... hasten the coming of war and destruction.

1779. World Conditions, Christian Not Dismayed by

SOURCE: Judith N. Shklar, *After Utopia*, pp. 177–179. Copyright © 1957 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 177] Indeed, no despair at all is permitted Christians. The call to hope cannot be evaded... [p. 178] The doctrine of hope must somehow be salvaged, in spite of the signs of the times. Thus, so entirely orthodox a Catholic as Monsignor Ronald Knox, observing the world of the atomic bomb, is forced to agree that, "The Christian virtue of hope has nothing whatever to do with the world's future... (Hope) in the theological sense is concerned only with the salvation of the individual believer and the means which will help him attain it." A Christian does not sin if he expects the world to blow itself up in the near future, and Monsignor Knox reminds us that the first Christians lived in daily expectation of the world's end...

[p. 179] A Protestant theologian, Edwyn Bevan, again reminds us that the early Christians expected life in this world to get constantly worse, and that the experience of the present age should lead us to a return to their apocalyptic hopes. For, though it is clear that the world is in a very bad state, God remains the Lord of History.

1780. World Conditions—Christian's Faith and Secular Culture SOURCE: Judith N. Shklar, *After Utopia*, p. 165. Copyright © 1957 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

Christian faith has never been conducive to a complacent acceptance of secular culture. Not only does faith, like aesthetic sense, spring from an a-historical and a-political source of human feeling; it also stands as a constant challenge to and condemnation of the world of sin, error, and frivolity. If Christianity finds its origins in events within history, it also stands above them. Consequently, cultural conditions, however much they may appall the Christian, can never bring him to the utter despair of the unhappy consciousness. He may and does join the romantic in despairing of technological, scientific, urban mass society, but ... he himself remains secure in his faith; he observes the disaster of others. In short, even the most extreme Christian fatalist who is certain of the imminent end of Western culture, and even of the coming of Anti-Christ, can never share the total estrangement of the romantic.

1781. World Conditions—Deaths in Two World Wars

SOURCE: Lewis Mumford, *The Transformations of Man* (Vol. 7 of *World Perspectives*. New York: Harper, 1956), p. 180. Copyright © 1956 by Lewis Mumford. Used by permission.

Though man has now for the first time the technical means of achieving and perpetuating a world culture, he has already become seriously frustrated, indeed deeply discouraged, by the current miscarriage of these means. That miscarriage is recorded in two world wars, which brought premature death by military combat or genocide—leaving out those who succumbed to epidemic diseases—to between thirty and forty million human beings within thirty years. This decimation canceled out a century's gains in lowering the death rate from preventable disease.

1782. World Conditions.—Decline in Morals

SOURCE: John L. Thomas, *The Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 99, 100. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

[p. 99] We did not need two Kinsey reports to warn us that modern [p. 100] ideals and practices related to sex are confused and contradictory. Contemporary art, literature, and advertising reflect, even while they mold, a startling array of conflicting opinions and practices. Family theorists and marriage counselors appear to regard obvious disorganization as little more than regrettable "growing pains" in a period of rapid social change. Yet divorce rates and crime reports suggest that what was once considered socially pathological is gradually reaching the status of institutionalized normality.

1783. World Conditions—Decline of Reason SOURCE: Peter Hudson, "Effective Evangelism: Striking at the Modern Dilemma," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Nov. 7, 1960), 3. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

The first factor is that people are using their minds less and less to determine the course of their lives.

Apart from the more obvious ways in which independent thought is being controlled or hindered—such as, brainwashing, advertising by suggestion, and conditioning—there are more subtle ways which, because of their indirect influence on the mind, are more universal and effective. More people than ever are living together in big cities where genuine individuality of thought and action is difficult. The daily work of many no longer demands the concentration of the skilled craftsman. Rather, life's complexities exhaust the mind with the trivialities of red tape, and then leave it too fatigued to meditate on important things.

Knowledge has become specialized. A hundred years ago the average person could have a fair idea of why and how things happened in the world around him. Today only the expert can profess to know this. The average person is content with the bits of knowledge he picks up from magazines, radio, and television, and can leave to the experts, computers, adding machines, and electronic brains the responsibility of doing his thinking for him in areas he cannot understand.

The strongest deterrents to the use of the mind are modern views which do not regard man's reason as having any objective validity. If man's behavior is determined by his glands, his subconscious mind, or economic factors, any reasoning that he may claim to do is but the response of inner or outer environmental factors and is therefore purely subjective. And if he is no longer responsible for his actions, then condemnation of his behavior when unacceptable becomes unfair. But if objective truth and standards do exist, modern views notwithstanding, then the application of them to daily life demands considerable thought on our part.

1784. World Conditions—Fear, Anxiety, Suspicion

SOURCE: Percy L. Julian, "Has Science Come of Age?" (address delivered before the Maryland section of the American Chemical Society April 15, 1955, at Morgan State College, Baltimore, Maryland), *The Morgan State College Bulletin*, 21 (May, 1955), 11, 12.

[p. 11] Verily, we still live in the shadow of the cloud that the monster cast upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki. No single event in history has brought a world to such a state of anxiety, fear and suspicion... Fears, fears, and more fears; anxieties and more anxieties. Look at the titles of the books on our shelves. I wonder, often, if my children look at them, because I have all these in one spot, and I wonder if they ever walk by and wonder, "Is Daddy psychopathic?" Read the list as it stands on my shelf: "The Age of Anxiety" by Professor LeVan Baumer of Yale; "Our Age of Unreason" by the psychoanalyst, Franz Alexander; "The Decline of the West" by Spengler; [p. 12] "Mind at the End of Its Tether"; "The Plague"; "Troubled Sleep"; "The Age of Crisis"; "Mankind Beyond Salvation." If, indeed, this is the scientists' world, someone has the right to ask, "Has science come of age?"

I would like to add one more book to the list of titles that run the gamut. I would like to write a book entitled "The Age of Approaching Honesty" on behalf of the sorely beset scientists. I would like to ask you what was our faith before Hiroshima. Who was our God before Nagasaki? Let a scientist do a bit of probing. Was he a God whom we had fashioned to fit our rationalizations? Was he a God we had patterned to fit our pagan comfort? ... Was he not a God who smiled with indulgence over our devotion to and worship of a world of things? ... Was he the ancient God of our conscience who taught us that there are some things that are everlastingly right and some things that are everlastingly wrong?

1785. World Conditions—Fear, as a Sign of the Age

SOURCE: Franklin Le Van Baumer, "Age of Anxiety," in *Main Currents of Western Thought* (1956), pp. 577–579. Copyright 1952 by Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 577] With the opening of the new century the majority of western Europeans still lived in the comfortable assurance that all was right with the world or, at any rate, that the invincible combination of rational man and the machine could soon make it right. Fifty years later this assurance has vanished, has been replaced by a mood often approaching despair...

What does the twentieth century signify? The intellectual historian does not know, nor, truly, does anyone else. All he knows is that western Europe has moved into an age qualitatively different from either the Age of Religion or the Age of Science. In our time there has been something like a revival of religion, but religion by no means dominates culture as it did in the days of Aquinas and Luther. The last two generations have been a time of great scientific progress, but science is no longer a "sacred cow." The twentieth century lacks the conviction and certainty of the two ages it has superseded. Compared with the "day-light world" of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it is a "night-time world," an "age of anxiety." ¹ [Note 1: This is the title of a poem by W. H. Auden, published in 1947.]

"Anxiety," as here used, denotes a state of mind combining loneliness of spirit with a sense of loss of control. Unlike the confident bourgeois of the last century, the individual European now [p. 578] often feels that he has lost control over his private destiny. Likewise, the collective nation, and the collective civilization, no longer completely controls its political and economic destiny. In this circumstance the individual simply drifts, anxiously awaiting the shock of events which will determine his tomorrow. Having kicked over, first Christianity, and then the bourgeois code, he lives without benefit of a standard of values to which these events might be referred. It need hardly be pointed out that this is a dangerous state of mind, easily capitalized by totalitarian *Führers*.

Anxiety has been building up among western Europeans since 1914, and for good reasons... Europeans have had to adjust to a world in which there is no peace between nations. They do not need Freud to lecture to them on man's irrationality and potential savagery; the concentration camps and ruined cities, inevitable by-products of total wars and the ever-present threat of war, tell their own story of man's inhumanity to man. In times of social disintegration and physical pain, mental anguish and introversion (often morbid) are only to be expected...

[p. 579] Anxiety, or the idea of anxiety, permeates modern thought in all its aspects. You find it almost everywhere you look: in Freudian psychology, in the philosophy of existentialism, in poetry and the novel, in the language of religion, in "historical" prognostications, and, of course, in contemporary political movements. From the titles of books alone it would be possible to deduce that a good many first-rank intellectuals had developed serious misgivings about their civilization. *The Decline of the West, Our Age of Unreason, Mind at the End of its Tether, The Plague, Troubled Sleep, Age of Crisis*— these and other titles betoken a type of "crisis thinking" uncongenial, for the most part, to the nineteenth century.

1786. World Conditions—Fear, Even Among Christians SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), p. 43. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

During the last fifty years particularly, the quality of hope has ebbed away from our common life almost imperceptibly. I say again that we are affected far more than we know, far more than we should be, by the prevailing atmosphere of thought around us.

Christians, at any rate as far as western Europe is concerned, do not seem to exhibit much more hope than their non-Christian contemporaries. There is an unacknowledged and unexpressed fear in the hearts of many people that somehow the world has slipped beyond the control of God. Their reason may tell them that this cannot be so, but the constant assault of world tensions and the ever present threat of annihilation by nuclear weapons make people feel that the present setup is so radically different that the old rules no longer apply. Without realizing it, many of us are beginning to consent in our inmost hearts to the conclusion that we live in a hopeless situation.

1787. World Conditions—Increase in Technology Abrupt, at Turn of 19th Century

SOURCE: Norman Cousins, *Modern Man Is Obsolete* (New York: Viking, 1945), pp. 15, 16. Copyright 1945 by Norman Cousins. Used by permission.

[p. 15] A wheel turned no faster in Hannibal's time than it did in George Washington's. It took just as long to cultivate a wheat field in Egypt in 5000 B.C. as it did anywhere at the turn of the nineteenth century... [p. 16] The speed of technological change was almost as slow as that of life itself.

Then suddenly, with the utilization of steam and electricity, more changes were made in technology in two generations than in all the thousands of years of previous human history put together. Wheels and machines turned so fast that man could cover more distances in one day than he used to be able to do in a lifetime.

1788. World Conditions—Increase in Technology Facilitates Spread of Gospel

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *The Christian Outlook*, pp. 200, 201. Copyright 1948 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 200] As never before it is possible to acquaint men the world around with the Gospel. The many means of communication—the radio and the airplane, added to the seemingly more prosaic contributions of earlier days, the printed page, the railway, the steamship, and the automobile—[p. 201] make physically feasible the reaching of all men. Christian communities in almost every land and among almost every tribe and nation provide, as never before, nuclei for the spread of the faith.

1789. World Conditions— Increased Expansion of Knowledge in 19th and 20th Centuries

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *The Christian Outlook*, pp. 55, 56. Copyright 1948 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 55] In the eighteenth century a series of revolutions began in Western culture which continued into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and which partly swept away the existing order and brought in a new era. The French Revolution with its profound repercussions in Europe and the revolutions in the Americas which both preceded and succeeded it ushered in a new political order. Republics were set up which aspired to be democratic and more of popular representation in government was forced upon the remaining monarchs. The Age of Reason was a stage in the emergence of the Age of Science. Man's views and understanding of the physical universe increased with breathtaking speed... Concurrently with this expanding knowl- [p. 56] edge went its application to provide man with food, clothing, and shelter. The Industrial Revolution inaugurated the age of the machine. Wealth and population rapidly mounted. Cities mushroomed almost overnight. Vast shifts of people were seen, partly from rural areas

and small towns to cities and partly from Europe to Siberia, the Americas, Australasia, and South Africa... The commerce of the Occident penetrated to every inhabited country of the globe.

1790. World Conditions — Increasing Knowledge, From Near End of 18th Century

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, A History of Christianity, 1st ed., pp. 1064, 1065. Copyright 1953 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1064] The [19th] century was also marked by the rapidly mounting exploration by man of his physical environment. Through the scientific approach and at an exhilarating pace men pushed out the boundaries of their knowledge of the world about them and within them...

This increasing knowledge was utilized to effect progress in the mastery by men of their environment. Steam was harnessed, at first in manufactures and then in transportation by boats and railways. Through the telegraph, the telephone, and the trolley men made electricity their servant in speeding up communication. They constrained electricity to light their homes and their streets...

The additions to the knowledge and mastery of the physical environment contributed to great and transforming changes in the life of mankind. They made possible the industrial revolution. This began in the eighteenth century but mounted in the nineteenth century. Wealth grew by leaps and bounds. As throughout history, great extremes existed in the possession or absence of [p. 1065] wealth. Huge fortunes were accumulated by the few, moderate comfort was achieved by a large minority, but for another minority, in some places a majority, the new industrial processes meant grinding toil, sordid poverty, and moral and physical degradation. Populations multiplied. Cities mushroomed. The largest of them attained unprecedented dimensions. A new kind of urban life arose.

1791. World Conditions—Labor—Influence of Pope Leo IX's Social Teachings

SOURCE: Pius XII, Encyclical Letter *Quadragesimo Anno*, March 19, 1942 (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, [1942]), sec. 21, pp. 10, 11.

[p. 10] 21. Nor is the benefit that has poured forth from Leo's Encyclical confined within these bounds; for the teaching which *On the Condition of Workers* contains has gradually and imperceptibly worked its way into the minds of those outside Catholic unity [p. 11] who do not recognize the authority of the Church. Catholic principles on the social question have as a result, passed little by little into the patrimony of all human society, and We rejoice that the eternal truths which Our Predecessor of glorious memory proclaimed so impressively have been frequently invoked and defended not only in non-Catholic books and journals but in legislative halls also and courts of justice.

1792. World Conditions—Man in Space SOURCE: Norman Cousins, Editorial, "Put Poets Into Space," *Saturday Review*, 44 (April 29, 1961), 20. Copyright 1961 by Saturday Review, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The idea of man in space is an explosion in the imagination. It shakes free the sense of wonder; it cracks open a vast area of the human potential; it confronts the intelligence with the prospect of an encounter with the infinite. But it also adds to the terror. Not terror from what is unknown about space but from what is known about man. These cosmic vehicles are the forerunners of space platforms carrying loaded nuclear pistols pointed at the head of man on earth. A great ascent has taken place without any corresponding elevation of ideas. Man has raised his station without raising his sights. He roams the heavens with the engines of hell.

1793. World Conditions—Nuclear Age, an Utterly New Era SOURCE: Norman K. Gottwald, "Nuclear Realism or Nuclear Pacifism?" *The Christian Century*, 77 (Aug. 3, 1960), 895. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

Everywhere men are awakening to the fact that ours is the first generation in an utterly new era. Whether they are awakening rapidly enough is open to question—and apprehension. Arthur Koestler calls 1960 the year 15 p.H. (post-Hiroshima). He finds it natural that the full import of man's newly found ability to bring history to an end will take a long while to spread from the unconscious mind into the conscious levels of thought and finally into political policies.

Others wonder if we can afford the time. They feel nervously for the feeble moral pulse of the creature who spares no efforts to perfect the means and to multiply the possibilities for destruction. Among these troubled analysts of the new era are non-Christians who look to the church as the traditional source of social conscience. C. Wright Mills asks whether Christian history since Constantine has not been the sorry tale of Christians finding reasons for killing Christians.

1794. World Conditions — Nuclear Age, Impact of SOURCE: Richard M. Fagley, "Man and the Atomic Bomb," *The Chaplain*, 2 (November, 1945), 5–8. Used by permission.

[p. 5] The inexorable "either-or" of the atomic bomb, upon which hangs the fate of life on this planet, leaves the pride of man no means by which to save itself. The only alternative to Armageddon is repentance and regeneration...

Of course, atomic energy can lift the burden of poverty from the backs of countless millions and give all mankind the material basis for creative living. What should be equally obvious is that only if man has a new spirit within him can he pass over into this Promised Land. The Atomic Age is otherwise almost certain to be extremely short and extremely brutish! ...

The end of a scientific race between the development of anti-bombs and the development of bigger, faster bombs is not hard to see. It is the end of man on this earth...

[p. 6] Again, there is the common illusion that fear can protect mankind from atomic war. Fear, it is true, may help—if it leads men to seek, with a contrite heart, the protection and guidance of God. But fear by itself offers a shortcut to catastrophe. The fear of destruction from atomic bombs in the present world of competing states would insure and hasten sudden, ruthless attacks with atomic bombs. Total aggression would become the strategy for survival...

Atomic power is here to stay for the remainder of human history. And unless man can control hims[e]If as well as atomic power according to the moral law, both will no doubt terminate within a comparatively few years...

Unless men everywhere are moved to confess their own inadequacy, and seek to follow God's will rather than their own, no other strategy can save us.

The fate of the world, therefore, in a literal sense, depends upon the ability of the moral and religious forces, and above all, of the Christian churches, to call men effectively to repentance, worship, and service. The conversion of man, who, as Cousins

puts it, "has ex- [p. 7] alted change in everything but himself," has suddenly become a life-and-death issue, not merely for individuals, but for the race.

There is little comfort in recognizing the supreme responsibility of our churches for the fate of mankind. For nineteen centuries we Christians have preached the Good News more often with our lips than with our lives. We have preached, in tolerant fashion, that "the wages of sin is death," and proceeded generally to accommodate ourselves to the society about us. And now our churches, infected with the secularist spirit, are suddenly called upon to save humanity from the impending doom created by that spirit. No, the prospect is far from comforting...

[p. 8] The present difficulties are formidable enough. Fear already stalks the halls of government and the homes of our people. The corrosive effects of fear are already seen in government policy. Every short-sighted or evil-minded politician has new fuel for the fires of nationalism or imperialism. The timid politician is paralyzed with doubts or self-concern. Others are confused by the technical difficulties.

1795. World Conditions—Nuclear Energy for Destructive Purposes SOURCE: Lewis Mumford, *The Transformations of Man* (Vol. 7 of *World Perspectives*. New York: Harper, 1956), p. 160. Copyright © 1956 by Lewis Mumford. Used by permission.

Now the supreme achievement of mathematical and physical science in our time was, without doubt, the succession of discoveries that led to the modern conception of the atom and the equation that identified mass and energy: only mind and method of the highest order could have unlocked these cosmic secrets. But to what end was this consummate feat of the intelligence directed? What in fact prompted the final decision that enabled man to start the process of atomic fission? We all know the answer too well: its object was the production of an instrument of largescale destruction and extermination.

In the course of a decade's wholesale development of this new source of energy, the governments of Soviet Russia and the United States have now produced enough atomic and thermonuclear weapons to make it possible, even on the most conservative estimate, to wipe out all life on this planet. While these lethal powers were being multiplied, with all the resources available, the amount of thought spent on creating the moral and political agents that would be capable of directing such energies to a truly human destination was, by comparison, of pinheaded dimensions.

1796. World Conditions—Optimism Changed to Foreboding SOURCE: Harry Emerson Fosdick, Sermon, "Who Do You Think You Are?" in his *What Is Vital in Religion*, p. 178. Copyright 1955 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

Ours in particular is a generation when it is easy to take a dim view of human nature. Man's wickedness now threatens the very survival of the race. Here, indeed, is the biggest change that has taken place in my lifetime—this swing from the cheerful optimism about man and his prospects, which prevailed in the late nineteenth century, to the grim confrontation of human folly and depravity and the dire foreboding about man's future which prevail today...

In the years before the two world wars we oldsters did live in an era of optimism about man. What days those were when science began pouring out its new inventions promising to remake the world! Now, however, we grimly wonder what devilish horrors man will perpetrate with his new science, and we hear dismal forebodings about the possibility that with the H-bomb we may coming racial suicide.

1797. World Conditions — Optimism Concerning Science Shattered

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *The Christian Outlook*, pp. 186, 187. Copyright 1948 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 186] First of all, we of this generation are suspicious of easy—or even difficult optimism. Two world wars and their attendant and more basic revolutions have sobered us. We look back with mingled wistfulness and sophisticated scorn upon the complacent optimism of the nineteenth century.

The doctrine of progress is dated. It belongs to that short and relatively halcyon age of the Occident which intervened between 1815 and 1914. Even that century knew such conflicts as the Crimean, American Civil, and Franco-Prussian wars. Yet, compared with the earlier Occident, and especially the eighteenth century, and with the post-1914 era it was peaceful. For the Occident, equipped newly with the machines of the In- [p. 187] dustrial Revolution, the nineteenth century was increasingly prosperous. Into this scene came the theory of evolution. The optimism of progress appeared logical. Life was believed to have begun in simple forms and to have developed into higher and more complex stages. At the apex came man himself who, springing from lower organisms, was now supreme. He had become so through his superior intelligence. What hypothesis seemed so reasonable as that which gave man and civilization an indefinitely growing and blissful future? So ran the argument.

In our day science and the machine are feared as the Frankenstein Monster which turns on its creator and destroys him. Civilization may be hurtled back into worse than barbarism by the forces which man has evoked.

1798. World Conditions—Optimism of Recent Centuries Dashed SOURCE: Reinhold Niebuhr, *Faith and History*, pp. 1, 6–8. Copyright 1949 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and James Nisbet, Ltd., London.

[p. 1] The history of mankind exhibits no more ironic experience than the contrast between the sanguine hopes of recent centuries and the bitter experiences of contemporary man. Every technical advance, which previous generations regarded as a harbinger or guarantor of the redemption of mankind from its various difficulties, has proved to be the cause, or at least the occasion, for a new dimension of ancient perplexities...

[p. 6] [In the 19th century almost] the whole chorus of modern culture learned to sing the new song of hope in remarkable harmony. The redemption of mankind, by whatever means, was assured for the future. It was, in fact, assured by the future.

There were experiences in previous centuries which might well have challenged this unqualified optimism. But the expansion of man's power over nature proceeded at such a pace that all doubts were quieted, allowing the nineteenth century to become the "century of hope" and to express the modern mood in its most extravagant terms. History, refusing to move by the calendar, actually permitted the nineteenth century to indulge its illusions into the twentieth. Then came the deluge. Since 1914 one tragic experience [p. 7] has followed another, as if history had been designed to refute the vain delusions of modern man.

The "laws" and tendencies of historical development proved in the light of contemporary experience to be much more complex than any one has supposed. Every new freedom represented a new peril as well as a new promise. Modern industrial society dissolved ancient forms of political authoritarianism; but the tyrannies which grew on its soil proved more brutal and vexatious than the old ones. The inequalities rooted in landed property were levelled. But the more dynamic inequalities of a technical society became more perilous to the community than the more static forms of uneven power. The achievement of individual liberty was one of the genuine advances of bourgeois society. But this society also created atomic individuals who, freed from the disciplines of the older organic communities, were lost in the mass; and became the prey of demagogues and charlatans who transmuted their individual anxieties and resentments into collective political power of demonic fury.

The development of instruments of communication and transportation did create a potential world community by destroying all the old barriers of time and space. But the new interdependence of the nations created a more perplexing problem than anyone had anticipated. It certainly did not prompt the nations forthwith to organize a "parliament of man and federation of the world." Rather it extended the scope of old international frictions so that a single generation was subjected to two wars of global dimensions. Furthermore the second conflict left the world as far from the goal of global peace as the first. At its conclusion the world's peace was at the mercy of two competing alliances of world savers, the one informed by the bourgeois and the other by the proletarian creed of world redemption. Thus the civil war in the heart of modern industrial nations, which had already brought so much social confusion into the modern world, was re-enacted in the strife between nations. The development of atomic instruments of conflict aggravated the fears not only of those who lacked such instruments, but of those who had them. The fears of the latter added a final ironic touch to the whole destiny of modern man. The possession of power has never [p. 8] annulled the fears of those who wield it, since it prompts them to anxiety over its possible loss. The possession of a phenomenal form of destructive power in the modern day has proved to be so fruitful of new fears that the perennial ambiguity of man's situation of power and weakness became more vividly exemplified, rather than overcome. Thus a century which was meant to achieve a democratic society of world-scope finds itself at its half-way mark uncertain about the possibility of avoiding a new conflict of such proportions as to leave the survival of mankind, or at least the survival of civilization, in doubt.

1799. World Conditions—Optimism Shattered

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 44, 45. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 44] This safe, comfortable world with its boundless optimism was shattered for ever by the 1914–1918 War. I do not think that ever again has that hopeful, almost bumptiously hopeful, atmosphere reappeared in this country [England]. Quickly or slowly people began to see that science by itself is not enough...

The Second World War put a final end to any easy hopes or shallow optimism, and, except in places which are particularly fortunate or where people do not think or read about what is happening to the world, we do not find to- [p. 45] day any trace of those shining hopes of the early 1900's. Indeed, that particular kind of hope ... seems almost incredible to us today. It is not simply that we have become disillusioned about human nature through the evidence of two world wars and the contemporary evidence of atheistic Communism today, but that all of us are far more aware of the world with its tensions and problems than our cheerful forefathers could ever have been. Vastly improved methods of communication and travel have meant the end of a safe, complacent "parochial" outlook. Even if we try to detach ourselves personally from the world's burdens, we are assailed by newspapers, radio, and television, and we can scarcely help feeling something of the world's pains and problems. This I venture to think is by no

means altogether a bad thing, for it means that for the very first time in human history a great many intelligent men and women are realizing how interdependent we are as human beings. Nations, even whole continents, are awakening from the sleep of centuries, and while violent nationalism flares up from time to time, there is a growing sense among responsible people of all nations that we are "all in it together." If we are to have hope amidst all the menaces and threats of today's world, it has got to be a sturdy and well-founded hope.

1800. World Conditions — Progress Theory Now Outmoded SOURCE: Harry Emerson Fosdick, Sermon, "Who Do You Think You Are?" in his *What Is Vital in Religion*, p. 179. Copyright 1955 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

And what days those were when not only science and education were supposed to be saving the world, but when evolution was interpreted as guaranteeing inevitable progress; when men like Samuel Butler, half a century ago, could predict that inevitably, automatically, because of evolution man's body would become "finer to bear his finer mind, till man becomes not only an angel but an archangel." Well, look at mankind today and try to imagine us automatically evolving into archangels. What nonsense!

1801. World Conditions—Prospect—Apocalyptic End Seen Possible SOURCE: Lewis Mumford, *The Transformations of Man* (Vol. 7 of *World Perspectives*. New York: Harper, 1956), p. 178. Copyright © 1956 by Lewis Mumford. Used by permission.

An apocalyptic termination of all human development has become possible in our day; far more so than in the comparatively innocent times of John of Patmos. With our present lethal weapons the swift suicide of post-historic man is even more likely than his gradual triumph.

1802. World Conditions—Prospect—Children, and Their Future SOURCE: Winston Churchill, Speech in Commons, March 1, 1955, extract in "Thoughts for a Time of Crisis," *The New York Times Magazine*, Aug. 17, 1958, p. 69. Used by permission.

What ought we to do? Which way shall we turn to save our lives and the future of the world? It does not matter so much to old people. They are going soon anyway. But I find it poignant to look at youth in all its activities and ardor, and most of all to watch little children playing their merry games, and wonder what would lie before them if God wearied of mankind.

1803. World Conditions—Prospect—Dark Future

SOURCE: Lewis Mumford, *The Transformations of Man* (Vol. 7 of *World Perspectives*. New York: Harper, 1956), 153. Copyright © 1956 by Lewis Mumford. Used by permission.

The powers of New World man so confidently evoked now threaten to turn against him, as in the tale of the Sorcerer's Apprentice. Mankind now lives under the threat of self-destruction, on a scale hitherto unthinkable by methods heretofore unimaginable. A single homicidal command, escaping such rational controls as remain, might trigger a world catastrophe. Even if that does not happen, an equally dark future seems already visible: the replacement of historic man by a new form: post-historic man. We must face this final threat before turning to a consideration of happier alternatives.

1804. World Conditions—Prospect—Destruction of the Race Possible SOURCE: Lewis Mumford. *The Transformations of Man* (Vol. 7 of *World Perspectives*. New York: Harper, 1956), p. 181. Copyright © 1956 by Lewis Mumford. Used by permission.

One may doubt if any factors now known will be capable of bringing about the needed transformation of man in time to avoid the self-destruction of the human race—either by swift thermonuclear annihilation, by slow atomic pollution of air, soil and

water, or by the insidious conditioning of man to post-historic compulsions. If viewed on purely rational terms, one might be tempted to accept the dying judgment of H. G. Wells as something more than senile hallucination: "Mind is at the end of its tether." A more benign alternative would call for something like a miracle.

1805. World Conditions—Prospect—Human Race on Brink of Disaster SOURCE: Norman Cousins, Editorial, "Don't Resign From the Human Race," *Saturday Review of Literature*, 31 (Aug. 7, 1948), 7, 8. Copyright 1948 by Saturday Review Associates, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 7] The human race has existed until now largely because it has had an ample margin for error...

But today that margin for error has been used up. One more mistake of the type which in the past repeatedly led to war could be the final mistake. The world can no longer afford the fatal mistake of war.

Yet man persists in clinging to old errors as though they were life's own trophies—at a time when every major move must be the correct one. He has yet to demonstrate the capacity for presiding over experience, whether personal or historical...

[p. 8] We can now kill more in a single day than used to be killed in generations of perpetual conflict.

1806. World Conditions—Prospect—Later Than We Think

SOURCE: Wernher von Braun, "Why Should America Conquer Space?" *This Week* (March 20, 1960), p. 10. Copyright 1960 by United Newspapers Magazine Corporation, New York. Used by permission of the author and publishers.

America is not only the richest and technically most advanced country in the world, but also the one where people laugh and enjoy God's world more than anywhere else. But in their constitutionally guaranteed pursuit of happiness many Americans seem to refuse to look at the dark clouds which are rapidly moving up. I fear it is later than we think, and our position in the world is gravely endangered.

1807. World Conditions—Prospect—Time Is Short for Our Civilization SOURCE: "Choose Life, Not Death! Message of the World Council of Churches, issued at Geneva, March, 1946," *The Christian Century*, 63 (March 27, 1946), 396. Copyright 1946 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

The world today stands between life and death. Men's hopes of a better world have been fulfilled...

We face this crisis as Christians whose own consciences are gravely disturbed. ... Men are going the way of death because they disobey God's will. All renewal depends upon repentance, upon turning from our own way to God's way. He is calling men to a supreme decision...

But the time is short. Man's triumph in the release of atomic energy threatens his destruction. Unless men's whole outlook is changed, our civilization will perish.

1808. World Conditions—Religion Versus Atheism

SOURCE: J. Edgar Hoover, "Soviet Rule or Christian Renewal?" *Christianity Today*, 5 (Nov. 7, 1960), 8. Copyright 1960 by christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

Today two vast ideological worlds confront each other, worlds which embody different deities and conceptions of man. Casting our eyes down the avenue of the next generation, we may pose the issue between the worlds as *Communist domination or Christian rededication*. Shall the world fall under the cold hand of dialectical materialism where every man must conform to the atheistic, irrational, and immoral laws of a way of life which is contrary to the divine Intelligence? Or shall the answer be a rededication to

Christian moral values, a digging deep of the wells of personal faith in the bottomless ocean of God's love and the creation of a society which is in harmony with the laws of God?

1809. World Conditions—Science and Materialism Pose Problems of Theology

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 471–473. Copyright 1961 by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 471] Living in an age of science and materialism, the church of Jesus Christ finds itself now faced with some of the most perplexing problems of theology and apologetics in its entire history. There is increas- [p. 472] ing evidence from every side that the modern mind, characterized by dogmatic claims to finality in the realms of metaphysics and epistemology, has little patience with those who insist upon finding the criteria for ultimate truth within the covers of a supernaturally-inspired Book.

Perhaps the most obvious clash between these two world-views is in the field of anthropology, where modern science, because of its materialistic presuppositions, is forced to establish a continuous genealogy between man and the lower forms of life. But most evangelical scholars, recognizing the immense importance of the doctrines of Creation and the Fall so far as the plan of salvation is concerned, have been willing to part company with evolutionary anthropologists on this question...

When we come to the question of the animal kingdom in relation to the Fall, however, we discover a much greater hesitancy on the part of such scholars in taking a united stand in opposition to the claims of uniformitarian paleontology. They seem to have been overawed, to a large extent at least, by the unanimous voice of modern paleontologists to the effect that death and violence reigned in the animal kingdom for hundreds of millions of years before the appearance of man on the earth.

But the Scriptures contain powerful testimonies to the contrary. For example, Romans 8:19–22 speaks of the stupendous transformation experienced by the entire creation, when, at the time of the Fall and as a result of the Edenic curse, it entered into a "bondage of corruption" from which it still longs to be delivered. This is strikingly confirmed by what we read in Genesis 1:28 of the original "dominion" which man exercised over God's creation and by the inspired commentary on Psalm 8 which is provided for us in Hebrews 2:8–9. Further support for this doctrine is found in the terms of the Noahic Covenant, in Isaiah's prophecy of ideal conditions in the animal [p. 473] kingdom, in the cursing of the serpent, the inflicting of birthpangs upon the woman, and the cursing of the ground. So powerful, in fact, are these Biblical evidences that many of the greatest modern theologians have been willing to incur the intense opposition of modern uniformitarians rather than attempt to mold the text of Scripture into conformity with current scientific theories...

We must accept either the current theories of paleontology, with an inconceivably vast time-scale for fossils before the appearance of man on the earth, or we must accept the order of events as set forth so clearly in the Word of God... If the "bondage of corruption," with all that such a term implies for the animal kingdom, had its source in the Edenic curse, then the fossil strata, which are filled with evidences of violent death, must have been laid down *since* Adam. And if this be true, then the uniformitarian time-table of modern paleontology must be rejected as totally erroneous; and a Biblical

catastrophism (centering in the year-long, universal Deluge) must be substituted for it as the only possible solution to the enigma of the fossil strata.

1810. World Conditions—Scientism

1

SOURCE: James G. Leyburn, "Idols We Bow Before," *The Christian Century*, 77 (Aug. 31, 1960), 993. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

Still another form of idolatry is scientism. The intellectual affirms that every intelligent man must respect science, regarding it as one of the means God has given us to discover his laws of nature, to conquer age-old ills, to explore the universe of the macrocosm and the microcosm. The idolatry consists in the worship of science as the panacea for all woes; in the myth that science is infallibly accurate, whereas all other knowledge is random and partial; in the belief that man can with security rely on science alone for salvation.

In its present form the idol of scientism was given foundation during the revival of learning in the Renaissance; it reached its height of glory in the confident optimism of the late 19th century. Given the remarkable discoveries and advances of the latter era, one can well understand the enthusiasm with which its adherents welcomed the new messiah. One can also understand the relief of man who breathed the free air that had long been tainted by decaying religious dogma. It is not even surprising that men began to assume that to be scientific required one to be materialistic in philosophy.

The 20th century, with its devastating wars made hellish by "scientific" weapons, has witnessed the defection of a number of sensitive souls away from the idol of scientism. It is now apparent to the thoughtful that science is knowledge, not wisdom; that its discoveries are quite impersonal and can be turned by man to devilish as well as to beneficial ends. A number of brilliant contemporary physicists have stalked out of the temple of scientism. Their exploration of the atom has cast serious doubt on materialism. Grandsons of men who announced that God was dead are now admitting that there may after all be a God; some are even proclaiming their belief in him.

Many social scientist, however, have become devoted adherents of scientism. A decade or so ago, one of them wrote a book with the title, *Can Science Save Us?* His answer was a clear Yes. This, I think, is scientism.

1811. World Conditions—Secularization and Neglect of the Bible SOURCE: Mary McLeod Bethune, "Recommends Bible as Source of Wisdom, Inspiration" (column), in the *Chicago Defender*, Oct. 9, 1954, p. Copyright 1954 by the Robert S. Abbott Publishing Co. Used by permission of the publisher.

Sometimes we get too proud to acknowledge our religious background of simple, pious Christian faith. It is strange that we should be ashamed or reluctant about the very thing that made us what we are as people! ...

I am greatly concerned with the fact that as the standards of education are being raised, there is somehow less and less emphasis on the teaching of the Word.

Secularization is a process that sets in when a society becomes proud. But God confounds such.

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

How can any man call himself educated who has no knowledge of the Bible ...? And how can any nation justify its own life without the Bible in the hands and in the hearts of its people?

Perhaps we do not know the God of the Bible, our Father and Creator to whom we owe life itself. The Bible is our means of such acquaintance and throught [i.e., through] it every man is free to form his own friendship with the Divine.

1812. World Conditions—Social Conditions and Attitudes

SOURCE: Paul Tillich, "On the Boundary Line," *The Christian Century*, 77 (Dec. 7, 1960), 1437. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

But there is another side to the picture: my increasing awareness of the state of mind in large groups of university and college students (and sometimes even high school students) since the end of World War II and the beginning of the cold war. It is a feeling of emptiness, insecurity, meaninglessness-often increased by loneliness-feelings of guilt, hostility and disgust; in short, characteristics of the human predicament as described by existentialist literature, art and philosophy. These experiences have led some to cynicism, others to indifference, and many to a search for security at any price. It was unavoidable that as a widely traveling lecturer I would discuss the problems implied in this situation; and the response showed that this was the point from which the question of the meaning of life, the religious problem, could be approached. From here it was also possible to arrive at an appraisal of the sources and value of the resurgence of religious interest in the last ten years. The fact is indisputable; the interpretations and evaluations are controversial. Perhaps one can say that the predicament described above is widely felt, is not confined to youth, and that the turn to religion is an attempt to find a transcendent security in a world in which neither social nor spiritual security is guaranteed.

1813. World Conditions—A "Time of Troubles"

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Ordeal of Christianity* (New York: Association Press, 1957), p. viii. Copyright 1957 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

The only thing of which we can be certain is that we are in the midst of a global crisis—a "time of troubles," to use Toynbee's phrase—which is agitating every region and every type of society and is affecting every phase of human activity.

We are warned by those whose words carry weight that this crisis differs from others which have gone before in that we now have at our command means for the extermination of our kind, while we have no assurance that our moral controls are strong enough to insure that these means will not be employed. Our technology has so far outstripped our morals that there is a real danger of racial self-destruction. Even if our native optimism rejects this terrifying prospect, we still know that we are caught in a time of awful tension and conflict, that we seem to be helpless puppets blindly stumbling about in a nightmare world where gigantic, impersonal forces which we cannot even comprehend, much less control, are locked in desperate battle.

1814. World Conditions—Union of all Higher Religions Urged SOURCE: Arnold Toynbee, *Christianity Among the Religions of the World* (New York: Scribner, 1957), p. 85. Copyright 1957 by the Trustees under the will of Waterman T. Hewett. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

I have suggested that, in the unified world that has been called into existence by the world-wide expansion of the post-Christian modern Western civilization, all the living higher religions ought to subordinate their traditional rivalries and make a new approach

towards one another in face of a fearful common adversary: a revival of the worship of collective human power, armed with new weapons, both material and spiritual. I have also suggested that we might consider whether this reconciliation can be achieved without abandoning convictions, because, without convictions, a religion has no spiritual power.

²Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

SOURCE: James G. Leyburn, "Idols We Bow Before," *The Christian Century*, 77 (Aug. 31, 1960), 993. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

Still another form of idolatry is scientism. The intellectual affirms that every intelligent man must respect science, regarding it as one of the means God has given us to discover his laws of nature, to conquer age-old ills, to explore the universe of the macrocosm and the microcosm. The idolatry consists in the worship of science as the panacea for all woes; in the myth that science is infallibly accurate, whereas all other knowledge is random and partial; in the belief that man can with security rely on science alone for salvation.

In its present form the idol of scientism was given foundation during the revival of learning in the Renaissance; it reached its height of glory in the confident optimism of the late 19th century. Given the remarkable discoveries and advances of the latter era, one can well understand the enthusiasm with which its adherents welcomed the new messiah. One can also understand the relief of man who breathed the free air that had long been tainted by decaying religious dogma. It is not even surprising that men began to assume that to be scientific required one to be materialistic in philosophy.

The 20th century, with its devastating wars made hellish by "scientific" weapons, has witnessed the defection of a number of sensitive souls away from the idol of scientism. It is now apparent to the thoughtful that science is knowledge, not wisdom; that its discoveries are quite impersonal and can be turned by man to devilish as well as to beneficial ends. A number of brilliant contemporary physicists have stalked out of the temple of scientism. Their exploration of the atom has cast serious doubt on materialism. Grandsons of men who announced that God was dead are now admitting that there may after all be a God; some are even proclaiming their belief in him.

Many social scientist, however, have become devoted adherents of scientism. A decade or so ago, one of them wrote a book with the title, *Can Science Save Us?* His answer was a clear Yes. This, I think, is scientism.

1811. World Conditions—Secularization and Neglect of the Bible SOURCE: Mary McLeod Bethune, "Recommends Bible as Source of Wisdom, Inspiration" (column), in the *Chicago Defender*, Oct. 9, 1954, p. Copyright 1954 by the Robert S. Abbott Publishing Co. Used by permission of the publisher.

Sometimes we get too proud to acknowledge our religious background of simple, pious Christian faith. It is strange that we should be ashamed or reluctant about the very thing that made us what we are as people! ...

I am greatly concerned with the fact that as the standards of education are being raised, there is somehow less and less emphasis on the teaching of the Word.

Secularization is a process that sets in when a society becomes proud. But God confounds such.

How can any man call himself educated who has no knowledge of the Bible ...? And how can any nation justify its own life without the Bible in the hands and in the hearts of its people?

Perhaps we do not know the God of the Bible, our Father and Creator to whom we owe life itself. The Bible is our means of such acquaintance and throught [i.e., through] it every man is free to form his own friendship with the Divine.

1812. World Conditions—Social Conditions and Attitudes

SOURCE: Paul Tillich, "On the Boundary Line," *The Christian Century*, 77 (Dec. 7, 1960), 1437. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

But there is another side to the picture: my increasing awareness of the state of mind in large groups of university and college students (and sometimes even high school students) since the end of World War II and the beginning of the cold war. It is a feeling of emptiness, insecurity, meaninglessness-often increased by loneliness-feelings of guilt, hostility and disgust; in short, characteristics of the human predicament as described by existentialist literature, art and philosophy. These experiences have led some to cynicism, others to indifference, and many to a search for security at any price. It was unavoidable that as a widely traveling lecturer I would discuss the problems implied in this situation; and the response showed that this was the point from which the question of the meaning of life, the religious problem, could be approached. From here it was also possible to arrive at an appraisal of the sources and value of the resurgence of religious interest in the last ten years. The fact is indisputable; the interpretations and evaluations are controversial. Perhaps one can say that the predicament described above is widely felt, is not confined to youth, and that the turn to religion is an attempt to find a transcendent security in a world in which neither social nor spiritual security is guaranteed.

1813. World Conditions—A "Time of Troubles"

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Ordeal of Christianity* (New York: Association Press, 1957), p. viii. Copyright 1957 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

The only thing of which we can be certain is that we are in the midst of a global crisis—a "time of troubles," to use Toynbee's phrase—which is agitating every region and every type of society and is affecting every phase of human activity.

We are warned by those whose words carry weight that this crisis differs from others which have gone before in that we now have at our command means for the extermination of our kind, while we have no assurance that our moral controls are strong enough to insure that these means will not be employed. Our technology has so far outstripped our morals that there is a real danger of racial self-destruction. Even if our native optimism rejects this terrifying prospect, we still know that we are caught in a time of awful tension and conflict, that we seem to be helpless puppets blindly stumbling about in a nightmare world where gigantic, impersonal forces which we cannot even comprehend, much less control, are locked in desperate battle.

1814. World Conditions—Union of all Higher Religions Urged SOURCE: Arnold Toynbee, *Christianity Among the Religions of the World* (New York: Scribner, 1957), p. 85. Copyright 1957 by the Trustees under the will of Waterman T. Hewett. Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

I have suggested that, in the unified world that has been called into existence by the world-wide expansion of the post-Christian modern Western civilization, all the living higher religions ought to subordinate their traditional rivalries and make a new approach towards one another in face of a fearful common adversary: a revival of the worship of collective human power, armed with new weapons, both material and spiritual. I have also suggested that we might consider whether this reconciliation can be achieved without abandoning convictions, because, without convictions, a religion has no spiritual power.

1

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Numbers refer to the numbered extracts, not to pages. Cross references refer to other headings in this index, not to the headings in the body of the work.

The Index of Authorities provides information concerning the authors and publications cited, so as to enable the reader to evaluate the statements included in this source book. The facts are listed principally under the author entries, to which there are cross references from titles. The brief biographical sketches are sometimes incomplete for lack of access to the information. For example, the reference books consulted often omitted scholastic degrees, especially with the names of Europeans, because on the Continent the title *Professor* indicates a rank higher than *Doctor*.

Under each author the sources from which he is quoted are classified and the numbers of the extracts are given. A title means a work by that author; "in" preceding the title indicates an article by him in a periodical or a chapter or other subordinate portion written by him in a book; "quoted" refers to an extract entirely by the author as it is quoted in another' book; "quoted by ——" indicates a statement by the author quoted in an extract from another author.

This index includes, without biographical data, authors or editors whose works are used in this book merely as sources of statements by others. It omits all translators except those whose direct statements are used.

About Earthquakes. See Eiby

"Abraham Davenport." See Whittier

Abu Bekr (573–634); Arab leader; father–in–law and successor of Mohammed; first Moslem caliph; preserver of the sayings of Mohammed from which was formed the Koran; leader in the Moslem invasion of Persia and Syria; successfully fought Heraclius, the Eastern Roman emperor

quoted, 63

Acton, John Emerich Edward Dalberg (Lord Acton), hon. Ph.D., LL.D., D.C.L. (1834– 1902); English Catholic editor and historian; leading liberal in politics and opponent of Catholic ultramontanism; with Döllinger opposed the dogma of papal infallibility, but was never excommunicated

History of Freedom and Other Essays, 770, 1748

Lord Acton on the States of the Church, 1157

Ad Nationes. See Tertullian

Adams, Charles Francis, Massachusetts: Its Historians and Its History, 1211

Adams, Nathaniel (1756–1829); court reporter in Superior Court of Judicature, New Hampshire

Annals of Portsmouth, 575

Adolphus, John, F.S.A. (1768–1845); English lawyer and historian

The History of France, 777, 1161

The Advent Herald (Millerite journal), 7, 571

The Advent Review (early SDA periodical), 1086

The Advent Shield and Review (a short-lived Millerite periodical), 895, 1079, 1080, 1085

Advice to ... Methodists. See Wesley

After Utopia. See Shklar

Against Apion. See Josephus

Against Heresies. See Irenaeus

Against Marcion. See Tertullian

Agatharchides (2d cent. B.C.); Greek historian and geographer of Cnidus, sometimes called Agatharchus; writer of treatise on Europe, Asia, and the Red Sea

quoted, 1371

The Age of Faith. See Durant

Albert (Albrecht), Archbishop of Mainz and Magdeburg and Bishop of Halberstadt (1490– 1545); German prelate, chancellor of the Empire, and cardinal (1518); was entrusted with the sale of indulgences and, through his representative Tetzel, occasioned Luther's 95 theses

in Translations and Reprints, 861

Albertan (Calgary, Alta., daily newspaper), 1589

Albornoz. See Carrillo de Albornoz

- Albright, William Foxwell, Litt.D., Ph.D., D.H.L., Th.D., LL.D. (1891–); American orientalist (b. in Chile); noted archeologist, heading expeditions in Palestine during many years; for a decade director of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Jerusalem; prof. of Semitic languages, Johns Hopkins Univ. 1929–58; author of numerous books on archeology and Biblical history and criticism (neither conservative nor radical); Methodist, but attendant at Baptist, Lutheran, and Presbyterian churches; wife and children are Catholic; has close Jewish associates
 - Archaeology and the Religion of Israel, 74, 84
 - The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, 253, 296
 - The Biblical Period, 322, 323, 905
 - Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands, 2, 67, 68, 70, 155, 309, 313, 325, 376, 536, 637, 728, 907, 919
 - in *BA*, 303, 1101
 - in BASOR, 77, 294, 326, 332, 1529
 - in H. H. Rowley, ed., The Old Testament and Modern Study, 329
 - in Religion in Life, 73, 300, 304, 305, 312, 324, 581
 - in Studies in the History of Culture, 374
- Alcohol and Man. See Emerson
- Ali, Abdullah Yusuff, C.B.E., M.A., LL.M. (1872–1953); Indian Moslem scholar; author of works on Islam; translator and commentator on the Koran; Indian civil servant and educationist; revenue minister, Hyderabad, 1921–22; principal Islamia College, Lahore, 1952–27; rep. to League of Nations Assembly, 1928; Fellow Punjab Univ., 1935–37 commentary and notes in his trans. of the Koran, 483, 778, 1018, 1509, 1752
- Alison, Sir Archibald, F.R.S.E. (1792–1867); Scottish historian, lawyer; sheriff of Lanarkshire

History of Europe, 1159

Allen, Thomas Gilchrist, M.D. (1858–?); physician; degree from Iowa College of Medicine

joint author; see Duff

- Allis, Oswald T., Ph.D., D.D. (1880–); taught in OT dept., Princeton Theological Seminary; prof. of OT, Westminster Theological Seminary; consulting editor, *Evangelical Quarterly* Prophecy and the Church, 1248, 1249, 1521, 1532, 1533
- Alvarez, Francisco (fl. 1527); Portuguese traveler; lived six years in Abyssinia; wrote account of the country

Narrative of the Portuguese Embassy to Abyssinia, 1462

America, National Catholic Weekly Review, 1319 American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Memoirs, 566 The American Catholic Quarterly Review, 1625, 1627, 1663, 1668 American Catholics. See Scharper The American Commonwealth. See Bryce American Historical Association, Annual Report, 350 The American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. 605. 622 American Journal of Public Health, 606 The American Journal of Science and Arts, 730 The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures (AJSL), 453, 458 American Judaism. See Glazer American Medical Association. See Journal of the American Medical Association American Protestantism. See Parker, T. V. American Schools of Oriental Research, Bulletin (BASOR), 77, 294, 326, 331, 332, 1529 American Scientist (periodical published in the interest of scientific research), 466, 710 Ammianus Marcellinus (330?–395?); Roman historian, a Greek of noble birth; a professional soldier; wrote a history of Rome from A.D. 96 to 378, a clear, impartial, largely contemporary account History, 1350 Anabasis. See Arrian; Xenophon Ancharano, Pietro (d. 1416); Italian canonist; prof. of jurisprudence, Univ. of Siena quoted by Ferraris, 1123 The Ancient Church. See Killen Ancient Egyptian Religion. See Černý; Frankfort Ancient Israel. See Orlinsky The Ancient Library of Qumran. See Cross Ancient Near Eastern Texts. See Pritchard Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia. See Luckenbill The Ancient World. See Swain Anderson, Bernhard Word, B.D., M.A., Ph.D. (1916-); American Methodist educator, clergyman, author; dean, prof. of Biblical theology, Drew Univ., from 1954 Rediscovering the Bible, 247, 781, 988 Andrae, Walter (1875–1956); German archeologist; excavated in Babylonia and Assyria, 1899–1913; writer on Assyrian culture Babylon, 144, 149 Anghiera, Pietro Martire d' (called in English, Peter Martyr) (1455–1526); Italian historian; ambassador to Egypt; wrote a history from original documents supplied by Columbus De Orbe Novo, 356 Angus, Samuel, M.A., Ph.D. (1881–1943); prof. of NT and historical theology, St. Andrew's College, Univ. of Sydney The Religious Quests of the Graeco–Roman World, 104, 478, 481, 524, 1203, 1573 Anjou, Lars Anton (1803–84); bishop; counselor to the king of Sweden The History of the Reformation in Sweden, 1468 The Annals. See Tacitus Annals of Internal Medicine (a journal of the American College of Physicians), 810 Annals of Portsmouth. See Adams, Nathaniel

The Answer to the Jews. See Tertullian Antiquities. See Josephus The Antiquities of the Christian Church. See Bingham Antiquity (a British journal of archeology), 463, 464 Apology. See Tertullian Apology and Defence. See Miller Appian (2d cent. A.D.); Roman historian from Alexandria; wrote (in Greek) on the barbarians and Romans Roman History, 33, 56, 787 Applied Physiology. See Wright, Samson The Approaching Advent of Christ. See Reese Apuleius, Lucius (born c. A.D. 125); Roman poet, philosopher, traveler, and rhetorician; b. in Numidia (modern Algeria) quoted by Hyde, 1005 Aquinas, Thomas. See Thomas Aquinas Aramaic Papyri. See Cowley Archaeology and the Bible. See Barton Archaeology and the Old Testament. See Pritchard (see also Archeology and the Old Testament) Archaeology and the Religion of Israel. See Albright Archaeology in the Holy Land. See Kenyon, K. M. The Archaeology of Herod's Temple. See Hollis The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible. See Albright Archaeology and the Old Testament. See Unger, M. (see also Archaeology and the Old Testament) Archives of Marvland. See Browne Armstrong, Donald Budd, Ph.B., M.D., D.Sc. (1886-); physician; lecturer on public health, Columbia Univ.; chairman, Med. Information Bur.; mem., council N.Y. Acad. Medicine; mem., com. on cardiovascular disease in industry, N.Y. Heart Assoc.; director, American Social Hygiene Assoc. in JAMA, 811 Arnold, Sir Edwin (1832–1904); English poet and journalist; principal, Deccan College, Bombay, India "The Feast of Belshazzar," 210 Arrian (Flavius Arrianus) (2d cent. A.D.); Greek historian from Nicomedia, in Bithynia; governor of Cappadocia; archon of Athens; writer on history, on India, and on philosophy Anabasis, 37, 45 Assertio Omnium Articulorum. See Luther Asterius of Amasea (c. 375–c. 405); preacher of Pontus; known only from his extant homilies Homilies, 1424 Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans. See Cumont Astrology in Roman Law and Politics. See Cramer Astronomical Cuneiform Texts. See Neugebauer, Otto Astronomy. See Skilling

Athanasius (the Great) (293?–373?); Greek Church Father; patriarch of Alexandria; voluminous writer on dogmatic and controversial subjects; noted as the opponent of Arius

Homilia de Semente, 1422

Attwater, Donald (1892–); English Catholic writer; specialist in the study of the Christian Orient; ed. in chief, *The Catholic Encyclopedic Dictionary* (1931); a convert to Catholicism

in Worship, 397

_, ed., A Catholic Dictionary, 177, 185, 381, 401, 514, 1114, 1169

Aubhincloss, Douglas; assoc. ed. and religious writer, *Time* (1960)

in *Time*, 386

The Augsburg Sunday School Teacher (Lutheran periodical), 980, 1703

Augustine (Aurelius Augustinus) (354–430); Church Father and philosopher, b. in Numidia; a convert from Manichaeism, influenced by Ambrose of Milan; bishop of Hippo; the intellectual leader of the Western Church and champion of orthodoxy; his *City of God* concept laid the foundation for the medieval church as a world power

The City of God, 929

Letters, 827, 1425

Reply to Faustus, 1588. See also 436

- quoted by Coulton, 1737
- Aulén, Gustaf, D.D. (1879–); bishop of Strängnäs, Sweden; prof. of systematic theology in the Univ. of Lund, 1913; author of *Christus Victor*, etc.
 - in World Council of Churches, Man's Disorder and God's Design, 957
- Aurelian (212?–275?); Roman emperor, 270–275; rose from common soldier to military commander, then emperor; strengthened border territories, captured Palmyra, recovered Egypt, Gaul, and Britain; began new walls of city of Rome; made sun worship official imperial religion

in Translations and Reprints, 1195

- Axelrod, Daniel Isaac, M.A., Ph.D. (1910–); American geologist; prof. of geology, Univ. of Calif. at L.A.; research in paleobotany in Sol Tax, ed., *The Evolution of Life*, 715
- **Baab, Otto Justice,** B.D., Ph.D. (1896–1958); educator; Methodist minister; prof. and acting pres., Garrett Biblical Institute
 - quoted by Merrill F. Unger, 297

Babylon. See Andrae

Babylonian and Assyrian Religion. See Hooke

Babylonian Chronicle, in D. J. Wiseman, Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings, 129, 906, 1100

[Bachofen], Charles Augustine, D.D. (1872–); Benedictine priest; prof. of canon law at Benedictine Univ., Rome, 1906–15; author of works on canon and civil law *A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law*, 389

Bagdad, Babylon, Ninive. See Hedin

Baikie, James, F.R.A.S. (1866–1931); Scottish clergyman; Egyptologist; author of works on the ancient Near East

The Life of the Ancient East, 380

Baillaud, Edouard Benjamin, D.Sc. (1848–1934); French astronomer; dean of the Faculty of Sciences and prof. of astronomy, Univ. off Toulouse; director, Toulouse Observatory, 1877–1907; director, Observatory of Paris, 1907–28; a leading figure in many projects

involving international astronomical cooperation; author of numerous scientific papers and an astronomy textbook

quoted in League of Nations, Report, 1764

Baker's Dictionary of Theology, 897

Baly, Denis, B.A.; English-born specialist in physical and historical geography; spent 15 years in Palestine; Episcopalian; visiting lecturer on political science, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio

Multitudes in the Valley, 887, 917

- The Banished Count; ... Zenzendorf. See Bovet
- Baptism in the New Testament. See Cullmann
- **Baratti, Giacomo** (fl. 1655); Italian "gentleman traveler" The Late Travels of S. Giacomo Baratti, 1465
- Barker, Sir Ernest, F.B.A., D.Lit. (1874–1960); British classical scholar; prof. of political science, Univ. of Cambridge and Univ. of Cologne

in The Cambridge Medieval History, 1354

Barnabas (Pseudo) (fl. c. 130 or 150?); an unknown author who used the name of Barnabas in a Greek epistle of doubtful date and unknown locality; the epistle was for a time accepted by some in the early church as a genuine NT epistle The Epistle of Barnabas, 1405

The Epistle of Barnabas, 1405

- **Barnes, Albert** (1798–1870); pastor, First Presbyterian church in Philadelphia, 1830–67; author of many works on theology
 - Notes ... on ... Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, 1475
- Barnett, Thomas Ratcliffe, Ph.D., F.S.A.Scot. (1868–); Scottish author; minister, Church of Scotland

Margaret of Scotland, Queen and Saint, 1460

Barth, Karl, D.Theol., D.D., LL.D. (1886–); Swiss Protestant Reformed theologian and educator; prof. of theology at Univ. of Basel; champion of dialectic theology; author of numerous works on theology

in Christianity Today, 667

Bartlett, John Russell, ed., Letters of Roger Williams, 1620

Barton, George Aaron, Ph.D., LL.D. (1859–1942); Canadian–born American Biblical scholar; prof. of Semitic languages and Biblical literature at Bryn Mawr College, and prof. of Semitic languages, Univ. of Pa.; prof. of NT literature and language, Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia; some–time director of American Schools of Oriental Research, Jerusalem

Archaeology and the Bible, 75

Basil (the Great) (330?–379); Cappadocian Church Father; founder of monastic institutions De Fide ("Concerning Faith"), 269

On the Spirit, 1415

Basis of Millennial Faith. See Hamilton

Baudrillart, Henri Marie Alfred, cardinal, Litt.D. (1859–1942); French Catholic scholar and prolific writer; prof. of history; vicar–general of the Institut Catholique, Paris, 1908; mem. French Academy, 1918

The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism, 830, 876

Baumer, Franklin Le Van (1913–); instructor in history, Yale Univ.; ed., *Main Currents of Western Thought*

in Main Currents of Western Thought, 1785

Bede, the Venerable (673–735); English monk of Jarrow; historian and theologian; taught Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and theology

In Marci Evangelium Expositio, 1228

In Matthaei Evangelium Expositio, 1227

Begg, James A. (1800–69); mem. Reformed Presbyterian Church of Scotland; later Seventh Day Baptist; author of several books on prophecy (literalist premillennialism) in *Signs of the Times*, 894

Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters. See Döllinger

Bellarmine, Robert, cardinal (1542–1621); Italian Jesuit prelate and controversialist; rector, Roman College, 1592

Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei, 828

- **Bellesheim, Alphons,** D.D. (1839–1912); Catholic canon of Aachen (aix–la–Chapelle) History of the Catholic Church in Scotland, 1458
- Bémont, Charles (1848–1939); French historian; assoc. director of the École des Hautes Études, from 1896; known chiefly for his studies in English and European medieval history

_, and G. Monod, Medieval Europe From 395 to 1270, 1136

- **Benedict XIV,** Pope (1675–1758); formerly archbishop of Bologna; settled controversies concerning Indian and Chinese rites; greatly encouraged education, literature, and science "De Matrimonia," 838
- **Benjamin of Tudela** (d. 1173); Jewish rabbi; traveler from Spain; visited Southern Europe, the Near East, and China, and wrote accounts of his travels quoted, 148, 1108
- Bennett, John Coleman, M.A., B.D., D.D., S.T.M. (1902–); Congregational minister; prof. of Christian theology and ethics, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1943–55, dean of faculty from 1955

in Philip Scharper, ed., American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View, 495

- Benrath, Karl, Ph.D., Th.D. (1845–1924); Protestant prof. of church history, Univ. of Königsberg (formerly in Germany, now Russia) in New Schaff–Herzog Encyclopedia, 875
- Bentzen, Aage (1894–1953); prof. of theology in the Univ. of Copenhagen; author of works on OT
 - quoted by M. F. Unger, 302
- Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. See Neugebauer, Paul V.
- **Berkhof, Louis,** B.D. (1873–); Netherlands–born American theologian of Christian Reformed Church; pres. emeritus, Calvin Theological Seminary; prof. of dogmatic theology; amillennialist; systematizer of conservative theology; author of numerous works

Systematic Theology, 625

Bernard Guidonis (Bernard Guy) (1261–1331); French Catholic bishop and Inquisitor against the Albigenses; Dominican; author of many books (most important on the Inquisition), treatises, and sermons

in Translations and Reprints, 8

Berosus (Berossus) (3d cent. B.C.); Babylonian priest of Bel and teacher of astrology; settled in Cos; author of a history of Babylonia in Greek (now lost) quoted by Josephus and Eusebius

quoted by Josephus, 1099; in Gadd, 1

Bethune, Mary McLeod (1875–1955); Negro American educator; cofounder and pres., Bethune–Cookman College; special adviser to Pres. F. D. Roosevelt on minority affairs in *Chicago Defender*, 1811

Bettenson, Henry Scowcroft, B.A., Brisbane, 1931, M.A.; Church of England clergyman; chaplain Wellingborough School, 1940–44; asst. master Charterhouse School from 1945; ed., *Documents of the Christian Church*

in Documents of the Christian Church, 1708. See also 924, 925, 1153, 1277 Between the Planets. See Watson

- **Bevan, Edwyn Robert,** O.B.E., M.A., hon. D.Litt., hon. LL.D. (1870–1943); British scholar; hon. Fellow of New College, Oxford; lecturer on Hellenistic history and literature at King's College, London, 1922–33; author of numerous works on ancient history The House of Seleucus, 43
 - Jerusalem Under the High-Priests, 57, 841, 912, 914

Later Greek Religion, 785

, and Charles Singer, eds., The Legacy of Israel, 1631

- **Beveridge, James M. R.,** M.D. (1912–); mem. Faculty of Med., Queen's Univ., Kingston, Ontario, Can.; degree granted at Univ. of Ontario Faculty of Med., London
 - in Panel Discussions of International Congress on Nutrition (Fifth), 618
- Beware Familiar Spirits. See Mulholland
- Beyond Personality. See Lewis, C. S.
- The Bible an Authority Only in Catholic Hands, 268
- The Bible in the Making. See MacGregor
- The Bible: Its Origin and Nature. See Dods
- The Bible Speaks to You. See Brown, R. M.
- Biblical Archaeologist (BA), 88, 303, 752, 756, 760, 1033, 1101
- The Biblical Period. See Albright
- Biddolf, John (fl. 1755)
- A Poem on the Earthquake at Lisbon, 646
- **Bilheimer, Robert Sperry,** B.A., B.D. (1917–); American Presbyterian clergyman; gen. ed. of *The Interseminary Series,* five volumes preparatory to a national conference of the Interseminary Movement scheduled for June, 1947
- The Quest for Christian Unity, 591, 592, 675. See also 1047
- Billy Graham and the New York Crusade. See Burnham
- **Bingham, Joseph,** B.A. (1668–1723); Church of England clergyman; tutor at Oxford; author of a number of minor religious works, but his great contribution was his exhaustive ten–volume work on the ancient customs, practices, and usages of the Christian church The Antiquities of the Christian Church, 1394, 1396
- **Binney, Amos** (1802–78); American Methodist minister and presiding elder; author of a *Theological Compend* that was published for forty years in many languages and enlarged with the assistance of Daniel Steele; also wrote a NT commentary Theological Compend, 1450
- Biochemistry for Medical Students. See Thorpe

Biologic Effects of Tobacco. See Wynder

- **Birch, Walter de Gray,** hon. LL.D., F.S.A. (1842–1924); British expert on manuscript charters and seals in British Museum, 1864–1902; specialist in medieval languages and in literary and record research; ed., *Journal of the British Archeological Assn.;* author of a history of the Domesday Book and many other specialized works quoted by Coulton, 839
- **Birnbaum, Philip,** Ph. D.; American Jewish Biblical scholar; director, School for Advanced Jewish Studies, Wilmington, Del.

High Holyday Prayer Book, 112, 113, 114

- **Bishlawy, Salma,** M.A. (1921–); Egyptian Moslem; in linguistic div., U.S. War Department, in World War II; at time of writing, studying for her doctorate in Moslem philosophy in Vergilius Ferm, ed., *Religion in the Twentieth Century*, 885
- Blake, William (1757–1827); English poet, painter, and mystic; works known for "lyrical and metaphysical power"

"Mock On," 1093

Blanshard, Paul, A.B., LL.B. (1892–); American lawyer; chief legal counsel for Protestants and Other Americans United; author of several volumes on the separation of church and state; Unitarian

God and Man in Washington, 486, 1314, 1660

- The Blessed Hope. See Ladd
- **Bliss, Sylvester** (1814–1863); American Congregationalist layman; an ed. of *Signs of the Times* (a Millerite periodical); writer of various works setting forth Miller's doctrines in *Signs of the Times*, 893
- The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution. See Williams, Roger
- Boak, Arthur Edward Romilly, M.A., Ph.D. (1888–); Canadian–born American; Presbyterian; historian and author; prof. of ancient history, Univ. of Michigan, from 1940 A History of Rome to 565 A.D., 430, 523, 1208, 1326, 1327
 - _____, and others, *The Growth of European Civilization*, 40, 1330, 1331
- **Boase, Charles William,** M.S. (1828–95); Church of England clergyman; Fellow, tutor, and univ. reader in foreign history, Oxford in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 913

Bogert, Lotta Jean, Ph.D. (1888–); American biochemist; prof. of food economics and nutrition, Kansas State College, 1919–22; research chemist, Henry Ford Hosp., Detroit, 1922–24; biochem. and nutrition textbook writer from 1929
Nutrition and Physical Fitness, 620

- Boland, Francis Joseph, Ph.D. (1896–); Catholic priest; mem. of Congregation of the Holy Cross; prof. of politics, head of dept., and dean, College of Arts and Letters, Notre Dame Univ.; pres., Stonehill College, H. Easton, Mass.; chaplain, Lt. Commander, U.S.N. joint author. *See* Ryan
- **Boniface VIII,** Pope (125?–1303); Italian; pope, 1294–1303; concerned with European affairs; in the bull *Unam Sanctam* asserted papal temporal supremacy in the most sweeping terms; quarreled with Philip IV of France and died as Philip's prisoner in Anne Fremantle, ed., *The Papal Encyclicals*, 468
- in Translations and Reprints, 1129

The Book of a Thousand Tongues. See North

The Book of Common Prayer, 579

The Book of Isaiah. See Smith, George Adam

Book of the Popes, 654, 1412

Boston Gazette and the Country Journal (newspaper), 562

- **Botsford, George Willis, and Lillie Shaw Botsford,** eds., *A Source–Book of Ancient History*, 34
- **Boulton, William Henry** (1869–); English author of several works on history Greece and Rome, 35
- **Bouscaren, Timothy Lincoln,** LL.B., M.A., S.T.D. (1884–); American Jesuit canonist; consultor to the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith and to the Sacred Congregation of the Council; prof. of canon law, Gregorian Univ., Rome, 1938–40, and W. Baden (Ind.) College, 1941–47; procurator general of Society of Jesus from 1947
 - , and Adam C. Ellis, Canon Law: A Text and Commentary, 859
- **Bovet, Felix** (1824–1903); Swiss historian and literary writer; librarian, Univ. of Neuchatel; prof. of French literature and Hebrew
- The Banished Count; ... Zinzendorf, 1472
- Brennan, William J[oseph], Jr., B.S., LL.B., hon. D.J.S. (1906–); New Jersey lawyer, 1931; superior court judge, 1949–50; appellate div. judge, 1950–52; justice Supreme Court, N.J., 1952–56; assoc. justice U.S. Supreme Court from 1956 in *Braunfeld v. Brown*, 1671
 - in Braunfeld v. Brown, 1671
 - _____, and Potter Stewart, in Gallagher v. Crown Kosher Market, 1674
- Bridges, Milton Arlanden, M.D., F.A.C.P. (1894–1939); dir. of med., Dept. of Correction Hospitals; consulting physician, Sea View Hosp., Staten Island, New York; Episcopalian; Mason
 - Bridges' Dietetics for the Clinician, 220
- A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government. See Duppa
- A Brief History of Epidemic and Pestilential Diseases. See Webster, Noah
- Bright, John, D.D., B.D., Th.M., Ph.D. (1908–); Presbyterian clergyman; prof. of Hebrew, interpretation, OT, Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va. in *BA*, 752, 756, 760

in Interpretation, 339

- The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review (Anglican), 59
- British Medical Journal, 617, 1718
- **Brock, Mourant,** B.A., M.A. (1802–56); English clergyman; chaplain to the Bath Penitentiary, England; later incumbent, Christ Church, Clifton Glorification, 1513
- **Brookes, James Hall,** D.D. (1830–97); American Presbyterian minister; ed., *The Truth* (monthly); fundamentalist; active in Niagara Conference movement; premillennialist of the pretribulationist type; extreme literalist in prophetic interpretation; a voluminous writer

quoted by Allis, 1249

- Brown, Raymond G., B.A., Ph.D.; lecturer on social med., Univ. of Birmingham, England; lecturer on soc. science, Univ. of Melbourne, Australia; writer on social medicine , and others, in *The Lancet*, 801
- **Brown, Robert McAfee,** Ph.D. (1920–); theological scholar and writer on contemporary Christianity; Navy chaplain; teacher at Amherst College and acting pastor of First Congregational church at Amherst; head, dept. of religion, Macalester College (Minn.);

prof. of systematic theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York; mem. of com. revising the *Book of Common Worship* of the United Presbyterian Church

The Bible Speaks to You, 852, 948, 1002, 1088, 1236

in Philip Scharper, ed., American Catholics, 398, 495, 672

Browne, William Hand, ed., Archives of Maryland, 346

Bruce, Frederick Fyvie, M.A., D.D. (1910–); prof. of Biblical history and literature, Univ. of Sheffield, England; prof. of Biblical criticism and exegesis, Univ. of Manchester, England; ed., *The Evangelical Quarterly* from 1949 and the *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* from 1957; author of several works on NT studies Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 587, 916

Bryce, James (1st Viscount Bryce) (1838–1922); British statesman, jurist, and author; b. at Belfast, Ireland, of a Scottish family; ambassador to the United States, 1907–13 The American Commonwealth, 499, 501

Buchheim, C. H., joint editor. See Wace

Buck, Charles (1771–1815); British Independent minister and writer A Theological Dictionary, 971

Buckingham, Joseph Tinker (1779–1861); journalist; publisher, *New England Galaxy* in *New–England Magazine*, 734

Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research (BASOR), 77, 294, 326, 331, 332, 1529

Bunche, Ralph Johnson, A.M., Ph.D., LL.D. (1904–); Negro American; United Nations official in various capacities; Nobel Peace Prize, 1950, and other awards for work as UN mediator in Palestine

in Christian Century, 977

- **Burnett, Peter Hardeman** (1807–95); American attorney and jurist; justice of the State supreme courts of Oreg. and Calif. quoted by W. O. Douglas, 1672
- Burney, Leroy E., M.D., M.P.H. (1906–); surgeon, U.S. Public Health Service in *JAMA*, 1713
- **Burnham, George, and Lee Fisher,** *Billy Graham and the New York Crusade. See* 1699, 1700
- Burrows, Millar, B.D., Ph.D. (1889–); Congregationalist minister; prof. of Biblical theology, Yale Univ., 1934; director, American Schools of Oriental Research in Jerusalem, 1931–32, 1947, 1948; author of works on Biblical archeology and on the Dead Sea scrolls

The Dead Sea Scrolls, 330, 334, 336–338, 585

What Mean These Stones? 315

in BASOR, 331

Bury, John Bagnell (1861–1927); Irish historian; regius prof. of modern history, Cambridge; much influenced by the philosopher Hegel; rationalist; a philologist turned historian; an editor of *Cambridge Ancient History*

A History of Greece, 786

History of the Papacy in the 19th Century, 509

Butler, Francis John (1859–?); Catholic priest of the diocese of Boston, author of a series of catechisms

Holy Family ... Catechisms, No. 8, 1725

Byerly, Perry, A.M., Ph.D. (1897–); prof. of seismology, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley; pres., Seismological Society, 1957–58

in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 645

The Caliphate. See Muir

- **Callan, Charles J.,** S.T.L. (1878–); American Catholic priest, Dominican friar; prof. Thomistic philosophy, Dominican scholsticate, Washington, D.C.; author of books and articles; contributor to the original *Catholic Encyclopedia* joint translator. *See* McHugh
- **Calvin, John** (1509–64); French theologian; Reformer; a convert to Reformation doctrines by 1528; founder (1559) of a theological academy in Geneva; systematizer of a body of Protestant theology; adherents, called Calvinists, formed second great group of Protestants in Europe; emphasized especially sovereignty of God in bestowal of grace
- Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, 958

Institutes of the Christian Religion, 176, 257, 959, 1234, 1501

The Cambridge Ancient History, 32, 48, 1565

The Cambridge Medieval History, 941, 1354

Campbell, Alexander (1788–1866); b. in Ireland; founder, in America, of the "Campbellites," the denom. known as the Disciples of Christ; founder and pres. of Bethany College, Bethany, [W.] Va.; opposed creeds, church establishments, and Sunday laws

Christian Baptism, 1280

- A Debate ... [With] J. B. Purcell, 1692
- Debate ... [With] Robert Owen, 1387
- in Christian Baptist, 1452

in Millennial Harbinger, 1077

- quoted, 1662
- Campbell, Horace E., M.D. (1899–); specialist in surgery; degree, Univ. of Nebr. College of Med., Omaha

quoted by Kearney, 13

Canada, Revised Statutes, 1657

Statutes, 1301

- Canon Law, Code of. See Bachofen; Bouscaren
- Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent.

See Trent, Council of

Carcopino, Jérôme (1881–); director of the École Française de Rome; mem., Institut de France

Daily Life in Ancient Rome, 418, 420, 1357

Carolstat, Andres. See Karlstadt, Andreas Rudolf

Carrillo de Albornoz, Angel Francisco, Dr. of Classical Philology, Licentiate of Law and Social Sciences (1905–); Research associate for the study on religious liberty, World Council of Churches; a former Jesuit; present denominational status a matter of controversy

Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty, 511, 670, 1302, 1304, 1306, 1307

Carrington, Philip, M.A., D.D., Litt.D., hon. S.T.D., hon. D.C.L. (1892–); English–born Anglican Archbishop of Quebec; author of book and articles pertaining to the church and to the Boy Scout movement in Albertan, 1589

Carroll, Robert Sproul, M.D. (1869–1949); psychiatrist; med. director, Highland Hosp., Asheville, N.C.

What Price Alcohol? 11, 16, 18, 22, 24, 25, 28, 31, 640

- **Carver, William Owen,** M.A., Th.D., D.D., LL.D. (1868–1954); prof. of comparative religion and missions in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky., 1895–1943
 - Sabbath Observance, 1368, 1385, 1580, 1617, 1762, 1766
- The Case Against Evolution. See O'Toole
- The Case for Christianity. See Lewis, C. S.
- Caspar de Fosso. See Ricciulli
- **Caspari, Walter,** Ph.D., Th.Lic. (1847–?); university preacher and prof. of practical theology, Univ. of Erlangen, 1885

in New Schaff–Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 520

Cassian, John (c. 370–c. 435); monk and theologian (possibly from Gaul); founded monastery at Marseilles; introduced monastic ideals of East in the West Institutes of the Coenobia, 1421

- Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States. See Faerber
- Catechism No. 1 ... of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1682
- Catechism of the Council of Trent, 393, 946, 1022, 1029, 1365, 1439, 1477, 1478, 1621, 1735, 1739
- *Catholic Belief. See* Faà di Bruno
- Catholic Christian Instructed. See Challoner
- Catholic Church in the Modern World. See Hales
- The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and Protestantism. See Baudrillart
- A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture, 558, 559, 1689

A Catholic Dictionary. See Attwater

- Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent. See Nampon
- A Catholic Primer on the Ecumenical Movement. See Weigel

The Catholic Spirit. See Rétif

- The Catholic Universe Bulletin (periodical), 1629
- The Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family. See Thomas, J. L.
- The Catholic Virginian (local Catholic periodical), 1595
- Catholic World (periodical), 1581

Catullus, Tibullus, and Pervigilium Veneris, 1772

Celtic Scotland. See Skene

- **Censorinus** (fl. A.D. 238); Roman scholar; only one extant work De Die Natali, 457
- Černý, Jaroslav, M.A., Ph.D. (Prague), F.B.A.; paleographer; prof. of Egyptology in the universities of London and Oxford

Ancient Egyptian Religion, 432, 682

Chafer, Lewis Sperry (1871–1952); American Presbyterian evangelist, Bible teacher and lecturer: founder, pres., prof. of systematic theology, Dallas Theological Seminary; ed., *Bibliotheca Sacra;* leading systematizer of dispensationalist premillennialist theology summarized by Ladd, 630 **Challoner, Richard** (1691–1781); English Roman Catholic priest; prof. of philosophy and divinity, English College at Douai, France; bishop of Debra, vicar apostolic of London; ed. of the 1749–50 ed. of the Douay (English Catholic) Version of the Bible

The Catholic Christian Instructed, 983, 1592

The Chaplain (a periodical for military chaplains), 1794

The Chaplet (De Corona). See Tertullian

Chapman, Daniel Ahmling, M.A. (1909–); educator; former diplomat; geographer; ambassador of Ghana to the United States and permanent rep. to the United Nations, 1957–59; Presbyterian layman; first African headmaster of Achimota School in Ghana, from 1959

in Presbyterian Life, 1778

Chapman, John (1865–1933); Benedictine monk, later fourth Abbot of Downside; writer on Biblical and Patristic studies

Studies on the Early Papacy, 940

- **Charlemagne** (Charles the Great, or Charles I) (742–814); king of the Franks; crowned (in 800) as Carolus Augustus, "Emperor of the Romans," by Pope Leo III; end of his conquests was the beginning of the Holy Roman Empire
- in Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Leges, 1613, 1653
- Chemical and Engineering News, 235
- Chemistry and Technology of Food and Food Products. See Jacobs

Chemistry of Food and Nutrition. See Sherman

Cheyne, Thomas Kelly, D.Litt., D.D. (1841–1915); Oriel prof. of the interpretation of Holy Scripture in the Univ. of Oxford; canon of Rochester; Fellow of the British Academy; priest of the Prince of Peace

in Encyclopaedia Britannica, 321

Chicago Defender (weekly newspaper), 1811

- **Chillingworth, William,** M.A. (1602–44); English theologian; accepted Roman Catholicism, studied a year at Douai Jesuit college, later rejected the religion; upheld Protestants' views
- The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation, 281

Christian Advocate (Methodist periodical), 26

Christian Baptism. See Campbell, A.

- Christian Baptist (periodical of the Disciples), 1452
- *Christian Century* (liberal, nondenominational weekly), 333, 583, 665, 683, 684, 977, 993, 1289, 1658, 1666, 1793, 1807, 1810, 1812
- Christian Herald (nondenominational monthly), 21, 27, 790, 794, 795

"The Christian in Action," 487

Christian Outlook. See Latourette

The Christian Sabbath (reprint from Christian Mirror), 1437, 1597

Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches. See Stafford

Christian Worship. See Duchesne

Christianity Among the Religions of the World. See Toynbee

Christianity and Classical Culture. See Cochrane

Christianity Today (evangelical, nondenominational weekly), 96, 667, 693, 695–697, 1094, 1288, 1783, 1808

Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings. See Wiseman, D. J.

Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers. See Young

Chrysostom (345?–407); a Father of the Greek Church; b. Antioch; noted for his eloquence; patriarch (archbishop) of Constantinople, 398–404

Commentary on Galatians, 1419

Homilies on Romans, 256

Homilies on Timothy, 274

The Church and the French Revolution. See Pressensé

Church-History of Ethiopia. See Geddes

- **Churchill, Sir Winston,** LL.D. (hon.) (1874–); eminent British statesman and notable writer; had a long and distinguished career in British politics; Prime Minister 1940–45 in *New York Times Magazine*, 1802
- **Cicero, Marcus Tullius** (106–43 B.C.); eminent Roman statesman, philosopher, and orator; delivered the orations called *Philippics* after Caesar's death; was slain for political reasons
 - The Republic, 1335
- Circulation (periodical of the American Heart Assn.), 594
- City of God. See Augustine
- The Civil Law. See Justinian; Theodosius I
- Civilization on Trial. See Toynbee
- La Civilta Cattolica (official Jesuit journal), 495
- **Clarke, Adam** (1760?–1832); Irish Wesleyan preacher; commentator; theological wrier; three times Methodist conference pres.
- The New Testament (commentary), 1383
- Clarke, Thomas (fl. 1819)
- History of Intolerance, 1179
- Claudian (Latin, Claudius Claudianus) (A.D. 370–410); a poet in Egypt, the last of classical Rome

"Panegyric," 639

- Clay, Albert Tobias, Ph.D., LL.D. (1866–1925); Lutheran clergyman; archeologist and orientalist; instructor in Hebrew, Assyriology, and OT theology, and prof. of Semitic philology and archeology, in several universities
- quoted by M. F. Unger, 755
- Cleland, Robert G., Ph.D. (1885–); American historian; prof. of history at Occidental College from 1912; prepared the *Mexican Year Book* in 1922 and 1924 This Reckless Breed of Men, 735
- **Clemence, Gerald Maurice,** Sc.D. (1908–); astronomer; director, Nautical Almanac, U.S. Naval Observatory, Washington, D.C.

in McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology, 362

- **Clement I, or Clemens Romanus** (30?–100?); bishop of Rome, 90?–99?; first of the Apostolic Fathers
- First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, 1183, 1403
- The Clergy Review (British Catholic periodical), 1615
- The Clifton Tracts, 1628
- **Clinebell, Howard John, Jr.,** Ph.D. (1922–); has written on how to help alcoholics by means of religion
 - in Christian Herald, 21, 27

- **Cobern, Camden McCormack,** Ph.D., D.D., Litt.D. (1855–1920); theologian; Methodist minister; prof. of English Bible and philosophy of religion, Allegheny College, from 1906; author of a number of books on Biblical archeology
 - The New Archeological Discoveries, 83
- **Cochrane, Charles Norris** (1889–1945); historian; assoc. prof. of ancient history, Univ. College, Toronto (1924)
- Christianity and Classical Culture, 529, 1348
- Codex of Canon Law. See Bachofen; Bouscaren
- Codex Justinianus. See Justinian
- **Cogley, John,** Ph.B. (1916–); American Catholic journalist; former executive ed., *Commonweal;* staff administrator for the project "Religion in a Free Society," sponsored by The Fund for the Republic, Inc. quoted by W. O. Douglas, 1672
- Cohen, Felix S., M.A., Ph.D., LL.B. (1907–); American lawyer in private practice and in U.S. Depts. of Interior and Justice; visiting lecturer (prof.) Yale Law School and City College of New York; author of books and magazine articles on legal subjects quoted by W. O. Douglas, 1672
- **Cohen, Richard Norman;** alumnus, Yale College; former newspaper reporter and foreign correspondent; director public relations for the American Jewish Congress in *Christian Century*, 1658
- Cohn, Norman Rufus Colin, M.A., D.Litt., F.R.Hist.S. (1915–); English; prof. of French, Magee Univ. College, Londonderry from 1951 The Pursuit of the Millennium, 1041, 1044, 1057
- **Coleman, Christopher Bush,** Ph.D. (1875–1944); prof. of history in Allegheny College,
- Meadville, Pa.
 - The Treatise of Lorenzo Valla on the Donation of Constantine, 1137, 1751
- **Columbus, Christopher** (1446?–1506); Italian navigator; discovered the New World; wrote book on prophecies near the end of his life
 - Libro de las Profecias, 1243
- Columella, Lucius Junius Moderatus (1st cent. A.D.); Roman writer (b. Gades, Spain) on agriculture
 - On Agriculture, 228, 230
- **Comba, Emilio,** D.D. (1839–1904); Italian; prof. in Waldensian Theological College, Florence, Italy
- History of the Waldenses of Italy, 1755, 1757, 1760. See also 1756
- Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States. See Story
- Commentary: ... Genesis. See Lange
- Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists. See Calvin
- Commentary on Galatians. See Chrysostom
- Commentary on Genesis. See Luther
- Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law. See Bachofen
- The Congressional Record, 279, 280
- Connecticut Historical Collections, 568
- **Constantine, Emperor** (280?–337); reigned 306–337; b. Naïssus (Nish) in Moesia; succeeded his father as joint emperor; invoked Christianity in his contest for the sole emperorship; raised persecuted Christianity to the preferred religion, but tolerated

paganism; convened the Council of Nicaea (325); moved the capital to Byzantium (Constantinople); was baptized just before his death

in Justinian's Code, 1642

in *Theodosian Code*, 528, 1647

quoted, 532, 658, 1642

Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, 1414

Consumer Reports (monthly analyses of quality of consumer goods), 1714

Contra Waldenses. See Passau Inquisitor

Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine. See Geiermann

Conway, Bertrand, S.T.L., M.A. (1872–1959); Paulist father; noted for making converts; founder and spiritual director of The Catholic Unity League

The Question–Box Answers, 1038, 1626, 1731

Conybeare, William John, M.A. (1815–57); English divine and author _____, and J. S. Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, 186

Cook, Charles Augustus, D.D. (1856–1940); Baptist clergyman; superintendent of Christian stewardship campaign in Northern States, 1903–09 Stewardship and Missions, 1710

Cook, Fred J.; American newspaper reporter noted for his articles on crime and law enforcement; author of several biographies in the series Bookshelf for Young Americans in *Coronet*, 845

Cooper, Lenna Frances, B.S., M.A., hon. M.H.E. (1884–); nutritionist; food director, Univ. of Michigan, 1927–30; supervising dietitian, Montefiore Hosp., New York, N.Y., from 1930

_____, and others, *Nutrition in Health and Disease*, 598 *Coronet* (monthly, general interest), 845

Coulton, George Gordon, F.B.A., Litt.D., LL.D. (1858–1947); English Protestant historian and noted authority on medieval history; prof. in St. John's College, Cambridge; univ. lecturer in English; later temporary prof. of medieval history, Univ. of Toronto, 1940–43 The Death–Penalty for Heresy, 829, 831, 833, 837, 839, 840

Five Centuries of Religion, 1737

Inquisition and Liberty, 873, 874, 877, 879, 880

___, ed., Life in the Middle Ages. See 277, 847

- Cousins, Norman, Litt.D., LL.D. (1912–); author; ed., *Saturday Review (of Literature)*; chairman, Connecticut Fact Finding Commission on Education, 1948–52 Modern Man Is Obsolete, 1787
 - in Saturday Review, 1792, 1805
- **Cowley, Sir Arthur Ernest,** D.Litt., F.B.A. (1861–1931); librarian, Bodleian Library, Oxford; Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford; trans. and ed. of Hebrew and Aramaic works

Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra, 910

___, ed., Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C., 911, 1172

- Cox, G[ershom] F., hon. M.A. (1799–1879); American Methodist minister; ed., the *Maine Wesleyan Journal;* became a Millerite, afterward returning to Methodist ministry Letters on the Second Coming of Christ, 895, 1074, 1105
- **Cramer, Frederick Henry,** Ph.D. (1906–54); German–born prof. of history, Mount Holyoke College; lecturer, Graduate School of Education, Harvard

Astrology in Roman Law and Politics, 100, 101, 108, 405, 1030, 1570, 1578 Creeds of Christendom. See Schaff Cristiani, Leon (1879-); Catholic priest; prof. of philosophy and dogma, Grand Seminaire de Moulins, 1910-19, of history, Univ. of Lyons, 1919-47 Heresies and Heretics, 673 Critical and Historical Essays. See Macaulay The Cross and the Flag. See Shea Cross, Frank Moore, Jr., B.D., Ph.D. (1921-); Presbyterian minister; assoc. prof. OT, Harvard Divinity School, from 1957; prof., American Schools of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, 1953–54 The Ancient Library of Qumran, 586, 588 in Christian Century, 333 Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God. See Ladd Crusade at the Golden Gate. See Wirt Crusader (American Baptist news magazine), 664, 666 Cullmann, Oscar (1902-); Protestant prof. of the theological faculty of the Univ. of Basel since 1938, and the Sorbonne in Paris Baptism in the New Testament, 182 Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? 589, 856, 1000 Königsherrschaft Christi und Kirche im Neuen Testament, 469 Cumont, Franz Valéry Marie (1868–1947); Belgian orientalist; prof., Univ. of Ghent, 1892–1910; writer on ancient Oriental religions, especially on Mithraism Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans, 98, 102, 103, 159, 160–162, 404, 407, 445, 1230, 1232, 1343-1345, 1566, 1569, 1572, 1577 The Mysteries of Mithra, 1576, 1584 The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism, 137, 154, 1090, 1571. See also 428 in Cambridge Ancient History, 1565 Curtis, William Alexander, M.A., B.D., D.Litt. (1876-); Scottish theologian; prof. of systematic theology, Univ. of Aberdeen, Scotland A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith, 542, 1281 Cushing, Richard James, cardinal (1895–); American Catholic prelate; writer of sermons and articles on moral, social, and ecclesiastical questions quoted by Blanshard, 1660 A Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature. See Kitto Cyprian (3d cent. A.D.); bishop of Carthage, from 248; martyred in 258 Letter 80, 1194 Treatises, 473 Cyropaedia. See Xenophon Cyrus (the Great) (d. 530 B.C.); founder of the Persian Empire; originally king of Anshan (from 558 B.C.), ruling the Persian tribes as a vassal of the Median Empire; founded the Persian Empire by conquering Media, 553–550; Lydia, 547; and Babylon, 539; repatriated subject peoples, including the captive Jews Cyrus Cylinder, quoted by Dougherty, 546, 554 Daily Life in Ancient Rome. See Carcopino Daniel and His Prophecies. See Wright, C. H. H.

1

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Daily Life in Ancient Rome. See Carcopino

Daniel and His Prophecies. See Wright, C. H. H.

Daniel, Glyn Edmund, M.A., Ph.D. (1914–); Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, from 1938; university lecturer in archeology, from 1948; ed., *antiquity*, from 1958 in *Antiquity*, 464

Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires. See Rowley

- Davidson, Sir Leybourne Stanley Patrick, M.D., F.R.S.E., F.R.C.P. (1894–); prof. of med., Univ. of Edinburgh, 1938–59, now retired; physician to the Queen in Scotland from 1952 , and others, *Human Nutrition and Dietetics*, 615
- Davison, Ellen Scott, B.A., 1887, M.A., Ph.D. (d. 1921); specialist in hist. research on the life of the common people in the Middle Ages
 - Forerunners of Saint Francis, 1758
- **Davison, William Theophilus,** M.A., D.D. (1846–1935); British Methodist preacher and ed.; prof. of systematic theology in Richmond College, Surrey

in James Hastings, ed., Dictionary of the Bible, 1263

Daylight, Twilight, Darkness, and Time. See Harrison, Lucia C.

De Castigatione. See Gregory of Nyssa

De Clericorum Institutione. See Rabanus

De Die Natali. See Censorinus

De Fabulis Haereticorum. See Theodoret of Cyrrhus

De Fide. See Basil

"De Matrimonia." See Benedict XIV

De Orbe Novo. See Anghiera

Dead Sea Scrolls. See Burrows

The Death–Penalty for Heresy. See Coulton

Debate ... [With] J. B. Purcell. See Campbell, A.

Debate ... [With] Robert Owen. See Campbell, A.

Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees. See Döllinger

Deen, Edith (Mrs. Edgar), B.A. (1905–); author and lecturer; women's ed., daily columnist, Fort Worth *Press*, 1925–54; radio commentator, 1950–57

Great Women of the Christian Faith, 1775

Deissmann, Gustav Adolf, D. Theol., D.D. (1866–1937); prof. of NT exegesis, Univ. of Berlin; as a young candidate for the ministry, discovered the identity of the NT language with the Greek of the papyri, the ordinary language of the time (Koiné) Light From the Ancient East, 403, 1497

Light Fioli the Ancient East, 405, 1497

Democracy and the Churches. See Nichols

- **de Ropp, Robert Sylvestor,** Ph.D. (1913–); English–born biochemist; asst. curator N.Y. Botanical Garden, 1945–50; research scientist American Cyanamid Co., from 1950; advanced work in biochemistry of central nervous system, immunochemistry, and electrophoresis
- Drugs and the Mind, 20
- **Deschamps, Eustace** (14th cent.); French Catholic layman, a contemporary of Chaucer; wrote poetry on the life of that period

in Coulton, ed., Life in the Middle Ages, 847

Description of Greece. See Pausanias

Deuel, Harry James, Jr., Ph.D. (1897–1956); prof. of biochemistry, later dean, Graduate School, Univ. of S. Calif., Los Angeles

in Melville Sahyun, ed., Proteins and Amino Acids in Nutrition, 593

Development of Modern Christianity Since 1500.

See Norwood

Devotional and Ascetic Practices in the Middle Ages. See Gougaud

De Wolf, Lotan Harold, S.T.B., S.T.D., Ph.D. (1905–); prof. of systematic theology, Boston Univ.; writer on religious subjects; pastor of Methodist and Congregational churches Present Trends in Christian Thought, 701, 718, 780, 987, 1104, 1295

in Christian Century, 1289

Der "Dictatus Papae" Gregors VII. See Hofmann

Dictionary of the Bible. See Hastings

Didache, 1406

Diehl, Charles (1859–1944); French Byzantine scholar and historian; prof. of Byzantine history, Univ. of Paris; mem., the Institute of France

in Cambridge Medieval History, 941, 1205

Dietetics for the Clinician. See Bridges

- Digging Up Jericho. See Kenyon, K. M.
- Dignity and Duties of the Priest. See Liguori
- Dill, Sir Samuel, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D. (1844–1924); Irish classical scholar and historian; tutor, librarian, and dean, Corpus Christi College, Oxford; high master of Manchester Grammar School; prof. of Greek, Queen's College, Belfast quoted by Angus, 1573
- **Dillenberger, John** (1918–); taught at Princeton, Columbia, and Harvard Divinity School; prof. of theology at Drew Univ.

, and Claude Welch, Protestant Christianity, 700, 1264

Dingle, Herbert, D.Sc. (1890–); prof. of history and philosophy of science in the Univ. of London (1951)

in Science, 699

Dio Cassius (A.D. 155?–after 230); Roman historian and politician; lived in Bithynia; twice consul

Roman History, 926, 1333, 1770, 1771

Diodorus Siculus (of Sicily) (late 1st cent. B.C.); Greek historian; wrote 40–book *Historical Library*, not all extant

[Historical Library], 47, 1339

Diplomatarium Norvegicum, 1466

Discoveries Among the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon. See Layard

Dispensationalism in America. See Kraus

Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei. See Bellarmine

Divino Affante Spiritu. See Pius XII

A Doctrinal Catechism. See Keenan

Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Church. See Methodist Church

A Documentary Survey of the French Revolution. See Stewart, John Hall

Documents of German History. See Snyder

Documents of the Christian Church. See Bettenson

Dods, Marcus, D.D. (1834–1909); prof. of exegetical theology in New College, Edinburgh; English Presbyterian

The Bible: Its Origin and Nature, 290

_____, and others, An Exposition of the Bible, 319

Dogmatic Canons and Decrees. See Pius IX; Trent, Council of

Dole, Kenneth, M.A. (1903–); American newspaperman; religious ed., *Washington Post and Times–Herald*

in Washington Post, 669

- **Doll, William Richard Shaboe,** O.B.E., D.S.C.; M.D., F.R.C.P.; British physician; dep. director, Statistical Research Unit, Research Council; author, various arts. on the aetiology of cancer, and aetiology and treatment of peptic ulcer
 - ___, and A. Bradford Hill, in British Medical Journal, 1718
- **Döllinger, Johann Joseph Ignaz von,** Th.D. (1799–1890); German; prof. of church history and (Catholic) ecclesiastical law, Univ. of Munich; excommunicated in 1871 for rejecting the dogma of papal infallibility; connected with the founding of the Old Catholic Church, though not a mem.: also used pseudonyms Ouirinus and Janus
 - Declarations and Letters on the Vatican Decrees, 870
 - Fables Respecting the Popes, 867
 - Letters From Rome (under pseudonym Quirinus), 868
 - The Pope and the Council (under pseudonym Janus), 1009

___, ed., Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte des Mittelalters, Vol. 2, 1461, 1469

- Domenicus Dei Domenici (fl. 1455); bishop of Torcello
- quoted by Döllinger, 867
- Donation of Constantine. See Coleman
- **Donner, Anders Severin,** Ph.D. (1854–1938); Swedish astronomer; director Helsingfors Observatory, 1883–1929

quoted, 1764a

- Douay Bible (notes), 201, 202
- **Dougherty, Raymond Philip,** A.M., B.D., Ph.D. (1877–); American Assyriologist and author; United Brethren minister; prof. of Assyriology and Babylonian literature and curator of the Babylonian Collection, Yale Univ., from 1926
- Nabonidus and Belshazzar, 132, 204–209, 212, 213, 546, 551, 555, 556. See also 554
- Douglas, William Orville, B.A., LL.B., hon. M.A., hon. LL.D. (1898–); assoc. justice, U.S. Supreme Court from 1939; admitted to N.Y. bar, 1926; mem. law faculty, Columbia, 1925–28, Yale, 1928–34; Presbyterian; author of various law–case books and other books in *McGowan* v. *Maryland*, 1672
- **Douglass, Earl Leroy,** D.D., Litt.D. (1888–); Presbyterian clergyman, author; religious columnist; ed. of Sunday school lessons; moved from theological liberalism to evangelical position

The Snowden–Douglass Sunday School Lessons, 1691, 1698, 1702

Douglass, Frederick (1817–95); Negro American abolitionist, orator, journalist; U.S. minister to Haiti, 1889

Life and Times of Frederick Douglass, 739

Doyle, Arthur Conan, M.B., M.D., hon. LL.D. (1859–1930); Irish Catholic, born in Scotland; prolific writer of fiction (especially the Sherlock Holmes stories); in later life believed in and wrote on spiritualism

quoted, 1558

Draper, John William (1811–82); English scientist and author, came to U.S. in 1831; not a church member, Unitarian in belief; prof. of chemistry and natural philosophy, Hampden–Sidney College, Va.; prof. of chemistry and physiology, Univ. of the City of N.Y.

History of the Intellectual Development of Europe, 434

Drill, Victor, ed., Pharmacology in Medicine, 216

- Driver, Samuel Rolles, D.D. (1846–1914); English Biblical scholar; prof. of Hebrew and canon of Christ Church, Oxford; mem., OT revision committee, 1876–84 quoted by M. F. Unger, 82
- Drugs and the Mind. See De Ropp
- **Dryden, John,** B.A. (1631–1700); English poet and playwright; defender of Anglicanism, and finally convert to Catholicism quoted by P. D. White, 805
- **Du Chaillu, Paul Belloni** (1838–1903); American explorer and discoverer of many new species of wildlife in Africa; traveled also in Scandinavia; author of travel books Land of the Long Night, 1393

Land of the Midnight Sun, 1392

- **Duchesne, Louis Marie Olivier** (1843–1922); French Catholic ecclesiastical historian; director of the École Française at Rome
 - Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution, 1606 guoted by Kelly, 1432

Duff, Edward Macomb; Episcopal clergyman, St. Thomas church, Buffalo, N.Y., in 1902

- , and Thomas Gilchrist Allen, *Psychic Research and Gospel Miracles*, 1089
- **Duppa, Richard,** LL.B., F.S.A. (1770–1831); British artist and author; wrote on botany, art, and political topics

A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government, 1162, 1163

- **Durand de Maillane, Pierre–Toussaint** (1729–1814); French official; one of the framers of the cahiers at Arles; deputy of the third estate in the Convention; voted for the banishment of Louis XVI; denounced Robespierre; was arrested for suspected royalism, but was later released
- in Higgins, The French Revolution as Told by Contemporaries, 773
- **Durant, William James,** M.A., Ph.D. (1885–); American lecturer; writer on philosophy and history; prof. philosophy, Univ. of Calif. at Los Angeles, 1935; originally a Catholic, later a social radical, now a humanist

The Age of Faith, 425, 1096, 1353, 1355

- Our Oriental Heritage, 1221
- **Dwight, Timothy** (1752–1817); American Congregational minister, author, educator; pres., Yale, 1795–1817; a thoroughgoing Calvinist
 - Theology: Explained and Defended, 1701

quoted, 568

Earnest Worker (Southern Presbyterian Sunday school teachers' journal), 1433

Ecce Venit: Behold He Cometh. See Gordon, A. J.

Ecclesiastical History. See Eusebius; Socrates Scholasticus; Sozomen

Eck, Johann, B.Th., D.Th. (1486–1543); German Roman Catholic theologian; prof. of theology, Ingolstadt; debated in Leipzig against Karlstadt and Luther, 1519, 1530, 1540; archfoe of the Reformation

Enchiridion Locorum Communium ... Adversus Lutheranos, 1445, 1447

Eckhardt, Carl Conrad, Ph.D. (1878–); prof. of history in the Univ. of Colo. The Papacy and World–Affairs, 1149

- Ecumenical Review (journal of World Council of Churches), 671
- Egyptian Conception of Immortality. See Reisner
- Eiby, G. A., M.Sc., F.R.A.S.; geophysicist at the Seismological Observatory, Willington, New Zealand, 1957
- About Earthquakes, 644

Einiges über die rufenden Stimmen, 1500

- Eldersveld, Peter H., A.B., Th.B., M.A.; minister; speaker of The Back to God Hour; radio and television voice of The Christian Reformed Church Of Law and Love, 981, 984
- Ellis, Adam Charles, S.J.; M.A., J.C.D. (1889–); prof. emeritus of canon law; consultor to the Sacred Congregation of Religious; formerly prof. of canon law, Gregorian Univ., Rome

joint author. See Bouscaren

- Emerson, Haven, A.M., M.D. (1874–); prof. emeritus of public health, DeLamar Institute of Public Health, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia Univ. Alcohol and Man, 19
- Enchiridion Locorum Communium ... Adversus Lutheranos. See Eck
- Encvclopaedia Britannica, 321, 645, 771, 913, 1754, 1769

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. See Hastings

Encyclopedia of Food. See Ward, A.

The End of Religious Controversy. See Milner

The End of the Ancient World. See Lot

Engberg, Robert Martin, Ph.D.; connected with the Oriental Institute of the Univ. of Chicago; for four years excavated at Megiddo; in Egypt, a specialist in the Hyksos period; joint author of several books dealing with Biblical and other Near East archeology

in BA, 1033

Epilogue to Pamphilus the Martyr's Apology for Origen. See Rufinus

Epiphanius (315?–403); Church Father of the Eastern Church; author; Jewish parentage; accepted Christianity and became a priest; founded and directed a monastery; opposed Origen

Expositio Fidei, 1417

The Episcopal Church Sunday School Magazine, 1686

Epistle to Diognetus, 417

- Epistles. See Barnabas (Pseudo); Gregory I (the Great); Ignatius; Pelagius I; Siricius
- *Epitome of Rev. Dr. Erick Pontoppidan's Explanation of Martin Luther's Small Catechism*, 976

Epochs of the Papacy. See Pennington

Esarhaddon (d. 669 B.C.); king of Assyria, 681–669 B.C.; rebuilt Babylon; directed conquests; had jurisdiction over Jewish rulers in Palestine; one of Assyria's greatest kings

Inscription, 128

Espine, Henri d'; Protestant pastor and prof. at Geneva

quoted, 685

An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine. See Newman, J. H.

- **Eupolemus** (fl. c. 150 B.C.); a Hellenized Jew; writer of a popular history of the Jews in a rhetorical style; purported author of extract cited quoted by Gadd. 1
- **Eusebius** (of Caesarea) (c. 260–c. 340); b. probably in Palestine; known as father of ecclesiastical history; bishop of Caesarea; favored by Constantine Commentary on the Psalms, 1413
 - Ecclesiastical History, 472, 653, 657, 747, 923, 1188, 1190, 1191, 1197, 1198, 1311, 1413. *See also* 656
 - Life of Constantine. See 532, 658
 - Praeparatio Evangelica. See 1583
- Evening Star (Washington, D.C., daily), 1623
- Evolution of Life. See Tax
- The Exact Sciences in Antiquity. See Neugebauer, O.
- The Excavations at Babylon. See Koldewey
- Excavations at Ur. See Woolley
- Existentialism. See Sartre
- An Existentialist Theology. See Macquarrie
- Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament. See Wesley
- Expositio Fidei. See Epiphanius
- An Exposition of the Bible. See Dods; Farrar
- The Expositor's Bible. See Farrar
- Faà di Bruno, Joseph (Giuseppe) (1825–88); Italian mathematician and Catholic priest; rector–general of the Pious Society of Missions; served in Church of SSmo Salvatore in Onda, Ponte Sisto, Rome, and St. Peter's Italian church, Hatton Garden, London Catholic Belief, 1724, 1729
- Fables Respecting the Popes of Middle Ages. See Döllinger
- **Faerber, Wilhelm** (1841–1905); American Catholic priest; diocesan consultor of archdiocese of St. Louis
 - Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States, 178, 383, 543, 1010, 1027, 1483, 1688, 1734
- Fagley, Richard Martin, Ph.D. (1910–); Congregational minister; executive secretary of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs of the World Council of Churches in *The Chaplain*, 1794
- Faith and History. See Niebuhr
- The Faith of Christians. See Mollegen
- Faith of Our Fathers. See Gibbons
- Faith or Fact. See Taber
- Fallaw, Wesner, M.A., Ed.D. (1907–); American Congregationalist minister; prof. of education, Andover Newton Theological School in *Christian Century*, 683, 684 *Familiar Discoveries. See* Luther
- **Farrar, Frederic William,** M.A., D.D. (1931–1903); British, b. India; Anglican clergyman, writer, educator; dean of Canterbury

in An Exposition of the Bible, 319 in Expositor's Bible, 318

Farris, Allan L; prof. of church history, Knox College, Toronto, 1958; chairman, Dept. of Social Relations in the Canadian Council of Churches "Worship and Work." 1003

Faustus (fl. c. A.D. 400); a Manichaean heretic from N. Africa; author of work (not extant) attacking the OT, and the NT where incompatible with Manichaeism; his publication occasioned Augustine's treatise *Reply to Faustus*

quoted, 436

"The Feast of Belshazzar." See Arnold

Ferm, Vergilius, ed., Religion in the Twentieth Century, 885, 1815

Ferraris, Lucius (d. before 1763); Italian Catholic canonist; prof.; provincial of Franciscan order; consultor of the Holy Office

Prompta Bibliotheca, 1123, 1125

Ferris, Daniel; Catholic writer on doctrine Manual of Christian Doctrine, 1442

- Fessenden & Co.'s Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. See Himes
- Fey, Harold E[dward], B.D., D.D. (1898–); American ed.; minister of Disciples of Christ; ed., *Christian Century*

in Christian Century, 665

- Fifth International Congress on Nutrition. See International Congress of Nutrition, fifth congress, 1960, panel discussions
- Fifty-Three Years in Syria. See Jessup
- Finegan, Jack, B.D., hon. LL.D., Th.M. (1908–); writer on archeology and Biblical interpretation; prof. of NT literature and interpretation, Pacific School of Religion (interdenominational), Berkeley, Calif.; minister, Univ. Christian church, Berkeley, Calif., from 1949; Fulbright award, India

Light From the Ancient Past, 903

- **Finlay, George** (1799–1875); English historian; helped Byron fight for Greek independence; settled on estate in Attica and studied history of Greece; mem., Society of Natural History, at Athens
 - Greece Under the Romans, 1356

First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. See Clement

Fisher, George Park, D.D., LL.D. (1827–1909); prof. of ecclesiastical history in Yale Univ. History of the Christian Church, 1397

Fisher, Lee, joint author. See Burnham

Fisher, Willard James, Ph.D. (1867–1934); instructor of physics, Cornell; prof. at Univ. of N.H.; mem., faculties of the universities of Hawaii and Manila; research assoc. and lecturer on astronomy, Harvard Observatory

Five Centuries of Religion. See Coulton

The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World. See Rawlinson

Fleming, Sir John Ambrose, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., hon. M.I.E.E. (1849–1945); English scientific investigator; hon. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge Origin of Mankind, 705

The Telescope, 732, 740

Fleming, Wallace Bruce, M.A., D.D., B.D., Ph.D., LL.D. (1872–); Methodist minister; prof. of Hebrew and Greek, Drew Theological Seminary, 1911–15; pres., W. Va. Wesleyan College, 1915–22; pres., Baker Univ., 1922–36

History of Tyre, 1741

- Fletcher, Joseph Francis (1905–); prof. of theology and social studies, Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge, Mass. in *Harper's*, 1297
- Flick, Alexander Clarence, Ph.D., Litt.D. (1869–1942); prof. of European history in Syracuse Univ.
- The Rise of the Mediaeval Church, 884, 1119, 1130, 1142, 1144, 1146, 1154, 1358, 1457 Florence, Council of, "Definitio," 1124
- Foakes–Jackson, Frederick John, M.A., B.D., D.D., D.Th., hon. D.Litt. (1855–1941); English–born Episcopal theologian, ed.; dean and lecturer, Cambridge Univ., 1882–1916; graduate prof. of Christian institutions, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1916– 34; author of numerous works on church history
- in An Outline of Christianity, 1145, 1351
- **Forbes, Robert James,** M.N.R.I.E. (1900–); Dutch chemist of the laboratory of the Bataafsche Petroleum Maatschappij at Amsterdam
- Studies in Ancient Technology, 226, 533, 609
- Forbidden Sunday and Feast-Day Occupations. See Kelly
- Force, Peter, ed., Tracts and Other Papers, 347, 1655
- Forerunners of Saint Francis and Other Studies. See Davison, E. S.
- Forty Years of Psychic Research. See Garland
- Fosdick, Harry Emerson, M.A., D.D., LL.D. (1878–); Baptist minister, but held Presbyterian and nondenominational pastorates, notably the Riverside church, New York, 1926–46; prof. of practical theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York What Is Vital in Religion, 1796, 1800
- Fosso, Caspar de. See Ricciulli
- Foundations of Bible History; Joshua, Judges. See Garstang
- **Fox, Sidney Walter,** Ph.D. (1912–); research chemist; prof. of chemistry, Florida State Univ., and director of the Oceanographic Institute in *Science*, 707
- **Frankfort, Henri,** M.A., Ph.D. (1897–1954); research prof. of Oriental archeology in the Oriental Institute Univ. of Chicago; extraordinary prof. in the history and archeology of the ancient Near East in the Univ. of Amsterdam
 - Ancient Egyptian Religion, 681
 - Kingship and the Gods, 1562
- Frankfurter, Felix, A.B., LL.B., D.C.L., LL.D. (1882–); Austrian born; assoc. justice of U.S. Supreme Court from 1939; assistant U.S. atty., Southern District of N.Y., 1906–10; prof., Harvard Law School, 1914–39; author and ed. of numerous legal works in *McCollum* v. *Board of Education*, 506

in McGowan v. Maryland, 1317

Franklin, Benjamin (1706–90); American statesman, scientist, and philosopher; publisher of *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 1730–48, and *Poor Richard's Almanack*, 1732–57; mem., Second Continental Congress, 1775; on com. to draft Declaration of Independence, and one of its signers; mem., Constitutional Convention, 1787; signed a memorial to Congress asking for the abolition of slavery, Feb. 12, 1790 Letter, 1300c

Frazer, Sir James George, M.S. (1854–1941); British social anthropologist and classical scholar; Fellow of the Royal Society quoted by Hyde, 1005

Fremantle, Anne: ed., The Papal Encyclicals, 468

The French Revolution as Told by Contemporaries. See Higgins

- Friedberg, Emil Albert, Th.D., Dr.Jur. (1837–1910); prof. of ecclesiastical, public, canon, and German law, Univ. of Leipzig
- in New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 399
- From the Founding of the City. See Livy

Fuller Theological Seminary Bulletin, 782

The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth. See McNicol

Furniss, John, C.S.S.R. (1809–65); Catholic priest; well–known children's missioner; founder of "the children's Mass."

- Tracts for Spiritual Reading, 821
- Gadd, Cyril John, C.B.E.; M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A. (1893–); keeper, dept. of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities, British Museum, 1948–55; prof. of ancient Semitic languages and civilizations, London Univ. School of Oriental and African Studies, from 1955 History and Monuments of Ur, 1.
- **Galerius, Emperor** (d. 311); Roman emperor 305–311; b. Dacia; made Caesar by Diocletian; enemy of the Christians, in all likelihood it was he who persuaded Diocletian to put out his edict of persecution guoted, 1310
- **Garland, Hamlin** (1860–1940); American novelist and dramatist; mem., American Academy of Arts and Letters; investigator of psychic phenomena

Forty Years of Psychic Research, 1551

- **Garrison, Winfred Ernest,** Ph.D., (1874–); assoc. prof. of church history, Chicago Univ., 1921–; literary ed., *Christian Century*, 1923– joint author. *See* Hutchinson
- **Garstang, John,** M.A., D.Sc., B.Lit., F.S.A. (1876–1956); British archeologist; director, British School of Archaeology, Jerusalem; prof. of archeological methods and practice in the Univ. of Liverpool, 1907–41; excavations in England, Egypt, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine

Foundations of Bible History; Joshua, Judges, 311

- Gaspare de Fosso. See Ricciulli
- Gastineau, Clifford Felix, M.D. (1920–); Fellow in med., Mayo Foundation, Rochester, Minn.
- in Annals of Internal Medicine, 810

Gazette de Lausanne (Swiss newspaper) 685

- Gearon, Patrick J., D.D. (1890–); Catholic priest, Carmelite friar; prof. of theology, Carmelite Monastery, Donvale, Victoria, Australia
- Spiritism: Its Failure, 1537, 1540

Geddes, Michael, Church-History of Ethiopia, 1463

Geiermann, Peter, C.S.S.R. (1870–1929); Catholic priest of Mt. St. Clement's College, De Soto, Mo.

- Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine, 1438, 1687
- General History of the Christian Religion and Church. See Neander

Genes, Genesis, and Evolution. See Klotz

The Genesis Flood. See Whitcomb

Geography of Strabo. See Strabo

- **Gibbon, Edward** (1737–94); English historian; mem. of Parliament; embraced and renounced Catholic faith; spent later years in Lausanne; in his great work on the decline of Rome his treatment of Christianity gave rise to much controversy
 - History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 62, 421, 480, 530, 942, 943, 1112, 1204, 1329

quoted by Hutchinson and Garrison, 475

- **Gibbons, James,** cardinal (1834–1921); archbishop of Baltimore; noted as Catholic controversialist, writer, apologete
 - Faith of Our Fathers, 1305, 1600

in Shea and others, The Cross and the Flag, 1436, 1622

- Gildea, William L., D.D. (1856–1914); English Catholic writer; canon; rector of St. James' church, London
- in Catholic World, 1581

The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels. See Heidel

- **Gladstone, William Ewart,** B.A. (1809–98); British statesman; four times prime minister; with the exception of a year and a half was a member of Parliament continuously from 1832–1895; leader in the cause of peace and arbitration
 - The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance, 497
- **Glazebrook, Michael George,** D.D. (1853–1926); canon of Ely Cathedral; later prof. of divinity, Cambridge
- in Hastings, ed., Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 1639
- **Glazer, Nathan;** American–Jewish sociologist and ed.; gave Walgreen Foundation lectures at Univ. of Chicago, 1955; received Guggenheim Foundation Fellowship; an ed., Doubleday; taught at Univ. of Calif., Berkeley American Jadaism, 935
- Glenn, Jacob B., M.A., M.D. (1905–); b. Lithuania; assoc. ed., Israelitische Wochenblatt (Zurich); contributing ed., Jewish Forum
- in Jewish Forum, 600, 602, 604
- Glories of Mary. See Liguori
- Glorification. See Brock
- Glueck, Nelson, LL.D., B.H.L., Ph.D. (1900–); American rabbi (Reform Judaism); director, American Schools of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, 1932–33, 1936–40, 1942–47; pres., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio; noted archeologist

in *BA*, 88

quoted by M. F. Unger, 91

God and Man in Washington. See Blanshard

- **Goetz, Ronald;** Baptist; graduate study at Garrett Biblical Institute (1960) after obtaining degrees at Northwestern Univ. and Harvard Univ. Divinity School
 - in Christian Century, 1666

- **Goldschmidt, Richard Benedict,** Ph.D., hon. M.D. (1878–); German–born zoologist; prof. of zoology, Imperial Univ., Tokyo, 1924–26; prof., Univ. of Calif., 1936–48, emeritus; mem., learned societies in 12 different countries in *American Scientist*, 710
- Goodspeed, George Stephen, Ph.D. (1860–1905); prof. of ancient history in the Univ. of Chicago
 - A History of the Ancient World, 36, 1325
- **Gordon, Adoniram Judson,** A.M. (1836–95); American Baptist minister; trustee, Newton Theological Seminary and Brown Univ.; founder, Boston Missionary Training School; writer of religious books; premillennialist
- Ecce Venit: Behold He Cometh, 1502
- Gordon, Cyrus Herzl, M.A., Ph.D. (1908–); American–Jewish archeologist and teaching scholar in Semitics, Johns Hopkins; prof. of Assyriology and Egyptology, Dropsie College, Philadelphia; author of works on ancient history
- The World of the Old Testament, 86, 727, 909
- Gore, Charles, M.A., D.D., hon. D.C.L. (1853–1932); English bishop; court chaplain; bishop of Oxford
 - Roman Catholic Claims, 1115
- **Gorton, Benjamin** (1758–1836); American businessman, village trustee, and pres.; writer on premillennialism of the literalist type
 - A View of Spiritual, or Anti-typical Babylon, 565
 - Gospel of the Kingdom. See Ladd; Spurgeon
- Gospel of the Old Testament. See Mather
- Gottwald, Norman Karol, Th.B., B.D., Ph.D. (1926–); assoc. prof. of OT, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Mass., from 1955 in *Christian Century*, 1793
- **Gougaud, Dom Louis,** O.S.B. (1877–1941); Benedictine monk of St. Michael's Abbey, Farnborough, Hants., England; educated in France; writer on Celtic and monastic history Devotional and Ascetic Practices in the Middle Ages, 1364
- **Graham, William Franklin** (Billy), A.B., D.D., LL.D. (1918–); American Baptist minister, but worldwide evangelist under interdenominational auspices; leader, weekly television and radio program, The Hour of Decision quoted, 1534, 1699, 1700
- **Gratian, Emperor** (359–383); reign, 375–383; b. Sirmium, Pannonia; emperor in the W. with brother, Valentinian II, who was co–Augustus; after 378, emperor in the E. also; chose Theodosius as an assoc.; directed campaigns against the Alamanni, Goths, and other peoples
 - quoted, 824, 1202, 1209, 1651
- Great Britain. Statutes at Large, 1656
- Great Encyclical Letters. See Leo XIII
- Great Women of the Christian Faith. See Deen
- Greece. See Shuckburgh
- *Greece and Rome. See* Boulton
- Greece Under the Romans. See Finlay
- Green, James Benjamin, ed., A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards, 61, 245, 961, 974, 1602

Green, John Richard (1837–83); English historian; a vicar of St. Philip's; a librarian at Lambeth

History of the English People, 265

Gregory of Nyssa (331?–396?); younger brother of Basil the Great; E. Church ecclesiastic; bishop of Nyssa in 371 or 372 De Castigatione, 1418

Gregory I (the Great), Pope (540?–604); pope, 590–604; zealous in propagating Christianity; enforced celibacy of clergy; considered last of the Latin fathers

Epistles, 58, 283, 345, 1431

Gregory VII, Pope (1020?–85); b. Tuscany; eager to make pope supreme in the church, church supreme over state; excommunicated Henry IV of Germany twice, died in exile Dictatus Papae, 1128

in Thatcher and McNeal, eds., A Source Book for Mediaeval History, 402, 1150

Gregory XVI, Pope (1765–1846); Italian; pope, 1831–46; put down revolt in Papal States; was subjected to French occupation for six years quoted by Leo XIII, 496b

Grier, William James, B.A. (1902–); minister, Irish Evangelical Church, Belfast, Ireland; ed. of monthly *Irish Evangelical;* amillennialist The Momentous Event, 1515, 1522

Grollman, Arthur, M.D., Ph.D. (1901–); prof. of experimental med., Univ. of Tex. Southwestern Med. School, Dallas, Tex.

- Pharmacology and Therapeutics, 215, 234, 236
- **Gross, Ludwik,** M.D. (1904–); specialist, internal med., Veterans Administration Hosp., New York City; degree Uniwersytet Jagiellonski Wydzial Lekarski, Cracow, Poland in *JAMA*, 819

Growth of European Civilization. See Boak

Guillon de Montléon, Aimé (1758–1842); French abbé and literary writer; participant in the events centering in Lyons during French Revolution

Histoire de la ville de Lyon, 776

Guy, Bernard. See Bernard Guidonis

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

- Hadrian, Emperor (76–138); Roman emperor, 117–138; set the empire's e. boundary at the Euphrates; built a wall across Britain; put down the revolt of the Jews under Bar Cocheba; built up the monarchical system of Rome in *Translations and Reprints*, 1186
- Hagan, John, D.D. (1873–); Irish Catholic churchman; mem., Superior Council of the Propagation of the Faith from 1924; rector of the Irish College in Rome; author of a 4– vol. catechism; contributor to periodicals

quoted by McHugh and Callan, 1739

- Hagan, William Arthur, M.S., D.V.M. (1893–); head of dept. of pathology and bacteriology and dean of N.Y State Veterinary College, Cornell Univ.; special consultant to chief of Bur. of Animal Industry, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, 1944–45 in Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 603
- **Hagenbach, Karl Rudolf,** Th.D. (1801–74); Swiss–German Protestant theologian; 50 years prof. of theology in Basel; author on theology and church history

History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries, 1156

Hales, Edward Elton Young (1908–); English Catholic; honors in modern history, Oxford, 1929; Carnegie Fellow in U.S., 1949

Catholic Church in the Modern World, 390, 508, 1155, 1158, 1167

Hallam, Henry, B.A. (1777–1859); English historian

Constitutional History of England, 1634, 1635

- History of Europe During the Middle Ages, 1484
- Hamilton, Floyd Eugene, B.D., Th.M. (1890–); Presbyterian minister; prof. of Bible, Union Christian College, Pyengyang, Korea, 1931; secretary of the Com. on Christian Education of the Orthodox Presbyterian Church

Basis of Millennial Faith, 629, 1060, 1063, 1070, 1073, 1525

- Hammond, Edward Cuyler, Sc.D. (1912–); statistician; prof. of biometry, and chairman, Univ. Executive Com. on Statistics, Yale Univ.
 - ____, and Daniel Horn, in JAMA, 1717, 1723
- Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs. See Weiser
- Handbook to the Controversy With Rome. See Hase
- Hard, William, L.H.D. (1878–); American ed. and author; Fellow in history, Northwestern Univ., 1900–01; connected with *Chicago Tribune, Reader's Digest*, etc. in *Reader's Digest*, 1291
- Hardinge, Mervyn G., M.D. (1914–); assoc. prof. of pharmacology and experimental therapeutics, College of Medical Evangelists, Loma Linda Univ., Calif.

_, and Frederick J. Stare, in American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 622

A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards. See Green, J. B.

Harnack, Adolf von (1851–1930); German Protestant theologian; prof. of church history, Univ. of Berlin

History of Dogma, 431, 848, 1011, 1490

What Is Christianity? 1359

Harofé Haivri. See Hebrew Medical Journal Harper's, 1297

Harrison, Everett Falconer, A.M., Th.D. (1902–); prof., NT, Fuller Theological Seminary; ed. in chief, *Baker's Dictionary of Theology*, 1960 in *Baker's Dictionary of Theology*, 897 Harrison, Lucia Carolyn, M.S.; prof. of geography and geology, later assoc. prof. emeritus, W. Michigan Univ., Kalamazoo, Mich.

Daylight, Twilight, Darkness, and Time, 355

Sun, Earth, Time and Man, 353, 357, 358

- Hartmann, Albert (1903–); German; prof., Jesuit College Maximum, Frankfurt am Main quoted, 512, 883
- Harvey, Paul; ABC radio news commentator and newspaper columnist, Chicago in *The Lima News*, 1776
- Hase, Karl August von, Ph.D., Th.D. (1800–90); German Protestant theologian; prof. of theology, Univ. of Jena

Handbook to the Controversy With Rome, 939

- Hastings, James, ed., Dictionary of the Bible, 456, 1263
- _____, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 95, 485, 1050, 1263, 1473, 1474, 1639 *Hebrew Medical Journal (Harofé Haivri)* (published in New York, each issue in both Hebrew and English), 601
- **Hedin, Sven Anders** (1865–1952); Swedish geographer and explorer in Asia; author of several works on his travels

Bagdad, Babylon, Ninive, 146

Hefele, Karl (Charles) Joseph von (1809–93); German Catholic churchman and historian; opposed the dogma of infallibility at the Vatican Council of 1870, but in 1871 submitted to the papal authority; church historian; prof. of theology at Tübingen, 1840; bishop of Rottenburg, 1869

History of the Christian Councils, 1400, 1416, 1435

- **Heggtveit, Hallvard Gunleikson** (1850–1924); Norwegian church historian; teacher; ed. Illustreret Kirkehistorie, 1644
- Hegsted, David Mark, M.S., Ph.D. (1914–); American nutritionist, biochemist; assoc. prof. of nutrition, Harvard School of Public Health, from 1946

, and others, in Journal of Laboratory and Clinical Medicine, 607

Heidel, Alexander, Ph.D. (1907–); research assoc. instructor, later asst. prof., Oriental Institute, Univ. of Chicago

The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels, 751, 753, 754

Hein, Fred V., Ph.D.; consultant in health and fitness, Bur. of Health Education, American Med. Assoc.

joint author. See Rice

- Hellenistic Civilisation. See Tarn
- Hendry, George Stuart, M.A., B.D., D.D. (1904–); Scottish–born American Presbyterian minister; secretary, Joint Comm. of British Churches on New Translation of the Bible, 1946–49; prof. of systematic theology, Princeton Theological Seminary

Westminster Confession for Today, 539, 633, 635, 853, 1237, 1773, 1774

Hening, William Waller; compiler, Statutes at Large, ... Virginia, 351

Henry IV, Emperor (1050–1106); as ruler of the Holy Roman Empire, 1056–1106, he lost his first contest with the pope over lay investiture of bishops (at Canossa, 1077); excommunicated again in 1080, he was backed by his princes, invaded Italy, exiled Gregory, and set up Clement III as antipope; his later antipapal activities were curtailed by his sons' support of the papal party

quoted in Snyder, 1151

Herberg, Will (1906–); Jewish lecturer and writer on religion, philosophy, and social science; graduate prof., Judaic studies and social philosophy, Drew Univ., Madison, N.J. Protestant—Catholic—Jew, 1285, 1290, 1292, 1293

Heresies and Heretics. See Cristiani

- Herodotus (5th cent., B.C.); Greek historian from Asia Minor; traveler; historian of Greco– Persian wars, 500–479 B.C.; known as the father of history [Histories], 125, 549, 1219, 1220
- Hickey, James C.; writer of "Stars of the Week" column in *New York Sun* (now defunct), 1934–49

Introducing the Universe, 741

Higgins, E. L., compiler, *The French Revolution as Told by Contemporaries,* 773, 776 *High Holyday Prayer Book. See* Birnbaum

Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367?); a doctor of the church; bishop of Poitiers, c. 353; strongly fought Arianism

quoted, 1309

Hill, Austin Bradford, C.B.E., F.R.S.; Ph.D. (1897–); prof. of med. statistics, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Med.; hon. director of the Statistical Research Unit of the Med. Research Council

joint author. See Doll

Hill, Matthew William, hon. LL.D. (1894–); judge; chief justice, Wash. State Supreme Court, 1957–58; Baptist

in Listen, 23

- **Himes, Joshua, Vaughan** (1805–95); American minister, reformer, and leader in the Millerite movement; founder and ed. of *The Signs of the Times* (1840) and publisher of other Millerite literature; minister in the Christian Connection; late in life became Episcopal minister
 - in Fessenden & Co.'s Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 413
 - in The Outlook, 1324
 - in The Midnight Cry, 1081
 - in The Signs of the Times, 894c
- Hinschius, Paul (1835–98); German jurist; prof. of ecclesiastical law, Halle, Berlin, Kiel; mem. Reichstag

in New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 822

Hippolytus (died c. A.D. 235); ecclesiastical writer; bishop of Porto, near Rome; supposedly martyred in Sardinia

Treatise on Christ and Antichrist, 1244, 1342

Histoire de la ville de Lyon pendant la révolution. See Guillon de Montléon

Historical Account of Earthquakes. See Hunter

Histories. See Herodotus; Polybius; Tacitus

History. See Ammianus Marcellinus

History and Monuments of Ur. See Gadd

History of Ancient Civilization. See Trever

History of Babylon and Assyria. See King, L. W.

History of Babylonia and Assyria. See Rogers; Winckler

History of Christianity. See Latourette; Milman

History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith. See Curtis

History of Dogma. See Harnack History of Europe. See Alison History of Europe During the Middle Ages. See Hallam History of France. See Adolphus History of Freedom. See Acton History of Greece. See Bury History of Intolerance. See Clarke, T. History of Modern Spiritualism. See Thompson History of Rome. See Mommsen History of Rome to 565 A.D. See Boak History of the Ancient World. See Goodspeed; Rostovtzeff History of the Catholic Church in Scotland. See Bellesheim History of the Christian Church. See Fisher, G. P.; Robertson; Schaff; Summerbell History of the Christian Councils. See Hefele History of the Christian Religion and Church. See Neander History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. See Hagenbach History of the Commandments of the Church. See Villien History of the Council of Constance. See Lenfant History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. See Gibbon History of the English People. See Green, J. R. History of the Girondists. See Lamartine History of the Hebrew Monarchy. See Newman, F. W. History of the Inquisition of Spain. See Llorente History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. See Lea *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe. See* Draper History of the Papacy in the 19th Century (1864–1878). See Bury History of the Persian Empire. See Olmstead, A. T. History of the Primitive Church. See Lebreton History of the Reformation in Sweden. See Anjou History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe. See Lecky History of the Waldenses of Italy. See Comba History of the Wars. See Procopius History of the World. See Justin History of Tyre. See Fleming, W. B. History of Western Philosophy. See Russell, B. Hoadly, Charles Jeremy (1828–1900); admitted to the bar; in charge of Conn. State library Records ... of New Haven, 349, 1654 Hofmann, Karl, Der "Dictatus Papae" Gregors VII, 1128 Hole, Donald, A.K.C., F.R.S. (1867–); English clergyman; founder and hon. secretary, Actors' Church Union; mem., Soc. for Psychic Research, London Spiritualism and the Church, 1539 Hollis, Frederick James, D.D. (1878–); Anglican clergyman; rector of Widford, England; wrote on OT literature and languages The Archeology of Herod's Temple, 1680 Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius (1832–1910); German Protestant theologian; prof. of NT, Heidelberg, 1861; Strassburg, 1874; leader in critical Bible research

Kanon und Tradition, 1444

Holy Family Series of Catholic Catechisms, No. 8. See Butler

The Holy Qur-an. See Koran

Home Book of Quotations. See Stevenson

Homilies. See Asterius; Athanasius; Chrysostom; Origen

Hooke, Samuel Henry, D.D., F.S.A. (1874-); prof. emeritus, Univ. of London

Babylonian and Assyrian Religion, 99, 127, 150, 153, 156–158, 163, 166, 168–170, 316, 750, 1564

in PEQ, 582

- Hoover, John Edgar, LL.B. (1895–); American lawyer and criminologist; director, Federal Bur. of Investigation, Dept. of Justice
- in Christianity Today, 1808
- Horn, Daniel, A.M., Ph.D. (1916–); statistician, director of Program Evaluation, American Cancer Soc.

joint author. See Hammond

- House of Seleucus. See Bevan
- Howson, John Saul, M.A., D.D. (1816–85); English clergyman; dean of Chester Cathedral; principal, Liverpool College joint author. *See* Conybeare
- Hudson, Peter Goodwin, B.D.; Church of England clergyman in Surrey, England, 1960 in *Christianity Today*, 1783
- Human Nutrition and Dietetics. See Davidson
- A Hundred Years of Astronomy. See Waterfield
- Hunter, Thomas, Historical Account of Earthquakes, 643
- Husslein, Joseph, Ph.D. (1873–1952); American Jesuit writer; prof. at several colleges; on editorial staff of *America*; contributor to the *Catholic Encyclopedia* The Souls in Purgatory, 1023, 1270, 1271
- Hutchinson, Paul, D.D., Ph.B., Litt.D. (1890–1955); ed., author; executive secretary (Methodist) China Centenary Movement, 1920–21; ed., *Christian Century* The New Leviathan, 498

The New Ordeal of Christianity, 1008, 1013, 1171, 1813

- **, and Winfred E. Garrison,** 20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History, 416, 475, 476, 482, 484, 502, 522, 886, 1106, 1110, 1133, 1138, 1141, 1200, 1312, 1352, 1733
- Huxley, Sir Julian Sorell, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (1887–); biologist and writer on science and philosophy; grandson of Thomas Huxley Man Stands Alone, 110
- **Huxley, Thomas Henry,** M.B. (1825–95); English biologist and champion of Darwin's theory of evolution; advocate of practical education based on physical training, physical science, the tool studies, and the Bible; a philosophical agnostic quoted by Lamont, 1553
- **Hyatt, James Philip,** B.D., Ph.D. (1909–); assoc. prof., later prof. of OT, Divinity School, Vanderbilt Univ., Nashville, Tenn. in *The Teacher*, 967
- **Hyde, Walter Woodburn,** A.M., Ph.D., Litt.D. (1870–); prof. of Latin, Greek, and ancient history in several American universities

Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire, 344, 449, 1005, 1092, 1182, 1184, 1187, 1189, 1192, 1193, 1196, 1199, 1201, 1206, 1340, 1360, 1579, 1587, 1646, 1650

Ignatius of Antioch (early 2d cent.); bishop of Antioch; one of the Church Fathers; certain of his epistles are spurious, and others in their longer form contain 4th-cent. interpolations Epistle to the Magnesians, 1404, 1411

quoted by Powell, 1614

The Illusion of Immortality. See Lamont

Illustreret Kirkehistorie. See Heggtveit

Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? Cullmann

In Marci Evangelium Expositio. See Bede

In Matthaei Evangelium Expositio. See Bede

- *The Independent* (1848–1928); originally Congregationalist, later nondenominational, religious and literary weekly, 1777
- Independent Chronicle (Boston newspaper), 563, 573

Index of Prohibited Books, 248, 275

The Infallibility of the Church. See Salmon

Inge, William Ralph (1860–1954); English churchman and theologian; because of his philosophical pessimism, called the Gloomy Dean; Cambridge prof. of divinity; dean of St. Paul's, London

quoted by Hutchinson and Garrison, 482

Innocent I, Pope (?–417); bishop of Rome, 402–417; during his pontificate, Rome was sacked, 410, by Alaric

Epistle 25, 1426

Innocent III, Pope (1161–1216); Italian; pope, 1198–1216; brought papal temporal supremacy to its highest peak; promoted the 4th Crusade; excommunicated and deposed the emperor Otto; put England under interdict and deposed John, who then submitted; presided at the Fourth Lateran Council, which strengthened the episcopal inquisition against heretics

in Translations and Reprints, 1152

An Inquiry Into Spiritualism. See Whitehead

The Inquisition. See Vacandard

Inquisition and Liberty. See Coulton

Inside View of the Vatican Council. See Kenrick

Inspiration and Interpretation. See Walvoord

Institutes of the Christian Religion. See Calvin

Institutes of the Coenobia. See Cassian

Institutiones Iuris Ecclesiastici Publici. See Luca

International Congress of Nutrition, fifth congress, 1960, panel discussions, 616, 618 International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, 423, 1245

- *Interpretation* (a quarterly journal of Bible and theology, Presbyterian Church, U.S., Richmond, Va.), 339
- Interpretation of History. See Tillich

Interpreting Revelation. See Tenney, M. C.

Introducing the Universe. See Hickey

Introduction to the Old Testament. See Sellin

Irenaeus (c. 130–c. 202); early Church Father; b. Asia Minor; bishop of Lyons; writer in Greek

Against Heresies, 1408 quoted, 653, 655

- **Ironside, Henry Allan,** D.Litt., D.D. (1876–1951); Canadian–born American clergyman; prof., Biblical literature, Evangelical Theological College, Dallas, Tex.; pastor, Moody Memorial church, Chicago; author of works on dispensationalist type of premillennialism quoted by Pieters, 1253
- Ivy, Andrew Conway, M.S., Ph.D., M.D., hon. D.Sc., hon. LL.D. (1893–); prof. of physiology and pharmacology and head dept., medical school, Northwestern Univ., 1925–46; vice–pres., Univ. of Illinois, 1946–53; distinguished prof. of physiology and head dept., clinical science, Univ. of Illinois, from 1946; sci. dir., Naval Med. Research Inst., 1942–43; civilian with Atomic Energy Comm.; USAF; U.S. Public Health Service in *Listen*, 9, 10, 29
- Jaberg, Russell L., Rev. (1914–); pastor, Westminster Presbyterian church, South Bend, Ind. (1960)

in Christianity Today, 1288

Jackson, Frederick John Foakes-. See Foakes-Jackson

Jackson, Robert H., LL.D. (1892–1954); assoc. justice U.S. Supreme Court, 1941–54; admitted to N.Y. bar, 1913; solicitor gen. of U.S., 1938–39; U.S. atty. gen., 1940–41; chief of counsel for U.S. in prosecution of Nuremberg trials; Episcopalian; Mason; author of legal works

quoted by Brennan, 1671

- Jacobs, Morris B., ed., Chemistry and Technology of Food and Food Products, 222, 224, 241
- James, William, M.D., Ph. et Litt.D., LL.D. (1842–1910); American philosopher and pioneer in psychology; prof. of psychology, later philosophy, Harvard; interested in psychical phenomena from the psychological angle, but never accepted them as communication from another sphere; in philosophy, one of the founders of the movement called pragmatism

Principles of Psychology, 409

quoted by Lamont, 1553

Janus. See Döllinger

Jastrow, Morris, Jr. (1861–1921); Polish–born Jewish American; Semitic scholar; prof., Univ. of Pa.; librarian, ed., author

Religion of Babylon and Assyria, 122

Jefferson, Thomas (1743–1826); American patriot and statesman; third President of the U.S. (1801–09); graduate William and Mary, 1762; admitted to bar, 1769; author of the Declaration of Independence; champion of religious liberty and separation of church and state; founder of the Univ. of Va.; deist

Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, 1300b

Jeremias, Alfred, Ph.D. (1864–1935); Lutheran pastor; prof. of religious history, Univ. of Leipzig; OT scholar

Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East, 87, 89, 136

Jerome (340?–420); one of four "Doctors of the Church" so recognized during the Middle Ages; b. Pannonia; made a Latin version of the Bible (the Vulgate); wrote ecclesiastical history and Bible exegesis

Comment on Isaiah 56:2, 1423

Letters of St. Jerome, 1120, 1641

Jerusalem Under the High–Priests. See Bevan

Jessup, Henry Harris, D.D. (1832–1910); Presbyterian minister; missionary at Tripoli and Beirut

Fifty-Three Years in Syria, 743

Jewish Documents of the Time of Ezra. See Cowley

Jewish Forum (American periodical of Jewish opinion) 600, 602, 604

- John, King (of England) (1167?–1216); was forced to sign the Magna Charta; forfeited his lands to the pope and received them as a vassal in Bettenson, ed., *Documents of the Christian Church*, 1153
- John XXIII, Pope (real name Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli) (1881–); supreme pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church; Italian; created cardinal, 1953; Vatican observer to UNESCO; author of a 5–vol. history of St. Charles Borromeo; became pope, 1958; as pope, showed independence and a change from his predecessor's policies

Encyclical Mater et Magistra (1961), 1624

- Jones, Henry, A.B. (1804–80); Congregationalist minister, temperance advocate, and abolitionist; author of books on prophecy; one of the Millerite leaders who never accepted William Miller's definite "time" for the Second Advent in *The Signs of the Times*, 894
- Josephus, Flavius (A.D. 37–100?); Jewish historian and general; of royal and priestly lineage; gov. of Galilee; took part in Jewish revolt against Romans *Against Apion*, 250, 928, 1369. *See also* 1371
 - Antiquities, 41, 553, 899, 915, 1099, 1229, 1372, 1388, 1678

War, 364, 690, 922, 1174, 1370, 1679

quoted by Gadd, 1

- *Journal Asiatique* (1822– ; periodical on Oriental studies, published by the Société Asiatique, Paris), 64, 65
- *Journal of Geography* (periodical of the National Council for Geographic Education), 354 *Journal of Laboratory and Clinical Medicine*, 607
- Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 610
- Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), 214, 217, 218, 238, 239, 621, 791, 793, 811, 815, 819, 1713, 1717, 1723
- Julian, Percy Lavon, M.A., Ph.D., hon. D.Sc. (1899–); Negro American scientist; organic chemist; instructor in chemistry, Fisk Univ., 1920–22; assoc. prof. and acting head of dept., Howard, 1927–29; prof. and head of dept., 1931–32; director of research, Glidden Co., 1936–45; pres., Julian Laboratories, Inc., from 1953; Spingarn medal award, 1947 in *Morgan State College Bulletin* (1955), 1784
- Justin (Marcus Junianus Justinus) (probably 3d cent. A.D.); made an epitome in Latin of Pompeius Trogus' *Historiae Philippicae* (also known as *History of the World*), which was widely read in the Middle Ages
 - History of the World, 42

in Botsford and Botsford, eds., Source-Book of Ancient History, 34

Justin, Martyr (100?–165?); a Father of the church; philosophy student, teacher of Platonic ideas; started first Christian school in Rome; reputedly beaten and killed in Rome, c. 165 Apology, 1407a

Dialogue With Trypho, a Jew, 1407b,c

Justinian, Emperor (483–565); probably a Slav; b. Illyricum; emperor, 527–65; most notable reign of Eastern Empire; codified Roman law

Codex Justinianus. See 1642

in The Civil Law, 1134, 1135

Kanon und Tradition. See Holtzmann

- **Karlstadt, Andreas Rudolf** (1480?–1541); German Protestant Reformer; joined Luther's cause at Wittenberg, 1517; preacher and prof. at Basel, Switzerland, from 1534 Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen, 1362, 1374, 1381, 1390
- Kattenbusch, Ferdinand, Ph.D., Th.D. (1851–1935); German Protestant; prof. of theology in Giessen; prof. at Lutheruniversitat, Halle

in New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 1265

Kearney, Paul William (1896–); American author; contributor to many American magazines on the subject of safety

in Reader's Digest, 13

Keenan, Stephen; Scottish Catholic priest; author of a catechism much used in Roman Catholic schools

A Doctrinal Catechism, 869, 1440

- Kelly, Vincent James, S.T.D. (1913–); American Catholic priest; mem., Redemptorist order; his work cited was his doctoral dissertation, Catholic Univ. of America
- Forbidden Sunday and Feast–Day Occupations, 1386, 1401, 1432, 1434, 1451, 1453, 1609, 1616, 1638, 1640, 1648
- **Kennedy, John** (fl. 1780); a New England farmer who published a pamphlet containing an account of the Dark Day
 - Some Remarks on the Great and Unusual Darkness that Appeared on Friday, May 19, 1780, 572
- Kenney, James Francis, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S. (1884–1946); director of historical research and publicity in the Public Archives of Canada Sources for the Early History of Ireland, 650
- **Kenrick, Peter Richard** (1806–96); Irish–born Catholic archbishop of St. Louis; at the Vatican Council, 1870, he was one of the prelates opposed to the definition of the dogma of papal infallibility

in Inside View of the Vatican Council, 1224

Kenyon, Frederic, M.A., Ph.D. (1863–1952); director and principal librarian, British Museum, 1909–30; prof. of ancient history, Royal Academy, 1918; writer on ancient history

Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, 335, 340

- Kenyon, Kathleen Mary, M.A., F.S.A. (1906–); English archeologist; director of excavations in England and Palestine, noted especially for excavations at Jericho Archaeology in the Holy Land, 465, 1034
- Digging Up Jericho, 920
- **Killen, William Dool,** D.D. (1806–1902); prof. of ecclesiastical history and pastoral theology in the Irish Assembly's College, Belfast, and pres. of the faculty

The Ancient Church, 471, 1366

- **Kinder, Ernst** (1910–); German Lutheran pastor and scholar; prof. of theology, Münster Univ., from 1953
 - in Ecumenical Review, 671
- King, Charles Glen, Sc.D., Ph.D. (1896–); American chemist; prof., Columbia Univ., from 1946; science director, Nutrition Foundation, Inc., from 1942
 - in [American] Journal of Clinical Nutrition, 605
 - in Nutrition Reviews, 599, 808
- **King, Leonard William,** Litt.D., F.S.A. (1869–1919); English Assyriologist; assistant keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities in the British Museum; prof. of Assyrian and Babylonian archeology in the Univ. of London
 - History of Babylonia and Assyria, 124, 126, 134, 317
- Kingship and the Gods. See Frankfort
- **Kingsley, Charles** (1819–75); British ecclesiastic, poet and novelist; rector of Eversley, later canon of Chester and of Westminster; a broad churchman quoted by Ali, 483
- Kitto, John, ed., Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature, 1614
- Klotz, John William, Ph.D. (1918–); American biologist; prof. of biology, Concordia Teachers College, River Forest, Ill.; pastor of Calvary Lutheran church, Wood Dale, Ill.; prof., natural science, Concordia Senior College, Ind.
- Genes, Genesis, and Evolution, 711
- Know Thy Body. See MacLaren
- Knowing the Scriptures. See Pierson
- **Knox, Ronald Arbuthnott** (1888–1957); English Catholic author, a former Anglican; NT translator; chaplain at Oxford
- quoted by Shklar, 1779. See also 836n
- **Knox, Thomas Francis,** D.D. (1822–82); priest of the Congregation of the London Oratory (Roman Catholic)
- in Letters and Memorials of-William Cardinal Allen, 823
- **Koldewey, Robert** (1855–1925); German archeologist; leader in many excavations of the ruins of Babylon
- Excavations at Babylon, 138, 143, 145, 211
- Königsherrschaft Christi und Kirche im Neuen Testament. See Cullmann
- Koran, 686, 778, 1018, 1021, 1095, 1320, 1509, 1752
- Köstlin, Julius Theodor, Ph.D., Th.D., Dr.Jur. (1826–1902); prof. of New Testament exegesis, Univ. of Halle, 1870–96
- in New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 467
- Kraus, Clyde Norman, Th.M., Princeton, 1951; assistant prof. of Bible, Goshen College, Goshen, Ind., 1956
- Dispensationalism in America, 623, 626, 1071
- **Kromminga, Diedrich Hinrich** (1879–1947); prof. in church history, Calvin Seminary, Grand Rapids, Mich.; amillennialist
- The Millennium in the Church, 624, 689, 1055, 1061, 1072, 1075, 1254, 1255, 1261, 1523, 1528
- Krüger, Hermann Gustav Eduard, Ph.D., Th.D. (1862–?); German Protestant; prof. of church history, Univ. of Giessen; author of numerous books

in New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 944, 945

- Kulp, John Laurence, M.S., M.A., Ph.D. (1921–); geologist, dept. of geology, Columbia Univ.; geochemist for leading petroleum industries; mem. of the Society of Age Determination of Geologic Materials in *Scientific Monthly*, 462
- **Kyle, Melvin Gove,** D.D., LL.D. (1858–1933); research lecturer, Pittsburgh–Xenia Seminary; lecturer on archeology at Louisville Presbyterian Seminary; former pres. of Xenia Seminary

Mooring-Masts of Revelation, 1225

- Ladd, George Eldon, B.D., Ph.D. (1911–); assoc. prof. of NT, prof. of Biblical theology, Fuller Theological Seminary, Calif.; evangelical; futurist, nondispensationalist premillennialist
 - The Blessed Hope, 783, 1064, 1067, 1256, 1258, 1498, 1519, 1524, 1526, 1527
 - Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God, 295, 628, 631, 688, 949, 1054, 1059, 1066, 1068. *See also* 630
 - Gospel of the Kingdom, 891, 898, 947
- Ladies Diary: or Woman's Almanack For the Year of our Lord, 1752, 360
- Lagarde, André. See Turmel, Joseph
- Laing, Gordon Jennings, Ph.D., LL.D., Litt.D. (1869–1945); Canadian–born educator; prof. of Latin; head, dept. of classics and dean, Faculty of Arts, McGill Univ.; prof. of Latin, later dean, Div. Humanities, Univ. of Chicago
 - Survivals of Roman Religion, 427, 438, 440, 444, 1006, 1007, 1299, 1321, 1322, 1482, 1485–1489, 1563, 1574, 1761
- Lamartine, Alphonse Marie Louis de Prat de (1790–1869); French poet, statesman; minister of foreign affairs in the provisional government of 1848 History of the Girondists, 774, 775
- Lambert, Père [Bernard] (1738–1813); French Catholic theologian of the Jansenist sect; author of *Exposition des prédictions et des promesses faites à l'Eglise pour les derniers temps de la gentilité*, in which he professes the doctrines of millenarianism and sees in the pope the Antichrist

in Quarterly Journal of Prophecy, 174

- Lamer, Hans (1873–?); author of the sections on archeology, ancient science and technology, religion, and civilization in the *Wörterbuch der Antike*, Leipzig in *Wörterbuch der Antike*, 450, 1586
- Lammens, Henri (1862–1937); Belgian Jesuit; prof., Univ. of St. Joseph, Beirut, Lebanon in *Journal Asiatique*, 64, 65
- Lamont, Corliss, Ph.D. (1902–); author; teacher; instructor of philosophy, Columbia College, 1928–32; director, American Civil Liberties Union Illusion of Immortality, 1553

Lancet (a British medical journal), 613, 801, 817

Land of the Long Night. See Du Chaillu

Land of the Midnight Sun. See Du Chaillu

Landis, Benson Y.; ed., Yearbook of American Churches, 1961, 918

- Lang, Andrew (1844–1912); Scottish Greek scholar, historian, folklorist, poet, man of letters, journalist, and author; wrote on many subjects
 - quoted by R. W. Rogers, 140

- Langdon, Stephen Herbert (1876–1937); American Assyriologist; prof., Oxford Univ.; director of Oxford and Field Museum expedition in Mesopotamia, 1923–32
 Semitic [Mythology], 139, 152, 164, 167, 446, 1097, 1231, 1753
 in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1754
- Lange, John Peter, Commentary: ... Genesis, 1380
- Laodicea, Council of, in Hefele, History of the Christian Councils, 1400, 1416, 1435
- Large Catechism. See Luther
- Late Travels of S. Giacomo Baratti. See Baratti
- Later Greek Religion. See Bevan
- Latin Church in the Middle Ages, by André Lagarde. See Turmel
- Latourette, Kenneth Scott, D.D., Ph.D. (1884–); American Baptist clergyman and Oriental scholar; prof. of missions and Oriental history and Fellow of Berkeley College in Yale Univ.
 - History of Christianity, 419, 651, 1296, 1790
 - Christian Outlook, 1507, 1788, 1789, 1797
- Laux, John Joseph, M.A. (1878–1939); Catholic priest; instructor of religion, Catholic High School, and prof. of psychology, Villa Madonna College, Covington, Ky.; church historian and author of biographies of the saints and other religious works
- A Course in Religion for Catholic High Schools and Academies, 1727
- Layard, Sir Austen Henry (1817–94); French–born English politician and excavator of Nineveh; hon. foreign secretary of the Royal Academy of Arts Discoveries Among the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon, 142
- Lea, Henry Charles, D.Th. (1825–1909); American Quaker; publisher, publicist, historian; wrote editorials, articles, and pamphlets on public matters; devoted his last years chiefly to studying and writing; his *History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (1888) is still the one indispensable work on the subject; was honored by universities and learned societies in America and Europe
- History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages, 1207
- League of Nations, Report on the Reform of the Calendar, 1764
- Leben des ... Zinzendorf. See Spangenberg
- Lebreton, Jules Marie Léon (1873–1956); French Jesuit priest; dean of Faculty of Theology, Institut Catholique, Paris
- History of the Primitive Church, 652
- Lecky, William Edward Hartpole, LL.D., D.C.L., Litt.D. (1838–1903); Irish historian and essayist; mem. of Parliament; mem. of the British Academy and the French Institute History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe, 1210, 1212
- Lectures on Preaching. See Simpson, M.
- Lectures on the History of Religions, 1164
- Lectures on the Influence ... of Rome, on Christianity. See Renan
- Legacy of Israel. See Bevan
- Lenfant, James, History of the Council of Constance, 825
- Lenormant, François (1837–83); French Catholic historian; prof. of archeology, Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris quoted by Unger, 379
- Lentz, Francis George (d. 1917); Catholic priest, St. Patrick's church, Merna, Ill.; missionary of the diocese of Peoria, Ill.

The Ouestion Box, 1384, 1630

Leo I, Pope (390?–461); known as "the Great"; pope, 440–461; active in disciplinary of reforms; wrote many sermons and letters of historic interest

Letter 9, 1430

Letter 16, 1430

Sermon 27, 429

- Sermon 88, 1430
- in Thatcher and McNeal, eds., Source Book of Mediaeval History, 1127
- Leo XIII, Pope (1810–1903); pope, 1878–1903; eminent scholar and statesman; wrote important encyclicals on marriage, church and state, study of the Bible, education, and modern socialism
 - Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII, 276, 494, 1131, 1132

quoted by Carrillo de Albornoz, 511

quoted by R. M. Brown, 495

Letters and memorials of William Cardinal Allen. See Knox, T. F.

- Letters and Other Writings of James Madison. See Madison
- Letters From Rome on the Council. See Döllinger
- Letters of Pliny. See Pliny, the Younger

Letters of Roger Williams. See Williams, R.

- Letters on Astronomy, Addressed to a Lady. See Olmsted, D.
- Letters on the Second Coming of Christ. See Cox
- Leupold, Herbert Carl, D.D. (1892-); prof. of OT exegesis, Theological Seminary, Capital Univ., Columbus, Ohio; author of expositions of the books of the Bible; Lutheran quoted by M. F. Unger, 90, 379
- Lewis, Clive Staples, hon. D.D., hon. D.Litt., F.R.S.L. (1898-); Fellow and tutor in English language and literature of Magdalen College, Oxford; prof. of medieval and renaissance English, Cambridge, from 1954; author of numerous works on literature and on popularized theology for the lay person

Bevond Personality, 634, 1294

The Case for Christianity, 414, 538, 978, 1514

Lewis, Tayler (1802–77); prof. of Greek in Union College, Schenectady, N.Y.; prof. of Greek language and literature, Univ. of City of New York; Bible commentator; taught creation in 6 long periods, the present being the 7th

in Lange, Commentary: ... Genesis, 1380

Leyburn, James Graham, A.M., Ph.D. (1902-); sociologist; dean, Washington and Lee Univ.; prof. of sociology, George Washington Univ., 1956-; Presbyterian in Christian Century, 1810

- Libro de las Profecías. See Columbus
- Life (a pictorial weekly of news and feature articles), 662, 674

Life and Epistles of St. Paul. See Conybeare

Life and Times of Frederick Douglass. See Douglass, F.

Life in Christ. See White, E.

Life in the Middle Ages. See Coulton

Life of Apollonius of Tyana. See Philostratus

Life of Constantine. See Eusebius

Life of John Milton. See Masson

Life of Nicholas Lewis Count Zinzendorf. See Spangenberg

Life of the Ancient East. See Baikie

Light From the Ancient East. See Deissmann

Light From the Ancient Past. See Finegan

Liguori, Alphonus Maria de, LL.D. (1696–1787); Italian theologian, founder of the congregation of the Redemptorists; declared a saint, 1839, a doctor of the church, 1871 Dignity and Duties of the Priest, 395

Glories of Mary, 1012, 1020

Lillie, Mildred Loree, A.B., LL.B. (1915–); asst. U.S. atty., Los Angeles; judge municipal court, City of Los Angeles

in Listen, 15

L'Illusion Libérale. See Veuillot

Lima News (Ohio newspaper), 1776

Listen (bimonthly temperance journal), 9, 10, 14, 15, 23, 29

Listener (a general periodical, published by the BBC), 584

- Litch, Josiah (1809–86); Methodist minister; physician; author on prophetic interpretation; assoc. ed. of the Millerite journal *The Signs of the Times* in *Advent Shield and Review*, 896, 1079, 1080, 1085
- Littledale, Richard Frederick, M.A., LL.B., LL.D., D.C.L. (1833–90); Church of England clergyman; writer of ability; exerted wide influence as an opponent of the Church of Rome
 - Plain Reasons Against Joining the Church of Rome, 849
- Lives of the Caesars. See Suetonius

Living. See Rice

Livy (59 B.C.–A.D. 17); Roman historian; b. Padua; wrote a history of Rome from its beginning to 9 B.C.

From the Founding of the City, 1336

Llorente, D. Juan Antonio (1756–1823); Spanish Catholic priest; held rationalistic views; general secretary of the Spanish Inquisition, 1789–1801; in charge of the Inquisition property under Joseph Bonaparte; in 1809 was ordered to examine the archives of the Inquisition and write its history; his book was severely condemned by the Roman Catholic hierarchy

History of the Inquisition of Spain, 882

Lord Acton on the States of the Church. See Acton

- Lot, Victor Henri Ferdinand (1866–1952); prof., Univ. of Paris; mem., Institute; hon. prof. in the Sorbonne; director in l'École pratique des Hautes Études, Paris End of the Ancient World, 422
- **Loyola, Ignatius of** (1491–1556); Spanish soldier, ecclesiastic, and ascetic; decided to work for the Catholic Church during convalescence from wounds; went to three universities; founded the Soc. of Jesus (Jesuit order) to convert infidels and counteract the Reformation

in Bettenson, ed., Documents of the Christian Church, 925

Luca, Mariano de (1845–1905); Italian Jesuit prof. of canon law at the Gregorian Univ., Rome; mem., Pontifical Comm. for the codification of canon law; consultor of the Council and of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith

Institutiones Iuris Ecclesiastici Publici, 835, 836

Luccock, Halford Edward, B.D., M.A., D.D., Litt.D. (1885–1960); American writer; Methodist minister; ed. of *Christian Advocate* (1924–28); prof. of homiletics, Yale Divinity School (1928–53); was author of the anonymous column "Simeon Stylites" in *Christian Century*

in New Century Leader, 641

- Lucian of Samosata (2d cent. A.D.); Greek writer of satire, wit; b. Samosata, Syria quoted by Pritchard, 378
- Luckenbill, Daniel David, Ph.D. (1881–1927); prof. of Semitic languages and literatures, Univ. of Chicago; ed. and trans. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia* in *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, 128
- Luther, Martin, M.A., Th.D. (1483–1546); father of the Protestant Reformation; Augustinian friar; ordained priest, 1507; prof. of Biblical exegesis, Wittenberg, 1511–46; protested the sale of indulgences by nailing his 95 theses to the church door at Wittenberg; preached salvation by faith; upheld his position publicly with tongue and pen; was excommunicated by Pope Leo X; organized "Lutheran" church; translated the Bible into German
 - Assertio Omnium Articulorum, 854
 - Auslegung des 37. Psalms Davids, 252
 - Commentary on Genesis, 1376
 - Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther, 1512
 - Large Catechism, 179, 180, 183, 187, 190
 - Luther's Church Postil Gospels, 1511, 1517
 - Luthers Werke, 866
 - Ninety-five Theses, 1276
 - Primary Works, 1024
 - Small Catechism, 1697
 - Table Talk of Martin Luther, 189, 561, 765, 1510
 - "Wider die Antinomer," 960, 1695
 - "Wider die himmlischen Propheten," 1375, 1377
 - "Wider die Sabbather," 1378, 1696
 - in Bettenson, ed., Documents of the Christian Church, 1277
 - in Snyder, ed., Documents of German History, 264
 - quoted by Bellarmine, 828
- Lutheran World, 668, 669

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

- Macalister, Robert Alexander Stewart, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., F.S.A. (1870–1950); British archeologist; prof., Celtic archeology, Univ. College, Dublin; excavator of Gezer and other Biblical sites; author of works on Biblical and Irish archeology quoted by Baikie, 380
- MacArthur, Douglas, D.M.Sc., D.Int.L., LL.D., M.M.S., D.C.L., S.T.D. (1880–); general, United States Army; Allied Supreme Commander, land, air, and sea forces in S.W. Pacific, World War II; accepted surrender of Japan, Aug., 1945 in *New York Times*, 94
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 1st Baron Macaulay (1800–59); English writer and statesman; mem. of Parliament; secretary for war, 1839–41; historian and essayist Critical and Historical Essays, 382, 1076, 1165, 1181, 1267, 1268, 1279
- McCay, Clive Maine, M.S., Ph.D. (1898–); nutritionist; researcher in fields of biochemistry, foods and nutrition since 1921; prof. of nutrition, Cornell Univ., since 1927 quoted by Harvey, 1776
- McCollum, Elmer Verner, M.S., Ph.D., hon. Sc.D., LL.D. (1879–); American physiological chemist; prof. of biochemistry, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins, 1917–46

Newer Knowledge of Nutrition, 619

- MacCulloch, John Arnott, hon. D.D. (1868–); Scottish Episcopal clergyman; hon canon, Cumbrae Cathedral; examining chaplain to the bishop of St. Andrews in Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, 1050
- McDevitt, Ellen, M.D.; instructor in med., Cornell Univ. Med. College; chief, vascular clinic and asst. visiting physician, Bellevue Hosp.

_____, and Irving S. Wright, in E. L. Wynder, ed., *Biologic Effects of Tobacco*, 1720 McGoldrick, Edward J., Jr. (1905–); law graduate, Fordham Univ.; head of New York

City Bur. of Alcoholic Therapy

in Listen, 14

- McGraw–Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology, 362
- MacGregor, Geddes, B.D., LL.B., D.Phil., D.èsL. (1909–); Scottish–born philosopher and author; minister, Church of Scotland; taught in Univ. of Edinburgh; prof. of philosophy and religion, Bryn Mawr College
 - Bible in the Making, 278
 - Vatican Revolution, 863
- Macht, David Israel, M.D., LL.B. (1882–); Russian–born pharmacologist; educator; med. degree, Johns Hopkins Univ. in *Harofé Haivri*, 601
- McHugh, John Ambrose, S.T.L. (1880–1950); American Catholic priest; Dominican friar; prof. of philosophy, church history and theology, Immaculate Conception College, Washington, D.C.; contributor to the original *Catholic Encyclopedia*

_____, and Charles J. Callan, trans. and annotators, *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, 1739

Mackay, John Alexander, M.A., B.D., Litt.D. (1889–); Scottish–born Presbyterian theologian; third pres. Princeton Theological Seminary, and prof. of ecumenics since 1936

Presbyterian Way of Life, 955

MacLaren, James Paterson, M.A., M.B., C.M.; J.P. (now deceased); for some years author of health talks syndicated in the leading newspapers of the Union of S. Africa and Rhodesia.

Know Thy Body, 998

- Maclean, Arthur John, D.D. (1858–?); Episcopal bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness, Scotland
- in Hastings, ed., Dictionary of the Bible, 456

McNeal, Edgar Holmes, joint ed. See Thatcher

McNicol, John, B.A., B.D.; principal of Toronto Bible Training School, 1910; Protestant, fundamentalist

in Fundamentals, 1503

- **Macquarrie, John,** M.A., B.D.; lecturer on systematic theology in the Univ. of Glasgow An Existentialist Theology, 720
- McReavy, Lawrence Leslie, M.A., D.C.L., 1941; English Catholic priest in *Clergy Review*, 1615
- Madison, James (1751–1836); fourth President of the U.S., 1809–83; mem., Continental Congress, 1780–83, Constitutional Convention, 1787; coauthor, with Hamilton and Jay, of *The Federalist* papers on the Constitution; mem., U.S. House of Representatives, 1789–97; U.S. secretary of state from 1801–09
- Letters and Other Writings, 1300d
- Main Currents of Western Thought. See Baumer
- Major Features of Evolution. See Simpson, G. G.

Mallery, Garrick (1831–94); U.S. Army officer in U.S. Bur. of Ethnology, *Report*, 736 *Man Stands Alone. See* Huxley, J. S.

Manning, Henry Edward, M.A., D.D. (1808–92); English clergyman, at first a Protestant (Anglican), accepted the Roman Catholic faith and rose to cardinal (1875); prolific writer Petri Privilegium: Three Pastoral Letters, 490, 864

Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, 1116, 1126, 1148, 1346, 1479

- Man's Disorder and God's Design. See World Council of Churches
- Manual of Christian Doctrine. See Ferris
- Manual of Church History. See Newman, A. H.

Manual of Pharmacology. See Sollman

- Marcellinus, Ammianus. See Ammianus Marcellinus
- **Marcellus, Christopher** (d. 1527); Catholic priest; "noble lord of Venice"; notary of the Apostolic; archbishop of Corcyra

Oration in the Fifth Lateran Council, 1121

Margaret of Scotland. See Barnett

Marks, Herbert Henry; asst. statistician, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.

- joint author. See Shepard, W. P.
- Marsh, Joseph (d. 1863); Methodist, later convert to the Christian Connection; ed. of the *Christian Palladium* at Union Mills, N.Y.; also pastor there; a Millerite leader in *Advent Review*, 1086
- Marshall, Catherine Wood, B.A. (1914–); American author; widow and biographer of Peter Marshall (Presbyterian minister, chaplain U.S. Senate, 1947–49) To Live Again, 580, 1550

- Martinek, Robert George, M.S., Pharm. D. (1919–); American pharmacist and pharmaceutical chemist; chemical pharmacist American Med. Assn., 1950–55; clinical chemist, Iowa Methodist Hosp., from 1958
 - _, and Walter Wolman, in JAMA, 214, 218, 238, 239
- Martyr, Justin. See Justin Martyr
- Maryland, Archives of Maryland, 346
- Massachusetts Historical Society, Collections, 567
- Massachusetts: Its Historians and Its History. See Adams, C. F.
- Masson, David, M.A., LL.D. (1882–1907); Scottish man of letters; proof. of rhetoric and English literature, Univ. of Edinburgh
- Life of John Milton, 1313
- Master, Arthur Morris, M.D. (1895–); American cardiologist clinical experimental work in pathology and physiology, cardiographer, 1933; assoc. med., Mt. Sinai Hosp., N.Y., from 1934
 - ___, and others, in JAMA, 815
- Mater et Magistra. See John XXIII, Pope
- Mather, Samuel, M.A. (1626–71); English–born Congregationalist minister in New England; author of many theological works
 - Gospel of the Old Testament, 975
- **Mauro, Philip** (1859–?); American lawyer; lay theologian and writer on the prophecies; amillennialist
 - Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass, 1049, 1051-1053, 1062
- Maurus, Rabanus. See Rabanus Maurus
- Mayer, Josephine, and Tom Prideaux, eds., Never to Die: The Egyptians in Their Own Words, 679, 1568
- Maynard, Theodore, M.A., Litt.D., Ph.D. (1890–1956); Catholic author; b. Madras, India, of missionary parents; prof. of English literature, Georgetown Univ., Washington, D.C., from 1929
 - Story of American Catholicism, 488
- Meaning of Evolution. See Simpson, G. G.
- Medieval Europe From 395 to 1270. See Bémont
- Mehl, Roger; French Protestant philosopher; author of several books
- quoted by R. M. Brown, 672
- Memoirs of Alexander Campbell. See Richardson
- Menace of Spiritualism. See O'Donnell
- Merneptah, Pharaoh (reigned c. 1232–15 B.C.); Egyptian king of XIXth Dynasty; son of Ramses II; he overcame the Libyans who had come into Egypt
- in Pritchard, ed., Ancient Near Eastern Texts, 76
- Merry del Val, Raphael (1865–1930); English Catholic prelate; consultor of the Sacred Congregation of the Index; cardinal secretary of state of Piux X; secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office
- editor's foreword, Index of Prohibited Books, 275
- Methodist Church, Doctrines and Discipline, 962
- Methodist Review (New York, 1818-31; a journal for ministers), 1593
- The Midnight Cry (Millerite periodical), 1081, 1082
- Millennial Harbinger (periodical of the Disciples, ed. by Alexander Campbell), 1077

Millennial Studies. See Murray, G. L.

Millennium in the Church. See Kromminga

Miller, William (1782–1849); American evangelist; earlier, farmer, deputy sheriff, justice of the peace, infantry captain in War of 1812; a converted infidel; licensed Baptist preacher; in 1831 began to teach (chiefly from 14>Dan. 8:13, 14) that the premillennial Second Advent was to be expected, that the world would end, and the eternal kingdom of God would begin about 1843; between 50,000 and 100,000 people accepted his views; passing of the date brought the movement to a sharp climax, without the organization of a continuing church, but out of the movement grew several Adventist bodies

Apology and Defence, 1078

Advent Herald, 7

quoted in CRB, 1936, 6

- Millman, Peter Mackenzie, Ph.D. (1906–); Canadian astrophysicist; advanced work in observation of solar eclipses from the air, effects of atomic weapons in *Telescope*, 731, 742
- **Milman, Henry Hart,** D.D. (1791–1868); English clergyman; dean of St. Paul's Cathedral; poet and historian

History of Christianity, 527

Milner, John (1752–1826); English vicar apostolic of Roman Catholic Church; called "the English Athanasius"; opposed crown's claim of veto power over appointment of Roman bishops

End of Religious Controversy, 766, 1604

Milton, John, M.A. (1608–74); English poet and foreign secretary; celebrated for his poems, such as *Paradise Lost*, and for prose works, such as *Areopagitica*, a treatise on freedom of the press, written in reply to the threat of parliamentary prosecution for his pamphlets on divorce

Prose Works, 850, 1278, 1601, 1726

Minnesota Medicine, 813

Mishnah, 116-118, 367, 368, 370, 1173, 1373, 1480

"Mock On." See Blake

Modern Man Is Obsolete. See Cousins

Modern Science and Christian Beliefs. See Smethurst

Moehler, Johann Adam, D.D. (1796–1838); German Catholic priest and prof. of church history at Tübingen; theologian; lecturer on the doctrinal differences between Catholics and Protestants

Symbolism, 249, 636

Moehlman, Conrad Henry, B.D., M.A., Ph.D., D.D. (1879–); American prof. in various theological seminaries; pres., American Soc. of Church History; author of numerous works on church history

Wall of Separation Between Church and State, 1632

Mollegen, Albert T., S.T.M., D.D.; prof. of Christian ethics, Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va., 1953 Faith of Christians, 537

The Momentous Event. See Grier

- Mommsen, Theodor (1817–1903); German jurist, classical scholar, and historian; prof. of law and of ancient history, Leipzig, Zurich, and Berlin; Nobel Prize winner in literature, 1902; wrote prolifically on epigraphy, archeology, Roman law History of Rome, 1328
- **Monod, Gabriel** (1844–1912); French historian; founder and director of *Revue Historique*, 1875; director of the hist. section of l'École pratique des Hautes Études, Paris joint author. *See* Bémont
- Monthly Weather Review, (a journal of the U.S. Weather Bureau), 576
- Montléon, Aimé Guillon de. See Guillon

Monuments and the Old Testament. See Price

- **Moody, Dwight Lyman** (1837–99); American lay evangelist; toured and campaigned with Ira D. Sankey; founded Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, 1889; premillennialist; influenced by Plymouth Brethren, but not himself a full–fledged dispensationalist Second Coming of Christ, 1516, 1518
- Weighed and Wanting, 1382, 1684, 1685, 1694, 1704, 1706
- Mooring-Masts of Revelation. See Kyle

Moralia. See Plutarch

- **More, Sir Thomas** (1478–1535); English statesman and author; friend of Erasmus: known for his *Utopia*, describing an ideal community incorporating communal ownership of land, education of men and women alike, and religious toleration in Coulton, ed., *Life in the Middle Ages*, 277
- **Morel, Georges** (fl. 1530); French Waldensian pastor sent to Germany in 1530 to consult Reformation leaders Oecolampadius, Bucer, and others, in order to bring the Waldensians into closer harmony with the Reformation teachings quoted, 1756
- **Morgan, George Campbell** (1863–1945); English; ordained Congregational minister in England, Presbyterian pastor in America; clergyman, lecturer, pastor
- The Ten Commandments, 964, 982, 1367, 1705
- Morgan State College Bulletin, 1784
- **Morris, Henry M.,** Ph.D. in Civil Eng., (1918–); prof. and head, dept. of Civil Engineering, Virginia Polytechnic Institute joint author. *See* Whitcomb
- Morris, Jeremiah Noah, M.A., M.D., M.R.C.S. Eng., R.C.P. Lond.; British physician; prof., social med., London Univ.; connected with Med. Research Council's Social Med. Research Unit, London, England
 - _____, and others, in *Lancet*, 817
- **Motley, John Lothrop** (1814–77); American historian; U.S. minister to Austria and Great Britain
 - Rise of the Dutch Republic, 881
- Muelder, Walter George, Ph.D. (1907–); dean and prof. of social ethics, Boston Univ. School of Theology, from 1945; mem. of groups in National and World Council of Churches

in Bilheimer, Quest for Christian Unity, 1047

- Muir, William, The Caliphate, Its Rise, Decline, and Fall, 63
- **Mulholland, John** (1898–); professional magician, performing and lecturing in principal countries of the world; ed., *The Sphinx* (magicians' magazine)
 - Beware Familiar Spirits, 1549, 1555, 1556. See also 1558

Multitudes in the Valley. See Baly

Mumford, Lewis (1895–); American writer; lecturer, New School for Social Research, 1925, and Dartmouth College, 1931–35

The Transformations of Man, 1791, 1795, 1801, 1803, 1804

Murray, George Lewis (1896–); Scottish–born minister of the First United Presbyterian church, Boston, Mass.

Millennial Studies, 1531, 1740

Murray, John Courtney, M.A., S.T.L., S.T.D., LL.D. (1904–); American Jesuit priest; college prof.; ed. of *Theol. Studies*, from 1941; assoc. ed. *America*, 1945–46; a spokesman man for the modern liberal Catholic view on church–state relationships quoted by R. M. Brown, 495

Myconius, Friedrich M. (1491–1546); a German Franciscan friar who became a Protestant; fried of Luther; pastor in Gotha; opposed Thomas Münzer; one of the delegates to Henry VIII of England, 1538

in Thatcher and McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, 860 *Mysteries of Mithra*. See Cumont.

Nabonidus (d. 539 B.C.); king of Babylon, 556–539; last king of the Neo–Babylonian Empire, with his son Belshazzar as coruler (apparently from 552); conquered by Cyrus quoted by Dougherty, 205

Nabonidus and Belshazzar. See Dougherty

Nabonidus Chronicle, quoted by Dougherty, 206, 547

Nampon, Adrien (1809–69); a Jesuit of Geneva; writer on Catholic doctrine Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent, 391

Napier, B. Davie, in New Century Leader, 965, 979, 1690, 1707

Narrative of a Mission to Bokhara. See Wolff

Narrative of the Portuguese Embassy to Abyssinia. See Alvarez

National Spiritualist Association, U.S.A., Year Book, 1541-1544

Natural History. See Pliny the Elder

Nature (London, 1869– ; a periodical presenting scientific information to the general public), 1763

Nautical Almanac (British), 361, 454

Neander, Johann August(us) Wilhelm (original name, David Mendel) (1789–1850); German Jewish convert to Christianity; church historian and theologian; pupil of Schleiermacher; prof. of church history in Berlin, from 1813

General History of the Christian Religion and Church, 1399, 1591, 1612

Neugebauer, Otto Eduard, LL.D. (1899–); Austrian–born mathematician; Fellow, Royal Society of Science (Copenhagen), 1934; research prof., Brown Univ., from 1939 Astronomical Cunneiform Texts, 106, 373, 459

Exact Sciences in Antiquity, 105, 107, 109, 141, 372, 1767

Neugebauer, Paul Victor (1878–1940); German prof. in the Astronomische Rechen–Institut, Berlin; author of works on astronomical chronology and solar eclipses

, and Ernst F. Weidner, in Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich

Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, 452

Never to Die. See Mayer

New Archeological Discoveries. See Cobern

- *New Century Leader* (a nondenominational Sunday school magazine), 641, 1952, 963, 965, 979, 1690, 1693, 1707
- New Discoveries in Babylonia. See Wiseman, P. J.
- New England Journal of Medicine, 219, 225
- New-England Magazine (1831-35; a literary monthly), 734
- New Haven, Records of the Colony. See Hoadly
- New-Haven's Settling in New-England, 348
- New Leviathan. See Hutchinson, P.
- New Ordeal of Christianity. See Hutchinson, P.
- New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 399, 442, 467, 520, 763, 822,
- 875, 944, 945, 1016, 1247, 1250, 1265
- New Testament (with commentary). See Clarke, Adam
- New Testament Christianity. See Philips
- New York Academy of Sciences, Annals, 603
- New York Journal of Commerce (newspaper), 737
- New York Times (daily newspaper), 94, 1802
- New York Times Magazine (Sunday supplement), 1802
- New Yorker (a weekly magazine of humor and sophistication), 792
- Newer Knowledge of Nutrition. See McCollum
- Newman, Albert Henry, D.D., LL.D. (1852–1933); Baptist historian; prof. of church history, Baylor Univ., Waco, Tex., 1913–21 Manual of Church History, 526
 - Manual of Church History, 526
 - in New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 442
- Newman, Francis William (1805–97); author and philosopher; Latin prof., Univ. College, London
- History of the Hebrew Monarchy, 320
- Newman, John Henry, B.A. (1801–90); English theologian; Anglican clergyman and leader of Oxford movement; ed., *British Critic;* was converted to Roman Catholicism in 1845; rector of Dublin Catholic Univ.; became cardinal in 1879
 - Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, 435, 843, 1610, 1611
 - in British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review, 59
- quoted, 868
- Newton, Sir Isaac (1642–1727); English natural philosopher and mathematician; conceived idea of universal gravitation (set forth in his *Principia*) Observations Upon ... Daniel, and the Apocalypse, 560
- Nichols, James Hastings, Ph.D. (1915–); American Presbyterian minister and writer on church history; taught at Macalister College (1940–43), and at Univ. of Chicago Federated Theological Faculty, from 1943; joint editor of *Church History* Democracy and the Churches, 396, 493, 494, 510
- Niebuhr, Reinhold (1892–); American clergyman; prof. of applied Christianity, vice–pres. and graduate prof., Union Theological Seminary Faith and History, 60, 191, 687, 989, 1798
- Norlin, Theodor Arnold Valentin, Ph.D. (1833–70); Swedish clergyman, scholar, and church historian; prof. of church history, Lund Univ., Sweden Svenska Kyrkans Historia, 1467
- North, Eric M., ed., The Book of a Thousand Tongues, 255, 292

Norway, Diplomatarium Norvegicum, 1466

Norwood, Frederick Abbott, Ph.D. (1914–); assoc. prof. of church history, Garrett Biblical Institute

Development of Modern Christianity Since 1500, 924

Notes ... on ... Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians. See Barnes

Nubia and Abyssinia. See Russell, M.

- Nutrition and Physical Fitness. See Bogert
- Nutrition in Health and Disease. See Cooper
- *Nutrition Reviews* (periodical dealing with dietetics, published by the Nutrition Foundation, Inc.), 599, 806, 808
- Observations Upon ... Daniel, and the Apocalypse. See Newton
- **Ockenga, Harold John,** M.A., Th.B., Ph.D. (1905–); Congregational minister, Park Street church, Boston; pres. Fuller Theological Seminary; founder and first pres. National Association of Evangelicals
 - in Bulletin of Fuller Theological Seminary, 694, 782

in Christianity Today, 96, 693, 695, 696, 1094

O'Donnell, Elliot, Menace of Spiritualism, 1538

- Of Law and Love. See Eldersveld
- Of Things Which Soon Must Come to Pass. See Mauro
- Ohio State Reports, 503
- Old Testament Against Its Environment. See Wright, G. E.
- Old Testament and Modern Study. See Rowley
- Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East, See Jeremias
- Olmstead, Albert Ten Eyck, A.M., Ph.D. (1880–1945); prof. of Oriental history, Oriental Institute, Univ. of Chicago, from 1929
- History of the Persian Empire, 131, 133, 544, 550, 1031, 1032, 1214, 1216, 1222 in *AJSL*, 453
- **Olmsted, Denison,** M.A. (1791–1859); American scientist and teacher; graduated from Yale College, 1816; prof. of chemistry, Univ. of N.C., from 1817; N.C. State geologist and mineralogist; prof. of mathematics and natural philosophy, Yale, 1825–36; then prof. of natural philosophy and astronomy; wrote the first scientific paper on the nature of the Leonid meteor showers
 - Letters on Astronomy, Addressed to a Lady, 733
- in American Journal of Science and Arts, 730
- O'Loane, J. Kenneth; Catholic scientist in *Science*, 343
- **Olson, Everett Claire,** S.B., Ph.D. (1910–); vertebrate paleontologist; educator; assoc. dean of physical sciences, Chicago Univ.; director, American Geological Institute in Sol Tax, ed., *Evolution of Life*, 712
- On Agriculture. See Columella; Palladius
- On Fasting. See Tertullian
- On Idolatry. See Tertullian
- On Prayer. See Tertullian
- On Prescription Against Heretics. See Tertullian
- On the Spirit. See Basil

Orelli, Hans Conrad von, Ph.D., Th.D. (1846–1912); prof. of OT exegesis and history of religion, Univ. of Basel, Switzerland

in International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, 1245

in New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 1247, 1250

- Oriental Religious in Roman Paganism. See Cumont
- **Origen** (185?–254?); Christian writer and teacher of Alexandria; classed among the Greek Fathers of the church; author of many works on Biblical textual studies
 - "Homily 23 on Numbers," 1410
- Origin and History of the Books of the Bible. See Stowe
- Origin of Mankind. See Fleming, J. A.
- **Orlinsky, Harry Meyer,** Ph.D. (1908–); prof. of Bible, Hebrew Union College, New York; writer on Biblical literature and Jewish history Ancient Israel, 72, 725, 788, 900, 902
- **Orr, James,** M.A., D.D. (1844–1913); prof. of apologetics and theology at Theological College of United Free Church, Glasgow, from 1901; general ed. of *International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*
- in International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, 423
- L'Osservatore Romano (Vatican daily newspaper), 492
- **O'Toole, George Barry,** Ph.D., S.T.D. (1886–1944); American Catholic philosopher; prof. of theology and philosophy, of animal biology; founder of the Catholic Univ. of Peiping, China, 1925
 - Case Against Evolution, 708
- Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts. See Kenyon, F.
- Our Oriental Heritage. See Durant
- Our Sunday Visitor (Catholic weekly for the laity), 1750
- Oursler, William Charles (1913-); American novelist and feature writer
- in Christian Herald, 790, 794
- Outline of Christianity. See Foakes-Jackson
- Outline of History. See Wells
- Outlook (1893–1935; a literary and political journal of opinion), 1324
- **Overholt, Richard H.,** M.D. (1901–); thoracic surgeon; degree, Univ. of Nebraska College of Medicine; director of Overholt Thoracic Clinic, Boston
- in Smoke Signals, 1715, 1721, 1722
- Oxford English Dictionary, 1520
- Paganism in Our Christianity. See Weigall
- Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire. See Hyde
- Palestine Exploration Quarterly (PEQ) (British archeological journal), 582
- **Palladius, Rutilius Taurus Aemilianus** (4th cent., or later); Roman writer on agriculture On Agriculture, 244
- "Panegyric on the Third Consulship of the Emperor Honorius." See Claudian
- Papacy and World-Affairs. See Eckhardt
- Papal Encyclicals. See Fremantle
- Parker, Allan C., Jr.; Presbyterian minister; pastor of the S. Park Presbyterian church, Seattle
 - quoted by Justice W. O. Douglas, 1672

Parker, Richard Anthony, Ph.D. (1905–); asst. prof. of Egyptology, Oriental Institute, Univ. of Chicago; prof. of Egyptology, Brown Univ., from 1948; excavator in Egypt; Catholic

in AJSL, 458

- Parker, T. Valentine, Ph.D. (1878-)
 - American Protestantism: An Appraisal, 251, 385, 479
- [Passau Inquisitor (anonymous)]; a medieval writer of Passau, Austria, whose works went under the name of Reiner (or Reinerus, or Reinerius Saccho) (fl. 13th cent.), a Dominican friar and Inquisitor, who wrote against the heretics
 - Contra Waldenses, 1759
- quoted by Comba, 1757
- **Pausanias** (2d century A.D.); Greek traveler and geographer; author of *Periegesis of Greece*, a valuable source of information on topography, local history, religious customs, and architecture of Greece

Description of Greece, 49

- Pelagius I, Pope (d. 561); bishop of Rome; 556-561
- Epistle 2 (formerly 3) to Narses, 1180
- Peloubet's Select Notes. See Smith, W. M.
- Pennington, Arthur Robert, M.A., F. R. Hist. Soc. (1814–99); Anglican clergyman; canon nonresidentary of Lincoln Cathedral, and rector of Utterby, Lincs., England Epochs of the Papacy, 1166
- Pennsylvania Evening Post (Philadelphia newspaper), 564
- People's Manual.—The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. See Vaughan, H. A.
- A Persian Verse Account of Nabonidus, quoted by Dougherty, 207
- Peter Martyr. See Anghiera
- Petri Privilegium. See Manning
- Petrus de Ancharano. See Ancharano, Pietro
- **Pfeiffer, Robert Henry,** B.D., A.M., Ph.D., LL.D. (1892–1958); American, b. in Italy; prof. of Hebrew and other Oriental languages, Harvard Univ., and prof. in Boston Univ.; asst. prof. Semitic languages and history, later prof. of Hebrew and other Oriental languages, Harvard; director Harvard excavations in Iraq

quoted by Unger, 299

Pharmacology and Therapeutics. See Grollman

- Pharmacology in Medicine. See Drill
- Philips, John Bertram, M.A. (1906–); Church of England clergyman; free–lance journalist; Bible translator; writer and broadcaster since 1955; prebendary in Chichester Cathedral, 1957–60

New Testament Christianity, 301, 642, 820, 937, 1287, 1495, 1496, 1508, 1786, 1799

Philostratus (A.D. 170?–245); Greek; Sophist philosopher; studied and taught school in Athens; taught also in Rome

The Life of Apollonius of Tyana, 1768

Pierson, Arthur Tappan, D.D. (1837–1911); American Presbyterian minister; during 1891– 93 he was pastor of Spurgeon's Metropolitan (Baptist) Tabernacle, London, at the time of the latter's death; ed., *Missionary Review of the World*, from 1888 until his death; author of religious works, largely concerning mission work; a premillennialist; was dropped from the Presbyterian ministry because he abandoned his view on infant baptism and was himself immersed

Knowing the Scriptures, 262, 271, 284

- Pieters, Albertus, D.D. (1869–); minister and emeritus prof. of Bible and missions in W. Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, Holland, Mich. Studies in the Revelation of St. John, 1251, 1253, 1259
- **Piggott, Stuart** (1910–); prof. of prehistoric archeology in the Univ. of Edinburgh in *Antiquity*, 463
- **Pinches, Theophilus Goldridge,** LL.D., M.R.A.S. (1856–1934); lecturer in Assyrian at Univ. College, London, and at Institute of Archaeology, Liverpool; later in the dept. of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities, British Museum
- in Hastings, ed., Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 1473
- **Pius IV,** Pope (1499–1565); pope, 1559–65; conciliatory toward emperor and Philip II of France; called again the suspended Council of Trent in 1562; issued the bull confirming its decisions, 1564

creed of, 384

Pius IX, Pope (1792–1878); had to leave Rome in 1848; went to Gaeta; restored by French in 1850; responsible for Immaculate Conception idea in 1854; called the council that set forth the dogma of papal infallibility; overcome by Victor Emmanuel in 1870; made himself a prisoner in the Vatican; longest reign of any pope (1846–78) Decree on Immaculate Conception, 1015

Syllabus of Errors, 507

- **Pius XI,** Pope (1857–1939); pope, 1922–39; signed Treaty of the Lateran with Mussolini in 1929, whereby Vatican City was instituted, and granted political recognition by Italian government
 - Encyclical Letter Quadragesimo Anno, 1791

quoted by John L. Thomas, 342

Pius XII, Pope (1876–1958); secretary of state to Holy See, 1930–39; pope, 1939–58; author of several works

Divino Afflante Spiritu, 285, 293

quoted by Hutchinson, 1008

Plain Reasons Against Joining the Church of Rome. See Littledale

- Plain Talk About the Protestantism of To-day. See Segur
- Plass, Gilbert Norman, Ph.D. (1920–); asst. prof. in physics, Johns Hopkins Univ., from 1948; physicist with Atomic Energy Commission in American Scientist, 466
- **Platt, Frederic,** M.A., B.D. (1859–); tutor in OT languages and literature, and in philosophy, in the Wesleyan College, Didsbury, Manchester, England

in Hastings, ed., Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 95

- Pliny (the Elder: Gaius Plinius Secundus) (A.D. 23–79); Roman scholar; procurator in Spain, c. 70–72; writer on natural history, miliary subjects; perished at Pompeii while investigating the eruption of Vesuvius
- Natural History, 227, 229, 231, 242, 243, 406
- **Pliny** (the Younger; Gaius Plinius Caecilius Secundus) (A.D. 62–113); was a consul in 100; governor, Bithynia and Pontus in 111 or 112; made one of the earliest hist. mentions of Christianity in letter to Emperor Trajan

Letters, 1185

Plutarch (A.D. 46?–120?); Greek biographer; b. Boeotia; taught in Rome; author of essays and character studies of distinguished Greeks and Romans

Moralia, 39, 1338

A Poem on the Earthquake at Lisbon. See Biddolf

- A Political and Cultural History of the Ancient World. See Van Sickle
- Pollio. See Trebellius Pollio
- **Polybius** (205?–125? B.C.); Greek historian; b. Arcadia; in Achaean League; in political exile in Rome about 17 years; became associated with leading writers in Rome; went to Africa with Scipio, 147; saw Carthage destroyed, 146; afterward wrote a history of Rome from 266–146 B.C.

The Histories, 1337

- Polycrates, quoted, 656
- **Pontoppidan, Erick** (1698–1764); Danish theologian; bishop of Bergen, Norway; vicechancellor, Univ. of Copenhagen

epitomized, 976

Poole, Reginald Lane, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D. (1857–1939); English lecturer on history and diplomatics, Oxford Univ.; curator of the Bodleian Library, 1914–26

Studies in Chronology and History, 455

- Pope and the Council. See Döllinger
- **Porphyry** (original name Malchus), (232?–304?); b. Syria; Greek scholar and Neoplatonic philosopher; vigorously defended paganism and opposed Christianity quoted, 1583
- The Portland [Maine] Advertiser (newspaper), 738
- Potter, Elam (fl. 1780); Enfield, Conn.

quoted, 571

- Powell, Baden, M.A., F.R.S., F.G.S. (1796–1860); British clergyman; prof. of geometry in Univ. of Oxford, 1827–60; author on mathematical, scientific, and religious subjects in Kitto, ed., *A Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, 1614
- Practice of Psychiatry. See Sadler

Praeparatio Evangelica. See Eusebius

- The Presbyterian (now merged with The United Presbyterian as Presbyterian Life), 956
- Presbyterian Life (a semimontly of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., continuing The Presbyterian and The United Presbyterian), 1778
- The Presbyterian Way of Life. See Mackay

Present Trends in Christian Thought. See De Wolf

Pressensé, Edmond Dehaut de (1824–91); French Protestant clergyman and politician; founded, 1854, Protestant journal *Revue Chrétienne;* mem., National Assembly, 1871; senator for life, 1883

The Church and the French Revolution, 1168

- **Pribilla, Max, S.J.** (1874–); German Jesuit; prof. of ethics, Univ. of Valkenburg, Holland in *Stimmen der Zeit*, 1303
- Price, Ira Maurice, Ph.D., LL.D. (1856–1939); American orientalist; author; prof. of Semitic language and literature at Univ. of Chicago, 1900–25; wrote on OT history The Monuments and the Old Testament, 81, 460, 552, 908, 1217 quoted by Unger, 302

Prideaux, Tom, joint editor. See Mayer

Prince, Walter Franklin, Ph.D. (1863-1934); American minister; executive in first Methodist, later Episcopal, Church; executive research officer of the Soc. for Psychic Research, Boston; pres. of the Soc. for Psychical Research, London, 1930-31 in Annual Report of the American Historical Association, for the Year 1898, 350 The Principles of Psychology. See James Pritchard, James Bennett, Ph.D. (1909–): American archeologist: prof. of OT literature. Church Divinity School of the Pacific (Episcopal), Berkeley, Calif., from 1954; noted for his excavation at Gibeon Archaeology and the Old Testament, 78, 79, 378 , ed., Ancient Near Eastern Texts, 76, 678, 904 The Problem of Choice. See Roberts, W. H. **Procopius,** of Caesarea (fl. 6th cent.); Byzantine historian; private secretary to Belisarius, Justinian's general History of the Wars, 359 Prompta Bibliotheca. See Ferraris Prophecy and the Church. See Allis Proteins and Amino Acids in Nutrition. See Sahyun Protestant—Catholic—Jew. See Herberg Protestant Christianity. See Dillenberger Protestant Episcopal Church, The Book of Common Praver, 579 Protoplasm. See Seifriz Psychic Research and Gospel Miracles. See Duff The Pursuit of the Millennium. See Cohn **Ouadragesimo Anno. See Pius XI** Quarterly Journal of Prophecy (a mid-19th-cent. English premillennialist journal), 174 *Quest for Christian Unity. See* Bilheimer The Question Box. See Lentz The Ouestion-Box Answers. See Conway Quirinus. See Döllinger *Qur–an. See* Koran

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

Rabanus Maurus (776?–856); Frankish Catholic theologian, scholar, and teacher; archbishop of Mainz

De Clericorum Institutione, 1765

Rambler (1848–62; English Catholic journal of opinion, opposed to extreme ultramontanism), 834

Rawlinson, George (1812–1902); English historian and orientalist; prof. of ancient history, Oxford, 1861–89; canon of Canterbury, 1872; edited *History of Herodotus* in collaboration with his brother, 1858–60; writer on ancient history

Five Great Monarchies, 147, 1223

Reader's Digest (1922-; a general monthly, featuring condensed reprints from other magazines), 13, 1291, 1711

Rebuilding a Lost Faith. See Stoddard

Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands. See Albright

Records of the Colony ... of New Haven. See Hoadly

Rediscovering the Bible. See Anderson

Re–Discovery of the Old Testament. See Rowley

Redpath, Alan; pastor of Moody Memorial church, Chicago

in New Century Leader, 952

Reed, William Standish, M.D. (1922–); consulting surgeon, Samaritan Hospital, Bay City, Mich.; degree from Univ. of Mich. Medical School, Ann Arbor, Mich.; mem., American Specialty Board of Surgery

in Christian Herald, 795

Reese, Alexander (1881–); Presbyterian minister; writer on eschatology from the nondispensationalist point of view

Approaching Advent of Christ, 627

Rehabilitation of the Cardiovascular Patient. See White, P. D.

Reichler, Joe; Associated Press sports reporter

in Washington Post, 577

Reiner (Reinerius Saccho). See Passau Inquisitor

Reisner, George Andrew, Ph.D. (1867–1942); American Egyptologist; director, Egyptian expedition of Harvard and Boston Museum of Fine Arts, from 1905; prof. at Harvard, 1914–42

Egyptian Conception of Immortality, 680

Religion in Life (a Christian quarterly of opinion and discussion), 73, 300, 304, 305, 312, 324, 581

Religion in the Twentieth Century. See Ferm

Religion of Babylon and Assyria. See Jastrow

Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. See Rogers

Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation. See Chillingworth

"Religion Reported by the Civilian Population." See United States Bureau of the Census

Religious Bodies. See United States Bureau of the Census

Religious Encyclopaedia. See Schaff

Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World. See Angus

Renan, Joseph Ernest (1823–90); French philologist, philosopher, historian, and orientalist; writer on Biblical and historical topics from a point of view hostile to traditional Christianity

Lectures on the Influence ... of Rome, on Christianity, 1491

quoted by Hyde, 1340

Reply to Faustus. See Augustine

Report ... on Atherosclerosis and Ischaemic Heart Disease. See World Health Organization Report on the Reform of the Calendar. See League of Nations

The Republic. See Cicero

Rest Days. See Webster, H.

Rétif, André (1914-); French Jesuit priest and writer

Catholic Spirit, 426

- [Ricciulli], Gaspare (called in Latin Caspar de Fosso) (fl. 1562); Italian Catholic theologian; archbishop of Reggio in Calabria; mem., Council of Trent Address in Council of Trent, 1443
- Rice, Thurman Brooks, M.D., A.B. (chem.) (1888–); physician; prof. of bacteriology and public health, School of Medicine, Indiana Univ., from 1947, and Fred V. Hein, *Living*, 796, 799
- Richards, Harold Frederic, Ph.D. (1894–); head, physics dept., Florida State Univ. Universe Surveyed, 698

Richardson, Robert, Memoirs of Alexander Campbell, 1662

- Richardson, Robert Shirley, Ph.D. (1902–); American astronomer; specialist in solar research, Mt. Wilson Observatory, Carnegie Institution, from 1930 joint author. *See* Skilling
- **Rickaby, Joseph,** M.A. (1845–1932); English Jesuit priest; prof. of Latin, Greek, and moral philosophy, and lecturer to the Catholic undergraduates at Oxford; author of numerous works

in Lectures on the History of Religions, 1164

- **Ridgley, Douglas Clay** (1868–); prof. of geography in education, Clark Univ., Worcester, Mass.
- in Journal of Geography, 354

Rise of the Dutch Republic. See Motley

Rise of the Mediaeval Church. See Flick

Roberts, Carl Eric Bechhofer (1894–1949); English newspaper correspondent; lawyer; writer of novels and other works

The Truth About Spiritualism, 1536, 1547, 1561

Roberts, William Henry, Ph.D. (1888–); Burma–born American author; college prof.; taught mathematics in Burma and Ceylon; prof. of philosophy, Univ. of Redlands, Calif.; instructor in navigation, Navy V–5 program; prof. of psychology, Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa, from 1946; author of works on psychology; Baptist

The Problem of Choice, 807

- **Robertson, James Craigie,** M.A. (1813–82); Scottish–born Church of England clergyman; canon of Canterbury; prof. of ecclesiastical history, King's College, London; áuthor of a number of learned works on various phases of church history History of the Christian Church, 1398
- **Robinson, John** (1576?–1625); English Separatist pastor to Pilgrim Fathers; went with a group of them to Leiden; organized emigration to America in 1620; died in Holland before he could follow them

quoted by Winslow, 267

Robinson, Stewart M., D.D.; American Presbyterian minister

in The Presbyterian, 956

- Rogers, Robert William, Ph.D., Litt.D., LL.D. (1864–1930); prof. of Hebrew and OT exegesis, Drew Univ., Madison, N.J.; prof. of ancient Oriental literature, Princeton Univ. A History of Babylonia and Assyria, 121, 130, 451, 545, 1103. *See also* 148
 - Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, 140, 151, 165, 889, 1108
- Roman Catholic Claims. See Gore
- Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty. See Carrillo de Albornoz
- Roman Council, in Thatcher and McNeal, eds., Source Book for Medieval History, 402
- Roman History. See Appian; Dio Cassius
- Rome: From the Fall of the Western Empire. See Trevor, G.
- **Rostovtzeff, Michael Ivonich** (1870–1952); Russian–born American archeologist and historian; prof. of ancient history and classical archeology, Yale Univ.; author of works on history and archeology
 - History of the Ancient World, 53
- Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, 1042
- Roth, Julius Alfred, M.A., Ph.D. (1924–); research associate in human development, Univ. of Chicago, from 1955

_, and others, in *JAMA*, 217

- **Roueché, Berton** (1911–); American magazine writer and novelist in *New Yorker*, 792
- Rowley, Harold Henry, M.A., D.D., Theol. D., F.B.A. (1890–); prof. of Hebrew language and literature in the Victoria Univ. of Manchester
 - Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires, 557
 - Re–Discovery of the Old Testament, 66, 71, 85, 266, 272, 314, 377, 888, 1107
 - Unity of the Bible, 181, 184, 261, 892
 - in The Listener, 584
 - in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, 298, 328, 341. *See also* 329 auoted by Unger, 327
- **Rufinus, Tyrannius** (345?–410); Latin theologian, priest and monk; b. near Aquileia; trans. of works of Eusebius and Origen into Latin
- Epilogue to Pamphilus the Martyr's Apology for Origen, 768 *Rule of Conscience. See* Taylor, Jeremy
- **Russell, Bertrand Arthur William** (3d Earl Russell); English mathematician and philosopher; prof. of philosophy, Univ. of Calif. in Los Angeles; author of many books quoted by Orlinsky, 72
- **Russell, Michael,** LL.D., D.C.L. (1781–1848); bishop of Glasgow and Galloway in the Episcopal Church in Scotland; author of a number of works on ancient history Nubia and Abyssinia, 1464
- **Ryan, John Augustine,** Litt.D., S.T.D. (1869–1945); prof. of political science, moral theology, and industrial ethics, and subsequently of sociology, at Catholic Univ., Washington D.C.; appointed to Industrial Appeals Board of the NRA by Pres. Franklin D. Roosevelt

____, and Francis Joseph Boland, quoted in Scharper, ed., American Catholics: A Protestant–Jewish View, 495 Rynearson, Edward Harper, M.D., F.A.C.P. (1901–); division of med., Mayo Clinic, assoc. prof. of med., Mayo Foundation

joint author. See Gastineau

Sabbath Observance. See Carver

Sabbatic Question. See Taylor, J. J.

Sadler, William Samuel, M.D., F.A.P.A. (1875–); psychiatrist; professional lecturer in pastoral psychiatry, McCormick Theological Seminary; director and chief psychiatrist, Chicago Institute of Research and Diagnosis

Practice of Psychiatry, 797, 798, 818

Sahyun, Melville, ed., Proteins and Amino Acids in Nutrition, 593

Salmon, George, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., (1819–1904); Church of Ireland clergyman; prof. of mathematics and lecturer on theology, Univ. of Dublin; author of algebra and geometry texts, also of works on theology

Infallibility of the Church, 784

Salter, William Thomas, M.D. (1901–52); prof. of pharmacology, Yale Univ. School of Medicine

Textbook of Pharmacology, 233

San Francisco Chronicle (newspaper), 1170

Sarte, Jean–Paul (1905–); French philosopher, novelist, and playwright; major work on existentialism is *Being and Nothingness* (1943); traveled widely as lecturer in the United States

Existentialism, 719

- *Saturday Review (of Literature)* (originally a journal of book reviews and literary comment, later broadened to include general topics on contemporary affairs), 1792, 1805
- Schaff, Philip, D.D., LL.D. (1819–93); Swiss–born church historian; in U.S., from 1844; prof. in Mercersburg Theological Seminary, 1844–65; Presbyterian, from 1870; Union Theological Seminary prof., 1870–93; pres., American Com. for working on revision of the English Bible, 1881–85; ed. in chief of the American translation of Johann J. Herzog's *Realencyklopädie*, entitled *A Religious Encyclopaedia*, etc. (1st ed., 1882–84), but generally known as *The Schaff–Herzog Encyclopedia* (the predecessor of the later revision, ed. by S. M. Jackson, known as *The New Schaff–Herzog Encyclopedia*)
 - Creeds of Christendom, 246, 254, 259, 260, 270, 273, 282, 286–289, 384, 540, 541, 590, 726, 865, 871, 872, 986, 1015, 1017, 1025, 1026, 1113, 1274, 1379, 1448, 1476, 1504–1506, 1535, 1636, 1697, 1728, 1736, 1738, 1747, 1749
 - History of the Christian Church, 92, 439, 470, 474, 477, 513, 525, 531, 1117, 1118, 1139, 1226, 1275, 1341, 1347, 1349, 1633, 1642, 1643
 - in New Schaff–Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 1016 in Religious Encyclopaedia, 1273, 1449

Scharper, Philip, ed., American Catholics: A Protestant–Jewish View, 398, 495, 672

- Schenck, Ferdinand Schureman, D.D., LL.D. (1845–1925); American theologian of the Reformed Church; prof. of preaching and sociology in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, New Brunswick, N.J.
- The Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, 972
- Schroeder, H. J., ed., Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, 519, 826, 938, 1213, 1235

- *Science* (a journal published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, tending to emphasize the biological sciences), 343, 699, 702, 707, 1719
- Scientific Monthly (a journal covering scientific subjects, for scientists and the science– educated lay public), 462
- Scott, Charles Anderson, M.A., D.D. (1859–1941); prof. of NT, Theological College of Presbyterian Church of England, 1907
- in Hastings, ed., Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 485
- Scott, Martin, J., M.A. (1865–1954); Jesuit theologian; one of the foremost Catholic apologetic writers
- Things Catholics Are Asked About, 1599, 1603
- Scott, S. P. See The Civil Law
- Scrimshaw, Nevin S., M.D., Ph.D. (1918–); director, Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama, Guatemala City, Guatemala; delegate, Fifth International Congress on Nutrition, Washington, D.C. (1960)
- in Panel Discussions of International Congress on Nutrition (fifth), 616
- Scriptores Historiae Augustae. See Trebellius
- Sebrell, William H., Jr., M.D. (1901–); American nutritionist and surgeon; prof. of publichealth nutrition, Columbia Univ.; consultant for the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; degree, Univ. of Virginia Dept. of Medicine; director, National Institutes of Health (nutrition), from 1950
- in U.S. News & World Report, 595, 596, 611, 809, 812, 816 Second Coming of Christ. See Moody
- **Ségur, Louis Gaston de** (1820–81); French Catholic prelate and apologist; diplomatic and judicial official at Rome; was prevented by blindness from functioning as bishop; founder of the St. Francis de Sales Association; author of many works, mostly brief pamphlets, on polemic or ascetical subjects; opposed Jansenism and Gallicanism
- Plain Talk About the Protestantism of To-day, 1441
- Seifriz, William Ernest, Ph.D. (1888–); prof. of botany, Univ. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia Protoplasm, 709
- Selbie, William Boothby, M.A., D.D. (1862–?); English Congregational clergyman; lecturer on Hebrew and OT, Oxford, and on pastoral theology, Cambridge; retired, 1932; author of numerous works on theology; pres., National Free Church Council, 1917 in Bevan and Singer, eds., *Legacy of Israel*, 1631
- Sellin, Ernst, Th.D., Ph.D. (1867–1945); Austrian Protestant; prof. in the universities of Vienna and Berlin; archeologist, excavator in Palestine
- Introduction to the Old Testament, 890
- Semitic [Mythology]. See Langdon
- Sennacherib (d. 681 B.C.); king of Assyria 705–681 B.C.; took up wars of his father (Sargon II) against Merodach–baladan, the rebellious vassal king of Babylon, drove him out, and took over the kingship; invaded Palestine in Hezekiah's reign; destroyed Babylon in 689; restored Nineveh to former glory
- in Pritchard, ed., Ancient Near Eastern Texts, 904
- Sermons. See Spurgeon

Sermons on Several Occasions. See Wesley

Sertillanges, Antonin Gilbert (1863–1948); French Catholic priest; Dominican friar; moral theologian and Thomistic philosopher; popular preacher at Notre Dame de Paris; mem., Institut de France

quoted by Rétif, 426

Severus, Lucius Septimius, Emperor (146–211); Roman emperor 193–211; born in N. Africa; held civil and military offices; was proclaimed emperor by his soldiers; his triumphal arch still hands in the Roman Forum

in Translations and Reprints, 1190

- **Shea, John Dawson Gilmary** (1824–92); American Catholic historian; chief among his works, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, 1886–92
 - in American Catholic Quarterly Review, 1625, 1627, 1663, 1668 , and others, *The Cross and the Flag, Our Church and Country. See* 1436, 1622
- Shepard, Thomas, M.A. (1605–49); English clergyman; Calvinist; silenced by Laud for nonconformity in 1630; came to Boston, 1635; helped establish Harvard College; helped formulate the platform for Congregational Churches in America quoted, 1211
- Shepard, William Peacey, M.D. (1895–); specialist in public-health practice; degree, Univ. of Minn. Med. School

_, and Herbert Henry Marks, in Minnesota Medicine, 813

Sherman, Henry Clapp (1875–); American chemist; prof. of organic analysis of food chemistry, Columbia Univ.

Chemistry of Food and Nutrition, 614

- in Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 610
- Shklar, Judith Nisse, Ph.D; instructor in government, Harvard Univ.
- After Utopia, 1499, 1779, 1780
- Should Christians Drink? See Tilson
- Showerman, Grant, A.M., Ph.D. (1870–1935); prof. of classics, Univ. of Wis.; author and trans.

introd. in Cumont, Oriental Religions, 428

Shuckburgh, Evelyn Shirley, Litt.D. (1843–1906); British classical scholar; librarian, Emmanuel College, Cambridge; ed., trans., and author

Greece, 54

- The Sign (Catholic periodical, published by the Passionist Fathers), 1014, 1608
- The Signs of the Times (Millerite periodical), 893, 894, 1083, 1084, 1087
- Simpson, George Gaylord, Ph.D., hon. Sc.D., hon. LL.D. (1902–); American scientist; curator of fossil mammals and birds, American Museum of Natural History, chairman, dept. of paleontology and geology, from 1944; prof. of vertebrate paleontology, Columbia Univ., from 1945; made expeditions in various countries

Major Features of Evolution, 713

- Meaning of Evolution, 706
- in Evolution of Life, 714

in Science, 702

- quoted in Christianity Today, 697
- Simpson, Matthew (1811–84); American Methodist bishop; delivered eulogy at Lincoln's burial (Springfield, Ill.); best–known Methodist of his day Lectures on Preaching, 954

Singer, Charles, joint editor. See Bevan

Siricius, Pope (bishop of Rome, 384–398); convened Council of Capua, 391; much occupied with doctrines of heretics; several of his papal decretals still extant Epistle, 1420

Skene, William Forbes (1809–92); Scottish historian and antiquarian; historiographer royal for Scotland in 1881

Celtic Scotland, 1459

- Skilling, William Thompson, M.S. (1866–?); teacher; science writer; prof. of astronomy, San Diego State Normal School and San Diego State College, Calif. , and Robert S. Richardson, Astronomy, 363
- **Skydsgaard, K. E.;** Danish Lutheran theologian; prof. at Univ. of Copenhagen; chairman, Christian Student Movement in Denmark in *Lutheran World*, 668, 669
- Smethurst, Arthur F., M.A., Ph.D. (1904–); Anglican churchman; canon residentiary of Salisbury Cathedral; diocesan secretary for higher education; writer on ecclesiastical and scientific subjects

Modern Science and Christian Beliefs, 597

- Smith, A. E. Wilder; English prof. on the faculty of the Farmakologisk Institute in Bergen, Norway; researcher and lecturer in science; has preached the gospel in English, French, and German; active in the ministry of the German Studentenmission quoted in editorial in *Christianity Today*, 697
- Smith, Clarence D., Jr.; connected with Analysis Center, United States Weather Bureau, Washington, D.C. (1950)

in Monthly Weather Review, 576

- Smith, Sir George Adam, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Litt.D. (1856–1942); Scottish Biblical scholar and educator; principal and vice–chancellor of Univ. of Aberdeen; formerly prof. of OT language, literature, and theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow The Book of Isaiah, 171
- Smith, Roy Lemon, D.D., LL.D., B.D., A.M., Litt.D., S.T.D., L.H.D. (1887–); Methodist clergyman; ed., *Christian Advocate*, 1940–48; author of numerous books relating to religion
 - in Christian Advocate, 26
- Smith, Wilbur M., ed., Peloubet's Select Notes, 1681
- Smith, Sir William, hon. LL.D., D.C.L., Ph.D. (1813–93); British lexicographer; Greek and Latin scholar; ed. and author of Biblical and classical dictionaries
- Smith's Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible, 1594
- Smith's Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible. See Smith, Sir William
- *Smoke Signals* (quarterly leaflet dealing with dangers of smoking, published by American Temperance Soc.), 1715, 1721, 1722
- Snowden–Douglass Sunday School Lessons. See Douglass, E. L.
- Snyder, Louis L., ed., Documents of German History, 264, 729, 866, 1151, 1276
- Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. See Rostovtzeff
- **Socrates Scholasticus** (5th cent.); Church historian b. Constantinople; author of an ecclesiastical history of the period from 306 to 439
 - Ecclesiastical History, 647, 748, 1428, 1456. See also 1619

Sollmann, Torald H., M.D. (1874–); degree Western Reserve Univ. School of Med., Cleveland, Ohio

Manual of Pharmacology, 232

Some Remarks on the ... Darkness ... May 19, 1780. See Kennedy

Souls in Purgatory. See Husslein

Source Book for Mediaeval History. See Thatcher

Source-Book of Ancient History. See Botsford

Sources for the Early History of Ireland. See Kenney

- Sozomen, Hermias (early 5th cent. A.D.); Greek, b. Palestine; author of ecclesiastical history (from 324 to 415), similar to that of Socrates Scholasticus Ecclesiastical History, 1429
- **Spangenberg, Augustus Gottlieb** (1704–92); b. Prussia; Moravian Church clergyman; assistant to Count Zinzendorf; organized and directed Moravian settlement at Bethlehem, Pa. (1744–50)
- Leben des ... Zinzendorf (Life of ... Zinzendorf), 767, 1471

Spirit, Son and Father. See Van Dusen

Spiritism: Its Failure. See Gearon

Spiritualism and the Church. See Hole

Spurgeon, Charles Haddon (1834–92); English Baptist minister of Metropolitan Tabernacle, London, 1859–92; a Calvinist, suspicious of modern criticism of the Bible; repudiated baptismal regeneration; published weekly sermons (totaling 50 volumes); and other books

Gospel of the Kingdom, 966

Sermons, 985

Stafford, Thomas Albert, F.R.G.S. (1885–); Methodist clergyman, author, denominational executive

Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches, 846, 1233, 1675

Standard Jewish Encyclopedia, 111, 119, 371, 1043, 1677

Stare, Frederick J., M.D. (1910–); prof. of nutrition, Harvard Med. School, Boston; specialist, internal med.; degree, Univ. of Chicago, School of Med. joint author. See Hardinge; Hegsted

, and George W. Thorn, in *American Journal of Public Health*, 606, 608 Stearns, Samuel (fl. 1780), in *Independent Chronicle*, 573

Steele, Daniel, A.B. (1824–1914); American Methodist pastor, teacher, author; prof. of ancient languages and acting pres., Genesee College, Lima, N.Y.; prof. and acting chancellor of Syracuse Univ.; contributor to religious periodicals and author of numerous works on religious subjects; collaborated on a new edition of his father–in–law Amos Binney's *Theological Compend*

joint author. See Binney

Steele, Wilbur Fletcher, M.A., S.T.B., D.D. (1851–1935); American Methodist pastor, teacher, administrator; prof. of theology, Bible religion, Univ. of Denver in *Methodist Review*, 1593

Stevenson, Burton, compiler, Home Book of Quotations, 1093

Stewardship and Missions. See Cook, C. A.

Stewart, John Hall, ed., Documentary Survey of the French Revolution, 772

Stewart, Potter, B.A., LL.B. (1915–); lawyer in Ohio and N.Y.; assoc. justice, U.S. Supreme Court, from 1958; U.S. judge, Court of Appeals, 6th Circuit, 1954; Episcopalian Braunfeld v. Brown, 1673

joint author. See Brennan

Stimmen der Zeit, 1303

Stoddard, John L. (1850–1931); author, lecturer, and traveler; agnostic most of his life; convert to Catholicism

Rebuilding a Lost Faith, 1596

- Story, Joseph (1779–1845); jurist, writer; U.S. Supreme Court justice for 34 years; a foremost American legal writer; Congressman one year; Unitarian
- Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, 505

Story of American Catholicism. See Maynard

Stowe, Calvin Ellis, D.D. (1802–86); American educator; ed.; husband of Harriet Beecher Stowe; prof. of Biblical literature, Lane Theological Seminary; helped found the College of Teachers, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1833; prof. of natural and revealed religion at Bowdoin; of sacred literature, Andover Theological Seminary

Origin and History of the Books of the Bible, 258, 263

- Stowe, Leland, M.A., LL.D. (1899–); American journalist; Paris correspondent, N.Y. Herald Tribune, 1926–35; Pulitzer prize, 1930
 While Time Demains, 02
- While Time Remains, 93
- Strabo (63 B.C.?–A.D. 24?); Greek geographer; b. Pontus, went to Rome, c. 20 B.C.; traveled; wrote a 17–book geography of Europe, Asia, Egypt, and Libya; also wrote a now–lost history of Rome

Geography of Strabo, 135, 408

Stritch, Samuel Alphonsus, cardinal, Ph.D., S.T.D. (1887–1958); formerly bishop of Toledo; archbishop of Chicago

quoted by Cristiani, 673

Studies in Ancient Technology. See Forbes

Studies in Chronology and History. See Poole

Studies in the History of Culture, 374

Studies in the Revelation of St. John. See Pieters

- Studies on the Early Papacy. See Chapman, J.
- Suetonius Tranquillus, Gaius (2d cent. A.D.); Roman biographer and historian; in Bithynia (A.D. 112) with Pliny the Younger; secretary to Emperor Hadrian c. A.D. 119–21 Lives of the Caesars, 932, 1183b, 1332
- Sulpicius Severus (360?–410?); Christian Latin writer; b. Aquitaine; a lawyer who gave all his worldly goods to the poor and devoted his life to religion as a disciple of St. Martin of Tours; his chief work was a Chronicle summarizing world history

Chronicle, 1183d

The Sumerians. See Woolley

Summa de Potestate Ecclesiastica. See Triumphus

Summa Theologica. See Thomas Aquinas

Summaries ... (American Psychiatric Assn.), 844

- Summerbell, Nicholas (1816–89); minister of the Christian Church (Christian Connection); first pres., Union Christian College, Merom, Ind., 1860–65
 - History of the Christian Church, 1455

Sun, Earth, Time and Man. See Harrison, L. C.

- Sunday Problem, 1395
- Sunday School Times (a nonmodernist nondenominational journal for Sunday school teachers), 970

Survivals of Roman Religion. See Laing

Svenska Kyrkans Historia. See Norlin

- Sverdrup, George (1848–1907); Norwegian–born American theologian; left the Evangelical Lutheran Church and founded the Lutheran Free Church; principal, Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.; founded the Norwegian–American mission on Madagascar in his *Samlede Skrifter*, 1454
- Swain, Joseph Ward, M.A. Ph.D. (1891–); educator; chairman, dept. of history, Univ. of Illinois, from 1956; Episcopalian
 - Ancient World, 44

Symbolism. See Moehler

- Systematic Theology. See Berkhof
- **Taber, Henry Morehouse** (1825–97); American businessman and banker; religious liberal; promoter of public institutions for the advancement of knowledge Faith of Fact, 1598
- Table Talk of Martin Luther. See Luther
- **Tacitus, Cornelius** (A.D. 55?–after 117); Roman orator, politician, and historian; author of a history of the reigns of a number of Roman emperors, a *Dialogue on Orators, Life of Agricola,* and *Germania*
 - Annals, 1178
 - Histories, 921, 933, 1334
 - quoted by Hyde, 1182
- Talmud, 115, 365, 366, 369, 1039, 1040
- **Taraporewala, Irach J. S.,** Ph.D. (1884–); Zoroastrian; b. in India; prof., comparative philology, Univ. of Calcutta; author of *The Religion of Zarathustra*
- in Vergilius Ferm, ed., Religion in the Twentieth Century, 1815
- **Tarn, Sir William Woodthorpe,** Litt.D., F.B.A. (1869–1957); hon. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; mem. of Inner Temple
 - Hellenistic Civilisation, 52
- in Cambridge Ancient History, 32, 48
- Tax, Sol, ed., Evolution of Life, 712, 714, 715
- **Taylor, Jeremy,** M.A., D.D. (1613–67); English churchman and theological writer; chaplain in ordinary to the king; taught in a school he operated in Wales; after the Restoration was appointed bishop; mem., the Irish privy council
 - The Rule of Conscience, 1402
- **Taylor, Joseph Judson,** M.A., D.D., LL.D. (1885–c. 1930); American Baptist pastor; vice– pres., Home Mission Board, Southern Baptist Convention, 1884–87
- The Sabbatic Question, 500, 1389, 1391, 1618, 1661, 1664, 1665, 1667
- The Teacher (a Southern Baptist monthly), 967
- Teitel, Bernard, M.D. (1921–); Calif. psychiatrist
- in Summaries ... (American Psychiatric Assn.), 844
- **Tejada, Carlos;** chief, div. of pathology, Institute of Nutrition of Central America and Panama

, and others, in Circulation, 594

- *Telescope* (a periodical presenting astronomical information on the popular level), 731, 732, 740, 742
- Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. See Manning
- The Ten Commandments. See Morgan
- The Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer. See Schenck
- **Tenney, Merrill Chapin,** Ph.D. (1904–); dean of the Graduate School, Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill.; author of numerous books on Biblical subjects
- Interpreting Revelation, 1056, 1058, 1065, 1069, 1252, 1257, 1260, 1262
- **Tenney, Samuel** (1748–1816); physician; patriot surgeon in Revolutionary War; wrote much on political subjects
- in Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 567
- **Terry, David Smith** (1823–89); American jurist and political leader; lawyer and chief justice of the Calif. Supreme Court, 1857–59
- quoted by Douglas, 1672
- **Tertullian** (Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus) (A.D. 160?–230?); Latin ecclesiastical writer of Carthage; one of the Fathers of the church; educated to be a lawyer; became a Christian c. 190; presbyter in Carthage; left orthodox church c. 207 to become a Montanist; author of many works, including a defense of Christianity addressed to Emperor Septimius Severus
 - Ad Nationes, 1409e, 1582
 - Against Marcion, 1409f
 - An Answer to the Jews, 1409c,d
 - Apology, 1409a, 1567, 1183a
 - The Chaplet (De Corona,), 1091, 1730
 - On Fasting, 1409h
 - On Idolatry, 433, 1409b
 - On Prayer, 1409g
 - On Prescription Against Heretics, 1111
 - To Scapula, 1190b, 1308
 - quoted by Hutchinson, 1008
- Textbook of Pharmacology. See Salter
- **Thatcher, Oliver J., and Edgar Holmes McNeal,** eds., *Source Book for Mediaeval History,* 402, 860, 1127, 1140, 1147, 1150
- **Theodoret of Cyrrhus** (390?–4557?); Greek Christian theologian of the Antioch school; bishop of Cyrrhus, 423; author of a church history, commentaries, and controversial treatise
 - De Fabulis Haereticorum, 1427
- Theodosian Code, 528, 1202, 1209, 1647, 1651, 1652
- **Theodosius I** (the Great) (346?–395); Roman emperor, 379–95; b. in Spain; as a general, defeated Sarmatians in 374; was made Augustus with Gratian, 379; given Egypt and the East; made peace with Goths along the Danube and let Goths settle within the empire in *Civil Law*, 824

in Theodosian Code, 528, 1202, 1209, 1647, 1651

Theodosius II (401–450); son of Arcadius; emperor, 408–50, at first under the regency of the praetorian prefect Anthemius (d. 414) and the emperor's sister Pulcheria, then jointly

with her, 414–50; his reign was marked by expeditions against Persia, the Vandals and the Huns; published, 438, the *Theodosian Code*, a collection of imperial laws.

in Theodosian Code, 1652

Theological Compend. See Binney

Theological Dictionary. See Buck

Theologische ... Bedencken. See Zinzendorf

Theology; Explained and Defended. See Dwight

Things Catholics Are Asked About. See Scott, M. J.

This Reckless Breed of Men. See Cleland

This We Believe, 858, 1363

This Week (newspaper Sunday supplement), 1806

Thomas Aquinas (1225?–74); Italian scholastic philosopher and theologian; known as the Angelic Doctor, and Prince of Scholastics; a Dominican; made a saint in 1323;

systematizer of Catholic theology in the system now called Thomism

Summa Theologica, 832

quoted by John L. Thomas, 969

quoted by Leo XIII, 496f

Thomas, John Lawrence, M.A., S.T.L., Ph.D. (1910–); Jesuit sociologist; asst. prof. of sociology, St. Louis Univ.

Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family, 342, 410, 632, 969, 1004, 1782

Thomas's Massachusetts Spy (newspaper), 570

- **Thompson, Ernest,** D.S.N.V. (1904–); English lecturer and ed.; author of books and pamphlets on Spiritualism; contributor to Spiritualist periodicals History of Modern Spiritualism, 1545
- **Thorn, George Widmer,** M.D., M.A., hon. Sc.D. and LL.D. (1906–); Hersey prof. of theory and practice of physics, Harvard Med. School, from 1942; physician in chief, Peter Bent Brigham Hosp., Boston, Mass., from 1942 joint author. *See* Stare

Thorpe, William Veale, M.A., Ph.D.; reader in chemical physiology, Univ. of Birmingham, England, 1960

Biochemistry for Medical Students, 221, 237

Thutmose IV, Pharaoh; king of Egypt, c. 1420–1411 B.C.; son of Amenhotep II (who may have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus); made alliances with Babylonia and Mitanni; took military expeditions into Phoenicia and Nubia

in Pritchard, ed., Ancient Near Eastern Texts, 678

Tibullus, Albius (54?–18 B.C.); Roman elegiac poet [Poems], 1772

Tillich, Paul Johannes, Th.L., D.Th., Ph.D., D.D., D.H.L. (1886–); German–born American Protestant theologian and philosopher, author; prof. of philosophy and theology in Union Theological Seminary N.Y.; and prof. at Harvard Univ. from 1955

Interpretation of History, 1242

in Christian Century, 1812

summarized by D. A. Williams, 1709

Tilson, Charles Everett, B.D., Ph.D.; Presbyterian pastor; instructor in OT, Vanderbilt Univ. School of Religion, 1953

Should Christians Drink? 12, 17, 30

Time (news weekly), 386, 489, 491, 1269

The Times (London newspaper), 744

To Live Again. See Marshall

To Scapula. See Tertullian

Toronto Daily Star, 1605

Toynbee, Arnold Joseph, Litt.D., D.C.L., F.B.A. (1889–); historian; prof. of international history, Univ. of London, 1925–55; author of numerous works on history

Christianity Among the Religions of the World, 1814

Civilization on Trial, 415, 424, 437, 1298

quoted by Hutchinson and Garrison, 482

Tracts for Spiritual Reading. See Furniss

Tracts ... Relating ... to the Colonies. See Force

Trajan, Emperor (A.D. 52 or 53–117); Roman emperor, 98–117; b. Spain; soldier in Syria and Spain; consul in 91; as emperor, finished Rhine fortifications, made Dacia a Roman province (commemorated by his famous triumphal column), defeated Armenians and Parthians, 114–116

Letter to Pliny, 1185

Transformations of Man. See Mumford

Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History, 8, 861, 1129, 1152, 1183, 1186, 1188, 1190, 1191, 1194, 1195, 1197, 1310

Treatise of Lorenzo Valla on the Donation of Constantine. See Coleman *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist. See* Hippolytus

- **Trebellius Pollio;** Roman historian of the time of Diocletian, one of six writers known as the Scriptores Historiae Augustae (Writers of the History of the Emperors) in *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 638
- **Tregelles, Samuel Prideaux,** LL.D. (1813–75); English Biblical scholar; Presbyterian; one of the early leaders of the Plymouth Brethren, disagreeing, however, with Darby's secret rapture and dispensationalism; prepared parts of a new Greek Testament quoted by Ladd. 1526
- Trent, Council of. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent,* ed. by H. J. Schroeder, 519, 826, 938, 1213, 1235

in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, 392, 394, 400, 521, 862, 1175, 1272, 1481, 1732 in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 259, 726, 1026, 1476, 1728, 1736, 1738

Trever, Albert Augustus, M.A., Ph.D. (1874–1940); prof. of ancient and European history in Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.

History of Ancient Civilization, 46, 50, 55, 927

Trevor, George, M.A.; Church of England clergyman; canon of York; author of a number of works

Rome: From the Fall of the Western Empire, 1160

- **Triumphus, Augustinus** (Augustinus de Ancona) (1243–1328); a notable Augustinian theologian; extreme advocate of the primacy of the pope over all temporal rule Summa de Potestate Ecclesiastica, 1122
- Truth About Spiritualism. See Roberts, C. E. B.
- **Tschackert, Paul,** Ph.D., Th.D. (1848–1911); German Protestant prof. of church history at the universities of Köningsberg and Göttingen; writer of numerous works

in New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 763

Tunney, James Joseph (Gene), hon. LL.D. (1897–); boxing champion, retired undefeated; Lt. Commander, U.S.N.R., to direct athletic and physical–fitness program for U.S., 1940; Catholic

in Reader's Digest, 1711

- **Turmel, Joseph** (1859–?); French Catholic priest and theologian; pseudonyms: André Lagarde and 13 other names
- The Latin Church in the Middle Ages, 1143, 1361

20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History. See Hutchinson

- **Unger, Merrill Frederick,** Th.M., Th.D., Ph.D. (1909–); taught at Gordon Divinity School, Boston, and since 1948 has been prof. of OT and chairman of the dept. in the Dallas Theological Seminary
 - Archeology and the Old Testament, 69, 80, 82, 90, 91, 299, 302, 306, 375, 379, 535, 677, 723, 755, 901, 1102, 1493, 1676
- in John F. Walvoord, ed., Inspiration and Interpretation, 297, 327

Union With Rome. See Wordsworth

- [United States] Bureau of Ethnology, Report (1888-89), 736
- United States Bureau of the Census. "Religion Reported by the Civilian Population," 1286 Religious Bodies (*CRB*), 5, 6, 97, 192–200, 352, 387, 411, 412, 515–518, 659–661, 691, 692, 749, 779, 857, 934, 950, 951, 990–992, 994–997, 1035–1037, 1045, 1046, 1047b,c,d, 1048, 1098, 1176, 1177, 1238–1241, 1266, 1282–1284, 1492, 1530, 1560, 1742, 1743
- United States Code, 504
- U.S. News & World Report (news weekly), 595, 596, 611, 800, 803-805, 809, 812, 814, 816
- United States Supreme Court, United States Reports (330 U.S.) 506; (333 U.S.) 1317; (366
- U.S.) 1318, 1669, 1670–1672, 1674
- Unity of the Bible. See Rowley
- The Universe Surveyed. See Richards
- Ur of the Chaldees. See Woolley
- Vacandard, Elphège, S.T.D. (1849–1927); Catholic priest; pres., Academy of Rouen; canon, Cathedral of Rouen
 - The Inquisition, 878. See also 1309
- Val, Merry del. See Merry del Val
- Valentinian II (372–392); Roman emperor, jointly with his half brother Gratian, 375–383; ruled (mostly under a regent) Italy, Illyricum, and Africa; driven out of Italy, 387; murdered by his general Arbogasat quoted, 824, 1202, 1209, 1651
- Van Dusen, Henry Pitney, Ph.D., D.D., S.T.D. (1897–); educator; Presbyterian clergyman; pres., Union Theological Seminary, New York City

Spirit, Son and Father, 676

Van Sickle, Clifton Edwin, Ph.D. (1895–); assoc. prof., later prof., of history, Ohio Wesleyan Univ.; author of works on Roman history

Political and Cultural History of the Ancient World, 51

- Vatican Council, in Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, 865
- Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance. See Gladstone

Vatican Revolution. See MacGregor

- **Vaughan, Bernard** (1847–1922); British Jesuit priest; lecturer in many parts of Europe, in U.S., in Japan; author of a number of books
 - in Elliot O'Donnell, Menace of Spiritualism, 1538
- Vaughan, Herbert Alford, D.D. (1832–1903); Catholic prelate; bishop of Salford; later archbishop of Westminster; cardinal
- People's Manual—The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, 1028
- Veuillot, Louis François (1813–83); French Catholic self–educated journalist; papal politician; advocate of ultramontanism

L'Illusion Libérale, 1659

- A View of Spiritual, or Anti-typical Babylon. See Gorton
- Villien, Antoine (1867–); Catholic priest; prof. at the Catholic Univ. of Paris History of the Commandments of the Church, 1607Virginia, Act for establishing Religious Freedom, 1300b
 - Lawes Divine, Morall, and Martiall, 347, 1655

Statutes at Large, 351

- **Volck, Wilhelm,** Ph.D., Th.D. (1835–1901); prof. of OT exegesis, Univ. of Rostock in *New Schaff–Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, 1494
- **Von Braun, Wernher,** Ph.D. (1912–); German–born American rocket scientist; director, George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Huntsville, Ala.; developer of the V–2, the first guided missile; the world's top practical rocket man and boldest theoretician of space travel in *This Week*, 1806
- Von dem Sabbat und gebotten feyertagen. See Karlstadt

Wace, Henry, and C. H. Buchheim, eds., Luther's Primary Works, 1024

- Wall of Separation Between Church and State. See Moehlman
- Wallace, Oates Charles Symonds, M.A., D.D., LL.D. (1856–1947); Canadian–born Baptist minister; author; pastor, Eutaw Place Baptist church, Baltimore, Md., 1921–35; ed. writer for the American Baptist Publishing Soc. for many years What Baptists Believe, 953
- Walvoord, John F., ed., Inspiration and Interpretation, 297, 327
- War. See Josephus
- Ward, Artemas (1848–1925); ed.; advertiser, publisher, manufacturer, and philanthropist; mem., New England Historic Genealogical Soc., from 1917 , ed., *The Encyclopedia of Food*, 223, 240
- Ward, Henry Dana, M.A. (1797–1884); Episcopal minister; an assoc. of William Miller; chairman of first "General Conference of Christians Expecting the Advent," 1840; one of those among the Millerites who never accepted Miller's "definite time" for the Second Advent

in New York Journal of Commerce, 737

- Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge, M.A., D.D., LL.D. (1851–1921); theologian and writer; Presbyterian clergyman; prof. of theology, Princeton Seminary; author of numerous works on Biblical and theological subjects quoted by Ladd, 1066
- Warren, Earl, B.L., J.D., LL.D., H.H.D., D.C.L., D.Polit.Sc. (1891–); Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, from 1953; lawyer, State legislator, atty. gen., Calif.; gov. of Calif., 1943–53

Opinion of the Supreme Court in Braunfeld v. Brown, 1670

Opinion of the Supreme Court in McGowan v. Maryland, 1318, 1669

- Washington, George (1732–99); commander of the American Revolutionary Army and first President of U.S.A., 1789–97
 - Letter to the Baptists, 1300a
- The Washington Post (newspaper), 388, 577, 578, 669
- Waterfield, Reginald L., M.B., B.S., M.R.C.P., F.R.A.S.; English amateur astronomer and writer on astronomy
 - A Hundred Years of Astronomy, 745
- Watson, Fletcher Guard, Ph.D. (1912–); astronomer, Harvard Observatory; specialist on meteors; educator; ed., *Critical Years Ahead in Science;* technical aide, NDRC radiation laboratory; MIT; citation for loran development work, 1946 Between the Planets, 746
- Webster, Hutton, Ph.D. (1875–); American historian; prof. of social anthropology, Univ. of Nebraska; prof. emeritus of sociology, Stamford Univ. Rest Days, 1446, 1649

in Hastings, ed., Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, 1474

- Webster, Noah (1758–1843); American lawyer and lexicographer, author of the original Webster's Dictionary; served in Revolutionary War; taught four years Brief History of Epidemic and Pestilential Diseases, 574
- Weidner, Ernst F. (1891–); German Assyriologist; specialist in Babylonian astronomy and chronology; collaborated in publication of archeological documents from Tell Halaf and Boghazkoi; ed. of *Archiv für Orientforschung* joint author. *See* Neugebauer, Paul V.
- Weigall, Arthur Edward Pearse (1880–1934); British Egyptologist; author, artist; formerly inspector–general of antiquities, Egyptian Government Paganism in Our Christianity, 1590, 1645
- Weigel, Gustave, M.A., Ph.D., S.T.D. (1906–); Jesuit theologian; prof. of ecclesiology, Woodstock College, Md.
 - Catholic Primer on the Ecumenical Movement, 663

quoted, 489

- Weighed and Wanting. See Moody
- Weiser, Francis Xavier (1901–); Jesuit; a curate of Boston, 1939–43; writer of Catholic stories for children
 - Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs, 441, 443, 447, 448, 648, 649, 764, 789, 842, 1019
- Welch, Claude Raymond Ph.D. (1922–); pastor in Iowa and Conn.; a Fulbright Scholar for 1956–57 at the Univ. of Heidelberg; assoc. prof. of theology at Yale Divinity School joint author. *See* Dillenberger
- Welch, John, LL.D. (1805–91); judge, Supreme Court of Ohio Board of Education v. *Minor*, 503
- Wellhausen, Julius (1844–1918); renowned German theologian and Bible critic; prof. at Göttingen and Halle
 - quoted by Albright, 296
 - quoted in Jeremias, Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East, 89

Wells, Herbert George, D.Sc., D.Litt. (1866–1946); English novelist, journalist, and popular historian; Fellow of Imperial College of Science and Technology

The Outline of History, 931, 1218, 1323, 1585

quoted by Lamont, 1553

quoted by Mumford, 1804

Wesley, John, M.A. (1703–91); English clergyman, theologian, evangelist, founder of Methodism; in Oxford Univ. became leader of his brother Charles's "Methodist" Soc.; en route as missionary to Georgia, was deeply impressed by German Moravians; stirred at Aldersgate prayer meeting, he left High Church views, employed lay preachers, and ordained Methodist minsters, thus setting up, without intending to, a new denomination; author of numerous works on varied subjects

"Advice to ... Methodists," 1315

Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament, 188, 203, 291, 1246

Sermons, 973,

Works, 968, 1683

Westminster Confession for Today. See Hendry

Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible. See Wright, G. E.

What Baptists Believe. See Wallace

What Is Christianity? See Harnack

What Is Vital in Religion. See Fosdick

What Mean These Stones? See Burrows

What Present–Day Theologians Are Thinking. See Williams, D. D.

What Price Alcohol? See Carroll

While Time Remains. See Stowe, L.

Whitcomb, John C., Jr., Th.D.; prof. of OT, Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Ind.

_____, and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, 461, 534, 703, 704, 717, 757–759, 761, 762, 1809

White, Edward (1819–98); English Congregational minister, lecturer, contributor to religious magazines; advocate of the doctrine of the nonimmortality of the soul and of eternal life only in Christ

Life in Christ, 851, 855, 936, 999, 1001

White, Paul Dudley, M.D. (1886–); noted heart specialist; degree, Harvard Med. School, Boston

in U.S. News & World Report, 800, 803-805

_____, and others, Rehabilitation of the Cardiovascular Patient, 1716

Whitehead, George, F.R.E.S. (1883–); English lecturer and author

An Inquiry Into Spiritualism, 1546, 1548, 1552, 1554, 1557, 1559

Whittier, John Greenleaf (1807–92); American Quaker poet and abolitionist "Abraham Davenport," 569

"Wider die Antinomer." See Luther

"Wider die himmlischen Propheten." See Luther

- "Wider die Sabbather." See Luther
- Williams, Daniel Day, B.D., Ph.D. (1910–); Congregationalist clergyman; prof. of systematic theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City

What Present–Day Theologians Are Thinking, 721, 722, 1709

Williams, Roger (1603?–83); English–born clergyman; pioneer of religious liberty, favoring democracy and liberal government; pastor in Salem, Mass., 1631; banished by Mass., 1635; founded Providence, R.I., earliest settlement in that State; was Baptist for a time but withdrew from all church affiliation

The Bloudy Tenent of Persecution, 1316 Letters, 1620

Williams, Samuel, A.M., LL.D. (1743–1817); prof. of mathematics and natural philosophy in Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.

in Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 566

- Wilson, [Thomas] Woodrow, Ph.D. (1865–1924); the 28th President of the U.S., 1913–21; lawyer; historian; prof. then pres. of Princeton; gov. of N.J., 1911–13; 17th–19th constitutional amendments passed during his administration; made many reforms; declared war on Germany; proposed League of Nations; Nobel peace prize, 1919 in *The Congressional Record*, 279, 280
- Winckler, Hugo (1863–1913); German Assyriologist; prof. at Univ. of Berlin, 1904 et seq.; excavated at Sidon, 1903–04; and at Boghazköy, 1906–12; identified the capital of the ancient Hittites

History of Babylonia and Assyria, 123

- **Winslow, Edward** (1595–1655); Pilgrim Father; a leader in Plymouth colony, several times gov.; author of the first published accounts of the new colony written in America Briefe Narration, in Young, *Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers*, 267
- Wirt, Sherwood Eliot, Crusade at the Golden Gate, 1534
- Wiseman, Donald John, O.B.E., M.A., F.S.A. (1918–); asst. keeper, dept. of W. Asiatic antiquities, British Museum; author of works on cuneiform documents Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings, 129, 906, 1100
- Wiseman, Percy John, C.B.E. (1888–); British R.A.F. officer; made special study of Biblical archeology; ed., *Bible League Quarterly* (father of D. J. Wiseman) New Discoveries in Babylonia About Genesis, 307, 308
- **Wolff, Joseph,** D.D., LL.D. (1795–1862); Jewish convert to Church of England; missionary and traveler in Palestine, Persia, Bokhara, and Balkh; literalist premillennialist, expected Second Advent in 1847 to inaugurate earthly kingdom Narrative of a Mission to Bokhara, 930
- Wolman, Walter, M.S., Ph.D. (1914–); American research chemist; laboratory chemist, American Med. Assn., 1945–48; laboratory director, from 1945 joint author. *See* Martinek
- Woolley, Sir [Charles] Leonard, M.A., hon. D.Litt., F.S.A. (1880–1960); English archeologist; excavator at Tel el Amarna (Egypt), Ur, and other places in Mesopotamia and Syria; author of a number of works on archeology Excavations at Ur, 1746

The Sumerians, 3, 4

Ur of the Chaldees, 1744, 1745

Wordsworth, Christopher, M.A., D.D. (1774–1846); Anglican clergyman and ecclesiastical biographer; youngest brother of the poet William Wordsworth; chaplain to archbishop of Canterbury; master of Trinity College, Cambridge, 1820–41

Union With Rome, 120, 172, 173, 175

World Council of Churches. Man's Disorder and God's Design, 957

in Christian Century, 1807

World Health Organization. *Report ... on Atherosclerosis and Ischaemic Heart Disease*, 802 *The World of the Old Testament. See* Gordon, C. H.

Worship (a leading periodical of the Catholic liturgical movement), 397

"Worship and Work." See Farris

Wörterbuch der Antike, 450, 1586

Wright, Charles Henry Hamilton, M.A., B.D., D.D., Ph.D. (1836–1909); Irish Hebraist, theologian, philologist; a militant Protestant

Daniel and His Prophecies, 38

Wright, George Ernest, M.A., Ph.D. (1909–); American Presbyterian Biblical scholar and archeologist; prof. of divinity, Harvard Divinity School; ed.; author of works on Biblical history and archeology; excavator in Palestine; ed., with Floyd Vivian Filson, *Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*

Old Testament Against Its Environment, 310

in Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible, 724

Wright, Irving Sherwood, M.D. (1901–); prof., clinical med., Cornell Univ. Med. College, from 1949

joint author. See McDevitt

Wright, Samson, M.D., M.B., F.R.C.P., M.R.C.S.; British physiologist; lecturer in physiology, King's College, London

Applied Physiology, 612

Wynder, E. L., ed., Biologic Effects of Tobacco, 1720

Xenophon (434?–355? B.C.); Greek (Athenian) historian and essayist; disciple of Socrates; went to Persia with the Greek forces employed by Cyrus the Younger in his abortive attempt to gain the Persian throne; afterward he led back the Greek soldiers to the Black Sea, as described in his *Anabasis;* wrote also a hist. romance of the life of Cyrus the Younger

Anabasis, 1109

Cyropaedia, 548, 1215

Yearbook of American Churches, 1961. See Landis

Young, Alexander, Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers, 267

- Zaga Zaba (Christopher Licanot) (fl. 16th cent.); Ethiopian ambassador to Portugal, sent in 1524 in connection with the submission of the Ethiopian church to Rome; while in Lisbon wrote an account of his native religion, c. 1530 quoted, 1463
- Zeiller, Marie Joseph Charles Jacques, Litt.D. (1878–); prof. in Univ. of Fribourg, Switzerland, and director of studies at the Sorbonne, Paris; author of several works on early Christian church

joint author. See Lebreton

Zinzendorf, Nikolaus Ludwig von (1700–60); b. Dresden; German count; founder of reorganized Moravian Church, or Unity of Brethren; hymn writer; made Moravian bishop in Berlin, 1737

Theologische ... Bedencken, 1470

1

¹Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.