

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. 14:14ff. 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 Shamash-bel-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-bel-ilani, 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 Church	30,586	(’58)
Church of God (Abrahamic Faith)	5,400	
Life and Advent Union	363	
Primitive Advent Christian Church	586	
Seventh-day Adventists	311,535	(in U.S.).]

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 arrogance. To this I reply, that it cannot be arrogance 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), *Practica 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, Nashville. 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 ceremonies 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 caffeine in tea, coffee, and chocolate, reinforced today from puberty on by increasingly concentrated absorption of nicotine, 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 pre-alcoholic'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 dream-life.

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. Appian 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 figure 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 decisive 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.: Harvard University Press, 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 Antigonos 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 Antigonos 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 Perdikkas, 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. Perdikkas was assassinated in 321 B.C., and Antipater, his successor as regent, died two years later. Antigonos 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 Antigonos 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 Antigonos, 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 Antigonos 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 Seleucia 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.

¹

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 Niebuhr, *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 Omniads") [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 Omniads”) [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‘il, in his famous letter to ‘Abdalmasih 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 Pottery

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 to-day 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'Égypte* (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 (*Khîru*) 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 Judaeen 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 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 archaeological 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 nineteenth century 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 literal¹⁴ 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 burial-place. 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 distinguishable 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 sobriety 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 (φύσει) changeable, but remains good (χαλός) 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 Uytenbogaert 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 irresistible. 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 "decision-question" 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 *barû*, 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 omens, 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 thralldom 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 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.1: 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* 121a), 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, ובבן is repeated three times in the *Amidah* for Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur so as to allude to the biblical expression ובבן אבוא אל חמלך ("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* 16a, 16b, 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*. [16a] 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 death.

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 chooseth 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 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 whom 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.

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.