

## 120. Babylon, Ancient, and Rome

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

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

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

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

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

## 121. Babylon, Center of Semitic Civilization

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

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

## 122. Babylon, Center of the Semitic Religion

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

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

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

### 123. Babylon, Cultural Capital, Compared With Rome

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

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

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

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

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

The Southern or chief Citadel was built on the mound now known as the Kasr, and within it Nebuchadnezzar erected his principal palace, partly over an earlier building of his father Nabopolassar. The palace and citadel occupy the old city-square or centre of Babylon, which is referred to in the inscriptions as the *iršit Bâbili*, "the Babil place." ... We may conclude that the chief fortress of Babylon always stood upon this site, and the city may well have derived its name Bâb-ilî, "the Gate of the Gods," from the strategic position of its ancient fortress, commanding as it does the main approach to E-sagila, the famous temple of the city-god. [See No. 211.]

## 125. Babylon, Description of—Herodotus' Account

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

extended for more than about eleven miles, a figure very far short of any of those given by Herodotus, Ctesias and other writers.

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

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

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

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

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

### **127. Babylon, Description of—Temple Tower**

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

[p. 49] The largest and most splendid of Babylonian temples was, naturally, that of Marduk, the tutelary god of Babylon. Its Babylonian name was Esagila, ‘the house that lifts up its head’. It was a vast quadrangular enclosure on the east bank of the Euphrates, surrounded by high turreted walls. In the northern part of the great court was the *ziqqurat*, the temple-tower, commonly known as ‘the Tower of Babel’, of which more will be said later; in the southern half of the court was the temple of Marduk, with its fifty-five side-chapels. The Sacred Way, or processional street passed up the ... side of

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

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

### **128. Babylon, Destroyed by Sennacherib, Rebuilt by Esarhaddon**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **130. Babylon, Empire of, Nebuchadnezzar the Great Builder of**

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

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

### **131. Babylon, Empire of—Nebuchadnezzar’s Successors**

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire [Achaemenid Period]*, pp. 35–37. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of The University of Chicago Press.

[p. 35] After a long and successful reign, the great Babylonian conqueror [Nebuchadnezzar] passed away on October 7, 562. After less than two years of rule, his son Amel-Marduk had by August 13, 560, been followed by Nebuchadnezzar’s son-in-law, Nergal-sharusur; he in turn lasted only until May 22, 556, when a tablet is dated by his youthful son, Labashi-Marduk.

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

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

### **132. Babylon, Fall of, at Various Times**

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

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

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

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

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

### **134. Babylon, Falls Gradually Into Decay**

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

SOURCE: Strabo, *The Geography of Strabo* xvi. 1. 5; translated by Horace Leonard Jones, Vol. 7 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), p. 201. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

What was left of the city [Babylon] was neglected and thrown into ruins, partly by the Persians and partly by time and by the indifference of the Macedonians to things of this

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

### **136. Babylon, in 5th Century A.D., a Swamp**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **138. Babylon—Lion in Art**

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

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

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

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

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

#### 140. Babylon—Panbabylonian Theory, Passing of, Predicted

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

[p. 211] The theory that the whole religion of Babylonia and Assyria, nay, practically the whole of the serious thinking and writing of both realms, rests down upon a *Weltanschauung*, a great *theory of the universe*, owes its origin and exposition at least in its chief form to Professor Hugo Winckler, of the University of Berlin [and Alfred Jeremias]...

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

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

This effort to unlock all doors with one key, to explain all mysteries with one theory, has been repeatedly tried before and has always gone down to failure. Perhaps the most striking of these failures is the magnificent effort of Charles François Dupuis. It all began with an investigation of the origin of the Greek months. From that he passed to a study of the constellations, and thence to an attempt to locate the origin of the zodiac...

[p. 224] Champollion showed readily enough that the Egyptian use of the zodiac dates only to the Greco-Roman period, and the whole theory crumbled at once to pieces. But before this had happened Dupuis had gone on to use this principle, which he believed he had discovered, to erect a tremendous system by which he sought to explain the origin of all religions. The learning of the book is fairly staggering. It excited at the time great and bitter controversy, and then, without any particular disproof, its theories melted quietly away like the morning mists and disappeared.

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

[EDITORS' NOTE: Rogers was right. The Panbabylonian theory also has become outmoded. See No. 141.]

### **141. Babylon—Panbabylonianism Exposed**

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

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

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

### **142. Babylon, Ruins of—an Early Excavator's Impression**

SOURCE: Austen H. Layard, *Discoveries Among The Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* (New York: Harper, 1856), p. 413.

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

### **143. Babylon, Ruins of, as Seen by Excavator**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **144. Babylon, Ruins of, Erroneous Stories Concerning, Likely Origin of**

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

Another incident occurred in Babylon, according to O. Reuther. Adherents of a Bible-devoted sect, two women and three men, came to sinful Babylon and wanted to see everything. In the evening they sat on the banks of the Euphrates and sang sacred songs with very lively tunes. In the hotel they conducted prayer meetings to which they invited us. Besides they drank whisky. Koldewey [the excavator] conducted them through the ruins, showed them a hill of cinders as the site of the fiery furnace, a deep excavation as

Daniel's lions' den, and the throne chamber where the "menetekel" appeared on the wall. There lay one of the millions of pieces of bricks with the stamp of Nebuchadnezzar (there were none of Belshazzar) and the credulous pounced upon it. They had found the piece of the wall with the inscription. With all gravity Koldewey took the piece home with him and denied them the wish to possess it. Such an extraordinary valuable find he could under no circumstances give away; they would have to content themselves with the joy of discovering it.—As we later reproached him for giving these poor people such humbug, he replied, "How so? He who believes is blissful. Should I take their joy away from them and disappoint them? To the end of their life it will be for them their great experience." Was he right?

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

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

When we gaze to-day over the wide area of ruins we are involuntarily reminded of the words of the prophet Jeremiah (50:39): "Therefore the wild beasts of the desert, with the wild beasts of the islands, shall dwell there, and the owls shall dwell therein: and it shall be no more inhabited for ever; neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation."

#### **146. Babylon, Ruins of, Fulfill the Prophecies**

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

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

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

#### **147. Babylon, Ruins of, Fulfill the Prophecies**

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

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

#### **148. Babylon, Ruins of, in the 12th Century**

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

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

#### **149. Babylon, Without an Inhabitant**

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

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

#### **150. Babylon, Religion of—Astrology**

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

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

#### **151. Babylon, Religion of—Bel Marduk**

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

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

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

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic [Mythology]* (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), pp. 156, 157. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York.

[p. 156] Marduk is the Bel of Babylonian and Assyrian religion, corresponding to the West Semitic Ba'al, "lord." ... Bêl-Marduk, as a mighty figure in ancient religion, represents the spring sun and the older Ninurta. His great festival, beginning at the spring equinox and lasting for eleven days, was called *zagnuk*, "beginning of the year," or the *akitu*, from a special part of the festival or procession to the "house of the akitu," which was the essential part of the New Year festivals in the old Sumerian calendars of all the great cults...

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the month Nisan, on the second day, two hours before the end of the night, the *urigallu* ... [principal priest] shall rise and wash himself with water from the river; he shall go in before Bel, then he shall put on a linen garment; he shall say this prayer before Bel:

Bel, without equal in his anger;

Bel, merciful king, lord of the lands,

Causing the great gods to be favorably disposed;

Bel, whose glance overthrows the mighty;

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

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

The wide heavens compose thy liver;

Bel, with thine eyes thou dost behold the universe;

With thine oracles thou dost control the oracles;

With thy glance thou dost give the law;

With thine arms thou dost crush the mighty...

[p. 105] In the month Nisan, on the fourth day, three and a third hours before the end of the night, the *urigallu* shall rise, and wash himself with water from the river; he shall put on a linen garment; before Bel and Beltia ... he shall address this incantation to Bel; he shall utter this prayer to Bel:

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

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

Glorious, exalted, most high prince;

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

Be gracious to thy city, Babel;



Have mercy on thy temple, Esagila  
At thy exalted word, lord of the great gods,  
May the light shine upon the children of Babel ...  
1

#### **154. Babylon, Religion of—Bel Transmitted to Rome, Through Palmyra, as a Sun-God**

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

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

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

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

#### **155. Babylon, Religion of—Divination**

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

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

#### **156. Babylon, Religion of—Fertility Rite in New Year Festival**

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

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

---

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

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

### **157. Babylon, Religion of—Gods in Trinities**

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

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

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

### **158. Babylon, Religion of, Immorality in**

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

[p. 52] The priesthood was not confined to men, but women formed part of the staff of the great temples. It was considered an honour to belong to the order of priestesses, and we hear of several kings who dedicated their daughters to the priestly calling. The Code of Hammurabi lays down rules for their behaviour and defines their civil rights. Some of them lived in a special abode or cloister, but in general they were free to move about in society. Their most important function was to serve as sacred prostitutes at the great seasonal festivals. Their Akkadian name, *qadishtu*, corresponds to the [p. 53]

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

### **159. Babylon, Religion of—Influence on Greek Civilization**

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

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

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

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

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

### **160. Babylon, Religion of—Influence on Israel**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **162. Babylon, religion of—Influence Widespread**

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

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

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

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

### **163. Babylon, Region of—Ishtar**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **164. Babylon, Religion of—Ishtar, Mother Goddess**

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

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

#### **165. Babylon, Religion of—Polytheistic Concepts**

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

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

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

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

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

### **166. Babylon, Religion of—Sin, the Moon-God**

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

Sin is thought to be of nomadic origin, and in early Arabian cult the moon is masculine, while the sun is feminine. Although, since the name Sin is Semitic, the invading Semites may have brought the cult of the moon-god with them, nevertheless he is found in the early Sumerian lists under the name Nannar. While he is called the son of Enlil in the Sumerian lists, his genealogy is not carried back further, and he seems to occupy an independent place among the early Mesopotamian gods. The phases of the moon were of special importance in the cult, and the period of darkness had the distinctive name of *bubbulu*; it was thought to be a time when evil spirits were particularly dangerous. Sin was regarded as the lord of the calendar, by whom days, months, and years were fixed; but he was also a vegetation-god, and to him the fertility of cattle was ascribed. His sacred number was naturally 30, and his emblem was the crescent. His beard was of lapislazuli, and on the relief of Maltaia he is represented as riding on his sacred beast, the winged bull. Ur and Harran were the two chief centres of his cult in Mesopotamia. His consort was Ningal, the mother of the sun-god.

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

### **167. Babylon, Religion of, Sumerian Origin of**

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

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

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

constructed this pantheon were monotheists at an earlier stage, having only the god An, a word which actually means “high.” This is to be expected, for we have here not a mythology springing from primitive religion, but speculation based upon nature, spiritual, and ethical values.

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

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

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

### **169. Babylon, Religion of—Tammuz, Weeping for**

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

[p. 36] There is only one explicit reference to the cult of Tammuz in the Old Testament, namely, the well-known passage in Ezek. viii, 14, in which the prophet describes his vision of the women [p. 37] of Jerusalem weeping for Tammuz at the north gate of the Temple at Jerusalem. An indirect reference may be found in Isa. xvii, 10, where the words *nit'e na'amanim* are usually interpreted as referring to the ‘gardens of Adonis’, a feature of the Phoenician form of the Tammuz cult.

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

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

[p. 60] One other seasonal element of the [Babylonian] cult may be mentioned, namely, that connected with the phases of the moon. The Babylonian religious calendar, while determined in part by the agricultural seasons, was originally a lunar calendar, like all early calendars, and the phases of the moon were carefully observed and were the subject of many omens. The two most important points of the moon’s course, from the religious point of view, were the full moon (*shabattum*), and the day of the moon’s total disappearance (*bubbulum*); the latter was regarded as a specially dangerous period, and was marked by fasting, prayers, and other rites. The new moon also was watched for, [p. 61] and its appearance, marking the beginning of the month, was an occasion for ritual. It

is possible that the early Hebrew ‘new moons’ and ‘sabbaths’ (Isaiah i, 13–14) were lunar festivals, marking new moon and full moon, and may go back to the common origin in ancient custom of both Babylonian and Canaanite lunar feasts. But it is extremely unlikely that the later Hebrew Sabbath, the seventh day of the week, had any connection with the Babylonian *shabattum*. In the Assyrian period the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eight of the month were unlucky days, and the nineteenth was called ‘the day of wrath’, and was marked by special fasts and prayers.

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

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

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

### **172 Babylon, Woman of Prophecy—Antiquity Interpretation**

SOURCE: Ch[ristopher] Wordsworth, *Union With Rome* (London: Longmans, 1909), pp. 19, 20.

[p. 19] The interpretation, which identifies the Church of Rome with the Apocalyptic Babylon, does *not date from* the Reformation; the truth is, that it was *prior* to the Reformation, and did much to *produce* the Reformation.

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

### **173. Babylon, Woman of Prophecy—Identified With Rome**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 175. Babylon, Woman of Prophecy, a Mystery

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

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

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

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

### 176. Baptism—Calvin on Meaning of Word

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

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

### 177. Baptism, Catholic, by a Layman

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

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

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

### **178. Baptism, Catholic Catechism on**

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

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

Baptism is the most necessary Sacrament

- 1) because without Baptism no one can be saved,
- 2) because without Baptism no other Sacrament can be received.

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

323. How is Baptism administered?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[p. 163] We have here the words: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

To what do they refer but to baptism, that is to "the water" comprehended in God's ordinance? Hence, it follows that he who rejects baptism, rejects God's Word, and faith, and Christ who directs us, and binds us, to baptism.

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

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

### **180. Baptism, Importance of Rite, Luther on.**

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

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

### **181. Baptism, Infant—Introduction**

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

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

[p. 213; Note 37:] Cf. F. J. Leenhardt, *E.Th.R.* [*Études Théologiques et Religieuses*], xxv, 1952 [or 1950? Cf. notes 39, 40] p. 149: 'It is necessary to go to the third century to find incontestable evidence of the existence of paedobaptism. Remarkably enough, the first attestation is hostile to the practice, which is opposed as an innovation without justification'; also Th. Preiss, *La Vie en Christ*, 1951, p. 133: 'We should never forget that paedobaptism only became general with Constantine' (Preiss's essay 'Le Baptême des Enfants' appeared first in *Verbum Caro*, 1947, pp. 113–22, to which the present writer

has had no access, and in German translation in *Th.L.Z.*, lxxiii, 1948, cols. 651ff.). The view of Preiss is that infant baptism is valuable in a Christian family but has no meaning where there is no serious likelihood of Christian training. Nevertheless he thinks it is a good thing that there should be some Christian families which do not practise infant baptism...

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

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

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

## 182. Baptism, Infant, and the New Testament

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

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

## 183. Baptism, Infant, Luther on

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### **185. Baptism, Mode of—Catholic Rite**

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

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

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

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

### **186. Baptism, Mode of—Conybeare and Howson on Immersion**

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

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

### **187. Baptism, Mode of—Immersion, a Death to Sin, Luther on**

SOURCE: Martin Luther, *Large Catechism*, trans. by John Nicholas Lenker, in *Luther's Catechetical Writings*, Vol. 1 (Minneapolis, Minn.: The Luther Press, 1907), pp. 168, 169. [FRS No. 45.]

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

### **188. Baptism, Mode of—John Wesley on Ancient Practice**

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

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

### **189. Baptism, Mode of—Luther on Immersion**

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

In 1541, Doctor Menius asked Doctor Luther, in what manner a Jew should be baptized? The Doctor replied: You must fill a large tub with water, and, having divested the Jew of his clothes, cover him with a white garment. He must then sit down in the tub, and you must baptize him quite under the water. The ancients, when they were baptized, were attired in white, whence the first Sunday after Easter, which was peculiarly consecrated to this ceremony, was called *dominica in albis*. This garb was rendered the more suitable, from the circumstance that it was, as now, the custom to bury people in a white shroud; and baptism, you know, is an emblem of our death. I have no doubt that when Jesus was baptized in the river Jordan, he was attired in a white robe.



## **190. Baptism, Mode of—Pouring, Luther on**

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

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

## **191. Baptism, Significance of, Reinhold Niebuhr on**

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

[p. 240] A community of grace, which lives by faith and hope, must be sacramental. It must have sacraments to symbolize the having and not having of the final virtue and truth. It must have sacraments to express its participation in the *Agape* of Christ and yet not pretend that it has achieved that love. Thus the church has the sacrament of baptism in which “we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should also walk in newness of life” (Romans 6:4). The admonition that “we should” walk in newness of life is a nice indication in Pauline thought of his consciousness of the Christian's having and yet not having that new life which is the fruit of dying to self. Christian participates sacramentally and by faith in Christ's dying and rising again; but he must be admonished that he should walk in that newness of life which is ostensibly his assured possession. He is assured that he is free from sin and yet admonished: [p. 241] “Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body” (Romans 6:12).

## **192. Baptist Bodies**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **193. Baptists—American Baptist Association**

SOURCE: *CRB* 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 249.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*Doctrine.* The doctrinal requisites for Baptists are at an almost irreducible minimum. Although various groups and assemblies, at various times, have endeavored to formulate "Confessions of Faith," such as the "New Hampshire Confession"; and although many local churches have "Articles of Faith" and "Church Covenants," these last are adopted by the individual churches, are for their own use locally, and are binding on no other churches than the ones which adopted them. Even in the local church there is wide liberty of opinion permitted concerning these doctrinal statements. The number and length of them tends steadily to decrease. One reason for this light hold of creedal statement is that Baptists generally hold to the view that the Bible itself, especially the New Testament, is the only proper compendium for faith and practice; and the individual conscience and intelligence, enlightened by the Divine Spirit, is the proper interpreter thereof. The second reason is that the epoch-making and successful battle which early American Baptists and others made for freedom of conscience in religion and worship was calculated to reduce the amount of regimentation of thought among them.

Baptists, in general, believe in religious freedom, the validity and inspiration of the Scriptures, the Lordship of Christ, the immortality of the soul, the brotherhood of man, the future life, the need of redemption from sin, and the ultimate triumph of the Kingdom of God. Various groups and individuals hold to other items of conviction, which are not so universally accepted, and by many are regarded as secondary.

While, for centuries, Baptists generally have stood for the validity and value of two ordinances, baptism and the Lord's Supper, their insistence has been limited to those two; and their views as to the vital efficacy of those ordinances have gradually shaded into a conviction of their value as an aid to Christian witness and comfort, rather than as a vital necessity for Christian character. This increasing liberalism is especially characteristic of Northern Baptists, and has come about more or less through the increase of scholarship and the association and conference in the north of many more diverse groups than are found elsewhere in the land.

So-called fundamentalism, or reactionary and conservative bodies of thought revolving around the Scriptures and theology, is found somewhat among Northern Baptists; but this phenomenon is not peculiar to them, being found also in practically all evangelical communions.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1957), 1,555,360 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 252).]

### **195. Baptists—Free Will Baptists**

SOURCE: *CRB* 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 175.

*History.* One of the influential factors in early Baptist history, especially in the Middle States, was a Welsh church, organized in Wales in 1701, which emigrated the same year to Pennsylvania. Two years later it received a grant of land known as the "Welsh Tract," where the colony prospered and was able to send a number of able ministers to various sections. One of these, Elder Paul Palmer, gathered a company in North Carolina and, in 1727, organized a church at Perquimans, in Chowan County. The principal element appears to have been Arminian, in sympathy with certain communities in Virginia which had received ministerial assistance from the General Baptists of England. There was no thought, however, of organizing a separate denomination, the object being primarily to provide a church home for the community, a place for the administration of the ordinances, and for the teaching of Christian ethics.

Under the labors of Elder Palmer and other ministers whom he ordained, additional churches were organized, which grew rapidly, considering the sparsely settled country, and an organization was formed, called a yearly meeting, including 16 churches, 16 ministers, and probably 1,000 communicants, in 1752. As the Philadelphia Association of Calvinistic Baptists increased in strength, a considerable number of these Arminian churches were won over to that confession, so that only four remained undivided. These, however, rallied, reorganized, and, being later reinforced by Free Will Baptists from the North, especially from Maine, regained most of the lost ground.

In the early part of their history they do not appear to have had a distinctive name. They were afterward called "Free Will Baptists," and most of them became known later as "Original Free Will Baptists." They were so listed in the report on religious bodies, census of 1890, but have since preferred to drop the term "Original" and be called simply "Free Will Baptists."

In 1836 they were represented by delegates in a General Conference of Free Will Baptists throughout the United States, but after the Civil War they held their own conferences. In recent years they have drawn to themselves a number of churches of similar faith throughout the Southern States, and have increased greatly in strength. They hold essentially the same doctrines as the Free Baptist churches of the North, now a part of the Northern Baptist Convention, have the same form of ecclesiastical polity, and are to some degree identified with the same interests, missionary and educational.

As the movement for the union of the Free Baptist churches with the Northern Baptist Convention developed, some who did not care to join in that movement affiliated with the Free Will Baptists.

*Doctrine.* The Free Will Baptists accept the five points of Arminianism as opposed to the five points of Calvinism, and in a confession of faith of 18 articles declare that Christ "freely gave himself a ransom for all, tasting death for every man"; that "God wants all to come to repentance"; and that "all men, at one time or another, are found in such capacity as that, through the grace of God, they may be eternally saved."

Believers' baptism is considered the only true principle, and immersion the only correct form; but no distinction is made in the invitation to the Lord's Supper, and Free Will Baptists uniformly practice open communion. They further believe in foot washing and anointing the sick with oil.

*Organization.* In polity the Free Will Baptists are distinctly congregational.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 200,000 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 252).]

## **196. Baptists**—National Primitive Baptist Convention of the U.S.A. (formerly known as Colored Primitive Baptists)

SOURCE: *CRB* 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, p. 233.

*History.* The history of the Colored Primitive Baptists is the same as that of the white Primitive Baptists up to the time of the Civil War. During slave times the colored Primitive Baptists had full membership in the white churches, although seats were arranged for them in a separate part of the house. Before the war some of the colored members of the churches were engaged in the work of the ministry, many of them being considered very able defenders and exponents of the doctrine of the Bible. Such men were sometimes bought from their owners and set free to go out and preach where they felt it was the Lord's will for them to go.

After the Negroes were freed, many of them desiring to be set apart into churches of their own, the white Primitive Baptists granted them letters certifying that they were in full fellowship and good standing; white preachers organized them into separate churches, ordained their preachers and deacons, and set them up in proper order, throughout the South; and thus, gradually, the colored Primitive Baptists became a separate denomination.

*Doctrine and Organization.* The doctrinal principles and the polity of the Colored Primitive Baptists are precisely the same as those of the white Primitive Baptists. Each local church is an independent body and has control of its own affairs, receiving and disciplining its own members; there is no appeal to a higher court.

About the year 1900 a “progressive” move was introduced among the Colored Primitive Baptists, and a large number of them began the organization of aid societies, conventions, and Sunday schools, some of these organizations being based on the payment of money—things which the Primitive Baptists have not engaged in and which they have always protested against.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Membership (1957), 80,983, (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

### **197. Baptists—Negro Baptists**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 152, 153.

[p. 152] *History. The day of darkness.*—Although the first African slaves were brought to the Colonies in 1619, a long span of 154 years passed before we have an account of the first Negro Baptist Church. This was due to the fact that those who were the first purchasers of the Africans considered themselves as guardians of these heathen and hence, on becoming Christians, their numbers were added to the white churches. In time it became a question whether one Christian should enslave another. The step between guardianship and master was short and was soon taken. The results were written into the most inhuman laws ever promulgated by a civilized people. Later, there came a time when it was unlawful for Negroes to become Christians; when it was unlawful to build meeting houses for them; 150 long and cruel years of enslavement were meted out to these people. In the meantime, the spirit of abolition, born in the hearts of good men among the colonists, continued to grow and culminated in the Emancipation Proclamation issued by Abraham Lincoln, September 22, 1862. The proclamation went into effect January 1, 1863, which gave the emancipated people an opportunity to serve and worship God without interference.

*A new day.*—Hardly had the smoke of the Civil War lifted from a hundred battlefields when sympathetic friends, men and women, through the American Baptist Home Missionary Society, the Freedmen’s Aid Society, the American Missionary Association, and kindred organizations, sent preachers and teachers to the 4,500,000 freedmen in all parts of the Southland.

The chance given through the instructions of those devoted friends, from pulpit and schoolroom, did much to make American Negroes today the most advanced group of Negroes in the world. Many of the wisest and best laymen in the group were and are members of Baptist churches; among these are: W. H. Williams, historian; Dr. Booker T. Washington, founder of Tuskegee Institute; Dr. R. R. Moton, principal emeritus of Tuskegee Institute; Mrs. Mary Talbert, who saved Anacostia, the home of Frederick Douglass, as a shrine for the race; John Mitchell, Jr., the fighting editor; Mrs. Maggie L. Walker, the only woman banker of the Negro race; Carter G. Woodson, eminent historian; Miss Nannie H. Burroughs, educator and foundress of the National Trade and



Professional School for Women and Girls; C. C. Spaulding, the insurance wizard; Miss Jennie Porter, great organizer and teacher; T. C. Windham, contractor and builder; Dr. A. M. Townsend, financial genius; W. H. Wright, great insurance man and banker; Dr. John Hope, educator; with scores of other prominent and influential men and women.

*Revival period.*—From 1862 to 1890 has fittingly been called the revival period in the religious life of the Negro people. They organized churches by the thousands, baptized converts by the hundreds of thousands, so that within the brief interval of 15 years after the emancipation, approximately 1,000,000 former slaves and their children had been gathered into Baptist churches alone... [The baptized members,] each influencing presumably an average of 3 persons, have had a tremendous power over a large percentage of the race group of more than 12,000,000 souls.

*The National Baptist Convention.*—The first inception of the present National Baptist Convention was born in Montgomery, Ala., November 24, 1880, when 59 delegates reported and 9 States were represented. Rev. W. H. McAlpine was chosen as the first president. The Foreign Mission Baptist Convention of the United States of America was organized by this body. The American National Baptist Convention was organized in St. Louis, in 1886; the American National Educational Baptist Convention was organized in the District of Columbia in 1893. In 1895 all of these bodies united at Atlanta, Ga., and organized the [p. 153] National Baptist Convention of the United States of America. It was incorporated in 1915 under the laws of the District of Columbia. They definitely systematized the work to be carried on by boards selected by the parent body...

*Doctrine and Organization.* In doctrine and polity the Negro Baptists are in close accord with the Northern and Southern Conventions. They represent the more strictly Calvinistic type in doctrine and in polity, "tell it to the Church," and refer the settlement of any difficulties that may arise to an ecclesiastical council. Their churches unite in associations, generally along State lines, for the discussion of topics relating to church life, the regulation of difficulties, the collection of statistics, and the presentation of annual reports. These meetings are consultative and advisory rather than authoritative.

In addition to the county and district associations there are State conventions which are held for the consideration of the distinctively missionary side of church life and not infrequently extend beyond State lines.

The lack of close ecclesiastical relations, characteristic of all Baptist bodies, is emphasized in the Negro Baptist churches, with the result that it has been and is very difficult to obtain satisfactory statistics of the denomination...

No accurate or definite statement of activities of the National Baptist Convention of America has been furnished for 1936. The report furnished is for the National Baptist Convention (incorporated), organized in 1915; its agencies for propagating its work are modeled in every detail after the National Baptist Convention of the United States of America.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership: National Baptist Convention of America, 2,668,799 (1956); National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc., 5,000,000 (1958). See *YAC*, 1961, p. 252.

There seems to be some discrepancy between the last paragraph and the statement on the present status of the two conventions in *YAC* lists first (p. 21) the National Baptist Convention of America, organized 1880; then the National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc. (the one incorporated in 1915?), which is described, rather confusingly, as the "older and parent convention of Negro Baptists," to be distinguished from the National Baptist Convention of America, known as the "unincorporated" body. It is not clear how a church incorporated in 1915 can be the parent of the body organized in 1880. Perhaps there is a conflict

of claims of priority. In any case, these are the two bodies now existing. For other Negro Baptists, see Baptists—National Primitive Baptist Convention of the U.S.A.]

### **198. Baptists—Primitive Baptists**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 224, 225.

[p. 224] *History*. With the development of organized church life shown in the formation of benevolent and particularly of missionary societies, of Sunday schools and similar organizations, during the early part of the nineteenth century, there developed also considerable opposition to such new ideas. The more independent church associations were based on the principle that the Scriptures are the sole and sufficient authority for everything connected with the religious life. The position taken was, in brief, that there were no missionary societies in the apostles' days, and therefore there should be none today. Apart from this, however, there seemed to many to be inherent in these societies a centralization of authority which was not at all in accord with the spirit of the gospel. Sunday schools also were considered unauthorized of God, as was everything connected with church life that was not included in the clearly presented statement of the New Testament writers. These views appeared particularly in some of the Baptist bodies, and occasioned what became known as the "antimission movement."

Apparently the first definite announcement of this position was made by the Kehukee Baptist Association of North Carolina, formed in 1765, at its meeting with the Kehukee Church in Halifax County in 1827, although similar views were expressed by a Georgia association in 1826. The Kehukee Association unanimously condemned all "modern, money-based, so-called benevolent societies," as contrary to the teaching and practice of Christ and His apostles, and, furthermore, announced that it could no longer fellowship with churches which indorsed such societies. In 1832 a similar course was adopted by the Country Line Association, at its session with Deep Creek Church in Alamance (then Orange) County, N. C., and by a "Convention of the Middle States" at Black Rock Church, Baltimore County, Md. Other Baptist associations in the North, South, East, and West, during the next 10 years, took similar action. In 1835 the Chemung Association, including churches in New York and Pennsylvania, adopted a resolution declaring that as a number of associations with which it had been in correspondence had "departed from the simplicity of the doctrine and practice of the gospel of Christ, \*\*\* uniting themselves with the world and what are falsely called benevolent societies founded upon a money basis," and preaching a gospel "differing from the gospel of Christ," it would not continue in fellowship with them, and urged all Baptists who could not approve prove the new ideas to come out and be separate from those holding them.

The various Primitive Baptist associations have never organized as a denomination and have no State conventions or general bodies of any kind. For the purpose of self-interpretation, each association adopted the custom of printing in its annual minutes a statement of its articles of faith, constitution, and rules of order. This presentation was examined carefully by every other association, and, if it was approved, fellowship was accorded by sending to its meetings messengers or letters reporting on the general state of the churches. Any association that did not meet with approval was simply dropped from fellowship. The result was that, while there are certain links binding the different associations together, they are easily broken, and the lack of any central body or even of any uniform statement of belief serves to prevent united action. Another factor in the situation has been the difficulty of intercommunication in many parts of the South. As groups of associations developed in North and South Carolina and Georgia, they drew

together, as did those in western Tennessee, northern Mississippi and Alabama, and Missouri, while those in Texas had little intercourse with any of the others. Occasional fraternal visits were made through all of these sections, and a quasi union or fellowship was kept up, but this has not been sufficient to secure what might be called denominational individually or growth. This is apparent in the variety of names, some friendly and some derisive, which have been applied to them, such as "Primitive," "Old School," "Regular," "Antimission," and "Hard Shell." In general, the term "Primitive" has been the one most widely used and accepted.

*Doctrine.* In matters of doctrine the Primitive Baptists are strongly Calvinistic. Some of their minutes have 11 articles of faith, some less, some more. They declare that by Adam's fall or transgression all his posterity became sinners in the sight [p. 225] of God; that the corruption of human nature is total; that man cannot, by his own free will and ability, reinstate himself in the favor of God; that God elected or chose His people in Christ before the foundation of the world; that sinners are justified only by the righteousness of Christ imputed to them; that the saints will all be preserved and will persevere in grace unto heavenly glory, and that not one of them will be finally lost; that baptism and the Lord's Supper are ordinances of the gospel in the church to the end of time; that the institutions of the day (church societies) are the inventions of men, and are not to be fellowshipped; that Christ will come a second time, in person or bodily presence to the world, and will raise all the dead, judge the human race, send the wicked to everlasting punishment, and welcome the righteous to everlasting happiness. They also hold uncompromisingly to the full verbal inspiration of the Old and New Testament Scriptures.

Some Primitive Baptists maintain, as formulated in the London Baptist Confession of Faith of 1689, that God eternally decreed or predestinated all things, yet in such a manner that He does not compel anyone to sin, and that He does not approve or fellowship sin. The great majority of them, however, maintain that, while God foreknew all things, and while He foreordained to suffer, or not prevent sin, His active and efficient predestination is limited to the eternal salvation of all his people, and everything necessary thereunto; and all Primitive Baptists believe that every sane human being is accountable for all his thoughts, words, and actions.

Immersion of believers is the only form of baptism which they acknowledge, and they insist that this is a prerequisite to the Lord's Supper. They hold that no minister has any right to administer the ordinances unless he has been called of God, come under the laying on of hands by a presbytery, and is in fellowship with the church of which he is a member; and that he has no right to permit any clergyman who has not these qualifications to assist in the administering of these ordinances. In some sections the Primitive Baptists believe that washing the saints' feet should be practiced in the church, usually in connection with the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. Of late years a group of churches in Georgia have used organs in public worship, but most of the churches are earnestly opposed to the use of instrumental music of any kind in church services. Sunday schools and secret societies are unauthorized. These are claimed not to be in accordance with the teachings of the Bible.

*Organization.* In polity the Primitive Baptists are congregational in that they believe that each church should govern itself according to the laws of Christ as found in the New Testament, and that no minister, association, or convention has any authority.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1950), 72,000 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

## 199. Baptists—Seventh Day Baptist

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 163–165.

[p. 163] *History*. From the earliest periods of the Christian church there have been those who claimed, in respect to the Sabbath, that Christ simply discarded the false restrictions with which the Pharisees had burdened and perverted the Sabbath, but that otherwise He preserved it in its full significance. Accordingly, they have held that loyalty to the law of God and to the ordinances and example of Christ required continuance of the observance of the seventh day as the Sabbath. Although the Apostolic church and some branches of it in every period since Christ have observed the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, and practiced immersion, Seventh Day Baptists do not claim an unbroken succession in the matter of church organization before the Reformation.

At the time of the Reformation, when the Bible was accepted as the supreme authority on all questions of faith and conduct, the question of the Sabbath again came to the front, and a considerable number forsook the observance of Sunday and accepted the seventh day as the Sabbath.

The date at which the observance of the Sabbath was introduced into Great Britain is somewhat uncertain. Nicholas Bounde's book, the first book on the sabbath question to be published in the English language, appeared in 1595, only to be suppressed 4 years later. During the next century, numerous other writers on this subject flourished.

There appears to be evidence that, in all, upwards of 30 Seventh Day Baptist churches have been established in Great Britain and Ireland. The most important of these are the Mill Yard, and the Pinner's Hall churches, both of London, England.

The Seventh Day Baptist Church of Mill Yard, Goodman's Fields, London, probably had its origin in 1617, and may be said to have been founded by John Trask and his wife—both school teachers—who were imprisoned for their views upon the Sabbath. The membership roll of this church contains, among its multitude of names, those of the following: Dr. Peter Chamberlen, royal physician to three kings and queens of England; John James, the martyr; Nathaniel Bailey, the compiler of Bailey's Dictionary (upon which Johnson based his famous dictionary), as well as a prolific editor of classical text books; William Tempest, F. R. S., barrister and poet; William Henry Black, archeologist; and others.

The Seventh Day Baptist Church of Pinner's Hall, Broad Street, London, was organized March 5, 1676, at his home, by Rev. Francis Bampfield, Speaker of the House of Commons, under [p. 164] Richard Cromwell, was also a Seventh Day Baptist; and the four generations of famous preachers by the name of Stennett, two of whom were Rev. Joseph Stennett, 2d, D. D., and Rev. Samuel Stennett, D. D.

In 1664 Stephen Mumford, a Seventh Day Baptist, came from London and settled at Newport, R. I. His observance of the Sabbath soon attracted attention, and several members of the Newport church adopted his views and practices, though they did not change their church relation until December 23, 1671 (Old Style), when they organized the first Seventh Day Baptist Church in America. At first this church was composed of those of like faith and practice throughout southern Rhode Island, but in a few years there were groups in various other parts of the colony, as well as in Massachusetts and Connecticut, who joined the church. Seventh Day Baptists in Rhode Island were co-laborers with both Roger Williams and Dr. John Clark in establishing the colony on the principles of civil and religious liberty. In doing this they suffered imprisonment and

other forms of persecution. They also joined with the Baptists in founding and supporting Brown University; and when the struggle with the mother country came they were among the foremost in the colony in the struggle with the mother country came they were among the foremost in the colony in the struggle that secured independence and established the Union.

Some 13 years after the organization of the Newport church, or about 1684, Abel Noble came to America and settled a few miles distant from Philadelphia. Subsequently he became a Seventh Day Baptist, through contact with Rev. William Gillette, M. D., a Seventh Day Baptist clergyman from New England. Abel Noble presented the claims of the Sabbath to his Keithian Baptist neighbors, with the result that some half dozen Seventh Day Baptist churches were organized in and near Philadelphia about the year 1700. Soon after this, or in 1705, Edmund Dunham, who formerly was a licensed preacher in the Baptist church, led in organizing a Seventh Day Baptist church in Piscataway, Middlesex County, N. J.

Under the influence of churches in these three centers (Newport, R. I., Philadelphia, Pa., and Piscataway, N. J.), and fostered by them, Seventh Day Baptist churches have been organized in many parts of the United States, and in China, India, Java, Germany, the Netherlands, Africa, South America, and Jamaica, British West Indies. There are 10 or more other denominations in the United States observing the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, all of which have received their Sabbath teaching from Seventh Day Baptists. Chief among these communions are the German Seventh Day Baptists, founded at Ephrata, Pa., in 1728, and the Seventh Day Adventists, whose organization grew out of the Millerite movement in the middle of the last century.

*Doctrine.* In doctrine Seventh Day Baptists are evangelical and, except for the Sabbath, are in harmony with other Baptists, particularly those of the Northern Convention and Southern Convention. They stand with the Baptists for salvation through personal faith in Christ, believers' baptism on confession of faith, soul liberty, civil liberty, independence of the local church with Christ as its sole head, the Bible in the hands of all men, and the right of everyone to interpret its teachings for himself. They believe that there are only two sacraments, baptism and the Lord's Supper, and that the seventh day of the week should be observed as the Sabbath.

Originally Seventh Day Baptists were restricted communionists and invitations to the Lord's Supper were given "to members of churches in sister relation"; but gradually this has changed, and by common consent invitations are now generally given to Christians of all churches. Neither do Seventh Day Baptists forbid their members to partake of the communion in other churches, the matter being left to the private judgment of each individual. Church membership is granted, however, only to those who have been immersed.

Seventh Day Baptists believe that the seventh day of the week should be observed as the Sabbath, not alone because its observance began with the history of man, was held sacred by the patriarchs and prophets, and commanded from Sinai, but primarily because it was observed and held sacred by Christ and the Apostolic Church. They (Seventh Day Baptists) believe Christ to be the final sanction for the Sabbath.

While Seventh Day Baptists for more than 300 years have held firmly to these doctrines they have always believed Christ would have them be friendly with other Christians and cooperate with them in every good work. Their pastors have [p. 165]

exchanged with pastors of other denominations, their ministers have served as pastors of Baptist churches, in their associations and the General Conferences they have interchanged delegates, and in more recent years they have belonged to the National Bible School organizations, the United Society of Christian Endeavor, the Foreign Missions Conference, the Layman's Missionary Movement, the Federal Council of Churches, the Faith and Order Movement, and other kindred efforts looking toward united work on the part of Christ's followers.

*Organization.* Since the policy of Seventh Day Baptist churches is that of a pure democracy, that fact determines the nature of the organizations among them, as well as the form of the government of the church itself. Each local church is independent in its own affairs, and all union for denominational work is voluntary. For administrative purposes chiefly, the churches are organized into associations and a General Conference, which, however, have only advisory powers. The General Conference was organized in 1802 and grew out of a yearly meeting established in 1684.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1957), 5,963 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253)].

## **200. Baptists—Southern Baptist Convention**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 140, 141.

[p. 140] *History.* At the time of the formation of the Triennial Convention in 1814 the Baptist population was chiefly in New England and the middle and southern seaboard States, and the center of executive administration was located first at Philadelphia and subsequently at Boston. With the growth of migration to the South and the Southwest, the number of churches in those sections of the country greatly increased, and it became difficult to associate in a single advisory council more than a small percentage of the Baptist churches in the United States, especially as means of transportation were deficient and expensive. At the same time the question of slavery occasioned much discussion between the two sections, which was brought to a focus by the impression in the Southern States that the foreign mission society of the denomination, which had its headquarters in Boston, was so thoroughly antislavery that it would not accept a slaveholder as a missionary. A letter addressed direct to that organization by the Alabama State Convention, asking for information, brought a courteous reply to the effect that while the board refused to recognize the claim of anyone, slaveholder or nonslaveholder, to appointment, "one thing was certain, they could never be a party to any arrangement which would imply approbation of slavery."

This decision led to formal withdrawal of the various Southern State conventions and auxiliary foreign mission societies and to the organization at Augusta, Ga., in May 1845, of the Southern Baptist Convention. About 300 churches were represented by delegates from Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, and Kentucky, the largest number of Baptist churches in the South at that period being in Virginia. In all the discussions and in the final act of organization, there was very little bitterness, the prevalent conviction being that those of kindred thought would work more effectively together, and that, in view of the sharp differences between the two sections, it was wiser that separate organizations should exist. The specific purpose of the convention, as plainly set forth, was to carry out the benevolent purposes of those composing it; to elicit, combine, and direct the energies of the denomination for the propagation of the Gospel; and to cooperate for the promotion of foreign and domestic missions and other important objects, while respecting the independence and equal rights of the local churches.

Previous to the Civil War the convention met biennially; since that time, for the most part, it has met annually. At first, its efforts were largely given over to foreign missions, under the direction of the Foreign Mission Board at Richmond, Va., and to home (“domestic”) missions under the direction of the Home Mission Board located first at Marion, Ala., and later at Atlanta, Ga., although a number of the cooperating State Conventions were fostering schools and colleges of various types. The Home Mission board, from the first, moreover, gave its most earnest consideration and its largest help to the mission work carried on in the several States, notably in the States where Baptists were weak. From 1845 onward, therefore, the Southern Baptist Convention fostered foreign missions, home missions, and State missions...

[p. 141] Up to 1860 the missionary work of the convention was carried forward with marked enthusiasm and success. Every department of denominational life was quickened by the increased sense of responsibility and the increased confidence that sprang from direct control. Parallel with this was the growth in numbers and liberality of the denomination, which was strengthened by the standing conflict with the anti-missionary spirit rife throughout the South, and manifest more particularly among the Primitive or “Hardshell,” the United, and Regular Baptists. The denomination suffered severely during the Civil War, but since that time has shown great prosperity.

As was inevitable, emancipation brought about great changes in racial conditions, and, whereas before the war the Negro Baptists were, in large part, identified with the white churches, after the war they formed their own churches, associations, and State conventions, and, later, the National Baptists Convention. The first Negro association to be formed under the new regime was one in Louisiana in 1865, and it was soon followed by others in North Carolina, Alabama, Virginia, Arkansas, and Kentucky. An indication of the development of the Southern convention is found in the fact that, whereas in 1845 the membership of the churches identified with it was 352,950, of whom 222,950 were white and 130,000 Negro, the report for 1890 showed a membership of 1,280,066, consisting of whites alone and by 1935 had become the leading non-Catholic religious body in America, reporting a total of 4,389,417 members...

*Doctrine and Organization.* In doctrine the Southern Baptist churches are in harmony with those of the North, although in general they are more strictly Calvinistic, and the New Hampshire Confession of Faith is more firmly held than in the Northern churches. In polity, likewise, there is no essential difference. The Northern and Southern churches interchange membership and ministry on terms of perfect equality, and their separation is purely administrative in character, not doctrinal or ecclesiastical.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 9,485,276 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

### **201. Beast, First, of Revelation 13—Note in Douay Bible**

SOURCE: Douay Bible (New York: Benziger, [1914]), Note on [Rev. 13:1](#). [See [FRS](#) No. 59.]

Chap. XIII, Ver. 1. *A beast.* This first beast with seven heads and ten horns, is probably the whole company of infidels, enemies and persecutors of the people of God, from the beginning to the end of the world. The seven heads are seven kings, that is, seven principal kingdoms or empires, which have exercised, or shall exercise, tyrannical power over the people of God: of these, five were then fallen, *viz.*:—the Egyptian, Assyrian, Chaldean, Persian, and Grecian monarchies: one was present, *viz.*, and chiefest was to come *viz.*, the great Antichrist and his empire. The ten horns may be understood of ten lesser persecutors.

## 202. Beast, Number of—Note in Douay Bible

SOURCE: Douay Bible (New York: Benziger, [1914]), Note on [Rev. 13:18](#). [See [FRS No. 59](#).]

Ver. 18. *Six hundred sixty-six*. The numeral letters of his name shall make up this number.

## 203. Beast, Second, of Revelation 13, John Wesley's placement of, in Asia

SOURCE: John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament* (reprint; London: The Epworth Press, 1952), p. 1010, comment on [Rev. 13:11](#).

11. *And I saw another wild beast*—So he is once termed, to show his fierceness and strength; but in all other places, 'the false prophet.' He comes to confirm the kingdom of the first beast. *Coming up*—After the other had long exercised his authority. *Out of the earth*—Out of *Asia*. But he is not yet come, though he cannot be far off; for he is to appear at the end of the forty-two months of the first beast.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This interpretation, from a book first published in 1755, anticipates the rise of this beast after the 42 months, but it should be noted that it expects the rise in Asia.]

## 204. Belshazzar, Associated With His Father Nabonidus in Oaths

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15 New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 96, 97.

[p. 96] Cuneiform texts dated in the twelfth year of Nabonidus record oath formulas which are unusual in that Belshazzar is associated with his father on terms of approximate equality. Pinches was the first to publish such an oath formula, the wording of which is as follows [transliterated cuneiform text omitted]: ...

<sup>1</sup>Ishi-Amurru, the son of Nûranu, by the gods Bêl, <sup>2</sup>Nabû, the Bêltu of Erech and Nanâ, the decrees of <sup>3</sup>of Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, and Belshazzar, <sup>4a</sup>the son of the king, took oath as follows.

Two texts in the Yale Babylonian Collection, also dated in the twelfth year of Nabonidus' reign, contain similar oaths...

These three passages show conclusively that the Babylonian oath formula in the twelfth year of the reign of Nabonidus placed Belshazzar on an equality with his father...

[p. 97] From the time of Hammurabi it was the custom of Babylonians to swear by the gods and the reigning king.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines of the original cuneiform text.]

## 205. Belshazzar, Called Eldest Son of Nabonidus

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 93–95.

[p. 93] Four cylinders found in the ziggurat of Ur contain the following prayer of Nabonidus [transliterated cuneiform text omitted]: ...

<sup>19</sup>As for me, Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, <sup>20,21</sup>save me from sinning against thy great divinity and <sup>22,</sup><sup>23</sup>grant life unto distant days as a gift. <sup>24</sup>Furthermore, as for Belshazzar, <sup>25</sup>the first son <sup>26</sup>proceeding from my loins, [p. 94] <sup>27,28</sup>place in his heart fear of thy great divinity and <sup>29,30</sup>let him not turn to sinning; <sup>31</sup>let him be satisfied with fulness of life.

A variant of the above text occurs twice in a large cylinder of Nabonidus found at Ur, as the following passage indicates [transliteration omitted]: ...

<sup>23</sup>[As for me], Nabonidus, the king of Babylon, <sup>24,25</sup>[the venerator of] thy great divinity, may I be satisfied with fulness of life, <sup>26,27</sup>[and as for] Belshazzar, the first son proceeding from my loins, lengthen his days; let him not turn to sinning.

Nabonidus, in supplicating the moon god of the temple at Ur in the earnest petitions given above, places Belshazzar in close association with himself. Such association of a royal father and his son in religious entreaty is rare in cuneiform literature. One other



instance can be mentioned. This is the association of Cambyses with Cyrus, his father, in the inscription of the latter known as the *Cyrus Cylinder*...

[p. 95] A similar association of Belshazzar with Nabonidus suggests that an analogous political elevation had come to the former and that Belshazzar had some share in ruling the Babylonian empire.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines of the original cuneiform text.]

### **206. Belshazzar—Father's Long Absence From Babylon**

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 111–113.

[p. 111] Of supreme importance is the fact that the *Nabonidus Chronicle* records that Nabonidus was in a city called Têmâ in the seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh years of his reign. The exact statements are as follows [transliterated cuneiform text omitted]: ...

In the seventh year the king (was) in the city of Têmâ. The son of the king, the princes (and) his troops (were) in the land of Akkad...

In the ninth year of Nabonidus, the king, (was in) the city of Têmâ. The son of the king, the princes and the troops (were) in the land of Akkad...

[p. 112] In the tenth year the king (was) in the city of Têmâ. The son of the king, the princes and his troops (were) in the land of Akkad...

In the eleventh year the king (was) in the city of Têmâ. The son of the king, the princes and his army (were) in the land of Akkad...

Each of the above initial statements for the seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh years of the reign of Nabonidus is supplemented by the following comment: [transliteration omitted]: ...

The king for the month Nisan did not come to Babylon; Nabû did not come to Babylon; Bêl did not go forth (from Esagila); the New Year's festival ceased (*i.e.* was not celebrated).

The passages of the *Nabonidus Chronicle* quoted above indicate that Nabonidus was in city of Têmâ during the years mentioned and that the son of the king, *i.e.* Belshazzar, was with the princes and [p. 113] troops in the land of Akkad. The non-observance of the New Year's festival was a natural result of Nabonidus' prolonged sojourn at a great distance from Babylon.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines as they appear in the original cuneiform text.]

### **207. Belshazzar, Kingship of, With His Father**

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 105–107.

[p. 105] The remarkable inscription published by Sidney Smith under the title *A Persian Verse Account of Nabonidus* [p. 106] ... indicates that affairs in Babylonia were entrusted to Belshazzar, in order that Nabonidus might proceed against Têmâ. The campaign is described with graphic details...

<sup>18</sup>He entrusted a camp to his eldest, firstborn son; <sup>19</sup>the troops of the land he sent with him. <sup>20</sup>He freed his hand; he entrusted the kingship to him. <sup>21</sup>Then he himself undertook a distant campaign; <sup>22</sup>the power of the land of Akkad advanced with him; <sup>23</sup>towards T□mf in the midst of the Westland [p. 170] he set his face. <sup>24</sup>He undertook a distant campaign on a road not within reach of old. <sup>25</sup>He slew the prince of T□mf with the [sword]; <sup>26</sup>the dwellers in his city (and) country, all of them they slaughtered. <sup>27</sup>Then he himself established his dwelling [in Têmâ]; the power of the land of Akkad... That city he made and glorious; he made ...; <sup>29</sup>they made it like the palace of Babylon...

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines of the original cuneiform text.]

### **208. Belshazzar, Kingship of, With His Father Nabonidus**

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 134, 135.

[p. 134] Inscriptions of varied type have been adduced as proof that Belshazzar was an administrator of government in Babylonia during Nabonidus' absence in Arabia. The historical texts quoted are of fundamental importance, since the two inscriptions available for interpretation, viz., *A Persian Verse Account of Nabonidus* and the *Nabonidus Chronicle*, contain statements which are not contradictory, but which lead to the same conclusion. One of the records is a descriptive account; the other is an annalistic chronicle. This difference in their character as literature adds significance to the fact that they supplement and corroborate one another so adequately. The former indicates that Nabonidus conquered Tê mâ of his reign; the latter shows that Nabonidus was in the Westland soon after he became king and that he was at Tê mâ in the seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh years of his reign. Each inscription, unsupported by the other, Belshazzar's administrative position in Babylonia during the period when Nabonidus was interested in Tê mâ. Their combined testimony is authentic evidence of the highest value.

Another type of Neo-Babylonian literature, viz., records of business transactions dated in the reign of Nabonidus, have been found to reveal the same historical situation. The validity of the contents of contract tablets is unquestioned. Coming from ancient archives, these documents are genuine and reliable. Each tablet represents a [p. 135] transaction which occurred at a certain time and place. The interested persons are mentioned by name, temple officials often participating in the agreement which is recorded. These considerations emphasize the worth of the two texts which show that there was contact by means of camel transportation between Erech and Tê mâ during the reign of Nabonidus. A Neo-Babylonian sphere of influence in the heart of Arabia is indicated. The inscription which refers to the fact that food for the king was taken to Tê mâ in the tenth year of Nabonidus is direct corroboration of the information conveyed by the *Nabonidus Chronicle*. Data presented by the two leases of land, one from the king himself in the first year of Nabonidus reign and one from Belshazzar in the eleventh year of his father's reign, may be regarded as throwing a great deal of light upon the period. Belshazzar is portrayed as exercising a jurisdiction which was Nabonidus' prerogative before he went to Tê mâ.

### **209. Belshazzar, Kingship of, With Nabonidus for Some Years**

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), p. 193.

A cuneiform text states that Nabonidus empowered Belshazzar with 'the kingship' in the third year of his reign. All accessible cuneiform documents capable of throwing light upon the situation indicate that Belshazzar occupied this high position until the fourteenth year of Nabonidus' reign and the probability is that he functioned as co-regent until the end of the reign. There is no room for doubt that Belshazzar ruled in the kingdom next to Nabonidus. The writer of the fifth chapter of Daniel comports with cuneiform data in picturing the chief character of his narrative as having enjoyed kingly dignity.

### **210. Belshazzar, Last Feast of—Arnold's Descriptive Poem**

SOURCE: Edwin Arnold, "The Feast of Belshazzar," *Poems* (Boston: Roberts Brothers), pp. 160–170.

[p. 160] High on a throne of ivory and gold,  
 From crown to footstool clad in purple fold,  
 Lord of the east from sea to distant sea  
 The king Belshazzar feasteth royally—...  
 Vessels of silver, cups of crusted gold  
 Blush with a brighter red than all they hold; ...

[p. 161] And bright and brighter at the festal board  
The flagons bubble and the wines are poured; ...

Whence came the anxious eye, the altered tone,  
The dull presentiment no heart would own,  
That ever changed the smiling to a sigh  
Sudden as sea-bird flashing from the sky:—  
It is not that they know the spoiler waits  
Harnessed for battle at the brazen gates...

[p. 162] The king hath felt it and the heart  
Heaved the broad purple of his belted breast;  
Sudden he speaks—“What! doth the beaded juice  
“Savor like hyssop that ye scorn its use?  
“Wear ye so pitiful and sad a soul  
“That tramp of foeman scares ye from the bowl? ...

[p. 163] “No—let them batter till the brazen bars  
“Ring merry mocking of their idle wars—  
“Their fall is fated for to-morrow’s sun,  
“The lion rouses when his feast is done:—  
“Crown me a cup—and fill the bowls we brought  
“From Judah’s temple when the fight was fought—  
“Drink, till the merry madness fill the soul  
“To Salem’s conqueror in Salem’s bowl...”

His eager lips are on the jewelled brink,  
Hath the cup poison that he doubts to drink?  
Is there a spell upon the sparkling gold,  
That so his fevered fingers quit their hold?  
Whom sees he where he gazes? what is there  
Freezing his vision into fearful stare?  
Follow his lifted arm and lighted eye  
And watch with them the wondrous mystery.—

[p. 164] There cometh forth a hand—upon the stone,  
Graving the symbols of a speech unknown;  
Fingers like mortal fingers—leaving there  
The blank wall flashing characters of fear;—  
And still it glideth silently and slow,  
And still beneath the spectral letters grow—  
Now the scroll endeth—now the seal is set—  
The hand is gone—the record tarries yet.—

As one who waits the warrant of his death,  
With pale lips parted and with bridled breath—  
They watch the sign and dare not turn to seek  
Their fear reflected in their fellows’ cheek—  
But stand as statues where the life is none,  
Half the jest uttered—half the laughter done...

With wand of ebony and sable stole  
Chaldea’s wisest scan the spectral scroll—

[p. 165] Strong in the lessons of a lying art  
Each comes to gaze, but gazes to depart—  
And still for mystic sign and muttered spell  
The graven letters guard their secret well—  
Gleam they for warning—glare they to condemn—  
God speaketh,—but he speaketh not for them...

[p. 166] So in the silence of that awful hour  
When baffled magic mourned its parted power—  
When kings were pale and satraps shook for fear,  
A woman speaketh—and the wisest hear;—  
She—the high daughter of a thousand thrones  
Telling with trembling lip and timid tones  
Of him the Captive, in the feast forgot,  
Who readeth visions—him, whose wondrous lot  
Sends him to lighten doubt and lessen gloom,  
And gaze undazzled on the days to come—  
Daniel the Hebrew, such his name and race,  
Held by a monarch highest in his grace,  
He may declare—Oh!—bid them quickly send,  
So may the mystery have happy end! ...

[p. 167] So through the hall the Prophet passed along,  
So from before him fell the festal throng.  
By broken wassail-cup, and wine o'erthrown  
Pressed he still onward for the monarch's throne.  
His spirit failed him not—his quiet eye  
Lost not its light for earthly majesty;  
His lip was steady and his accent clear,  
“The king hath needed me, and I am here.”—

“Art thou the Prophet? read me yonder scroll  
“Whose undeciphered horror daunts my soul—  
“There shall be guerdon for the grateful task,  
“Fitted for me to give, for thee to ask—  
“A chain to deck thee—and a robe to grace,  
“Thine the third throne and thou the third in place.” ...

[p. 168] “Keep for thyself the guerdon and the gold—  
“What God hath graven, God's prophet must unfold...

[p. 169] “Hear what he sayeth now, ‘Thy race is run,  
“The years are numbered and the days are done,  
“Thy soul hath mounted in the scale of fate,  
“The Lord hath weighed thee and thou lackest weight;  
“Now in thy palace porch the spoilers stand,  
“To seize thy sceptre, to divide thy land.””

[p. 170] He ended—and his passing foot was heard,  
But none made answer, not a lip was stirred—  
Mute the free tongue and bent the fearless brow,—  
The mystic letters had their meaning now!

Soon came there other sound—the clash of steel,  
The heavy ringing of the iron heel—  
The curse in dying, and the cry for life,  
The bloody voices of the battle strife.—

That night they slew him on his father's throne,  
The deed unnoticed and the hand unknown;  
Crownless and sceptreless Belshazzar lay,  
A robe of purple, round a form of clay.

### **211. Belshazzar, Last Feast of—Palace Banquet Hall**

SOURCE: Robert Koldewey, *The Excavations at Babylon*, trans. by Agnes S. Johns (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1914), pp. 103, 104. Used by permission.

[p. 103] To the south lies the largest chamber of the Citadel, the throneroom of the Babylonian kings. It is so clearly marked out for this purpose that no reasonable doubt can be felt as to its having been used as their principal audience chamber. If any one should desire to localise the scene of Belshazzar's eventual banquet, he can surely place it with complete accuracy in this immense room. It is 17 metres broad and 52 metres long. The walls on the longest side [p. 104] are 6 metres thick, considerably in excess of those at the ends, and lead us to suppose that they supported a barrel-vaulting, of which, however, there is no proof. A great central door and two equally important side doors open upon the court. Immediately opposite the main door in the back wall there is a doubly recessed niche in which doubtless the throne stood, so that the king could be visible to those who stood in the court, an arrangement similar to that of the Ninmach temple, where the temple statue could be clearly seen from the court. The pavement does not consist in the usual manner of a single layer of brick, but of at least six, which were laid in asphalt and thus formed a homogeneous solid platform which rested on a projecting ledge built out from the walls. As we have already seen from the east gate, the walls of these chambers were washed over with white gypsum.

The facade of the court was very strikingly decorated with richly ornamented enamelled tiles (*M.D.O.-G.* No. 13). On a dark blue ground are yellow columns with bright blue capitals, placed near together and connected by a series of palmettos. The capitals with the bold curves of their double volutes remind us of the forms long known to us in Cyprus... Above was a frieze of white double palmettos, bordered below by a band of squares, alternately yellow, black, and white. The various colours of the decoration were effectively heightened on the dark background by means of white borders.

### **212. Belshazzar—Relationship to Nebuchadnezzar**

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 38, 43, 59, 60–63, 70.

[p. 38] After explaining the achievements of Nitocris, Herodotus ... affirms (*a*) that Cyrus undertook an expedition against the son of Nitocris, (*b*) that the husband of Nitocris was Labynetus, *i.e.* Nabonidus, and (*c*) that the son of 'that woman' possessed the name of his father as well as the sovereign power of Babylonia... [p. 43] Heretofore critical students of Herodotus' account [i. 188] have favored the view that he really looked upon Nitocris as the wife of Nebuchadnezzar and the mother of Nabonidus. There is very little that can be used in defense of this interpretation. Enough evidence has been presented to make it apparent (*a*) that the Labynetus of Herodotus was Nabonidus, that Nitocris was the wife of Nabonidus, and (*c*) that their son was a man of authority in the

kingdom... [p. 59] [Many facts] indicate the probability as well as the possibility that Nebuchadrezzar wedded an Egyptian princess. [p. 60] ... That a daughter of Nebuchadrezzar by his Egyptian consort should have been named Nitocris is entirely believable, and that this daughter should have become the spouse of Nabonidus may be looked upon as a normal incident in the course of events.

The view that Nabonidus was connected with the family of Nebuchadrezzar by marriage is supported by a reasonable interpretation of data derived from ancient documents, as the following summary reveals:

(a) It is an established fact that Nabonidus married long enough before he became king to have a son old enough to be entrusted with the kingship in the third year (553 B.C.) of his reign. In addition to this, there is evidence that Belshazzar was mature enough in the accession year (560 B.C.) of Neriglissar to perform the functions of a chief officer of the king. Therefore it is very probable that Nabonidus was no longer unmarried in 585 B.C., when he acted as a mediator between the Lydians and the Medes. If Nitocris, his wife, was a daughter of Nebuchadrezzar, his appointment as a peace envoy to act with the Syennesis of Cilicia finds a ready explanation. A most suggestive parallel exists in the part played by Neriglissar, a son-in-law of Nebuchadrezzar, at Jerusalem in 586 B.C.

[p. 61] (b) If the wife of Nabonidus was a daughter of Nebuchadrezzar, one would expect the firstborn son of this union to be given responsibility in a position of prominence as soon as he was old enough to assume it. A grandson of Nebuchadrezzar would rise quickly to a post of authority. The reference [in a Babylonian record] to a Belshazzar who served as a chief officer of the king before Nabonidus ascended the throne supplies this link in the chain of evidence...

[p. 62] (e) Belshazzar was made coregent in the third year of Nabonidus' reign. His early exaltation to kingly rank may be best explained on the assumption that he was Nebuchadrezzar's grandson through Nitocris, his mother. With the blood of the kings of the Neo-Babylonian dynasty in his veins, he could inspire an allegiance equal to that which was shown his father, who as actual king was not debarred from his supreme position until Cyrus captured Babylon in 539 B.C. ...

[p. 63] (h) In the time of Darius the Great two persons, viz., Nidintu-Bêl, the Babylonian, and Arah, the Armenian, pretended to be Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabonidus, for the purpose of stirring up revolt against the Persian king. This indicates that Nabonidus must have had a son who was called Nebuchadrezzar, or else such claims could not have been made. What is more natural than that a son of Nabonidus should have been called Nebuchadrezzar if Nitocris, the mother, was a daughter of Nebuchadrezzar, the famous Neo-Babylonian king? ...

The foregoing discussion has drawn two highly-probable deductions from this passage [Herodotus i. 188], viz., (a) that Nitocris was the wife of Labynetus (Nabonidus), and (b) that Nitocris was the daughter of Nebuchadrezzar by an Egyptian wife...

[p. 70] Whether the consort of Nabonidus was actually the daughter of an Egyptian princess married to Nebuchadrezzar will be decided as the work of cuneiform decipherment proceeds. The theory submitted has resulted from the subjection of data now at hand to a consistent analysis. Future discoveries will verify or refute the hypothetical solution which has been presented.

### **213. Belshazzar, "Second Ruler"**

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 136, 137,

[p. 136] The different types of cuneiform literature, which deal in any way with the question of Belshazzar's participation in governmental administration during Nabonidus' absence in Arabia, are in complete agreement. It should be noted, however, that no cuneiform text applies the term *šarru* to Belshazzar. His title remains *mâr šarri*, 'the son of the king.' The title *šarru*, 'king,' is ascribed to Nabonidus as the real sovereign. A text in the Yale Babylonian Collection indicates that Belshazzar was subject to the commands of Nabonidus...

[p. 137]<sup>1</sup> The seed field of the god B□l, which in the month Nisan of the seventh year of Nabonidus, <sup>2</sup>the king of Babylon, Belshazzar, the son of the king, <sup>3</sup>at the command of the king divided for the tax-masters.

It is specifically stated in the *Nabonidus Chronicle* that Nabonidus was in Têma in the seventh year of his reign and that he did not come to Babylon for the festival in the month of Nisan. Hence the passage just quoted shows that Nabonidus while in Têma issued a command to Belshazzar in Babylonia and that this command was carried out. It is very evident that Nabonidus, although absent from Babylonia, did not relinquish his position as first ruler in the empire. All the fully-dated documents of his reign specify him as king. Furthermore, when Nabonidus and Belshazzar are mentioned together, precedence is never given to the latter. This detracts in no wise, however, from the royal rôle played by Belshazzar. Nabonidus himself states that he entrusted *šarrûiam*, 'the kingship', or 'the kingdom,' to his eldest son. Belshazzar was undoubtedly the second ruler in the land.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures indicate the lines of the original cuneiform text.]

#### **214. Beverages—Cocoa, Theobromine Content of**

SOURCE: Robert G. Martinek and Walter Wolman, "Xanthines, Tannins, and Sodium in Coffee, Tea, and Cocoa," *JAMA*, 158 (July 23, 1955), 1030. Copyright 1955 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

Analyses indicate that there is over twice as much xanthine (theobromine) present in a cup of cocoa ... as there is xanthine (caffeine) in coffee or tea.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Theobromine is closely related to caffeine.]

#### **215. Beverages—Coffee, Caffeine and Other Substances in**

SOURCE: Arthur Grollman, *Pharmacology and Therapeutics* (4th ed., rev.), p. 219. Copyright 1960 by Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The coffee bean contains about 1 to 2 per cent caffeine, and a cup of coffee is equivalent to 0.1 to 0.2 gram of caffeine along with some volatile substances, such as furfuralcohol, produced by the roasting; these have been called *Coffeol* and resemble in their action the volatile oils.

#### **216. Beverages—Coffee—Caffeine Habituation Possible**

SOURCE: Victor A. Drill, ed., *Pharmacology in Medicine* (2d ed.), part 6, chap. 23, p. 304. Copyright 1958 by the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The problem arises whether or not caffeine produces a habituation or addiction following continued use. Defining habituation as the mental craving for a drug on withdrawal and addiction as mental and physical dependence manifested by physical signs as well as mental on withdrawal, there can be no doubt that habituation takes place. If an individual does not receive his morning cup of coffee, he has a mental desire which leads to irritation and nervousness. In some individuals a definite pattern of headache follows withdrawal of the morning cup of coffee.

#### **217. Beverages—Coffee Compared With Other Drinks, as to Acid Effect**

SOURCE: J. A. Roth and others, "Caffeine and 'Peptic' Ulcer," *JAMA*, 126 (Nov. 25, 1944), 818, 819. Copyright 1944 by American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

[p. 818] Comparing the total output of free acid from each of the beverages with that from coffee for a period of seventy minutes, the average response to tea was 60 per cent, to "Postum" 59.3 per cent, to coffee with sugar and cream 59.7 per cent, to "Sanka" 75.3 per cent and to "Coca Cola" 89.5 per cent of the response to coffee. Although "Sanka" contains relatively little caffeine, it provokes [p. 819] considerable stimulation of gastric secretion, presumably because of its content of other secretagogues... We have confirmed the report that a so-called decaffeinated coffee preparation stimulated gastric secretion in patients with hyperchlorhydria and "peptic" ulcer about the same as coffee...

The ulcer patients have consistently shown a prolonged secretory response to the coffee test meal, maintaining a high level of acidity at the termination of the test. However, in the few instances in which it was tried a coffee substitute which contains no caffeine did not provoke a hypercontinuous secretion of gastric juice.

### **218. Beverages—Coffee, Decaffeinated, Impossible to Extract All Caffeine From**

SOURCE: Robert G. Martinek and Walter Wolman, "Xanthines, Tannins, and Sodium in Coffee, Tea, and Coca," *JAMA*, 158 (July 23, 1955), 1030. Copyright 1955 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

Instant coffee is prepared by extracting ground roasted coffee with water. The powdered soluble coffee remains after evaporation of the water from this extract. Decaffeinated coffees are generally prepared by steaming the green beans under pressure to soften them and by dissolving and extracting the caffeine with such organic solvents as benzene, chloroform, or alcohol. The residual solvent in the bean is then removed by re-steaming before the roasting process. As yet it has not been possible to extract all the caffeine in commercially prepared coffee. During the roasting process, previously colorless tannins in the coffee bean are oxidized to colored products.

### **219. Beverages—Coffee Drinking Classified With Other Drug Habits**

SOURCE: Editorial, "Minor Vices," *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 250 (May 13, 1954), 845. Copyright 1954 by the Massachusetts Medical Society, Boston. Used by permission.

It is reasonable to classify the coffee-drinking, or caffeine, "habit" with the other drug habits—opiates, alcohol, barbiturates and nicotine.

### **220. Beverages—Coffee, Effects of**

SOURCE: [Milton Arlanden Bridges], *Bridges' Dietetics for the Clinician*, 5th ed., rev. and ed. by Harry J. Johnson, p. 191. Copyright 1949 by Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

According to Voit (1936) a reduction of 23 per cent in target efficiency was observed in 10 soldiers subjected to six thousand tests following the ingestion of coffee. Caffeine-free coffee did not diminish their accuracy, although it produced the same psychic and euphoristic effects as the caffeinated beverage.

### **221. Beverages—Coffee Not a Food**

SOURCE: William Veale Thorpe, *Biochemistry for Medical Students* (6th ed.; Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1956), p. 463. Used by permission of J. B. Lippincott Company and J. & A. Churchill, Ltd., London.

Coffee is the roasted seed of the cherry-like fruit of *Coffea arabica*. The aroma is due to an oil, **caffeol**, formed when the beans are roasted. Like tea, the infusion, although containing more solids, is of little calorific value and contains caffeine and tannic acid in amounts of the same order as in tea infusion. Neither tea nor coffee, unless they are taken with milk and sugar, can be regarded as foods. Their value is largely due to the



pharmacological properties of caffeine. Coffee is frequently mixed with the caffeine-free roasted root of the wild endive, *chicory*.

### **222. Beverages—Coffee, Origin and History of**

SOURCE: Morris B. Jacobs, ed., *The Chemistry and Technology of Food and Food Products*, Vol. 2 (2d ed., rev.; 1951), p. 1656. Copyright 1951 by Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

Coffee was first mentioned in literature by Rhazes, an Arabian physician, about A.D. 900. It was first a food, then a wine, a medicine, and finally a beverage. Its use as a beverage dates back 700 years...

The coffee tree is indigenous to Ethiopia. From there its propagation spread to Arabia in the seventeenth century and then to India, Ceylon, and Java, and in the eighteenth century it was introduced into Martinique, Surinam, Brazil, the Philippines and Mexico. Its most recent development has been in Indochina in 1887 and British East Africa in 1901.

The beverage was introduced from Arabia into Turkey, where the coffee house began in 1554, to Venice in 1615, to France in 1644, to England and Vienna in 1650, and to North America in 1668.

### **223. Beverages—Coffee Plant, Description of**

SOURCE: Artemas Ward, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Food* (1929 ed.), p. 131. Copyright 1923 by The Baker & Taylor Company, New York. Used by permission of Peter Smith, Gloucester, Mass., publisher.

The coffee-shrub is an evergreen plant which in its native growth may become a slender tree of ten to twenty feet in height... Under cultivation the shrub is kept in a condition of short, close growth, from four to six feet high, so as to increase the crop and to facilitate picking... The fruit, which quickly follows the flower, is a fleshy berry...

The flesh, or pulp, of the fruit, sweet and agreeable in flavor ..., encloses two seeds, or beans... These seeds constitute the raw coffee of commerce. They are generally oval, rounded on one side and flat on the other where they rest together...

The bulk of the coffee found in the world's markets is of varieties of the Arabian coffee-plant (*Coffea arabica*).

### **224. Beverages—Coffee Plant, Description of**

SOURCE: Morris B. Jacobs, ed., *The Chemistry and Technology of Food and Food Products*, Vol. 2 (2d ed., rev.; 1951), pp. 1659, 1660. Copyright 1951 by Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1659] The coffee tree is a small tree or large shrub growing to a height of 12 to 20 ft., and belonging to the madder family (*Rubiaceae*)... The plant produces waxy white flowers which spring from the axils of the leaves, these flowers giving place to the fruit or berry, which is about the size and appearance of a small cherry, and develops a red or crimson color as it ripens...

[p. 1660] The species of the coffee plants most cultivated for its berries is *Coffea arabica*.

### **225. Beverages—Cola Drinks, Caffeine Present in**

SOURCE: Editorial, "Minor Vices," *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 250 (May 13, 1954), 846. Copyright 1954 by the Massachusetts Medical Society, Boston. Used by permission.

It is pertinent to recall that the popular "cola" drinks get their appeal from their caffeine content; should not "cola" addiction also be classed as drug addiction? There are tea addicts, too... Perhaps, after all, food addiction is the most devastating of the minor

vices. As Masfield so tersely phrased it, “A carelessness of life and beauty marks the glutton, the idler, and the fool.”

### **226. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving**

SOURCE: R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, Vol. 3, p. 124. Copyright 1955 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands. Used by permission.

We should also mention a side-line of viticulture. In the period we are discussing [500 B.C.—A.D. 1500] sugar was either unknown or an imported luxury. Hence honey was its substitute but as supplies were rather short, grape-juice was used as a substitute and often called so (*mellis vice*)... Must [grape juice] could be kept a year, the Romans filled it in jars, shut and sealed them tightly and immersed them in cold river or seawater, thus stopping fermentation. It could be evaporated in lead-lined vessels and used as a sweetening ingredient. Reduced to half its volume it was called “defrutum”, to 2/3 [rather, to 1/3; see No. 229] “sapa”. Quite an appreciable percentage of the must of the vineyards was turned into “defrutum” and “sapa”. We even now of factories of this substitute honey, some was imported from Syria. It was used to preserve olives and all kinds of food.

### **227. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (Boiled Down, Lasts Up to a Year)**

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* xiv. 24 121; translated by H. Rackham. Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), pp. 265, 267. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 265] Moreover, medicaments for this purpose are also made from the must itself: it is boiled down so as to become sweeter in proportion to its strength, and it is said that must so treated does not last beyond a year’s time. In some places they boil the must down into what is called sapa, [p. 267] and pour this into their wines to overcome their harshness. Still both in the case of this kind of wine and in all others they supply the vessels themselves with coatings of pitch.

### **228. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (Boiled Down, May Keep for a Year)**

SOURCE: Columella *On Agriculture* xii. 19. 3, 5; 20. 1, 3; 21. 1; translated by E. S. Forster and Edward H. Heffner, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), pp. 229, 231, 233, 235, 237. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 229] We shall pick the ripest possible grapes, and when they have been trodden, we shall carry from the vat to the boiling-vessels as much as we require of the [p. 231] must which has flowed from them before the pedicles of the grapes are removed from the winepress, and we shall heat the furnace at first with a gentle fire and with only very small pieces of wood, which the country people call *cremia* (brushwood), so that the must may boil in a leisurely manner... Next, when the vessel can stand a fiercer fire, that is, when the must, being partly boiled away, is in a state of internal seething, stems of trees and larger pieces of wood should be put underneath...

[p. 233] XX. Furthermore, boiled-down must, though carefully made, is, like wine, apt to go sour. This being so, let us be mindful to preserve our wine with boiled-down must of a year old, the soundness of which has been already tested... The more the must is boiled down,—provided it be not burnt—the better and the thicker it becomes. Of this boiled-down must, when it has been thus treated, it is enough if one *sextarius* is mixed with one *amphora* of wine. When you have boiled ninety *amphorae* of must in the

boiling-cauldron to such an extent that only a little of the whole remains (which means that it has been boiled down to a third), [p. 235] then, and not before, add the preservatives [pitch, resin, herbs, and spices]...

[p. 237] XXI. Must of the sweetest possible flavour will be boiled down to a third of its original volume and when boiled down, as I have said above, is called *defrutum*. When it has cooled down, it is transferred to vessels and put in store that use may be made of it after a year. But it can also be added to wine nine days after it has cooled; but it is better if it has remained undisturbed for a year.

3

### **229. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (by Boiling Down)**

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* xiv. 11. 80–82; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 241. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Siraeum, by some called hepsema and in our country sapa, is a product of art, not of nature, made by boiling down must to a third of its quantity; must boiled down to only one-half is called *defrutum*. All these wines have been devised for adulterating with honey; but the wines previously mentioned are the product of the grape and of the soil. Next after the raisin-wine of Crete those of Cilicia and of Africa are held in esteem. Raisin-wine is known to be made in Italy and in the neighbouring provinces from the grape called by the Greeks *psithia* and by us ‘muscatel,’ and also *scripula*, the grapes being left on the vine longer than usual to ripen in the sun, or else being ripened in boiling oil. Some people make this wine from any sweet white grape that ripens early, drying them in the sun till little more than half their weight remains, and then they beat them and gently press out the juice.

### **230. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (by Cooling, Kept for a Year)**

SOURCE: Columella *On Agriculture* xii. 29; translated by E. S. Forster and Edward H. Heffner, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 255. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

XXIX. That must may remain always as sweet as though it were fresh, do as follows. Before the grape-skins are put under the press, take from the vat some of the freshest possible must and put it in a new wine-jar; then daub it over and cover it carefully with pitch, that thus no water may be able to get in. Then sink the whole flagon in a pool of cold, fresh water so that no part of it is above the surface. Then after forty days take it out of the water. The must will then keep sweet for as much as a year.

### **231. Beverages—Grape Juice, Ancient Methods of Preserving (in Sealed Casks Under Water)**

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History*, xiv. 11. 83; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), pp. 241, 243. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 241] Between the sirops and real wine is the liquor that the Greeks call *aigleucos*—this is our ‘permanent must.’ Care is needed for its production, as it must not

---

<sup>3</sup>Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

be allowed to 'boil'—that is the word they use to denote [fermentation, or] the passage of must into wine. Consequently, as soon as the must is taken from the vat and put into [p. 243] casks, they plunge the casks in water till midwinter passes and regular cold weather sets in.

### **232. Beverages—Tea and Coffee—Effects of Excessive Consumption**

SOURCE: Torald H. Sollman, *A Manual of Pharmacology* (8th ed.), p. 269. Copyright 1957 by W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission of the publisher and the author.

The effects of excessive coffee consumption differ only in details from tea. Both interfere with digestion, the coffee through the irritant effects of its volatile oil, the tea through the coagulant action of the tannic acid. The caffeine itself probably contributes to the digestive derangement through its vasodilator action. This may account for the common tendency to hemorrhoids.

### **233. Beverages—Tea and Coffee, Effects of, on Central Nervous System**

SOURCE: William T. Salter, *A Textbook of Pharmacology*, p. 242. Copyright 1952 by W. B. Saunders Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The chief problem with the methyl xanthine beverages, of course, is the possible chronic effect on the central nervous system. Excessive and prolonged use of these drugs clearly may lead to increased irritability, loss of sleep, palpitation of the heart and even muscular tremors. Such effects are due to chronic mild intoxication with caffeine. Tea contains over twice as much caffeine as coffee but as it is ordinarily brewed there is approximately the same amount of caffeine present in the ordinary cup of tea as in a cup of coffee, i.e., 150 mg. In both cases, the nervous effects are due primarily to caffeine. Certain widely used soft drinks, especially popular in the southern United States, also contain as much caffeine as ordinary coffee.

### **234. Beverages—Tea and Coffee, Effects of, on Gastric Digestion**

SOURCE: Arthur Grollman, *Pharmacology and Therapeutics* (4th ed., rev.), p. 219. Copyright 1960 by Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The wakefulness and the relief from fatigue which are produced by tea and coffee are undoubtedly due to the caffeine contained in them. On the other hand, the feeling of well-being and comfort produced by coffee after a full meal is similar to the carminative effects of the volatile oils and appears to be due to the local action in the stomach of the volatile constituents of coffee. There is a widespread belief that excessive tea-drinking disturbs gastric digestion and this has generally been attributed to the tannic acid contained in it. It is not unlikely that the caffeine and theophylline may also play a part in this gastric action by causing irritation of the mucous membrane. Excessive consumption of tea or coffee may produce, in addition to digestive disturbances, increased nervous excitability, tremor, palpitation and insomnia, effects directly due to the caffeine content to these beverages.

### **235. Beverages—Tea and Radioactivity**

SOURCE: "Some Foods Are 'Hot,'" *Chemical and Engineering News*, 36 (Oct. 27, 1958), 38. Copyright 1958 by the American Chemical Society. Used by permission.

Tea harvested in 1956 and 1957 showed radioactivity that averaged 30 times greater than samples harvested before 1945.

### **236. Beverages—Tea, Caffeine and Other Substances in**

SOURCE: Arthur Grollman, *Pharmacology and Therapeutics* (4th ed., rev.), p. 219. Copyright 1960 by Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Tea leaves contain more caffeine than the coffee bean, but since a relatively smaller quantity of the leaves are used in preparing tea, this beverage contains slightly less caffeine than does coffee. In green tea there is a considerable quantity of a volatile oil which also passes into the infusion, and the flavor of black tea also arises from volatile substances (*Theon*). Both black and green tea contain about 7 per cent of tannic acid, but this is only extracted slowly; however, the bitter taste in tea that has been prepared too long is due to the tannic acid.

### **237. Beverages—Tea, Caffeine and Tannic Acid in**

SOURCE: William Veale Thorpe, *Biochemistry for Medical Students* (6th ed.; Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1956), p. 463. Used by permission of J. B. Lippincott Company and J. & A. Churchill, Ltd., London.

The black tea ordinarily sold consists of the leaves of young shoots of the tea plant which have been fermented and dried by heat. In green tea the fermentation is omitted. The infusion consumed is of negligible calorific value. Its chief interest lies in two constituents, a stimulant and diuretic, **caffeine**, and an astringent, **tannic acid**. The former, which is present to the extent of 2%–4% in the dry tea, is readily soluble and is quickly extracted when tea is made. The latter (5%–15%) is less soluble and only passes into the infusion slowly; this accounts, in part, for the increased bitterness of the liquid which has stood over the leaves for some time. A cup of strong tea contains about 0.1 g. (1½ grains) of caffeine. Strong tea, largely owing to the tannic acid, retards gastric digestion.

### **238. Beverages—Tea, Caffeine and Tannin in**

SOURCE: Robert G. Martinek and Walter Wolman, "Xanthines, Tannins, and Sodium in Coffee, Tea, and Coca," *JAMA*, 158 (July 23, 1955), 1030. Copyright 1955 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

The potential caffeine content per cup prepared from bulk black tea is comparable to that from regular ground bean coffee, although, if prepared according to the label, about 65% of the leaf's caffeine is extracted... There is about three-quarters the amount of caffeine in green tea as in black tea. In general, the tannin content of tea is roughly four times that of coffee. The lower amounts of caffeine and tannins per cup obtained with tea bags are simply the result of the smaller amounts of tea used in each bag, as compared with the amounts recommended for use on the label of the bulk teas.

### **239. Beverages—Tea, Two General Classes of**

SOURCE: Robert G. Martinek and Walter Wolman, "Xanthines, Tannins, and Sodium in Coffee, Tea, and Cocoa," *JAMA*, 158 (July 23, 1955), 1030. Copyright 1955 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

Teas are classified into two general classes, black tea and green tea. The differences arise from the treatment applied to the leaf. Black tea is a fermented product. The fermentation process (oxidation) reduces the astringency of the leaf and changes the color, aroma, flavor, strength, and body of its liquor. Upon fermentation of the tea the colorless tannins turn red or brown, which gives the tea its characteristic color. Green tea is a preparation in which the fermentation process has been arrested by steaming the green leaf and then drying it. The tannins in green teas are in their colorless state, and the lack of formation of the red or brown tannins is considered one measure of a good green tea. Of the xanthines in tea, theobromine and theophylline are present only in trace amounts. The predominant xanthine is caffeine.

### **240. Beverages—Tea, Various Facts Concerning**

SOURCE: Artemas Ward, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Food* (1929 ed.), p. 512. Copyright 1923 by The Baker & Taylor Company, New York. Used by permission of Peter Smith, Gloucester, Mass., publisher.

China is generally acknowledged as the birthplace of the tea industry...

Tea was brought to Europe early in the sixteenth century, the Dutch East India Company introducing it into Holland. The first authenticated mention of it in England is in the year 1657—at which time it was considered a very rare luxury. It was known as early as 1680 in the American colonies...

The tea-shrub is an evergreen somewhat similar in appearance to the camellia, to which it is botanically related.

### **241. Beverages—Tea, Various Facts Concerning**

SOURCE: Morris B. Jacobs, ed., *The Chemistry and Technology of Food and Food Products*, Vol. 2 (2d ed., rev.; 1951), pp. 1683, 1685–1687, 1689. Copyright 1951 by Interscience Publishers, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1683] Tea, although commonly associated with coffee in the food trade as well as in the public mind, is in reality a product of quite different character. Both have one important characteristic in common—that they produce or synthesize caffeine during the vital activity of the plant... The plants themselves are, however, of different families, and the parts of the plants which are commercially important are different—the seeds in the case of coffee and the young leaves in the case of tea. Both are natives of the Eastern Hemisphere...

[p. 1685] Normally, world tea production totals around 2,000,000,000 lbs. annually... Prior to World War II China was the greatest tea-producing area...

[p. 1686] The importing countries consuming the most tea are the United Kingdom, and the United States, Australia, and Canada, in that order...

[p. 1687] In Ceylon, a tea plucker, using both hands, plucks about 30,000 shoots a day. Approximately 3200 shoots are needed to make one pound of manufactured tea...

[p. 1689] *Black and Green* teas result from different manufacturing processes applied to the same kind of leaf... Green tea is manufactured by steaming without fermentation in a perforated cylinder or boiler, thus retaining some of the green color. Black tea is allowed to ferment after being rolled and before firing. In the case of black tea the process of fermentation, or oxidation, reduces the astringency of the leaf and, it is claimed, develops the color and aroma of the liquor.

### **242. Beverages—Wine—A First-Century Roman Tirade Against Drunkenness**

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* xiv. 28. 137, 139–142; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), pp. 227, 279, 281. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 227] There is no department of man's life on which more labour is spent—as if nature had not given us the most healthy of beverages to drink, water, which all other animals make use of, whereas we compel even our beasts of burden to drink wine! and so much toil and labour and outlay is paid as the price of a thing that perverts men's minds and produces madness, having caused the commission of thousands of crimes, and being so attractive that a large part of mankind knows of nothing else worth living for! ... The most cautious of these toppers we see getting themselves boiled in hot baths and being carried out of the bathroom unconscious, and others actually unable to wait to get to the dinner table, no, not even to put their clothes on, but straight away on the spot, while still naked and panting, they snatch up huge [p. 279] vessels as if to show off their strength,

and pour down the whole of the contents... Then again, think of the drinking matches! think of the vessels engraved with scenes of adultery, as though tippling were not enough by itself to give lessons in licentiousness! ... Then it is that greedy eyes bid a price for a married woman, and their heavy glances betray it to her husband; then it is that the secrets of the heart are published abroad: some men specify the provisions of their wills, others let out facts of fatal import, and do not keep to themselves words that will come back to them through a slit in their throat—how many men having lost their lives in that way! and truth has come to be proverbially credited to wine. Meantime, even should all turn out for the best, drunkards never see the rising sun, and so shorten their lives. Tippling brings a pale face and hanging cheeks, [p. 281] sore eyes, shaky hands that spill the contents of vessels when they are full, and the condign punishment of haunted sleep and restless nights, and the crowning reward of drunkenness, monstrous licentiousness and delight in iniquity. Next day the breath reeks of the wine-cask, and everything is forgotten—the memory is dead. This is what they call ‘snatching life as it comes!’ when, whereas other men daily lose their yesterdays, these people lose tomorrow also.

**243. Beverages—Wine, Artificial—Ancient Methods of Preparing “Weak Wine”**

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* xiv. 97. 100; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 253. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

XIX. The first of the artificial wines, which is called weak wine, is made from real wine in the following manner: ten quarts of white must and half that quantity of water are kept boiling till a considerable amount of the water is boiled away. Other people put in five quarts of sea-water and the same amount of rain-water and leave the mixture in the sun for 40 days to evaporate. This drink is given to invalids for whom it is feared that wine may be harmful.

**244. Beverages—Wine, Unfermented, From Raisins (Ancient Method of Making)**

SOURCE: Palladius, *On Agriculture*, bk. 11, sec. 19, trans. by T. Owen (London: J. White, 1807), p. 296.

Passum [raisin wine] will now be made before the vintage, which the Africans are always used to make rich and pleasant, and which, if you see instead of honey, you may keep yourself free from inflation. The dried grapes therefore are picked, and being confined in frails [another translation says baskets] of a loose texture, they are first smartly beaten with rods; then, when the grapes are rendered soft by this operation, the frail is put under the press; hence the passum is what flowed from it; and it is kept preserved in a vessel in the same manner as honey.

**245. Bible, Authority of, From God Alone**

SOURCE: Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. 1, “Of the Holy Scripture,” secs. 4, 5, in *A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards*, ed. by James Benjamin Green (1958), p. 17, col. 1. Copyright 1951 by John Knox Press, Richmond, Va. Used by permission.

Sec. 4. The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the word of God...

Sec. 5. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the church to an high and reverent esteem for the Holy Scripture; and the heavenliness of the matter, the efficacy of the doctrine, the majesty of the style, the consent of all the parts, the scope of the whole (which is to give all glory to God), the full discovery it makes of the only way of man’s

salvation, the many other incomparable excellencies, and the entire perfection thereof, are arguments whereby it doth abundantly evidence itself to be the word of God; yet, notwithstanding, our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.

#### **246. Bible, Baptist Confession (New Hampshire, 1833) on**

SOURCE: The New Hampshire Baptist Confession, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 742.

We believe that the Holy Bible was written by men divinely inspired, and is a perfect treasure of heavenly instruction; that it has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter; that it reveals the principles by which God will judge us; and therefore is, and shall remain to the end of the world, the true centre of Christian union, and the supreme standard by which all human conduct, creeds, and opinions should be tried.

[Schaff's introductory note, p. 742: This Confession was drawn up by the Rev. John Newton Brown, D. D., of New Hampshire (b. 1803, d. 1868), about 1833, and has been adopted by the New Hampshire Convention, and widely accepted by Baptists, especially in the Northern and Western States, as a clear and concise statement of their faith, in harmony with the doctrines of older confessions, but expressed in milder form.]

#### **247. Bible, Both Human and Divine**

SOURCE: Bernhard W. Anderson, *Rediscovering the Bible* (New York: Association Press), pp. 6–11. Copyright 1951 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 6] From one point of view of the Bible is a very human book. The word “bible,” derived from a Greek plural word meaning “booklets,” is descriptive of its diverse character. Here is a *library* of sacred writings...

[p. 7] In this library the human situation is presented with the utmost realism. Nothing human is alien to its range of interest. Stories about murder, rape, trickery, war, religious persecution, and church jealousies are mingled with accounts of divine action, heavenly visions, ventures of faith, and hymns of hope...

[p. 8] The Bible gives an uncensored description of the human situation. The picture of human life is not “touched up” to make it appear better than it is. Many of the biblical stories verify a central truth of the biblical revelation, namely, that man is a sinner who often attempts to justify himself in his sin by means of his religion. In one sense a more human library has never been written...

[p. 9] The uniqueness of the Bible, however, cannot be understood adequately by treating it merely as a human book. The Bible was never designed to be read as great literature, sober history, naive philosophy, or primitive science. Men remembered stories, treasured traditions, and wrote in various forms of literature because of one inescapable conviction: They had been confronted by God in events which had taken place in their history. Though hidden from mortal sight in light unapproachable, the holy God had revealed himself to mankind. He had taken the initiative to establish a relationship with his people. He had spoken his Word of judgment and of mercy. “In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son.” These opening words of the Letter to the Hebrews strike the keynote of the Bible. It is this central conviction which gives the Bible, both Old and New Testaments, the status of sacred scripture in the Christian Church.



This faith is a stumbling block to the modern mind... [p. 10] As a consequence, some people have dismissed the theology of the Bible as a poetic or mythical embellishment of men's maturing awareness of the distinction between right and wrong. Others have treated it as elementary philosophy, the first efforts of the Hebrews reflectively to understand Reality. These approaches to the meaning of human existence may be adequate outside the Bible. But the men of the Bible say something very different. It is their claim that God himself has spoken with a decisiveness, a once-for-all-ness. They do not tell us about searching for moral values, or attempting to reach a more satisfying philosophy by standing a bit taller on their intellectual tiptoes. Rather, they bear witness to their encounter with God in the midst of crucial events of history, their engagement with him in moments of historical crisis. And, above all, this revelation was not peripheral or incidental to their message; it was the vantage point from which they viewed everything else—politics, social injustice, and war; past, present, and future. They do not argue this faith; they proclaim it with confessional language: "Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise."

The subject matter of the Bible, then, is God's self-revelation to men. Because of this stupendous theme, traditional Christianity has described the Bible as the "Word of God" and has insisted upon the divine authorship of Scripture. Says a New Testament writer: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God," that is, as the Greek word suggests, it is "God-breathed" or "filled with the breath of God" (II Timothy 3:16). However seriously one may take the human dimension of Scripture, he cannot easily disregard the central claim of the [p. 11] Bible itself to be the record and witness of revelatory events in which God has spoken. This is sacred scripture because the Holy Spirit breathes through the ancient words and reveals to men in every age the Word of truth.

#### **248. Bible, Canon Law on the Publication of**

SOURCE: "General Rules From the Codex of Canon Law," in *Index of Prohibited Books*, revised and published by order of His Holiness Pope Pius XI (new ed.; [Vatican City]: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1930), pp. xiv, xv, xvii. Used by permission.

[p. xiv] Can. 1385. § 1. Without previous ecclesiastical censorship the following works may not be published even by laymen:

1) Editions of Holy Scripture, or notes, or commentaries on the same...

[p. xv] Can. 1391. Versions of Holy Scripture may not lawfully be published in the vernacular, unless approved by the Holy See, or published under the supervision of the bishops and with notes taken particularly from the works of the Fathers of the Church and of learned Catholic writers...

[p. xvii] Can. 1398. § 1. The condemnation of a book entails the prohibition, without especial permission, either to publish, to read, to keep, to sell, to translate it, or in any way to pass it on to others...

Can. 1399. The prohibition of the following works is implicitly contained in the general law of prohibition:

1) Editions of the original text or of ancient Catholic versions of Holy Scripture, even those of the Eastern Church, emanating from any non-Catholic source; translations of Holy Scripture into any language, made, or published by non-Catholics are likewise prohibited. [See Nos. 275–277.]

#### **249. Bible, Canon of, Catholic Claims Concerning**

SOURCE: John Adam Moehler, *Symbolism*, trans. by James Burton Robertson (5th ed.; London: Gibbings & Company, 1906), pp. 292, 293.

[p. 292] Tradition we have hitherto described as the consciousness of the Church, as the living word of faith, according to which the Scriptures are to be interpreted, and to be understood. The doctrine of tradition contains, in this sense, nothing else than the doctrine of Scripture; both, as to their contents, are one and the same. But, moreover, it is asserted by the Catholic Church, that many things have been delivered to her by the apostles, which Holy Writ either doth [p. 293] not at all comprise, or at most, but alludes to. This assertion of the Church is of the greatest moment, and partially indeed, includes the foundations of the whole system. Among these oral traditions must be included the doctrine of the canonicity, and the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures; for, in no part of the Bible do we find the books belonging to it designated; and were such a catalogue contained in it, its authority must first be made matter of inquiry. In like manner, the testimony as to the inspiration of the biblical writings is obtained only through the Church. It is from this point we first discern, in all its magnitude, the vast importance of the doctrine of Church authority, and can form a notion of the infinite multitude of things involved in that doctrine.

### **250. Bible, Canon of—Old Testament, According to Josephus**

SOURCE: Josephus *Against Apion* i. 38–43; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 179, 181. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 179] We do not possess myriads of inconsistent books, conflicting with each other. Our books, those which are justly accredited, are but two and twenty, and contain the record of all time.

Of these, five are the books of Moses, comprising the laws and the traditional history from the birth of man down to the death of the lawgiver. This period falls only a little short of three thousand years [see editors' note below]. From the death of Moses until Artaxerxes, who succeeded Xerxes as king of Persia, the prophets subsequent to Moses wrote the history of the events of their own times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life.

From Artaxerxes to our own time the complete history has been written, but has not been deemed worthy of equal credit with the earlier records, because of the failure of the exact succession of the prophets.

We have given practical proof of our reverence for our own Scriptures. For, although such long ages have now passed, no one has ventured either to add, [p. 181] or to remove, or to alter a syllable; and it is an instinct with every Jew, from the day of his birth, to regard them as the decrees of God, to abide by them, and, if need be, cheerfully to die for them. Time and again ere now the sight has been witnessed of prisoners enduring tortures and death in every form in the theatres, rather than utter a single word against the laws and the allied documents.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The chronological data of Josephus are not all clear and consistent.]

### **251. Bible, Central in Protestant Worship**

SOURCE: T. Valentine Parker, *American Protestantism: An Appraisal*, pp. 132, 133. Copyright 1956 by Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 132] The altar is appropriately of primary significance in the Roman Catholic church because in that church worship is centered in the mass. The bread and the wine are believed to be actually transformed by the priest into the body and blood of the Lord Jesus. So in a [p. 133] literal sense He is there as the sacrifice renewed day by day through the power conferred upon the priest. Protestantism holds a totally different belief.

In fact the controversy over the Catholic theory of transubstantiation has been one of the most uncompromising of all questions in dispute... Historically the Bible supplanted the altar in the Protestant conception. Views of the Bible have changed with a host of Christians as we know. But ... it has not therefore been relegated to secondary rank... The pulpit that formerly and without question was the center of vision in the free churches invariably displayed a Bible. All that the cross symbolizes is likewise and primarily symbolized in that Bible. The worshipper looking up at the pulpit sees it not as a reminder of ungoverned and perhaps presumptuous oratory but as a proclamation of the prophetic spirit of the truths related in the Book.

### **252. Bible, Clearness of (Luther on)**

SOURCE: Martin Luther, "Auslegung des 37. Psalms Davids ("Exposition of the 37th Psalm of David")," comment on Ps. 37:40, in his *Sämmtliche Schriften*, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, Vol. 5 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1896), cols. 334, 335, 337, 338. German.

[col. 334] If any of them [the papists] should dispute with you and say, "You must have the interpretation of the Fathers because the Scripture is obscure," you shall reply, "It is not true." There is on earth no clearer book written than the holy Scripture, which compared with all other books is like the sun compared with all lights. They say such a thing only to lead us out of [col. 335] the Scripture, and to set themselves up as masters over us that we may believe their sermons based on their dreams... [col. 337] Do not permit yourselves to be led away from and out of the Scripture, no matter how hard they [the papists] may try. For if you step out of it you are lost, then they lead you wherever they wish. But if you stay in it you have won... Be certain, and do not doubt, that there is nothing brighter than the sun, i.e. the Scripture. But if a cloud has come in front of it, there is still [col. 338] nothing else behind it except the same bright sun. In the same way, if there is an obscure passage in the Scripture, do not doubt, for surely the same truth is behind it as that which is clear in another place, and whoever cannot understand the obscure, let him remain in the light.

### **253. Bible—Conservative Positions Defended**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, (3d ed.), p. 176. Copyright 1935 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

Conservative scholars are, we believe, entirely justified in their vigorous denunciation of all efforts to prove the existence of fraudulent invention and deliberate forgery in the Bible. They are equally within their rights in objecting most emphatically to the introduction of a spurious mythology and a thinly veiled paganism into the Bible.

### **254. Bible, Contains All Things Necessary to Salvation**

SOURCE: The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (as revised A.D. 1801), Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 489, 500.

[p. 489] VI. Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite *or* necessary to salvation...

[p. 500] XX. It is not lawful for the church to ordain anything is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another.

### **255. Bible, Hope and Remedy for a Confused World**

SOURCE: Eric M. North, ed., *The Book of a Thousand Tongues* (New York; Harper, 1938), pp. 20, 21. Copyright, 1939, by the American Bible Society. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 20] Undoubtedly multitudes of folk, hearing the storm of controversy and criticism about the Bible a generation and more ago, took refuge in an indifference to which our generation is heir. Over-enthusiasm about the scope of science and the possible achievements of man “on his own” will account for much. There were many misconceived “defenses” of the Bible; when such “defenses” crumbled, many who could not see beyond them thought the Bible had crumbled too. Floods of new knowledge, desperately intricate relationships of industry and commerce in a suddenly contracted world, omnipresent new amusements—all these have swiftly overwhelmed modern men and thus displaced the center of their thought. Religion is for many pushed to the margin or beyond it. Whatever the causes, multitudes in our churches and just outside them regard the Bible with respect and a vague loyalty, but without conviction and fervor.

The attitude toward the Bible is reflected in the experience of the Church. Living in a confused age and assimilated all too much to its secular environment, it has found clear witness to the meaning of the Gospel for our present industrial age very difficult to bear...

[p. 21] In this situation, in the hesitation and perplexity of the church and the overwhelming confusion in the world, the hope and the remedy lie in the Bible itself. For out of the years of criticism the Bible and the Christian faith have emerged stronger than ever before—a new strength of which the congregations in the churches are hardly aware. They are stronger, not because anything has been added to them, but because they have been freed from a vast weight of misconceptions, from methods of interpretation false to their spirit, from confusion as to their historical basis, from entanglement with philosophies never a part of their genius.

With a new clarity and assurance men may be directed to the Bible as the primary and unique witness to God. Herein is shown the experience of men with God, not in a passing voice, not in legend or allegory, but veritable experience held firm before our eyes in letter and print that we may read and reread. Ay, herein God speaks to men through His Son, the world’s Redeemer—“I am the Way, the Truth, the Life.” Again and again men, with good intention but with an unrealized lack of faith in the power of the Bible to make its own way with men, have applied to it formularies, systems, diagrams of the progress of the soul. But though hampered for a time the Bible constantly breaks through these shackles, saying, “O my children, can you not learn that the Voice which speaks through me is not the voice of a preceptor to his class, but of a Father to his sons and daughters and that His name is not ‘I prescribe’ but ‘I AM.’”

Now the assurance that the Bible is this unique and indispensable witness to God does not come upon men as a reality because someone else says so, no matter how authoritative. It comes only by experience with the Bible. If our generation and the generation to follow are to find in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ the one Being worthy of absolute loyalty, if we are to lean our whole weight on Him for the saving that we and the world so desperately need, the only place we and the world can find Him is in the Bible and the one thing we need to do with the Bible is to read it—and read it and read it. Courage to stand off other preoccupations, faith that here is the supreme hope for us, patience with what we may not yet understand, and willingness to do God’s will—this and *reading* are all we really need. That is the Bible’s way to bring us into the presence of God.

It is to open this way that these thousand and more translations have been made and that many more must be made and put into the hands of the people. For if humankind all across the world—the multitude harassed by poverty, ignorance, and war and the few who vainly build their proud houses on wealth and force and the sowing of hate—are to know that the God and Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ is Sovereign Lord of all, they must have this Book.

### **256. Bible, Ignorance of—Effect**

SOURCE: Chrysostom, *Homilies on Romans*, trans. in NPNF, 1st series, Vol. 11, p. 335.

And so ye also, if ye be willing to apply to the reading of him with a ready mind, will need no other aid. For the word of Christ is true which saith, “Seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.” (Matt. vii. 7.) ... From this it is that our countless evils have arisen—from ignorance of the Scriptures; from this it is the plague of heresies has broken out.

### **257. Bible, Inspiration of, Calvin on**

SOURCE: John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (7th American ed., rev.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1936), Vol. 1, p. 89.

It is true that, if we were inclined to argue the point, many things might be adduced which certainly evince, if there be any God in heaven, that he is Author of the Law, and the Prophecies, and the Gospel. Even though men of learning and deep judgment rise up in opposition, and exert and display all the powers of their minds in this dispute, yet, unless they are wholly lost to all sense of shame, this confession will be extorted from them, that the Scripture exhibits the plainest evidences that it is God who speaks in it, which manifests its doctrine to be divine... If we read it with pure eyes and sound minds, we shall immediately perceive the majesty of God, which will subdue our audacious contradictions, and compel us to obey him.

### **258. Bible, Inspiration of—Writers Are God’s Penmen**

SOURCE: C. E. Stowe, *Origin and History of the Books of the Bible* (Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Publishing Company, 1867), p. 18.

The Bible is not a specimen of God’s skill as a writer, showing us God’s mode of thought, giving us God’s logic, and God’s rhetoric, and God’s style of historic narration. How often do we see men seeking out isolated passages of Scripture, and triumphantly saying that such expressions are worthy of God, and could not have proceeded from Him... God has not put himself on trial before us in that way in the Bible, any more than He has in the creation—any more than He has promised that the Bible shall always be printed for us on the best paper, with the best of type, and perfect freedom from typographical errors, and that after it is printed, it shall never be torn, nor soiled, nor any leaf be regularly handsome, men fine forms and beautiful faces, and faultless elocution. It is always to be remembered that the writers of the Bible were ‘God’s penmen, and not God’s pens.’\* [Note: \* Reply to Essays and Reviews.]

### **259. Bible, Interpretation of—Catholic Claims of Sole Right to Interpret**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session IV (April 8, 1546), Decree Concerning the Canonical Scriptures, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 83.

No one, relying on his own skill, shall,—in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine,—wresting the sacred Scripture to his own senses, presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother Church,—whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy

Scriptures,—hath held and doth hold; or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

### **260. Bible, Interpretation of, Episcopal Article on**

SOURCE: Protestant Episcopal Church. The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion (as revised A.D. 1801), art. 20, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 500.

It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, ye, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation.

### **261. Bible, Interpretation of—Idiom**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Unity of the Bible* (1957 ed.), pp. 45, 46. Published 1955 by The Westminster Press, Used by permission of The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, and Carey Kingsgate Press Ltd., London.

[p. 45] The general message of all these passages is 'not sacrifice, but obedience'—and by obedience the prophets meant the reflection of the character of God in life and the finding of its source in holy fellowship with Him. Here we may observe that it is characteristic of Hebrew idiom to say 'not this but that', when the meaning is 'that is more important than this.' This characteristic has often been observed, and we are not ordinarily troubled by it. When our Lord said that no one could be His disciple unless he hated his parents and all who were bound to him by natural ties, He meant that loyalty to Him must take precedence over loyalty to one's kindred. We do not for one moment suppose that He who enjoined the love of enemies enjoined the hatred of friends. Though the terms used were ostensibly absolute, we recognize that the meaning was comparative. It is therefore possible that the prophets were really saying that obedience was more important than sacrifice, and that for lack of obedience sacrifice was invalidated. So far as Hosea is concerned, we find that the second part of his statement is translated in comparative terms by translators ancient and modern, who had no axe to grind, but simply sought to give a natural rendering: 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.' The two halves of the verse are parallel, and it is improbable that in the first half sacrifice is absolutely condemned and in the [p. 46] second part comparatively. Both halves express the same thought that sacrifice is not the most important of the demands of God. This thought we find elsewhere in the Bible in such a passage as: 'Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.'

### **262. Bible, Interpretation of—Its Own Interpreter**

SOURCE: Arthur T. Pierson, *Knowing the Scriptures* (New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910), p. 106.

To know in what specific sense words and terms are employed by any writer, is to have, so far, keys to unlock his meaning. It pleases the author of Holy Scripture to provide, in the Bible itself, the helps to its understanding and interpretation. If all doors to its secret chambers are not left open, the keys are to be found; and part of the object of leaving some things obscure, instead of obvious, is to incite and invite investigation, to prompt us to patient and prayerful search. Its obscurities awaken curiosity and inquiry, and study is rewarded by finding the clew to what was before a maze of perplexity.

### **263. Bible—Limitations of Human Language**

SOURCE: C. E. Stowe, *Origin and History of the Books of the Bible* (Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Publishing Company, 1867), pp. 17, 18.

[p. 17] Moreover, human minds are unlike in the impressions which they receive from the same word; and it is certain that one man seldom gives to another, of different temperament, education, and habits of thought, by language, exactly the same idea, with the same shape and color, as that which lies in his own mind; yet, if men are honest and right-minded they can come near enough to each other's meaning for all purposes of practical utility.

Here comes in the objection that the Bible can be made to mean everything and anything, all sects build upon it, the most diverse doctrines are derived from it.

This infelicity it shares with everything else that has to be expressed in human language. This is owing to the imperfection, the necessary imperfection of human language, and to the infirmity and the perverse ingenuity also of the human mind. It is not anything peculiar to the Bible. Hear two opposing lawyers argue a point of statute law in its application to a particular case. Hear two opposing politicians make their diverse arguments in reference to the true intent and force of a particular clause in the United States Constitution. Is there not here as wide room for diversity of opinion and opposition of reasoning, as in regard to the meaning of any text of Scripture, or the correctness of any point of theology? Yet these laws and constitutions are made in our own language, and our own time, while the Bible comes to us from a remote age and in foreign tongues. Enough, that the Bible can be understood, if honestly studied, as well as any [p. 18] constitution or any body of statutes can be understood. This much is sufficient for all practical purposes, and it is for practical purposes only that the Bible was given.

#### **264. Bible—Luther on the Word of God**

SOURCE: Louis L. Snyder, ed., *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), p. 74. Copyright ? 1958 by Rutgers, The State University.

Let us hold it for certain and firmly established that the soul can do without everything, except the Word of God, without which none at all of its wants are provided for. But, having the Word it is rich and wants for nothing; since that is the word of life, of truth, of light, of peace, of justification, of salvation, of joy, of liberty, of wisdom, of virtue, of grace, of glory, and of every good thing. It is on this account that the prophets in a whole psalm (Ps. cxix), and in many other places, sighs for and calls upon the Word of God with so many groaning and words...

But you will ask: "What is this Word, and by what means is it to be used, since there are so many words of God?" I answer, the Apostle Paul (Rom. 1) explains what it is, namely, the Gospel of God, concerning His Son, incarnate, suffering, risen, and glorified through the Spirit, the sanctifier. To preach Christ is to feed the soul, to justify it, to set it free, and to save it, if it believes the preaching. For faith alone [see No. 729] and the efficacious use of the Word of God, bring salvation. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Rom 10:9).

#### **265. Bible, a Monument of Literature**

SOURCE: John Richard Green, *History of the English People*, bk. 7, chap. 1, par. 6 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1879), Vol. 3, p. 11.

As a mere literary monument the English version of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English tongue, while its perpetual use made it from the instant of its appearance the standard of our language.

#### **266. Bible, More Than History**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, p. 20. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

The Old Testament is essentially a religious book, and it has its place in the Bible of the Church solely as a religious book.

Many students of the Bible are far too inclined to forget this. It is studied merely as a record of the past, and men try to recapture ancient situations, ancient political, social and religious conditions, and they imagine that if they can somehow hear the accents of the prophets' voices as their first hearers heard them, or understand their words as those hearers understood them, they have reached the goal of Old Testament study. Nothing could be farther from the truth. For there is nothing essentially religious in that. Religion is more than the study of religion, and unless the study of the Bible is a religious exercise, it misses its deepest purpose. This is not to say, of course, that all Bible study should be made the organ of worship, for worship is by no means the whole of religion. But it is to say that in all Bible study the religious quality of the story should be realized, and the religious teaching and message emphasized. For all Bible study should minister to the spirit as well as to the mind, and should bring richer apprehension of divine truth.

### **267. Bible, New Light From (Robinson's Farewell to the Pilgrim Fathers)**

SOURCE: John Robinson, quoted in Edward Winslow, *Briefe Narration*, in Alexander Young, *Chronicles of the Pilgrim Fathers* (Boston: Little and Brown, 1841), pp. 396, 397.

[p. 396] For the wholesome counsel Mr. Robinson gave that part of the church whereof he was pastor at their departure from him to begin the great work of plantation in New England,—amongst other wholesome instructions and exhortations he used these expressions, or to the same purpose:

We are now ere long to part asunder, and the Lord knoweth whether ever he [Robinson] should live to see our faces again. But whether the Lord had appointed it or not, he charged us before God and his blessed angels, to follow him no further than he followed Christ; and if God should reveal any thing to us by any other instrument of his, to be as ready to receive it as ever we were to receive any truth of his ministry; for he was very confident the Lord had more truth and light [p. 397] yet to break forth out of his holy word. He took occasion also miserably to bewail the state and condition of the Reformed Churches, who were come to a period in religion, and would go no further than the instruments of their Reformation. As, for example, the Lutherans, they could not be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; for whatever part of God's will he had further imparted and revealed to Calvin, they will rather die than embrace it. And so also, saith he, you see the Calvinists, they stick where he left them; a misery much to be lamented; for though they were precious shining lights in their times, yet God had not revealed his whole will to them; and were they now living, saith he, they would be as ready and willing to embrace further light, as that they had received. Here also he put us in mind of our church covenant, at least that part of it whereby we promise and covenant with God and one with another, to receive whatsoever light or truth shall be made known to us from his written word; but withal exhorted us to take heed what we received for truth, and well to examine and compare it and weigh it with other Scriptures of truth before we received it. For, saith he, it is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such thick anti-christian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once.



### **268. Bible, Not Sole Guide for Protestants**

SOURCE: *The Bible, and Authority Only in Catholic Hands* (Huntington, Indiana: Our Sunday Visitor Press, 1960), pp. 26, 27. [See FRS No. 40.]

[p. 26] CATH.: Is the Bible the rule or guide of Protestants for observing Sunday?

[p. 27] Prot.: No, I believe the “Seventh Day Adventists” are the only ones who know the Bible in the matter of Sabbath observance.

### **269. Bible—Nothing to Be Added or Subtracted**

SOURCE: Basil the Great, *De Fide* (“Concerning Faith”), trans. in *MPG*, Vol. 31, Col. 680.

It is a manifest falling from faith and an accusation of arrogance either to set aside anything that has been written or to add anything that has not been written. Our Lord Jesus Christ said, “My sheep hear my voice”; and before this He said, “A stranger they will not follow, but they will flee from him because they know not the voice of the stranger.” And the apostle by a human example vehemently forbids the adding or the removing of anything from the inspired Scriptures, in which he says, “A humanly ratified covenant, no one takes from or adds to.”

### **270. Bible—Nothing to Be Added, Subtracted, or Changed**

SOURCE: The French [Protestant] Confession of Faith (1559), art. 5, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 362.

We believe that the Word contained in these books has proceeded from God... It is not lawful for men, nor even for angels, to add to it, to take away from it, or to change it. Whence it follows that no authority, whether of antiquity, or custom, or numbers, or human wisdom, or judgments, or proclamations, or edicts, or decrees, or councils, or visions, or miracles, should be opposed to these Holy Scriptures.

### **271. Bible—Old Testament Contains Same Message as New**

SOURCE: Arthur T. Pierson, *Knowing the Scriptures* (New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910), p. 53.

There is a persistent attempt in some quarters, to depreciate the Old Testament, with a lamentable result that it is comparatively neglected. Yet the New Testament itself unmistakably teaches the organic unity of the two Testaments, and in various ways exhibits their mutual relations.

### **272. Bible—Old Testament Fulfilled in New**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 21, 22. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 21] Often the significance of an utterance lies in what it shall come to mean, even more than in what it first means. Words are seeds, whose full fruition may take long to mature, and like seeds they can only be understood in the light of what they become... Hence, beyond the understanding of Old Testament teaching as its first hearers or readers understood it, we need to understand the meaning it has come to have in its developing life, the unfolding meaning it has yielded down the years, and oft-times the fuller meaning it may have for us in the light of Christ.

Some years ago the present writer quoted a word from a forgotten source, which has lain for many years in his memory. It was: “Old Testament prophecies run to Christ, as

---

<sup>4</sup>Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

tidal rivers to the sea, only to feel His reflex influence upon them.” That is true of more than prophecies. It is when we read the Old Testament in the light of the New that we perceive its real significance. We must, of course, beware of attributing to those who wrote the Old Testament the understanding which we have gained in the light of the New. [p. 22] That is why a historical sense and outlook are essential for the understanding of the Old Testament. Without it we merely reach confusion, reading back the New Testament into the Old at some points, and being then bewildered by those elements in the Old Testament which cannot be squared with the teaching of the New. We need both a historical and a teleological understanding, appreciating everything in relation to its contemporary situation as a moment in the process of the development, and appreciating it too in relation to the goal of the process.

### **273. Bible, Only Rule of Faith**

SOURCE: Declaration of Faith of the National Council of Congregational Churches, held at Boston, Mass., June 14–24, 1865, par. 1, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 734.

Standing by the rock where the Pilgrims set foot upon these shores, upon the spot where they worshiped God, and among the graves of the early generations, we, Elders and Messengers of the Congregational churches of the United States in National Council assembled—like them acknowledging no rule of faith but the Word of God—do now declare our adherence to the faith and order of the apostolic and primitive churches.

### **274. Bible, Purpose of**

SOURCE: Chrysostom, *Homilies on Timothy*, Homily 9, on 2 Tim. 3:16, 17, trans. in *NPNF*, 1st series, Vol. 13, p. 510.

“For doctrine.” For thence [from the Scriptures] we shall know, whether we ought to learn or to be ignorant of anything. And thence we may disprove what is false...

“That the man of God may be perfect.” For this is the exhortation of the Scripture given, that the man of God may be rendered perfect by it; without this therefore he cannot be perfect.

### **275. Bible, Reading of—Catholic Defense for Restrictions**

SOURCE: Cardinal Merry del Val, “Foreword,” in *Index of Prohibited Books*, revised and published by order of His Holiness Pope Pius XI (new ed.; [Vatican City]: Vatican Polyglot Press, 1930), pp. ix–ix. Used by permission.

[p. ix] What many, indeed, fail to appreciate, and what, moreover, non-Catholics consider a grave abuse—as they put it of the Roman Curia, is the action of the Church in hindering the printing and circulation of Holy Writ in the vernacular. Fundamentally however, this accusation is based on calumny. During the first twelve centuries Christians were highly familiar with the text of Holy Scripture, as is evident from the homilies of the Fathers and the sermons of the mediaeval preachers; nor did the ecclesiastical authorities ever intervene to prevent this. It was only in consequence of heretical abuses, introduced particularly by the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the followers of Wyclif, and by Protestants broadly speaking (who with sacrilegious mutilations of Scripture and arbitrary interpretations vainly sought to justify themselves in the eyes of the people; twisting the text of the Bible to support erroneous doctrines condemned by the whole history of the Church) that the Pontiffs and the Councils were obliged on more than one occasion to control and sometimes even forbid the use of the Bible in the vernacular... [See No. 248.]

[p. xi] Those who would put the Scriptures indiscriminately into the hands of the people are the believers always in private interpretation—a fallacy both absurd in itself and pregnant with disastrous consequences. These counterfeit champions of the inspired book hold the Bible to be the sole source of Divine Revelation and cover with abuse and trite sarcasm the Catholic and Roman Church.

### **276. Bible, Reading of, Catholic Restrictions Concerning**

SOURCE: Leo XIII, Apostolic Constitution *Officiorum ac Munerum*, Jan. 25, 1897, art. 1., “Of the Prohibition of Books,” chaps. 2, 3, trans. in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903), pp. 412, 413.

[p. 412] CHAPTER II. *Of Editions of the Original Text of Holy Scripture and of Versions Not in the Vernacular.*

5. Editions of the original text and of the ancient Catholic versions of Holy Scripture, as well as those of the Eastern Church, if published by non-Catholics, even though apparently edited in a faithful and complete manner, are allowed only to those engaged in theological and biblical studies, provided also that the dogmas of Catholic faith are not impugned in the prolegomena or annotations.
6. In the same manner, and under the same conditions, other versions of the Holy Bible, whether in Latin or in any other dead language, published by non-Catholics, are permitted.

CHAPTER III. *Of Vernacular Versions of Holy Scripture.*

7. As it has been clearly shown by experience that, if the Holy Bible in the vernacular is generally permitted without any distinction, more harm than utility is thereby [p. 413] caused, owing to human temerity: all versions in the vernacular, even by Catholics, are altogether prohibited, unless approved by the Holy See, or published, under the vigilant care of the bishops, with annotations taken from the Fathers of the Church and learned Catholic writers.
8. All versions of the Holy Bible, in any vernacular language, made by non-Catholics are prohibited; and especially those published by the Bible societies, which have been more than once condemned by the Roman Pontiffs, because in them the wise laws of the Church concerning the publication of the sacred books are entirely disregarded.

Nevertheless, these versions are permitted to students of theological or biblical science, under the conditions laid down above (No. 5).

### **277. Bible, Reading of, Catholic Restrictions on English Versions**

SOURCE: Sir Thomas More, *Dialogue* (bk. 3, chap. 16), in G. G. Coulton, editor and translator, *Life in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928), Vol. 2, pp. 142–144, 146, 147. Used by permission.

[p. 142] “SIR,” quoth your Friend . . . , “yet for all this can I see no cause why the clergy should keep the Bible out of laymen’s hands that can no more but their mother-tongue.” “I had weened,” quoth I, “that I had proved you plainly that they keep it not from them; for I have showed you that they keep none from them, but such translation as be either not yet approved for good or such as be already reproved for naught, as Wycliffe’s was and Tyndale’s; for as for other old ones that were before Wycliffe’s days, [they] remain lawful, and be in some folk’s hands had and read.” “Ye say well,” quoth he, “but ye, as women say, somewhat it was alway that the cat winked when her eye was out. Surely it is not for naught that the English Bible is in so few men’s hands when so many would so fain have it.” “That is very truth,” quoth I, “for I think that, though the favourers of [p. 143] a sect of heretics be so fervent in the setting forth of their sect, that

they let not to lay their money together and make a purse among them for the printing of an evil-made, or evil-translated book (which though it hap to be forbidden and burned, yet some be sold ere they be spied, and each of them lose but their part) yet I think there will no printer lightly be so hot to put any Bible in print at his own charge, whereof the loss should lie whole in his own neck, and then hang upon a doubtful trial, whether the first copy of his translation was made before Wycliffe's days or since. For, if it were made since, it must be approved before the printing..." "I am sure," quoth your Friend, "ye doubt not but that I am full and whole of your mind in this matter, that the Bible should be in our English tongue. But yet that the clergy is of the contrary, and would not have it so, that appeareth well, in that they suffer it not to be so. And, over that I hear, in every place almost where I find any learned man of them, their minds [are] all set thereon to keep the scripture from us; and they seek out for that part every rotten reason that they can find, and set them forth solemnly to the shew, though five of those reasons be not worth a fig. For they begin as far as our first father Adam, and shew us that his wife and he fell out of Paradise with desire of knowledge and cunning. Now if this would serve, it must from the knowledge and study of scripture drive every man, priest and other, lest it drive all out of Paradise. Then say they that God taught His disciples many things apart, because the people should not hear it, and therefore they would the people should not now be suffered to read all. Yet they say further that it is hard to translate the scripture out of one tongue into another, and specially, they say, into ours, which they call a tongue vulgar and barbarous. But of all things specially they say that scripture is the food of the soul, and that the common people be as infants that must be fed but with milk and pap; and if we have any stronger meat it [p. 144] must be champ'd afore by the nurse, and so put into the babe's mouth. But methinks, though they make us all infants, they shall find many a shrewd brain among us that can perceive chalk from cheese well enough, and if they would once take us our meat in our own hand we be not so evil toothed but that within a while they shall see us champ it ourselves as well as they. For let them call us young babes an [*sic*] they will, yet by God they shall ... well find in some of us that an old knave is no child." "Surely," quoth I, "such things as ye speak is the thing that, as I somewhat said before, putteth good folk in fear to suffer the scripture in our English tongue; not for the reading and receiving, but for the busy champing thereof, and for much meddling with such parts thereof as least will agree with their capacities... Finally methinketh that the Constitution Provincial,<sup>1</sup> [Note 1: Abp Arundel's constitution of 1408, forbidding as heretical all unauthorized translations or portions of the Bible, but making no provision for any authorized translation.] of which we spake right now, hath determined this question already; for when the clergy therein agreed that the English Bibles should remain which were translated before Wycliffe's days, they consequently did agree that to have the Bible in English was none hurt. And in that they forbade any new translation to be read till it were approved by the bishops, it appeareth well thereby that their intent was that the bishop should approve it if he found it faultless, and also of reason amend it where it were faulty; but if [*i.e.*, unless] the man were an heretic that made it, or the faults such and so many as it were more easy to make it all new than mend it, as it happed for both points in the translation of Tyndale... [p. 146] The Ordinary, whom God hath in the diocese appointed for the chief physician, to discern between the whole and the sick and between disease and disease, should after his wisdom and discretion appoint everybody their part as he should perceive to be good and wholesome

for them... I say, though the bishop might unto some layman betake and commit with good advice and instruction the whole Bible to read, yet might he to some man well and with reason restrain the reading of some part, and from some busybody the meddling with any part at all, more than he shall hear in sermons set out and declared unto him, and in like wise to take the Bible away from such folk again, as be proved by their blind presumption to abuse the occasion of their profit unto their own hurt and harm. And thus may the bishop order the scripture in our hands, with as good reason as the father doth by his discretion appoint which of his children may for his sadness keep a knife to cut his meat, and which shall for his wantonness have his knife taken from him for cutting of his fingers. And thus am I bold, without prejudice of other men's judgment, to show you my mind in this matter, how the Scripture might without great peril and not without great profit be brought into our tongue and taken to laymen and women both, not yet meaning thereby but that the whole Bible might for my mind be suffered to be spread abroad in English; but, if that were so much doubted that perchance all might thereby be letted, then would I [p. 147] rather have used such moderation as I speak of, or some such other as wiser men can better devise. Howbeit, upon that I read late in the Epistle that the King's Highness translated into English of his own, which His Grace made in Latin, answering to the letter of Luther, my mind giveth me that His Majesty is of his blessed zeal so minded to move this matter unto the prelates of the clergy, among whom I have perceived some of the greatest and of the best of their own minds well inclinable thereto already, that we lay-people shall in this matter, ere long time pass, except the fault be found in ourselves, be well and fully satisfied and content." "In good faith," quoth he, "that will in my mind be very well done; and now am I for my mind in all this matter fully content and satisfied." "Well," quoth I, "then will we to dinner, and the remnant will we finish after dinner." And therewith we went to meat.

### **278. Bible, Reading of, Catholics' Attitude Toward**

SOURCE: Geddes MacGregor, *The Bible in the Making* (Philadelphia: Lippincott), pp. 426, 427. Copyright 1959 by Geddes MacGregor. Used by permission.

[p. 426] My principal concern, of course, is with the Bible, and I have tried [p. 427] to show how there is a Biblical revival in the Roman Catholic Church. If you were to discuss this with a Benedictine or a Dominican, I think you would find three plain warnings given about assuming too much from this revival. They would be in the form of definitions of the Roman Catholic attitude to the Bible. First, the Bible cannot be taken as a single unit; it must be regarded as a collection of books, inspired by God but having different parts and showing a development. Second, the Bible is not the norm of faith but it reveals what were the norms of faith of past saints and patriarchs. It tells us of the faith of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, of Elijah and of Moses; it is not the norm of faith for the Church today. Third, the Bible is to be read, and now it is encouraged; but it must not be read as a personal activity. It must be read with the Church. When the Roman Catholic reads the Bible he is not able to read it alone, he reads it "Catholicly" with all his brethren. He must take to his reading of it all the richness that the Spirit has deposited in the Church. Tradition still holds a powerful place in the reading of the Bible.

### **279. Bible, Reading of, Daily—Benefits**

SOURCE: Woodrow Wilson, address (as governor of New Jersey) at the tercentenary celebration of the translation of the Bible into the English language, Denver, Colo., May 7, 1911; printed in Appendix to *The Congressional Record*, Aug. 8, 1912, p. 502.

I have a very simple thing to ask of you. I ask of every man and woman in this audience that from this night on they will realize that part of the destiny of America lies in their daily perusal of this great book of revelations—that if they would see America free and pure they will make their own spirits free and pure by this baptism of the Holy Scripture.

### **280. Bible, Reading of, Brings Liberty**

SOURCE: Woodrow Wilson, address (as governor of New Jersey) at the tercentenary celebration of the translation of the Bible into the English language, Denver, Colo., May 7, 1911; printed in Appendix to *The Congressional Record*, Aug. 8, 1912, p. 500.

Up to the time of the translation of the Bible into English, it was a book for long ages withheld from the perusal of the peoples of other languages and of other tongues, and not a little of the history of liberty lies in the circumstance that the moving sentences of this book were made familiar to the ears and the understanding of those peoples who have led mankind in exhibiting the forms of government and the impulses of reform which have made for freedom and for self-government among mankind.

For this is a book which reveals men unto themselves, not as creatures in bondage, not as men under human authority, not as those bidden to take counsel and command of any human source. It reveals every man to himself as a distinct moral agent, responsible not to men, not even to those men whom he has put over him in authority, but responsible through his own conscience to his Lord and Maker. Whenever a man sees this vision he stands up a free man, whatever may be the government under which he lives, if he sees beyond the circumstances of his own life.

### **281. Bible, the Religion of Protestants**

SOURCE: William Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation* (London: George Bell & Sons, 1888), p. 463.

The BIBLE, I say, the BIBLE only, is the religion of protestants! ... I for my part, after a long and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial search of “the true way to eternal happiness,” do profess plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot but upon this rock only. I see plainly and with mine own eyes, that there are popes against popes, councils against councils, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age... There is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only for any considering man to build upon. This therefore, and this only, I have reason to believe: this I will profess, according to this I will live, and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly, lose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me anything out of this book, and require whether I believe it or no, and seem it never so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this; God hath said so, therefore it is true.

### **282. Bible—Salvation in Old Testament and New Testament the Same**

SOURCE: Methodist Articles of Religion, 1784, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 808.

- V. The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation...
- VI. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New; for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be heard who feign that the

old fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the law given from God by Moses, as touching ceremonies and rites, doth not bind Christians, nor ought the civil precepts thereof of necessity be received in any commonwealth, yet, notwithstanding, no Christian whatsoever is free from the obedience of the commandments which are called moral.

### **283. Bible, Study of (Pope Gregory the Great)**

SOURCE: Pope Gregory the Great, *Epistles*, bk. 4, Letter 31, to Theodorus (physician to the emperor), trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 156 (2d pagination).

What is sacred Scripture but a kind of epistle of Almighty God to His creature? And surely, if your Glory were resident in any other place, and were to receive letters from an earthly emperor, you would not loiter, you would not rest, you would not give sleep to your eyes, till you had learnt what the earthly emperor had written.

The Emperor of Heaven, the Lord of men and angels, has sent thee his epistles for thy life's behoof; and yet, glorious son, thou neglectest to read these epistles ardently. Study then, I beseech thee, and daily meditate on the words of thy Creator. Learn the heart of God in the words of God, that thou mayest sigh more ardently for the things that are eternal.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract would seem to indicate that in the time of Gregory the Great (590–604) the Roman Catholic Church had not hedged about the reading of the Bible with such rules as to discourage any real study of the Scriptures by the laity. The restrictions rose mostly in regard to the question of vernacular translations, after the laity, because of language changes, could no longer read the official Latin version.]

### **284. Bible, Study of—Methods**

SOURCE: Arthur T. Pierson, *Knowing the Scriptures* (New York: Gospel Publishing House, 1910), p. 214.

No investigation of scripture, in its various parts and separate texts, however important, must impair the sense of the supreme value of its united witness. There is not a form of evil doctrine or practice that may not claim apparent sanction and support from isolated passages; but nothing erroneous or vicious can ever find countenance from the Word of God when the whole united testimony of scripture is weighed against it. Partial examination will result in partial views of truth which are necessarily imperfect; only careful comparison will show the complete mind of God.

### **285. Bible, Study of—Methods (Pope Pius XII, 1943)**

SOURCE: Pius XII, Encyclical Letter *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, Sept. 30, 1943 (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943), Part II (Doctrinal), pp. 10–23.

[p. 10] DOCTRINAL PART

#### BIBLICAL STUDIES AT THE PRESENT DAY

11. There is no one who cannot easily perceive that the conditions of biblical studies and their subsidiary sciences have greatly changed within the last fifty years. For, apart from anything else, when Our Predecessor published the Encyclical Letter *Providentissimus Deus*, hardly a single place in Palestine had begun to be explored by means of relevant excavations. Now, however, this kind of investigation is much more frequent and, since more precise methods and technical skill have been developed in the course of actual experience, it gives us information at once more abundant and more accurate. How much light has been derived from these explorations for the more correct and fuller understanding of the Sacred Books all experts know, as well as all those who devote themselves to these studies. The value of these excavations is enhanced by the discovery

from time to time of written documents, which help much towards the knowledge of the languages, letters, events, customs, and forms of worship of most ancient times. And of no less importance is the discovery and investigation, so frequent in our times, of papyri which have contributed so much to the knowledge of letters and institutions, both public and private, especially of the time of Our Saviour.

12. Moreover ancient codices of the Sacred Books have been found and edited with discerning thoroughness; the exegesis of the Fathers of the Church has been more widely and thoroughly examined; in fine the manner of speaking, relating and writing in use among the ancients is made clear by innumerable examples. All these advantages which, not without a special design of Divine Providence, our age has acquired, are as it were an invitation and inducement to interpreters of the Sacred Literature to make diligent use of this light, so abundantly given, to penetrate more deeply, explain more clearly and expound more lucidly the Divine Oracles. If, with the greatest satisfaction of mind, We perceive that these same interpreters have resolutely answered and still continue to answer this call, this is certainly not the last or least of the [p. 11] fruits of the Encyclical Letter *Providentissimus Deus*, by which Our Predecessor Leo XIII, foreseeing as it were this new development of biblical studies, summoned Catholic exegetes to labor and wisely defined the direction and the method to be followed in that labor.
13. We also, by this Encyclical Letter, desire to insure that the work may not only proceed without interruption, but may also daily become more perfect and fruitful; and to that end We are specially intent on pointing out to all what yet remains to be done, with what spirit the Catholic exegete should undertake, at the present day, so great and noble a work, and to give new incentive and fresh courage to the laborers who toil so strenuously in the vineyard of the Lord.  
§ 1—RECOURSE TO ORIGINAL TEXTS
14. The Fathers of the Church in their time, especially Augustine, warmly recommended to the Catholic scholar, who undertook the investigation and explanation of the Sacred Scriptures, the study of the ancient languages and recourse to the original texts. However, such was the state of letters in those times, that not many,—and these few but imperfectly—knew the Hebrew language. In the middle ages, when Scholastic Theology was at the height of its vigor, the knowledge of even the Greek language had long since become so rare in the West, that even the greatest Doctors of that time, in their exposition of the Sacred Text, had recourse only to the Latin version, known as the Vulgate.
15. On the contrary in this our time, not only the Greek language, which since the humanistic renaissance has been, as it were, restored to new life, is familiar to almost all students of antiquity and letters, but the knowledge of Hebrew also and of other oriental languages has spread far and wide among literary men. Moreover there are now such abundant aids to the study of these languages that the biblical scholar, who by neglecting them would deprive himself of access to the original texts, could in no wise escape the stigma of levity and sloth. For it is the duty of the exegete to lay hold, so to speak, with the greatest care and reverence of the very least expressions which, under the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, have flowed from the pen of the sacred writer, so as to arrive at a deeper and fuller knowledge of his meaning.
16. Wherefore let him diligently apply himself so as to acquire daily a greater facility in biblical as well as in other oriental languages and to support his interpretation by the aids which all branches of philology supply. This indeed St. Jerome strove earnestly to



achieve, as [p. 12] far as the science of his time permitted; to this also aspired with untiring zeal and no small fruit not a few of the great exegetes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, although the knowledge of languages then was much less than at the present day. In like manner therefore ought we to explain the original text which, having been written by the inspired author himself, has more authority and greater weight than any even the very best translation, whether ancient or modern; this can be done all the more easily and fruitfully, if to the knowledge of languages be joined a real skill in literary criticism of the same text.

*Importance of textual criticism*

17. The great importance which should be attached to this kind of criticism was aptly pointed out by Augustine, when, among the precepts to be recommended to the student of the Sacred Books, he put in the first place the care to possess a corrected text. “The correction of the codices”—so says this most distinguished Doctor of the Church—“should first of all engage the attention of those who wish to know the Divine Scripture so that the uncorrected may give place to the corrected.” In the present day indeed this art, which is called textual criticism and which is used with great and praiseworthy results in the editions of profane writings, is also quite rightly employed in the case of the Sacred Books, because of that very reverence which is due to the Divine Oracles. For its very purpose is to insure that the sacred text be restored, as perfectly as possible, be purified from the corruptions due to the carelessness of the copyists and be freed, as far as may be done, from glosses and omissions, from the interchange and repetition of words and from all other kinds of mistakes, which are wont to make their way gradually into writings handed down through many centuries.
18. It is scarcely necessary to observe that this criticism, which some fifty years ago not a few made use of quite arbitrarily and often in such wise that one would say they did so to introduce into the sacred text their own preconceived ideas, today has rules so firmly established and secure, that it has become a most valuable aid to the purer and more accurate editing of the sacred text and that any abuse can easily be discovered. Nor is it necessary here to call to mind—since it is doubtless familiar and evident to all students of Sacred Scripture—to what extent namely the Church has held in honor these studies in textual criticism from the earliest centuries down even to the present day.
19. Today therefore, since this branch of science has attained to such [p. 13] high perfection, it is the honorable, though not always easy, task of students of the Bible to procure by every means that as soon as possible may be duly published by Catholics editions of the Sacred Books and of ancient versions, brought out in accordance with these standards, which, that is to say, unite the greatest reverence for the sacred text with an exact observance of all the rules of criticism. And let all know that this prolonged labor is not only necessary for the right understanding of the divinely-given writings, but also is urgently demanded by that piety by which it behooves us to be grateful to the God of all providence, Who from the throne of His majesty has sent these books as so many paternal letters to His own children.

*Meaning of Tridentine decree*

20. Nor should anyone think that this use of the original texts, in accordance with the methods of criticism, in any way derogates from those decrees so wisely enacted by the Council of Trent concerning the Latin Vulgate. It is historically certain that the Presidents of the Council received a commission, which they duly carried out, to beg, that is, the

Sovereign Pontiff in the name of the Council that he should have corrected, as far as possible, first a Latin, and then a Greek, and Hebrew edition, which eventually would be published for the benefit of the Holy Church of God. If this desire could not then be fully realized owing to the difficulties of the times and other obstacles, at present it can, We earnestly hope, be more perfectly and entirely fulfilled by the united efforts of Catholic scholars.

21. And if the Tridentine Synod wished “that all should use as authentic” the Vulgate Latin version, this, as all know, applies only to the Latin Church and to the public use of the same Scriptures; nor does it, doubtless, in any way diminish the authority and value of the original texts. For there was no question then of these texts, but of the Latin versions, which were in circulation at that time, and of these the same Council rightly declared to be preferable that which “had been approved by its long-continued use for so many centuries in the Church.” Hence this special authority or as they say, authenticity of the Vulgate was not affirmed by the Council particularly for critical reasons, but rather because of its legitimate use in the Churches throughout so many centuries; by which use indeed the same is shown, in the sense in which the Church has understood and understands it, to be free from any error [p. 14] whatsoever in matters of faith and morals; so that, as the Church herself testifies and affirms, it may be quoted safely and without fear of error in disputations, in lectures and in preaching; and so its authenticity is not specified primarily as critical, but rather as juridical.

22. Wherefore this authority of the Vulgate in matters of doctrine by no means prevents—nay rather today it almost demands—either the corroboration and confirmation of this same doctrine by the original texts or the having recourse on any and every occasion to the aid of these same texts, by which the correct meaning of the Sacred Letters is everywhere daily made more clear and evident. Nor is it forbidden by the decree of the Council of Trent to make translations into the vulgar tongue, even directly from the original texts themselves, for the use and benefit of the faithful and for the better understanding of the divine word, as We know to have been already done in a laudable manner in many countries with the approval of the Ecclesiastical authority.

#### § 2—INTERPRETATION OF SACRED BOOKS

23. Being thoroughly prepared by the knowledge of the ancient languages and by the aids afforded by the art of criticism, let the Catholic exegete undertake the task, of all those imposed on him the greatest, that namely of discovering and expounding the genuine meaning of the Sacred Books. In the performance of this task let the interpreters bear in mind that their foremost and greatest endeavor should be to discern and define clearly that sense of the biblical words which is called literal. Aided by the context and by comparison with similar passages, let them therefore by means of their knowledge of languages search out with all diligence the literal meaning of the words; all these helps indeed are wont to be pressed into service in the explanation also of profane writers, so that the mind of the author may be made abundantly clear.

24. The commentators of the Sacred Letters, mindful of the fact that here there is question of a divinely inspired text, the care and interpretation of which have been confided to the Church by God Himself, should no less diligently take into account the explanations and declarations of the teaching authority of the Church, as likewise the interpretation given by the Holy Fathers, and even “the analogy of faith” as Leo XIII most wisely observed in the Encyclical Letter *Providentissimus Deus*. With special zeal should they apply

themselves, not only to expounding exclusively these matters which belong to the historical, archeological, philological and other auxiliary sciences—as, to Our regret, is done in certain [p. 15] commentaries,—but, having duly referred to these, in so far as they may aid the exegesis, they should set forth in particular the theological doctrine in faith and morals of the individual books or texts so that their exposition may not only aid the professors of theology in their explanations and proofs of the dogmas of faith, but may also be of assistance to priests in their presentation of Christian doctrine to the people, and in fine may help all the faithful to lead a life that is holy and worthy of a Christian.

*Right use of spiritual sense*

25. By making such an exposition, which is above all, as We have said, theological, they will efficaciously reduce to silence those who affirming that they scarcely ever find anything in biblical commentaries to raise their hearts to God, to nourish their souls or promote their interior life, repeatedly urge that we should have recourse to a certain spiritual and, as they say, mystical interpretation. With what little reason they thus speak is shown by the experience of many, who, assiduously considering and meditating the word of God, advanced in perfection and were moved to an intense love for God; and this same truth is clearly proved by the constant tradition of the Church and the precepts of the greatest Doctors. Doubtless all spiritual sense is not excluded from the Sacred Scripture.
26. For what was said and done in the Old Testament was ordained and disposed by God with such consummate wisdom, that things past prefigured in a spiritual way those that were to come under the new dispensation of grace. Wherefore the exegete, just as he must search out and expound the literal meaning of the words, intended and expressed by the sacred writer, so also must he do likewise for the spiritual sense, provided it is clearly intended by God. For God alone could have known this spiritual meaning and have revealed it to us. Now Our Divine Saviour Himself points out to us and teaches us this same sense in the Holy Gospel; the Apostles also, following the example of the Master, profess it in their spoken and written words; the unchanging tradition of the Church approves it; finally the most ancient usage of the liturgy proclaims it, wherever may be rightly applied the well-known principle: “The rule of prayer is the rule of faith.”
27. Let Catholic exegetes then disclose and expound this spiritual significance, intended and ordained by God, with that care which the dignity of the divine word demands; but let them scrupulously refrain from proposing as the genuine meaning of Sacred Scripture other figurative senses. It may indeed be useful, especially in preaching, to illustrate and present the matters of faith and morals by a broader use of the Sacred Text in the figurative sense, provided this be done with moderation and restraint; it should, however, never be forgotten that this use of the Sacred Scripture is, as it were, extrinsic to it and accidental, and that, especially in these days, it is not free from danger, since the faithful, in particular those who are well-informed in the sciences sacred and profane, wish to know what God has told us in the Sacred Letters rather than what an ingenious orator or writer may suggest by a clever use of the words of Scripture. Nor does “the word of God, living and effectual and more piercing than any two-edged sword and reaching unto the division of the soul and the spirit, of the joints also and the marrow, and a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart” need artificial devices and human adaptation to move and impress souls; for the Sacred Pages, written under the inspiration

of the Spirit of God, are of themselves rich in original meaning; endowed with a divine power, they have their own value; adorned with heavenly beauty, they radiate of themselves light and splendor, provided they are so fully and accurately explained by the interpreter, that all the treasures of wisdom and prudence, therein contained, are brought to light.

*Study of Holy Fathers*

28. In the accomplishment of this task the Catholic exegete will find invaluable help in an assiduous study of those works, in which the Holy Fathers, the Doctors of the Church and the renowned interpreters of past ages have explained the Sacred Books. For, although sometimes less instructed in profane learning and in the knowledge of languages than the scripture scholars of our time, nevertheless by reason of the office assigned to them by God in the Church, they are distinguished by a certain subtle insight into heavenly things and by a marvelous keenness of intellect, which enables them to penetrate to the very innermost meaning of the divine word and bring to light all that can help to elucidate the teaching of Christ and promote holiness of life.
29. It is indeed regrettable that such precious treasures of Christian antiquity are almost unknown to many writers of the present day, and that students of the history of exegesis have not yet accomplished all that seems necessary for the due investigation and appreciation of so momentous a subject. Would that many, by seeking out the authors of the Catholic interpretation of Scripture and diligently studying their works and drawing thence the almost inexhaustible riches therein stored [p. 17] up, might contribute largely to this end, so that it might be daily more apparent to what extent those authors understood and made known the divine teaching of the Sacred Books, and that the interpreters of today might thence take example and seek suitable arguments.
30. For thus at long last will be brought about the happy and fruitful union between the doctrine and spiritual sweetness of expression of the ancient authors and the greater erudition and maturer knowledge of the modern, having as its result new progress in the never fully explored and inexhaustible field of the Divine Letters.

§ 3—SPECIAL TASKS OF INTERPRETERS

31. Moreover we may rightly and deservedly hope that our times also can contribute something towards the deeper and more accurate interpretation of Sacred Scripture. For not a few things, especially in matters pertaining to history, were scarcely at all or not fully explained by the commentators of past ages, since they lacked almost all the information which was needed for their clearer exposition. How difficult for the Fathers themselves, and indeed well nigh unintelligible, were certain passages is shown, among other things, by the oft-repeated efforts of many of them to explain the first chapters of Genesis; likewise by the reiterated attempts of St. Jerome so to translate the Psalms that the literal sense, that, namely, which is expressed by the words themselves, might be clearly revealed.
32. There are, in fine, other books or texts, which contain difficulties brought to light only in quite recent times, since a more profound knowledge of antiquity has given rise to new questions, on the basis of which the point at issue may be more appropriately examined. Quite wrongly therefore do some pretend, not rightly understanding the conditions of biblical study, that nothing remains to be added by the Catholic exegete of our time to what Christian antiquity has produced; since, on the contrary, these our times have brought to light so many things, which call for a fresh investigation and a new

examination, and which stimulate not a little the practical zeal of the present-day interpreter.

*Character of sacred writer*

33. As in our age indeed new questions and new difficulties are multiplied, so, by God's favor, new means and aids to exegesis are also provided. Among these it is worthy of special mention that Catholic theologians, following the teaching of the Holy Fathers and especially of the Angelic and Common Doctor, have examined and explained the nature and effects of biblical inspiration more exactly and more fully [p. 18] than was wont to be done in previous ages. For having begun by expounding minutely the principle that the inspired writer, in composing the sacred book, is the living and reasonable instrument of the Holy Spirit, they rightly observe that, impelled by the divine motion, he so uses his faculties and powers, that from the book composed by him all may easily infer "the special character of each one and, as it were, his personal traits." Let the interpreter then, with all care and without neglecting any light derived from recent research, endeavor to determine the peculiar character and circumstances of the sacred writer, the age in which he lived, the sources written or oral to which he had recourse and the forms of expression he employed.
34. Thus can he the better understand who was the inspired author, and what he wishes to express by his writings. There is no one indeed but knows that the supreme rule of interpretation is to discover and define what the writer intended to express, as St. Athanasius excellently observes: "Here, as indeed is expedient in all other passages of Sacred Scripture, it should be noted, on what occasion the Apostle spoke; we should carefully and faithfully observe to whom and why he wrote, lest, being ignorant of these points, or confounding one with another, we miss the real meaning of the author."

*Importance of mode of writing*

35. What is the literal sense of a passage is not always as obvious in the speeches and writings of the ancient authors of the East, as it is in the works of the writers of our own time. For what they wished to express is not to be determined by the rules of grammar and philology alone, nor solely by the context; the interpreter must, as it were, go back wholly in spirit to those remote centuries of the East and with the aid of history, archaeology, ethnology [*sic*] and other sciences, accurately determine what modes of writing, so to speak, the authors of that ancient period would be likely to use, and in fact did use.
36. For the ancient peoples of the East, in order to express their ideas, did not always employ those forms or kinds of speech, which we use today; but rather those used by the men of their times and countries. What those exactly were the commentator cannot determine as it were in advance, but only after a careful examination of the ancient literature of the East. The investigation, carried out, on this point, during the past [p. 19] forty or fifty years with greater care and diligence than ever before, has more clearly shown what forms of expression were used in those far off times, whether in poetic description or in the formulation of laws and and [*sic*] rules of life or in recording the facts and events of history. The same inquiry has also clearly shown the special preeminence of the people of Israel among all the other ancient nations of the East in their mode of compiling history, both by reason of its antiquity and by reason of the faithful record of the events; qualities which may well be attributed to the gift of divine inspiration and to the peculiar religious purpose of biblical history.

37. Nevertheless no one, who has a correct idea of biblical inspiration, will be surprised to find, even in the Sacred Writers, as in other ancient authors, certain fixed ways of expounding and narrating, certain definite idioms, especially of a kind peculiar to the Semitic tongues, so-called approximations, and certain hyperbolic modes of expression, nay, at times, even paradoxical, which help to impress the ideas more deeply on the mind. For of the modes of expression which, among ancient peoples, and especially those of the East, human language used to express its thought, none is excluded from the Sacred Books, provided the way of speaking adopted in no wise contradicts the holiness and truth of God, as, with his customary wisdom, the Angelic Doctor already observed in these words: "In Scripture divine things are presented to us in the manner which is in common use amongst men." For as the substantial Word of God became like to men in all things, "except sin," so the words of God, expressed in human language, are made like to human speech in every respect, except error. In this consists that "condescension" of the God of providence, which St. John Chrysostom extolled with the highest praise and repeatedly declared to be found in the Sacred Books.
38. Hence the Catholic commentator, in order to comply with the present needs of biblical studies, in explaining the Sacred Scripture and in demonstrating and proving its immunity from all error, should also make a prudent use of this means, determine, that is, to what extent the manner of expression or the literary mode adopted by the sacred writer may lead to a correct and genuine interpretation; and let him be convinced that this part of his office cannot be neglected without serious detriment to Catholic exegesis. Not infrequently—to mention only one [p. 20] instance—when some persons reproachfully charge the Sacred Writers with some historical error or inaccuracy in the recording of facts, on closer examination it turns out to be nothing else than those customary modes of expression and narration peculiar to the ancients, which used to be employed in the mutual dealings of social life and which in fact were sanctioned by common usage.
39. When then such modes of expression are met with in the sacred text, which, being meant for men, is couched in human language, justice demands that they be no more taxed with error than when they occur in the ordinary intercourse of daily life. By this knowledge and exact appreciation of the modes of speaking and writing in use among the ancients can be solved many difficulties, which are raised against the veracity and historical value of the Divine Scriptures, and no less efficaciously does this study contribute to a fuller and more luminous understanding of the mind of the Sacred Writer.
- Studies of biblical antiquities*
40. Let those who cultivate biblical studies turn their attention with all due diligence towards this point and let them neglect none of those discoveries, whether in the domain of archaeology or in ancient history or literature, which serve to make better known the mentality of the ancient writers, as well as their manner and art of reasoning, narrating and writing. In this connection Catholic laymen also should consider that they will not only further profane science, but moreover will render a conspicuous service to the Christian cause if they devote themselves with all due diligence and application to the exploration and investigation of the monuments of antiquity and contribute, according to their abilities, to the solution of questions hitherto obscure.
41. For all human knowledge, even the non-sacred, has indeed its own proper dignity and excellence, being a finite participation of the infinite knowledge of God, but it acquires a

new and higher dignity and, as it were, a consecration, when it is employed to cast a brighter light upon the things of God.

§ 4—WAY OF TREATING MORE DIFFICULT QUESTIONS

42. The progressive exploration of the antiquities of the East, mentioned above, the more accurate examination of the original text itself, the more extensive and exact knowledge of languages both biblical and oriental, have with the help of God, happily provided the solution of not a few of those questions, which, in the time of Our Predecessor Leo XIII of immortal memory, were raised by critics outside or hostile [p. 21] to the Church against the authenticity, antiquity, integrity and historical value of the Sacred Books. For Catholic exegetes, by a right use of those same scientific arms, not infrequently abused by the adversaries, proposed such interpretations, which are in harmony with Catholic doctrine and the genuine current of tradition, and at the same time are seen to have proved equal to the difficulties, either raised by new explorations and discoveries, or bequeathed by antiquity for solution in our time.
43. Thus has it come about that confidence in the authority and historical value of the Bible, somewhat shaken in the case of some by so many attacks, today among Catholics is completely restored; moreover there are not wanting even non-Catholic writers, who by serious and calm inquiry have been led to abandon modern opinion and to return, at least in some points, to the more ancient ideas. This change is due in great part to the untiring labor, by which Catholic commentators of the Sacred Letters, in no way deterred by difficulties and obstacles of all kinds, strove with all their strength to make suitable use of what learned men of the present day, by their investigations in the domain of archaeology or history or philology, have made available for the solution of new questions.

*Difficulties not yet solved*

44. Nevertheless no one will be surprised, if all difficulties are not yet solved and overcome; but that even today serious problems greatly exercise the minds of Catholic exegetes. We should not lose courage on this account; nor should we forget that in the human sciences the same happens as in the natural world; that is to say, new beginnings grow little by little and fruits are gathered only after many labors. Thus it has happened that certain disputed points, which in the past remained unsolved and in suspense, in our days, with the progress of studies, have found a satisfactory solution. Hence there are grounds for hope that those also will by constant effort be at last made clear, which now seem most complicated and difficult.
45. And if the wished-for solution be slow in coming or does not satisfy us, since perhaps a successful conclusion may be reserved to posterity, let us not wax impatient thereat, seeing that in us also is rightly verified what the Fathers, and especially Augustine, observed in their time viz: God wished difficulties to be scattered through the Sacred Books inspired by Him, in order that we might be urged to read and [p. 22] scrutinize them more intently, and, experiencing in a salutary manner our own limitations, we might be exercised in due submission of mind. No wonder if of one or other question no solution wholly satisfactory will ever be found, since sometimes we have to do with matters obscure in themselves and too remote from our times and our experience; and since exegesis also, like all other most important sciences, has its secrets, which, impenetrable to our minds, by no efforts whatsoever can be unravelled.

*Definite solutions sought*

46. But this state of things is no reason why the Catholic commentator, inspired by an active and ardent love of his subject and sincerely devoted to Holy Mother Church, should in any way be deterred from grappling again and again with these difficult problems, hitherto unsolved, not only that he may refute the objections of the adversaries, but also may attempt to find a satisfactory solution, which will be in full accord with the doctrine of the Church, in particular with the traditional teaching regarding the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture, and which will at the same time satisfy the indubitable conclusions of profane sciences.
47. Let all the other sons of the Church bear in mind that the efforts of these resolute laborers in the vineyard of the Lord should be judged not only with equity and justice, but also with the greatest charity; all moreover should abhor that intemperate zeal which imagines that whatever is new should for that very reason be opposed or suspected. Let them bear in mind above all that in the rules and laws promulgated by the Church there is question of doctrine regarding faith and morals; and that in the immense matter contained in the Sacred Books—legislative, historical, sapiential and prophetic—there are but few texts whose sense has been defined by the authority of the Church, nor are those more numerous about which the teaching of the Holy Fathers is unanimous. There remain therefore many things, and of the greatest importance, in the discussion and exposition of which the skill and genius of Catholic commentators may and ought to be freely exercised, so that each may contribute his part to the advantage of all, to the continued progress of the sacred doctrine and to the defense and honor of the Church.
48. This true liberty of the children of God, which adheres faithfully to the teaching of the Church and accepts and uses gratefully the contributions of profane science, this liberty, upheld and sustained in every way by the confidence of all, is the condition and source of all lasting fruit and of all solid progress in Catholic doctrine, as Our Predecessor of happy [p. 23] memory Leo XIII rightly observes, when he says: “Unless harmony of mind be maintained and principles safeguarded, no progress can be expected in this matter from the varied studies of many.”

### **286. Bible, Sufficiency of, as Rule of Faith**

SOURCE: The Belgic Confession, A.D. 1561 (rev. 1619), art. 7, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 387, 388.

[p. 387] Art. VII. We believe that these Holy Scriptures fully contain the will of God, and that whatsoever man ought to [p. 388] believe unto salvation, is sufficiently taught therein.

### **287. Bible, Sufficiency of, for Salvation**

SOURCE: The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), chap. 1, “Of the Holy Scripture,” secs. 6, 9, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, pp. 603, 605.

[p. 603] VI. The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man’s salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture: unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men. . .

[p. 605] IX. The infallible rule of interpretation of Scripture is the Scripture itself; and therefore, when there is a question about the true and full sense of any Scripture (which is not manifold, but one), it must be searched and known by other places that speak more clearly.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The last sentence reads “it may be searched” in the present revised form in *A Harmony of the Westminster Presbyterian Standards*, ed. by James Benjamin Green (1958), p. 19.]



## 288. Bible, Sufficient and Infallible Guide

SOURCE: Confession of the Free-will Baptists (1834, 1868), chap. 1, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 749.

[Introductory note:] This confession was adopted and issued by the General Conference of the Free-will Baptists of America in 1834, revised in 1848, and again in 1865, and 1868. The text is taken from the *Treatise on the Faith and Practice of the Free-will Baptists, written under the direction of the General Conference* Dover, N. H.

These are the Old and New Testaments; they were written by holy men, inspired by the Holy Spirit, and contain God's revealed will to man. They are a sufficient and infallible guide in religious faith and practice.

## 289. Bible, Understandable to All

SOURCE: The Westminster Confession of Faith (1647), chap. 1, "Of the Holy Scripture," sec. 7, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 604.

VII. All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all; yet those things which are necessary to be known, believed, and observed, for salvation, are so clearly propounded and opened in some place of Scripture or other, that not only the learned, but the unlearned, in a due use of the ordinary means, may attain unto a sufficient understanding of them.

## 290. Bible, Unity of

SOURCE: Marcus Dods, *The Bible: Its Origin and Nature* (New York: Scribner, 1912), p. 18.

On the whole the unity of Scripture has been universally recognized. Moreover, this unity is obviously not designed and artificial; it is not even conscious; the writers of the several parts had no intention to contribute nor any idea that they were contributing to one whole... And yet when these various writings are drawn together, their unity becomes apparent.

## 291. Bible, Unity of, Wesley on

SOURCE: John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament* (reprint; London: The Epworth Press, 1952), pp. 8, 9.

[p. 8] Concerning the Scriptures in general, it may be observed, the word of the living God, which directed the first patriarchs also, was, in the time of *Moses*, committed to writing. To this were added, in several succeeding generations, the inspired writings of the other prophets. Afterward, what the Son of God preached, and the Holy Ghost spake by the apostles, [p. 9] the apostles and evangelists wrote... Every part thereof is worthy of God: and all together are one entire body.

## 292. Bible—Universality Its Message

SOURCE: Eric M. North, ed., *The Book of a Thousand Tongues* (New York: Harper, 1938), p. 10. Copyright 1939 by the American Bible Society. Used by permission.

Third, there is in the event here celebrated a demonstration of the universal character of the ministry of the Bible and of its message to humanity. To be sure, the Scriptures have not been translated into these thousand tongues because the people who spoke all these tongues demanded it. But they have been translated because Syrians and Goths, Armenians and Ethiopians, Slavs, Spaniards, Saxons, Poles, Germans, Scandinavians, Britishers, Americans, and men and women of many other nations, finding that this foreign Hebrew and Greek Book spoke to them as no other book spoke—ay more, had the very message of life for them—determined that their own people should have it and that other peoples ought to have it, too. "Among all the links which bind together the scattered branches of the English-speaking race, one of the very strongest is their

common possession of a book not a single line of which was written, or a single thought conceived, by an Englishman,”<sup>2</sup> [Note 2: Baikie, *The English Bible and Its Story*, 7.]

### **293. Bible, Use of, in Instruction of “Faithful” (Pope Pius XII, 1943)**

SOURCE: Pius XII, Letter *Divino Afflante Spiritu*, Sept. 30, 1943 (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1943), Part II (Doctrinal), sec. 5, pp. 23, 24.

[P. 23] § 5—USE OF SCRIPTURE IN INSTRUCTION OF FAITHFUL

49. Whosoever considers the immense labors undertaken taken by Catholic exegetes during well nigh two thousand years, so that the word of God, imparted to men through the Sacred Letters, might daily be more deeply and fully understood and more intensely loved, will easily be convinced that it is the serious duty of the faithful, and especially of priests, to make free and holy use of this treasure, accumulated throughout so many centuries by the greatest intellects. For the Sacred Books were not given by God to men to satisfy their curiosity or to provide them with material for study and research, but, as the Apostle observes, in order that these Divine Oracles might “instruct us to salvation, by the faith which is in Christ Jesus” and “that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work.”
50. Let priest therefore, who are bound by their office to procure the eternal salvation of the faithful, after they have themselves by diligent study perused the sacred pages and made them their own by prayer and meditations assiduously distribute the heavenly treasures of the divine word by sermons, homilies and exhortations; let them confirm the Christian doctrine by sentences from the Sacred Books and illustrate it by outstanding examples from sacred history and in particular from the Gospel of Christ Our Lord; and—avoiding with the greatest care those purely arbitrary and far-fetched adaptations, which are not a use, but rather an abuse of the divine word—let them set forth all this with such eloquence, lucidity and clearness that the faithful may not only be moved and inflamed to reform their lives, but may also conceive in their hearts the greatest veneration for the Sacred Scripture.
51. The same veneration the Bishops should endeavor daily to the increase and perfect among the faithful committed to their care, encouraging all those initiatives by which men, filled with apostolic zeal, laudably strive to excite and foster among Catholics a greater knowledge of and love for the Sacred Books. Let them favor therefore and lend help to those pious associations whose aim it is to spread copies of the Sacred Letters, especially of the Gospels, among the faithful, and to procure by every means that in Christian families the same be read daily with piety [p. 24] and devotion; let them efficaciously recommend by word and example, whenever the liturgical laws permit, the Sacred Scriptures translated, with the approval of the Ecclesiastical authority, into modern languages; let them themselves give public conferences or dissertations on biblical subjects, or see that they are given by other public orators well versed in the matter.
52. Let the ministers of the Sanctuary support in every way possible and diffuse in fitting manner among all classes of the faithful the periodicals which so laudably and with such heartening results are published from time to time in various parts of the world, whether to treat and expose in a scientific manner biblical questions, or to adapt the fruits of these investigations to the sacred ministry, or to benefit the faithful. Let the ministers of the Sanctuary be convinced that all this, and whatsoever else an apostolic zeal and a sincere love of the divine word may find suitable to this high purpose, will be an efficacious help to the cure of souls.

## 294. Bible Criticism—Albright's Retreat From Extreme Radicalism

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "In Memoriam" [of M. G. Kyle], *BASOR*, 51 (September, 1933), 5, 6. Used by permission.

[p. 5] The writer used to meet Dr. Kyle occasionally, before coming to Palestine in 1919, at learned society meetings. In those days, the fact that we were apparently at antipodes with regard to most crucial biblical and oriental problems seemed to preclude all real friendship. In the spring of 1921 Dr. Kyle came to Jerusalem with his family for a stay of several weeks as lecturer in the School, during the writer's year as acting director. The acquaintance then developed soon ripened into friendship...

[p. 6] We seldom or never debated biblical questions, but there can be no doubt that our constant association with the ever-recurring opportunity for comparing biblical and archaeological data has led to increasing convergence between our views, once so far apart. To the last, however, Dr. Kyle remained staunchly conservative on most of his basic positions, while the writer has gradually changed from the extreme radicalism of 1919 to a standpoint which can neither be called conservative nor radical, in the usual sense of the terms.

## 295. Bible Criticism, as Defined by a Conservative

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 44, 45, footnote 3. Copyright, 1952, by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 44] It is unfortunate that the very word "critical" has come to be identified with only one branch of biblical and theological studies: the liberal and rationalistic wing. This use of the word is so fixed in our thinking that Webster's dictionary defines biblical criticism as follows: "Designating, or pertaining to, that school of Bible students who treat the received text with greater freedom than the Traditionalists do, discussing its sources and history and departing in many places from the traditional conclusion." This is the common but nevertheless inaccurate limitation of the term. In fact, again to quote the dictionary, criticism properly speaking is "the scient[i]fic investigation of the origin, text, composition, character, history, etc., of literary documents, especially the Bible." The present writer would deny that scientific study of the Scriptures necessarily leads to the usually accepted "critical" positions. It is more accurate to speak of "liberal" criticism and "conservative" criticism, indicating by the two terms the philosophical assumptions which underly [*sic*] the study of the Scriptures. No man is free from philosophical presuppositions. One man may derive his assumptions from modern philosophical positions, another by inductive experience and study of the Bible itself. One position is in reality no more nor less "scientific" than the other, unless "scientific" be defined as the framework of philosophical assumptions within which a man to be a "scientist" must work. In that case, "scientist" refers not to the *method* of study but to the *assumptions* underlying the study; and this is the very point at issue. In some liberal quarters, especially in England, there is a growing recognition that "theology" and "history" cannot be kept separate in biblical study, but that [p. 45] the operation of the supernatural in biblical history must be admitted. This constitutes, for the historian, "The Riddle of the New Testament." (Cf. the book by this name written by Edwyn Hoskyns and Noel Davey, London: Faber and Faber, 1947; first published in 1931). The question which must be faced is the extent to which this supernatural element was operative. The thorough conservative feels that it extended to the very writing of the biblical record, and that inspiration is but the extension of the same supernatural factor which must be recognized in the person of Jesus and the rise of the Church.

We would urge that “criticism” be understood to mean the careful study of the Bible which deals with all problems by the scientific, historical method, including philology, history, exegesis, and doctrine; and the phrases “conservative criticism” and “liberal criticism” be permitted to designate the critical approach based on the assumptions of biblical orthodoxy on the one hand and of liberalism on the other. There will of course be many gradations between the two positions. While it is true that many conservatives have ignored the works of liberal critics, it must also be pointed out that liberal criticism has all too often ignored the works of conservative critics. One may search the bibliographies of many modern liberal books on the New Testament and find no mention of scholars like Theodor Zahn or J. G. Machen.

5

## **296. Bible Criticism—a Changing Trend From Criticism to Modern Conservatism**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible* (3d ed.), pp. 129, 130. Copyright 1935 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 129] The orthodox critical attitude toward the traditions of the Patriarchs was summed up by the gifted founder of this school, Julius Wellhausen, in the following words: ‘From the patriarchal narratives it is impossible to obtain any historical information with regard to the Patriarchs; we can only learn something about the time in which the stories about them were first told by the Israelite people. This later period, with all its essential and superficial characteristics, was unintentionally projected back into hoary antiquity, and is reflected here like a transfigured mirage.’ ... Practically all of the Old Testament scholars of standing in Europe and America held these or similar views until very recently. Now, however, the situation is changing with the greatest rapidity, since the theory of Wellhausen will not bear the test of archaeological examination. The opposition to this theory began in the camp of Assyriology, where the gauntlet was thrown by Sayce, Hommel, and [p. 130] Winckler, but the methods employed by these scholars were so fanciful, and the knowledge of ancient Palestine (apart from the Bible) which then existed was so slight, that they were not taken seriously by their antagonists.

## **297. Bible Criticism, Changing Trend Manifest in**

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, “H. H. Rowley and the New Trend in Biblical Studies,” in *Inspiration and Interpretation*, ed. by John F. Walvoord, pp. 189, 191. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 189] In open reaction against a mere intellectual and scientific approach, practically divorced from a spiritual understanding of content, which to a large degree has characterized the modern critical study of the Scriptures and stigmatized it with spiritual barrenness, the new movement is an attempt to synthesize the various elements which from the critical standpoint enter into a complete comprehension of these ancient Oracles—the divine as well as the human, the spiritual as well as the scientific, the practical as well as the theoretical, and the religiously relevant as well as the technical.

The task to which the new criticism thus sets itself involves the problem of integrating the alleged findings of modern critical scholarship into a reverent, believing approach to the Bible that will not eventuate, as has heretofore largely been the case, in

---

<sup>5</sup>Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

virtual abandonment of the Sacred Scriptures as the authoritative basis of religious faith, with resultant spiritual bankruptcy. To this end, as Otto Baab has pointed out, “biblical scholars are beginning to evaluate their work, not simply on the basis of the advancement of technical knowledge, but likewise in the light of the religious consequences.” ...

[p. 191] The task ... of attempting to harmonize the alleged discoveries of modern critical scholarship with the new constructive approach to the Bible as a spiritual Book demanding a “spiritual” as well as an “intellectual understanding” to its full comprehension is extremely difficult. It may well be that in accepting “substantially the work of Biblical criticism” any imagined harmonization effected between the Bible as a trustworthy guide to faith and practice and the alleged findings of modern criticism will have to be made almost totally at the expense of accepting the Bible as reliable. However, the shifting history of many of the higher critical views, such as the various documentary theories of the Pentateuch, together with the high degree of subjectivity which characterizes them and the questionable assumptions which underlie many of them, well warrant firm skepticism on the part of the conservative scholar toward many of the alleged “findings” of modern Biblical criticism, no matter how widely they are embraced or how loudly they are hailed as “assured results,” especially when they compel him to lower his attitude toward the inspiration and trustworthiness of the Bible. So it is that G. Ch. Aalders says, “... we feel the more obliged to put forth all our efforts in a real scholarly research of the Old Testament which does not in the least detract from its divine authority.”

### **298. Bible Criticism—Conservative Views, Tendency Toward**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, editor’s Introduction, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), pp. xvii, xviii. Used by permission.

[p. xvii] In general, it may be said that there has been a tendency towards more conservative views on many questions than were common at the opening of our period. These more conservative views are not shared by all scholars, though they are [p. xviii] widespread, and any assessment of the position today is bound to give prominence to them. They are hailed sometimes as evidence of the failure of critical scholarship, and as the justification of the older conservatism that has been mentioned. This is quite inaccurate and misleading. For they are reached by the critical method, and hence must be accounted among its fruits. On the other hand, their conservatism is both other and firmer than the older conservatism, just because it is critically, and not dogmatically, based, and because it is built squarely on the evidence, instead of merely using the evidence as a support where it is convenient, and explaining it away where it is not.

### **299. Bible Criticism—Daniel, Early Date of, Defended**

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 296. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

One of Nebuchadnezzar’s records recalls his boast mentioned in Daniel 4:30: “The fortifications of Esagila and Babylon I strengthened and established the name of my reign forever.”<sup>25</sup> [Note 25: J. P. Free, *Archeology and Bible History* (Wheaton, Ill., 1950), p. 228.]

Daniel’s allusion to Nebuchadnezzar’s building activities is important in reference to the common critical view of the book, which gives it a Maccabean date (c. 167 B.C.). But the problem is, How did the supposed late writer of the book know that the glories of Babylon were due to Nebuchadnezzar’s building operations? R. H. Pfeiffer, though defending the critical view, confesses that “we shall presumably never know.”<sup>26</sup> [Note

26: Pfeiffer, *Old Testament Introduction* (New York, 1941), pp. 758f.] But if one accepts the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, in this instance notably supported by archeology, the critics' problem vanishes.

### **300. Bible Criticism—Date for Songs of Deborah and Miriam**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 543, 544. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

[p. 543] With this new independent criterion for dating it becomes possible to push back the dates generally accepted for many early Hebrew poems. The son of Deborah (Judg. 5) has always been dated early by the great majority of scholars, but most emendations of its text by textual critics must now be discarded. However, the Song of Miriam (or of Moses, Exod. 15), which resembles the Song of Deborah so closely in style and meter that they should never have been far separated in time, has usually been dated after the building of the Temple of Solomon, or even after the Exile. The key reason for such a late date has been verse 17, with its reference to "the mountain of thine inheritance, O Yahweh," which has quite naturally been referred to Mount Zion and the Temple. However, we have the very same expression used in the Canaanite Baal Epic, where Baal speaks of "the mountain of mine inheritance," referring to the partly terrestrial, partly celestial mountain where he resides in the far north. Biblical scholars had inferred long before the discovery of the Canaanite literature that ancient phraseology which applied originally to the cosmic mountain in the far north had been utilized in poetic descriptions of Zion. It now becomes absurd to use the verse as an argument for such an improbably late date of the Song of Miriam. This beautiful triumphal hymn, which may rightfully be termed the national anthem of ancient Israel, must now be pushed back to Israelite beginnings, substantially per- [p. 544] haps to the time of Moses in the thirteenth century B.C. The Oracles of Balaam (Num. 22–24) also go back to the thirteenth century B.C., or perhaps in part to the following century. Similarly, the Blessings of Jacob (Gen. 49) and of Moses (Deut. 33) cannot be later than the eleventh century B.C.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Albright places Moses and the Exodus in the thirteenth century B.C. However, acceptance of 1 Kings 6:1 as a literal statement of the interval between the Exodus and the beginning of the building of Solomon's Temple requires an Exodus date considerably earlier than that—approximately in mid-fifteenth century. See No. 723.]

### **301. Bible Criticism—Epistles Prove Genuineness of Christian Experience**

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 9–12. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 9] It might be argued, and indeed has been argued, that the Man Jesus did exist but that some years after His death, perhaps after a generation or so, His followers wrote romantic and idealistic accounts of His life. Again, it is possible to argue that Luke's second book, the Acts of the Apostles, is something of an idealization of the beginnings of the Christian Church. But even if these contentions are true, if both the Gospels and the Acts were propaganda for the Christian sect and therefore not to be wholly relied upon as unbiased history, the critics of Christianity have still to explain the incontrovertible evidence of the "Epistles" or Letters. With one or two minor exceptions these are universally accepted as authentic, and it seems to me that Christians today do not always realize how valuable they are as evidence for the [p. 10] proof of the Faith.

For here we have no self-conscious documents, but vivid human letters, often bearing strong evidence of the emotion under which they were written...

Now if we were to compile a history of any place or nation, one of our most valuable discoveries would be a packet of letters reflecting the life of a certain part of that history. Newspapers, broadsheets, pamphlets, and any other printed matter would have their value of course; but because they were written for the public eye, and probably to prove a particular point, we should be very wary of [p. 11] accepting them as unbiased evidence. But that would not be true of a bundle of private letters, simply because they were not being written for the public at all, and the writer had no particular ax to grind. They would in all probability reflect most accurately the customs, habits, and thoughts of the times in which they were written. Now if this is true in the field of purely secular history, it is just as true, though of far deeper significance, when we study historically the beginnings of Christianity. What the Letters say and what the Letters imply, the new-quality life revealed by these human unselfconscious documents, give us, to my mind, our most valuable Christian evidence. What impression is left upon our minds, or, if I may again be personal, what impression is left upon my mind after spending some years in translating these letters? Above all, I think, that men and women are being changed: the timid become brave; the filthy-minded become pure in heart; the mean and selfish become loving and generous. It is quite plain that the writers of these letters took it as a matter of course, as a matter of observed experience, that if men and women were open to the Spirit of God, then they could be and were transformed. The resources of God are not referred to as vague pieties, but as readily available spiritual power. Quite clearly a positive torrent of love and wisdom, sanity and courage has already flooded human life, and is always ready to flow wherever human hearts are open.

Now critics of Christianity have somehow got to explain this if they are to have a leg to stand on. Let them read these Letters for themselves and attempt to explain these transformations of character. No one had anything to gain in those days from being a Christian; indeed, there was a strong chance that the Christian would lose security and property and even life itself. Yet, reflected in the [p. 12] pages of these Letters, both men and women are exhibiting superb courage and are growing, as naturally as fruit upon a tree, those qualities of the spirit of which the world is so lamentably short. To my mind we are forced to the conclusion that something is at work here far above and beyond normal human experience, which can only be explained if we accept what the New Testament itself claims, that is, that ordinary men and women had become, through the power of Christ, sons and daughters of God.

### **302. Bible Criticism—Esther, Book of, Accuracy Corroborated**

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 308. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The Book of Esther opens in the third year of Ahasuerus' reign (Esth. 1:3), but Esther was not made queen till his seventh year of rule (Esth. 2:16), evidently after the king had returned from Greece (479 B.C.), when Herodotus specifically relates that he paid attention to his harem.<sup>19</sup> [Note 19: IX, 108.] However, because the events of the story and the characters, except the King Ahasuerus, are as yet unknown from secular history, numerous critics deny the historicity of the book, except as history may be woven into fiction. A. Bentzen, for example, calls it a "historical novel."

Although it is true that archeology as yet cannot prove the actual historicity of the book, it supplies ample illustrative evidence pointing to its genuineness. There is a

notable absence in it of Hellenistic coloring or of Greek words, suggesting a date at least before the late fourth century B.C. A. Bentzen, despite his contention that the book is nothing more than historical fiction, is forced to confess that “the story teller knows something of the administration of the Persian kingdom, and especially of the construction of the palace at Shushan.”<sup>21</sup> [Note 21: Aage Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Copenhagen, 1948), Vol. II, p. 192.]

It is now well-known from excavations that “Shushan the Palace” (Esth. 1:2) refers to the acropolis of the Elamite city of Susa, on which site magnificent ruins remain of the splendor of the Persian kings. The French excavators between 1880–1890 uncovered Xerxes’ splendid royal residence covering two and a half acres... In fact, “there is no event described in the Old Testament whose structural surroundings can be so vividly and accurately restored from actual excavations as ‘Shushan the Palace.’”<sup>23</sup> [Note 23: Ira Price, *The Monuments and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia, 1925), p. 408.]

### **303. Bible Criticism—Ezekiel and Chronicles**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, “King Joiachin in Exile,” *BA*, 5 (December, 1942), 53, 54. Used by permission.

[p. 53] Every pertinent recent find has increased the evidence both for the early date of the Book of Chronicles (about 400 B.C. or a little later) and for the care with which the Chronicler excerpted and compiled from older books, documents and oral traditions which were at his disposal.

Another by-product of Weidner’s discoveries is new evidence for the [p. 54] authenticity of the Book of Ezekiel, sometimes held by recent writers to be a late fiction, or at least historically unreliable...

The new documentation brings other confirmations of the authenticity of the Book of Ezekiel—small but none the less significant, especially when added to the accumulated mass of archaeological illustrations of Ezekiel.

### **304. Bible Criticism—Ezekiel’s Authenticity Vindicated**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, “The Bible After Twenty Years of Archeology,” *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 546. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

Incidentally, Torrey asserted that no Jewish *gardeners* can possibly have been taken as captives to Babylon—but we have in these same ration lists [in Babylonian records (see No. 1101)] among other captive Jews, a Jewish *gardener!* The attempt by Torrey and Irwin to show that there was no Jewish dispersion in Babylonia to which Ezekiel can have preached—assuming that he existed at all—has collapsed entirely. That neither language nor content of the Book of Ezekiel fits any period or place outside of the early sixth century B.C. and Babylonia, has been proved in detail by C. G. Howie (1950).

### **305. Bible Criticism—Ezra, Book of, Authenticity Vindicated by Contemporary Documents**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, “The Bible After Twenty Years of Archaeology,” *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 546, 547. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

[p. 546] If we turn to the Book of Ezra, recent discoveries have vindicated the authenticity of its official documents in the most striking way. Here again Torrey and others have insisted that the language of the book is late, dating from the third century B.C., after Alexander the Great. The publication of the fifth-century Elephantine Papyri (1904–1911) from a Jewish colony near Assuan in upper Egypt had already made Torrey’s position difficult, but subsequent discoveries by Mittwoch, Eilers, and others



have dealt it the *coup de grâce*. For example, Torrey insisted that certain words, among them *pithgama*, “matter, affair,” were of Greek origin and could not, therefore, have been taken into biblical Aramaic before 330 B.C. In the last twenty years these very same words have turned [p. 547] up in Egyptian Aramaic and Babylonian cuneiform documents from the late fifth century, that is, from the very time of Ezra! The forced Greek etymologies which he proposed are now mere curiosities. The great ancient historian, Eduard Meyer, fifty-five years ago insisted on the substantial authenticity of the Persian decrees and official letters preserved in Ezra; during the past twenty years strong additional evidence for them has been published by H. H. Schaeder and Elias Bickerman.

### **306. Bible Criticism—Ezra, Book of, Papyri Throw Light on**

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 307. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The most valuable single result of the papyri finds in Egypt, besides shedding a great deal of light on matters of detail, is to demonstrate that the Aramaic employed in Ezra is characteristic of the fifth century B.C. and that the letters recorded in the fourth chapter of Ezra show the same general style and are written in the same language as the Elephantine papyri and other more recently discovered letters of the same period.

### **307. Bible Criticism—Genesis, Evidences for Antiquity of**

SOURCE: p. J. Wiseman, *New Discoveries in Babylonia About Genesis* (7th ed.; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1958), p. 58. Used by permission.

Every part of the book of Genesis furnishes evidence that it was compiled in the present form by Moses and that the documents from which he compiled it were written much earlier. The various lines of evidence may be summarised as follows:—

- (1) The presence of Babylonian words in the first eleven chapters.
- (2) The presence of Egyptian words in the last fourteen chapters.
- (3) Reference to towns which had either ceased to exist, or whose original names were already so ancient in the time of Moses, that as compiler of the book, he had to insert the new names, so that they could be identified by the Hebrews living in his day.
- (4) The narratives reveal such familiarity with the circumstances and details of the events recorded, as to indicate that they were written by persons concerned with those events.
- (5) Evidences that the narratives were originally written on tablets and in an ancient script.

### **308. Bible Criticism—Genesis, Jesus’ Attitude on**

SOURCE: p. J. Wiseman, *New Discoveries in Babylonia About Genesis* (7th ed.; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, Ltd., 1958), pp. 131, 132. Used by permission.

[p. 131] “Higher Critics” are unanimous that there is one Person whose witness about Genesis always tells against them. They realize that their theories collapse hopelessly unless the value of His testimony regarding Genesis is discredited. There is no attempt to question the kind of evidence our Lord Jesus Christ gives; they admit that His statements are opposed to their own, so two theories have been invented which result in refusing to admit Him as a reliable witness... The effect of the first theory is to deny His truthfulness, and of the second, His knowledge. The first implies that even if He believed the Book of Genesis to be a literary patchwork by unknown authors who lived long after the time of Moses, He would speak to the people in such a manner as to lead them to believe that Moses wrote it. In other words they allege that He accommodated Himself to the errors He found around Him. It is sufficient to say that He spent His public ministry cutting clean across the prevailing ideas and errors of His time; there is not the slightest

evidence whatever for the theory. It implies that Christ knew that Moses had little or nothing to do with the early books of the Old Testament, that, for instance, such a Flood as described therein had never occurred, but they say He accommodated His speech to the ideas of the people who believed in the narratives of Genesis. Yet the astounding thing is that these very critics often say that when preaching or writing about Genesis they themselves cannot be absolutely honest unless [p. 132] they indicate that they have no belief in the literal fact or accuracy of these records. This surely implies that they feel they themselves must maintain a higher degree of honesty than they attribute to the Lord. Many of these men would shudder to so represent themselves, because they do not wish to take their critical principles to their logical conclusion.

The second or “Kenosis theory,” in effect asserts that our Lord did not know as much as the modern critic does about the Book of Genesis. A critical Bible dictionary of the moderate school may be cited here: “Both Christ and His Apostles or writers of the New Testament held the current Jewish notions respecting the Divine authority and revelation of the Old Testament” (Hastings, Vol. III., p. 601). This dictionary maintains that these “current Jewish notions” were wholly unreliable. The consequence of this is, that the reliability of Christ is more insidiously undermined. They say that He may be relied upon for religious facts, but that His references to authorship or to certain narratives of the Old Testament cannot be relied on. On the other hand He said, “If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things?”

We find that our Lord Jesus Christ put His Seal on the Book of Genesis; the earlier chapters of it are most particularly, though incidentally, referred to by Him. He quotes from the second chapter, and also refers to the Creation account, to the Fall, to Satan, Abel, Noah, the Flood, to Lot and the destruction of Sodom. We find that general or specific attestations are made to Genesis, chapter i, ii, iii, iv, v, vi to ix, and xi, as well as to incidents in the lives of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as recorded in the other chapters.

### **309. Bible Criticism—Genesis 10 (Table of Nations) Accurate**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 70, 71. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 70] It [the tenth chapter of Genesis] stands absolutely alone in ancient literature, without a remote parallel even among the Greeks, where we find the closest approach to a distribution of peoples in genealogical framework...

[p. 71] In view of the inextricable confusion of racial and national strains in the ancient Near East it would be quite impossible to draw up a simple scheme which would satisfy all scholars; no one system could satisfy all the claims made on the basis of ethnic predominance, ethnographic diffusion, language, physical type, culture, historical tradition. The Table of Nations remains an astonishingly accurate document.

### **310. Bible Criticism—Influence of Environment on Faith of Israel Refuted**

SOURCE: George Ernest Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment* (Chicago: Regnery, 1950), pp. 12–14, 20–23. Used by permission of Alec R. Allenson, Inc., Naperville, Ill., present publishers.

[p. 12] How far can the study of the environment of Israel, for example, be used to explain the faith of Israel? Specifically, has the God of Israel evolved from the gods of the nations, or Israelite monotheism from pagan polytheism?

During the past century our preoccupation with the idea of development has led us to answer this last question in the affirmative... From animism Israel was thought to have evolved through polytheism and henotheism to monotheism. Israel and her environment

were understood to coalesce in large measure before the days of the prophets; only gradually thereafter did she free herself from its influence. Environment and growth are here used as the chief clues for the understanding of the real meaning of Israel's achievement. Are they sufficient, or has the measure of truth which they contain blinded us to other factors which they cannot explain?

In the first place, it is increasingly realized to-day that the attempt to make of the Old Testament a source book for the evolution of religion from very primitive to highly advanced concepts has been made possible only by means of a radical misinterpretation of the literature...

[p. 13] In the second place, we cannot assume that a mere description of an evolutionary process provides the explanation for matters which belong to the realm of religious faith. The development of ideas is not a theme in which Biblical writers show much interest, nor is it one which can create a community of faith, a people of God. How did Israel become a nation with such faith in its God that its very existence was conceived to be a miracle of grace? The prophets did not invent this remarkable conception since it existed before them. Sociological study cannot explain it, since the change in material status from nomadic to agricultural life could effect no such religious innovation. Nor can the environment provide the answer, since the Old Testament bears eloquent witness to the fact that Canaanite religion was the most dangerous and disintegrative factor which the faith of Israel had to face. Israel's knowledge [p. 14] of her election by God must be traced to a theological reflection on the meaning of the Exodus from Egypt. It is a primary datum in Old Testament theology, and it belongs to a realm of religious faith which cannot be described or understood by the criteria of growth...

[p. 20] The power of Yahweh the God of Israel was known because he had chosen this people for himself, because he had humbled Pharaoh and delivered Israel from slavery, had formed a dis- [p. 21] pirited people into a nation and given them a law and an 'inheritance' of land. Israel had been in bondage, but was now freed. No abstract words were needed to describe God's being; it was sufficient to identify him with a simple historical statement: he was the God who had brought Israel out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage (Ex. 20.2)...

[p. 22] So great was he that the Israelite acknowledged his Lordship over every phenomenon that his experience encountered. No [p. 23] one aspect of nature was more characteristic of Yahweh than another; he was Lord both of the natural and the historical event, 'the God of heaven and the God of the earth' (Gen. 24.3). He therefore transcended nature, as he transcended history.

It was not that Israelite leaders necessarily reasoned all this out in a speculative way. The experience of their people led them to know it almost intuitively. They recognized their God in the first instance as authoritative and decisive power. And the point where that power was apprehended led them to an entirely different faith from that of the polytheist. The problem of life was seen, not as an integration with the forces of nature, but as an adjustment to the will of the God who had chosen them.

### **311. Bible Criticism—Joshua and Judges Confirmed**

SOURCE: John Garstang, *The Foundations of Bible History; Joshua, Judges* (New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931), pp. vii, viii. Used by permission of Harper & Brothers, New York.

[p. vii] Every identified site mentioned in the ... Books of Joshua and Judges was revisited; while three selected cities, Jericho, Ai and Hazor, were examined more

thoroughly with the spade. The impression now became positive. No radical flaw was found at all in the topography and archaeology of these documents...

[p. viii] The results of piecing together the threads of evidence in this way will probably astonish many readers; and it has convinced the writer, after years of study, that not only were these records in general founded upon fact, but they must have been derived from earlier writings, almost contemporary with the events described, so detailed and reliable is their information.

### **312. Bible Criticism—Monotheism of Israel**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 544, 545. Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

[p. 544] The days when Yahweh was thought to have won a victory over Baal because he was chief god of a whole tribe, whereas Baal was merely a term designating a host of local deities, each ruling only in a single town and its vicinity, are over. We now know that the followers of Yahweh and of [p. 545] Baal both considered their own gods as cosmic in power; the main difference between them was that Baal was storm-god, head of a whole pantheon of deities, while Yahweh was sole God of the entire known universe, with no pantheon. The gods of Baal's pantheon included relatives and even foes; neither the gods nor the world were in general his creation. Yahweh, on the other hand, was creator of all that existed. This is not the place to describe the total breakdown of Wellhausenism under the impact of our new knowledge of antiquity; suffice it to say that no arguments have been brought against early Israelite monotheism that would not apply equally well (with appropriate changes in specific evidence) to post-exilic Judaism. Nothing can alter the now certain fact that the gulf between the religions of Israel and of Canaan was as great as the resemblance between their material cultures and their poetic literatures.

### **313. Bible Criticism—New Testament Written Earlier Than the Critics Have Thought**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), p. 136. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

We can already say emphatically that there is no longer any solid basis for dating *any* book of the New Testament after about A.D. 80, two full generations before the date between 130 and 150 given by the more radical New Testament critics of today.

### **314. Bible Criticism—Old Testament Borrowings From Heathen Neighbors, Exaggerated Views**

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

At the beginning of the present century there was a school which over-emphasized the Babylonian connexions, and the *Babel-und-Bibel* controversy raged fiercely. Everything in the Old Testament was interpreted in terms of things Babylonian, or treated as a borrowing from Babylon, and all spiritual originality was denied to Israel, or at least minimized. More recently, with the fuller knowledge we have of Canaanite life and culture, there is a tendency to read everything in the Old Testament in terms of the primitive origins of Israelite life. While both of these emphases have been mistaken, it should not surprise us that new knowledge should assume a disproportionate importance.

### **315. Bible Criticism, Old Testament—Mythology Not the Source of Biblical Accounts**

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *What Mean These Stones?* p. 285. Copyright 1941 by American Schools of Oriental Research, Ithaca, New York. Used by permission.

There is little reason to believe that the Hebrews derived their ideas directly from the Babylonians, but that both Babylonian and Hebrew accounts [of Creation and the Flood] go back ultimately to a common origin can hardly be questioned. Those for whom the account in the Bible is a record of actual events are free to say that the inspired Hebrew narrative preserves the true story of what happened, while the Babylonian story is a corrupt and degenerate version.

Echoes of other mythological conceptions, like the seat of God in the recesses of the north (Psalm 48:2; Isaiah 14:13; Ezekiel 1:4), are heard in the Bible. Here too there are notable parallels in the Ras Shamrah poems (§ 181). In view of the antiquity of these poems it is a striking fact that the allusions in the Old Testament are all in late and poetic books, in which the highest religious conceptions are expressed (RB 1937, p. 548). They do not, therefore, show a contamination of Hebrew faith by Canaanite influence, but rather a stage in the development of Old Testament religion in which primitive pagan ideas could be used without fear of misunderstanding. Such allusions to early myths are comparable in significance to the Puritan Milton's allusions to classical mythology.

### **316. Bible Criticism—Old Testament—Probable Source of Borrowings**

SOURCE: S. H. Hooke, *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion* (London: Hutchinson, 1953), pp. 39, 40. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 39] There are a number of passages in Hebrew poetic literature which suggest, not direct borrowing, but the influence of certain literary forms. It is not possible to do more here than indicate some of the more striking parallels in style...

[p. 40] In Psalm 74, 3–9 there is a vivid description of the destruction of the temple which presents remarkably close parallels with the descriptions of the ruin wrought in the temples of Tammuz by the underworld powers. The rather difficult verse 5, "they made themselves known as men that lifted up axes upon a thicket of trees", may find an explanation in the description of the enemy in the Tammuz liturgies as breaking through the enclosure of sacred cedars...

This line of comparison might be pursued considerably further, but its general effect is to suggest that the early and wide-spread prevalence of these liturgies in Mesopotamia and the lands subject to its cultural influence provided a stock of poetic forms and imagery available for use when an appropriate occasion called for them. It is not suggested that Hebrew prophets, or the composers of canticles for sacred occasions, borrowed directly from Mesopotamian sources, but that they made use of ancient poetic forms and metaphors where they could be adapted to the expression of the new religious ideas growing out of their own religious experience.

### **317. Bible Criticism—Old Testament—Supposed Borrowings From Babylonian Sources Disproved**

SOURCE: Leonard W. King, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Vol. 2 (London: Chatto & Windus, 1919), pp. 289, 290, 304, 305, 311, 312, 314. Used by permission.

[p. 289] during the Persian and Hellenistic periods Babylon exerted an influence upon contemporary races of which we may trace some survivals in the civilization of the modern world... During far earlier periods, the civilization of Babylon had penetrated throughout a great part of Western part of Western Asia... Since the religious element

dominated her own activities in a greater measure than was the case with most other races of antiquity, it has been urged that many features in Hebrew religion and in Greek mythology can only be rightly explained by Babylonian beliefs in which they had their origin. It is the purpose of this chapter to examine a theory of Babylon's external influence, which has been propagated by a school of writers [around 1900] and has determined the direction of much recent research.

[p. 290] It is scarcely necessary to insist on the manner in which material drawn from Babylonian and Assyrian sources has helped to elucidate points in the political and religious history of Israel. Scarcely less striking, though not so numerous, are the echoes from Babylonian legends which have long been recognized as existing in Greek mythology. The best known example of direct borrowing is undoubtedly the myth of Adonis and Aphrodite, the main features of which correspond closely to the Babylonian legend of Tammuz and Ishtar. In this case not only the myth, but the accompanying festival and rites were also borrowed, passing to Greece by way of Byblos on the Syrian coast and Paphos in Cyprus, both centres of Astarte worship...

[p. 304] It is claimed that the Biblical narratives relating to the earlier history of the Hebrews have in particular been influenced by the Babylonian myths of the universe, and that a great number of passages have in consequence an astral significance... The Descent of the goddess Ishtar into the Underworld in search of her youthful husband Tammuz... in its Babylonian form is unquestionably a nature-myth. There can be little doubt that in thy myth Tammuz represents the vegetation of spring; this, after being parched up by the summer-heat, is absent from the earth during the winter months, until restored by the goddess of fertility. There is also no doubt that the cult of Tammuz eventually spread into Palestine, for Ezekiel in a vision saw women at the north gate of the temple at Jerusalem weeping for Tammuz...

[p. 305] It is suggested that the story of Abraham's journey with his wife Sarah into Egypt may have been written, by a parallel system of allegory, in terms reflecting a descent into the underworld and a rescue from it... The pit into which Joseph is thrown by his brethren and the prison into which Potiphar casts him also represent the underworld; and his two fellow-prisoners, the chief baker and the chief butler, are two minor deities in Marduk's household...

[p. 311] Babylon was, indeed, the mother of astronomy no less than of astrology, and classical antiquity was indebted to her in no small measure; but, strictly speaking, her scientific observations do not date from a very early period. It is true we have evidence that, as early as the close of the third millennium, the [p. 312] astronomers recorded observations of the planet Venus, and there is also a fragment of an early text which shows that they attempted to measure approximately the positions of the fixed stars. But their art of measuring remained for a long time primitive, and it was only the later Babylonians, of the period from the sixth to the first century B.C., who were enabled to fix with sufficient accuracy the movements of the planets, especially those of the moon...

[p. 314] [The evidence] is surely decisive against any wholesale adoption of astral mythology from Babylon on the part of the writers or redactors of the old Testament whether in pre-Exilic or in post-Exilic times. But it is quite compatible with the view that some of the imagery, and even certain lines of thought, occurring in the poetical and prophetic books of the Hebrews, betray a Babylonian colouring and may find their explanation in the cuneiform literature. There can be no doubt that the Babylonian texts

have afforded invaluable assistance in the effort to trace the working of the oriental mind in antiquity.

### **318. Bible Criticism—Outmoded Critical View of Belshazzar**

SOURCE: F. W. Farrar, *The Book of Daniel (The Expositor's Bible)*; New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1895), p. 54.

When we reach the fifth chapter, we are faced by a new king, Belshazzar, who is somewhat emphatically called the son of Nebuchadrezzar. History knows of no such king. The prince of whom it *does* know was never king, and was a son, not of Nebuchadrezzar, but of the usurper Nabunaid...

But if we follow Herodotus, this Belshazzar never came to the throne; and according to Berossus he was conquered in Borsippa.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: A Babylonian tablet found in 1923 proves that the statements made by these historians concerning Belshazzar are erroneous, and that the Biblical account concerning his kingship is correct. See Nos. 207–209.]

### **319. Bible Criticism—Outmoded Critical View of Belshazzar (Supposedly Confused with Antiochus Epiphanes)**

SOURCE: F. W. Farrar, "The Book of Daniel," part 2, chap. 15, "The Fiery Inscription," in *An Exposition of the Bible* by Marcus Dods and others, Vol. 4: Jeremiah–St. Mark (Hartford, Conn.: The S. S. Scranton Co., 1910), p. 403.

To read it aright, and duly estimate its grandeur, we must relegate to the conclusion of thy story all worrying questions, ... as to whom the writer intended by Belshazzar, or whom by Darius the Mede... To those who, with the present writer, are convinced, by evidence from every quarter—from philology, history, the testimony of the inscriptions, and the manifold results obtained by the Higher Criticism—that the Book of Daniel is the work of some holy and highly gifted "Chasid" in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes [175–163 B.C.], it becomes clear that the story of Belshazzar, whatever dim fragments of Babylonian tradition it may enshrine, is really suggested by the profanity of Antiochus Epiphanes in carrying off, and doubtless subjecting to profane usage, many of the sacred vessels of the Temple of Jerusalem.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This 1910 statement was rendered completely out of date by the discovery of ancient Babylonian records mentioning the name of Belshazzar or otherwise referring to him as the king's eldest son and coregent. See Belshazzar.]

### **320. Bible Criticism—Outmoded Critical View of Hittites**

SOURCE: Francis William Newman, *A History of the Hebrew Monarchy* (2d ed.; London: John Chapman, 1853), pp. 178, 179.

[p. 178] We now enter on a yet more perplexing narrative, in which the unhistorical tone is far too manifest to allow of our easy belief in it; although it is impossible to doubt that there was a real event at bottom which deeply affected the national feelings. This event is the siege of Samaria by the king of Syria...

[p. 179] [The Bible] says, therefore, nothing incredible in assigning a *night-panic* as the reason for the sudden disappearance of the Syrians; but the particular ground of alarm<sup>2</sup> attributed to them does not exhibit the writer's acquaintance with the times in a very favourable light.

[Note 2:] The Syrians are stated to dread an attack from the kings of the Hittites and of the Egyptians. No Hittite kings can have compared in power with the king of Judah, the real and nearer ally, who is not named at all; and the kings of Egypt (if there were really more than one) were at a weary distance, with a desert [*sic*] between.

In the whole narrative, from **2 Kings, vi.8** to **vii.6**, the title “king of Israel” occurs twenty-two times, yet his name never slips out, nor that of the lord who is trampled to death; nor is there a single mark of acquaintance with the contemporaneous history.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Discoveries shedding light on the ancient Hittite Empire have shown that the adjective “unhistorical,” applied by this author of a century ago to the Biblical narrative belongs instead to the critical author’s erroneous conclusions. See No. 321n.]

### **321. Bible Criticism—Outmoded Critical View of Hittites**

SOURCE: T. K. Cheyne, “Hittites,” *The Encyclopedia Britannica*, 9th ed. Vol. 12 (New York: Scribner, 1881), p. 25.

Some confusion has been caused in the treatment of the history of the Hittites by the uncritical use of the Old Testament. It is true that the Khittim or Hittites are repeatedly mentioned among the tribes which inhabited Canaan before the Israelites . . . , but the lists of these pre-Israelitish populations cannot be taken as strictly historical documents . . . It is obvious that narratives written, or (as all will agree) edited, so long after the events referred to cannot be taken as of equal authority with Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions . . . It is not surprising that at least two eminent Egyptologists (Chabas, Ebers) should absolutely deny the identity of the Khita and the Khittim.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The same author says in another *Britannica* article (“Canaanites,” Vol. 4, p. 763) that in the Bible the Hittites seem “to have been included among the Canaanites by mistake.” Though mentioned frequently in the Bible, nothing was known of the Hittites from secular sources until late in the nineteenth century. It has been said that the resurrection of their history, culture, religion, and language is one of the sagas of modern archaeology. Their capital, called Khattushash was located in central Asia Minor, See *SDADic*, “Hittites.”]

### **322. Bible Criticism — Patriarchal Period, Scholars’ Opinion on, Changed by Archeology**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period* (reprint; Pittsburgh: Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania), p. 3. Copyright 1949 by Louis Finkelstein. Used by permission.

Eminent names among the scholars can be cited for regarding every item of Gen. 11–50 as reflecting late invention, or at least retrojection of events and conditions under the Monarchy into the remote past, about which nothing was thought to have been really known to the writers of later days.

The archaeological discoveries of the past generation have changed all this. Aside from a few die-hards among older scholars, there is scarcely a single biblical historian who has not been impressed by the rapid accumulation of data supporting the substantial historicity of patriarchal tradition.

### **323. Bible Criticism—Patriarchal Stories Vindicated as Historical by Nuzi Finds**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period* (reprint; Pittsburgh: Presbyterian Board of Colportage of Western Pennsylvania), p. 6. Copyright 1949 by Louis Finkelstein. Used by permission.

When we add the fact that our present knowledge of social institutions and customs in another part of northern Mesopotamia in the fifteenth century (Nuzu) has brilliantly illuminated many details in the patriarchal stories which do not fit into the post-Mosaic tradition at all, our case, for the substantial historicity of the tradition of the Patriarchs is clinched . . . Nor can we accept every picturesque detail as it stands in our present narrative. But as a whole the picture in Genesis is historical, and there is no reason to doubt the general accuracy of the biographical details and the sketches of personality which make the Patriarchs come alive with a vividness unknown to a single extrabiblical character in the whole vase literature of the ancient Near East.



### **324. Bible Criticism—Psalms, Evidence of Early Date**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Bible After Twenty Years of Archaeology," *Religion in Life*, 21 (Autumn, 1952), 543, 544, Copyright 1952 by Pierce and Smith. Used by permission of Abingdon Press, Nashville, and the author.

[p. 543] We also have a great many close parallels in grammar. It is remarkable how many apparent anomalies in early Hebrew verse, which have been explained away or emended by scholars, turn out to be accurate reflections of Canaanite grammatical peculiarities which were forgotten long before the time of the Masoretes, who vocalized the consonantal Hebrew text of the Bible in the seventh to ninth centuries A.D. These grammatical peculiarities grow fewer and fewer in later Hebrew verse and are scarcely to be found at all in our latest biblical poetry...

[p. 544] In harmony with the earlier date which must be assigned to Pentateuchal poetry, we must date many of the Psalms back to early Israelite times... This Psalm [68] has often been attributed to the Maccabean period (second century B.C.), in spite of the fact that the Jewish scholars who translated it into Greek in the same century did not understand it any better than the Masoretes a thousand years later. This is typical of the utter absurdity of much so called "critical" work in the biblical field. A rapidly increasing number of scholars today deny any Maccabean Psalms and doubt whether any part of the Psalter is later than the fourth or even fifth century B.C.

### **325. Bible Text—Accuracy in Copying Proved by Dead Sea Scrolls**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 127–129, 133. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 127] The first surprise that confronted scholars was the extraordinary closeness of most of the biblical scrolls to the Masoretic text, fixed by Jewish scholars and provided by them with vowel points in the eighth and ninth centuries A.D. The first Isaiah scroll seldom departs in essentials from the printed Hebrew Bible, though there are innumerable variations from the latter in spelling...

[p. 128] Many apparent differences between the text of the complete Isaiah MSS and the extant Hebrew Bible are, however, simply due to careless copying on the part of our Qumran scribes or their precursors. Nearly all other Hebrew biblical MSS from Qumran are very accurately copied and scarcely differ at all from the consonantal text of our Masoretic Bible. This fact proves conclusively that we must treat the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible with the utmost respect and that the free emending of difficult passages in which modern critical scholars have indulged, cannot be tolerated any longer.

However, other recensions of the Hebrew text of some biblical books were in circulation in the last two centuries B.C. ... [p. 129] Fragments of Hebrew recensions of Exodus and Deuteronomy have also been found to show closer relation to LXX than to the Hebrew text of our Bible. Since the Pentateuch was put into Greek before the middle of the third century B.C., this means that the Hebrew MS from which it was translated, goes back to a recension which diverged still earlier from the source of our Masoretic text. This divergent recension was still copied in the first century B.C., but by the second century A.D. we have reason to believe that it had disappeared from use. Where the two recensions agree, we must now reckon with a common ancestor going back into the Persian period, if not even earlier. Under such circumstances emendations become doubly precarious...

[p. 133] There has been further confirmation [since the above was written] of my view that we can trace the Masoretic text of the earlier books of the Hebrew Bible back to

the form in which they were edited during the Babylonian Exile. After the Exile these carefully fixed texts were brought back to Palestine, where they continued to be copied with extraordinary faithfulness to the old consonantal text.

### **326. Bible Text—Antiquity of Masoretic Text**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery," *BASOR*, 118 (April, 1950), p. 6.

It cannot be insisted too strongly that the Isaiah Scroll proves the great antiquity of the text of the Masoretic Book, warning us against the light-hearted emendation in which we used to indulge.<sup>1</sup> [Note 1: This stricture applies equally to the writer, who reacted against the excesses of Duhm and Haupt (his teacher), but who still emended the text much too light-heartedly. Elsewhere in this number he calls attention to the correctness of the consonantal text of Num. 22:5, where 'MW = 'Amau has been emended by virtually all scholars.]

### **327. Bible Text—Change in Attitude in Text Criticism Attributed to Archeological Discoveries**

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, "H. H. Rowley and the New Trend in Biblical Studies," in *Inspiration and Interpretation*, ed. by John F. Walvoord, p. 198. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 198] Is Professor Rowley's contention [in 1944] "that the Bible now in our hands cannot be relied on to give the authentic word of God" really true? It was certainly *thought* to be true a generation ago, as Professor Rowley himself points out: [see No. 328]...

Doubtless the climate must have changed considerably also since 1944... What effected the change? Archeology once again came to the aid of sober scholarship to act as a purge on radical criticism—this time in which [i.e., what] is unquestionably "the most important discovery ever made in Old Testament manuscripts"—the recovery of the Isaiah Scroll in 1947, dating from the second century B.C.

### **328. Bible Text—Critical View of Untrustworthiness of the Old Testament Text Formerly Held**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, editor's Introduction, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. xv. Used by permission.

Towards the text of the Old Testament, as represented by the Massoretic Hebrew, there was a rooted suspicion, and commentators vied with one another in the ingenuity with which it was emended. Where any version could be invoked in favour of a change its support was welcomed, but where no version could be laid under contribution it mattered little. Any guess was to be preferred to a text which was assumed to be untrustworthy. That this is an overstatement, and in some degree a caricature, is doubtless true; yet there was a very substantial justification for it, and the innumerable emendations that filled every commentary may be appealed to in evidence.<sup>1</sup> [Note 1: In Gunkel's *Die Psalmen* (H.K.), 1926, more than 250 new emendations were proposed, in addition to very large numbers of others that were adopted.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: This habit of "light-hearted emendation," as Albright calls it, is no longer so freely indulged in. This change has been brought about largely by the archeological discoveries of recent decades. For the change in attitude, see Nos. 327, 329.]

### **329. Bible Text—Days of Reckless Emendations Past**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "The Old Testament and the Archaeology of Palestine," in H. H. Rowley, ed., *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. 25. Used by permission.

One thing is certain: the days when Duhm and his imitators could recklessly emend the Hebrew text of the poetic books of the Bible are gone for ever; so also is the time when Wutz felt free to reinterpret the original Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX to suit himself. We may rest assured that the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, though not infallible, has been preserved with an accuracy perhaps unparalleled in any other Near Eastern literature... The flood of light now being shed on biblical Hebrew poetry of all periods by Ugaritic literature guarantees the relative antiquity of its composition as well as the astonishing accuracy of its transmission.

### **330. Bible Text—Dead Sea Fragment of Leviticus Agrees Almost Entirely With Masoretic Text**

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 319. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

The fragments of Leviticus in the old Hebrew script which were found in the first cave in 1949 gave us, as Birnbaum remarked, our oldest witness to the text of any part of the Bible. It is therefore significant that they agree almost entirely with the Masoretic text of Leviticus.

### **331. Bible Text—Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll Agrees With Masoretic Text**

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, "Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript," *BASOR*, 111 (1948), pp. 16, 17. Used by permission.

[p. 16] With the exception of ... relatively unimportant omissions to be noted below, the whole book is here, and it is substantially the book preserved in the Masoretic text. Differing notably in orthography and somewhat in morphology, it agrees with the Masoretic text to a remarkable degree [p. 17] in wording. Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition.

There are minor omissions, but nothing comparable with those found in the Septuagint of some of the books of the Old Testament.

### **332. Bible Text—Dead Sea Scrolls Agree With Masoretic**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," *BASOR* 140 (December, 1955), 28. Used by permission.

The greatest textual surprise of the Qumran finds has probably been the fact that most of the scrolls and fragments present a consonantal text which is virtually indistinguishable from the text of corresponding passages in our Masoretic Bible.

### **333. Bible Text—Dead Sea Scrolls Prove Early Stabilization of Old Testament Text**

SOURCE: Frank M. Cross, Jr., "The Scrolls and the Old Testament," *The Christian Century*, 72 (Aug. 10, 1955), 920. Copyright 1955 Christian Century Foundation. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

Scholars have assumed, quite understandably, that this evidence permits generalization. Not only in Isaiah but in other prophetic books, indeed in the entire Old Testament, we must now assume that the Old Testament text was stabilized early and that late recessional activities were only of slight effect. This conclusion, of course, powerfully supports textual scholars of conservative persuasion.

### **334. Bible Text—Essential Truth Preserved Unchanged**

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), pp. 320, 321. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

[p. 320] The general reader and student of the Bible may be satisfied to note that nothing in all this changes our understanding of the religious teachings of the Bible. We

did not need the Dead Sea Scrolls to show us that the text has not come down to us through the centuries unchanged. Interpretations depending upon the exact words of a verse must be examined in the light of all we know about the history of the text. The essential truth and the will of God revealed in the Bible, however, have been preserved unchanged through all the vicissitudes in the transmission of the text. Even when mistaken interpretations were [p. 321] propounded, as in the commentary on Habakkuk and the fragments of other commentaries, only slight changes in minor details were made in the text itself.

### **335. Bible Text—Manuscript Situation Before Finding of Dead Sea Scrolls**

SOURCE: Frederick Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (4th ed., rev.; London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1939), pp. 42, 48. Used by permission.

[p. 42] How well are we provided with manuscripts of the Hebrew Old Testament? It is generally rather a shock when one first learns that the oldest extant MSS are no earlier than the ninth century after Christ. Over a thousand years separate our earliest Hebrew manuscripts from the date at which the latest of the books contained in them was originally written. It is a disquieting thought, when one reflects how much a text may be corrupted or mutilated in the course of transmission by manuscript over a long period of time...

[p. 48] There is, indeed, no probability that we shall ever find manuscripts of the Hebrew text going back to a period before the formation of the text which we know as Masoretic. We can only arrive at an idea of it by a study of the earliest translations made from it.

### **336. Bible Text—Masoretic Surprisingly Unchanged in 1,000 Years**

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 304. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

It is a matter for wonder that through something like a thousand years the text underwent so little alteration. As I said in my first article on the scroll, "Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition."

### **337. Bible Text—Masoretic Text Is Old and in the Main Authentic**

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 314. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

Much more might be added about the St. Mark's Isaiah scroll, but what has been said may suffice to indicate its importance for establishing the best possible text of the Old Testament. By and large it confirms the antiquity and authenticity of the Masoretic text. Where it departs from the traditional text, the latter is usually preferable.

### **338. Bible Text—Masoretic Text of Isaiah Reveals Language Near Time of Isaiah**

SOURCE: Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking, 1955), p. 109. Copyright 1955 by Millar Burrows. Used by permission.

The book of Isaiah certainly comes from a time several centuries before the earliest date to which this manuscript can be assigned on any grounds. Most of the differences between the scroll and the Masoretic text consist of changes in spelling and in the grammatical forms of words. In these respects, with some notable exceptions, the Masoretic text has preserved a form of the Hebrew language closer to the dialect of Jerusalem as it was spoken in the time of Isaiah than the language of the scroll is. In other

words, the text of the scroll has more changes in grammar and spelling from the original language of Isaiah than the Masoretic text has.

### **339. Bible Text—Masoretic Text Upheld**

SOURCE: John Bright, review of Bleddyn J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (1951), in *Interpretation*, 6 (Jan., 1952), 116, 117. Used by permission.

[p. 116] One may mention the discovery of the Cairo Genizah . . . , now more recently, the sensational Dead Sea Scrolls—to single out only a few. The upshot has been in general, at once a new awareness of the complexity of the Masoretic tradition, and a new confidence in its fundamental tenacity. On the other hand, one must recall that the most of the Old Testament commentaries presently in use were written a generation or more ago when an older fashion in textual criticism prevailed. Great reliance was [p. 117] placed upon the Septuagint. It was thought that, in most cases where the two disagreed, the Hebrew text could be restored on the basis of the Greek. The result was an extensive emendation which amounted in places to the virtual rewriting of the Hebrew text—a process which is now seen to have been premature, to say the least. The user of these commentaries must learn to preserve a critical attitude before much of the discussion of the text found there, else he will find himself interpreting a text that never existed save in the commentator's mind.

### **340. Bible Text—No Vital Doctrine Rests on Disputed Readings**

SOURCE: Frederic Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1958), p. 55. Copyright 1958 by Kathleen Mary Kenyon and Gwendoline Margaret Ritchie. Used by permission.

No fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith rests on a disputed reading. Constant references to mistakes and divergences of reading, such as the plan of this book necessitates, might give rise to the doubt whether the substance, as well as the language, of the Bible is not open to question. It cannot be too strongly asserted that in substance the text of the Bible is certain.

### **341. Bible Text—Textual Criticism Becomes More Conservative**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, editor's Introduction, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951), p. xxv. Used by permission.

In the field of Lower, or Textual, Criticism, the most significant tendency of our period has been seen in the greater respect paid to the Massoretic text. Sometimes this has been carried to the extent of holding that the text is completely inviolable, but this has been an overpressing of the tendency. It has often to be recognized that the Hebrew text that has come down to us is not in its original state, though nothing like so often as was formerly held.

### **342. Birth Control, Catholic Position on Morality of**

SOURCE: John L. Thomas, *The Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 115–118. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 115]. In the light of these principles let us consider the morality of birth control. A study of the structure and function of the generative system indicates that its primary purpose is reproduction. The production of sperm in the male and the process of the menstrual cycle in woman are clearly geared to reproduction. Further, a study of the conjugal act indicates clearly that its primary purpose is to bring about the union of the co-principles of reproduction, sperm and ovum. Conception may not always follow the sexual act, but the act itself is designed to make the fusion of sperm and ovum possible. Although the immediate, experienced result of sexual relations is physical release, a

temporary cessation of sexual desire, and an intimate, psychological union of the partners, these are consequent, accompanying effects of the act and clearly not the primary purpose either of the reproductive system or of sexual union.

Since marital union is an act by which husband and wife mutually complete each other by supplying that which the other lacks in terms of reproduction, its very meaning implies that each gives freely and unreservedly what they are able. It is precisely this generous, mutual gift of self that unites husband and wife in a procreating act of love. To deprive this mutual gift of its life-giving, generative character by placing a direct obstacle to the natural procreative process inherent in it, is to destroy the essential significance of the act. In other words, when a couple employ contraceptives they perform an act that is generative by its nature, but at the same time they attempt to frustrate or hinder its inherent reproductive purpose by deliberately placing an obstacle to the natural generative process. Hence, they are not acting as reasonable persons because they will and do not will the generative act at the same time. Such [p. 116] action constitutes a clear contradiction in the practical order, for the couple freely choose to perform a generative act, and at the same time they do not choose it, inasmuch as they attempt to frustrate its primary generative character...

In using their reproductive faculties husband and wife supply the human co-principles of life and have the privilege of co-operating with the Creator in the production of a new life. This power has been entrusted to them by God...

To summarize then, the moral evil of birth control consists in the positive and direct intervention in the process of procreation which the couple have freely initiated by their marital union. It should be noted that the essential evil of the act is not that it may hinder a possible conception. The union of the sperm and the ovum may or may not follow the conjugal act and is quite independent of the will of the spouses. The evil of birth control consists primarily in deviation from the order of right reason. By interfering with the natural process of the reproductive act, the spouse assume a dominion that they do not possess over their generative faculties.

Some people argue that spouses have the right to use birth control because the marital act has other purposes besides re- [p. 117] production. Marital union does have other purposes which amply justify its use, but these purposes must not be achieved by means of an immoral act. Moral rectitude requires that the couple follow the order of right reason in their actions. If they desire to perform the conjugal act for any number of valid reasons they must respect the natural procreative process inherent in the act. It is not in their power to decide whether conception will follow from their union. They act in accord with right reason as long as they do not attempt to interfere with the natural physiological process that they have initiated in seeking marital relations. Thus, husband and wife do not act contrary to the order of reason if they desire sexual relations even when they are certain that conception cannot follow. In doing so they are seeking some of the other purposes that marital union achieves, while they are not interfering with the natural procreative process of the sexual act itself.

The Catholic viewpoint on birth control has been clearly stated by Pius XI in his encyclical *On Christian Marriage*: "Any use whatsoever of matrimony exercised in such a way that the act is deliberately frustrated in its natural power to generate life is an offense against the law of God and of nature, and those who indulge in such are branded with the guilt of grave sin." He shows that birth control violates the order of reason and is

gravely sinful as follows: “Since, therefore, the conjugal act is destined primarily by nature for the begetting of children, those who in exercising it deliberately frustrate its natural power and purpose, sin against nature and commit a deed which is shameful and intrinsically evil.”

Finally, it should be noted that the Catholic position on this matter does not represent a mere disciplinary regulation promulgated for the direction of the faithful and consequently binding only them. Rather, it is an obvious application of general moral principles to a specific act binding all who possess the use of reason. It follows that neither the Pope nor any one else has the power to change it. When Catholics say that the use of birth control is *unnatural* or *against nature*, they mean it is contrary to the created order of things which right reason [p. 118] can discover and to which reasonable creatures must adhere in their actions. The rejection of the Catholic viewpoint in this matter implies either a lack of logic in reasoning or a denial of the basic moral principles upon which it is based.

### **343. Birth Control—No Hope for Change of Catholic Position**

SOURCE: J. Kenneth O’Loane, Letter, *Science*, 131 (April 8, 1960), 1050. Copyright 1960 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Washington. Reprinted from *Science* by permission.

There remains the question of whether, as Sulloway, Davis, and Calingaert hope, the Catholic Church will change its opinion, even if it takes a few centuries to do so. This hope has been expressed repeatedly in the past several years by members of the Planned Parenthood Federation, various demographers, and even Protestant clergymen, who, in some cases, have asserted that the Catholic Church must or will change its mind. Perhaps the worst feature of Sulloway’s very unfortunate book will be its effect in helping to foster this delusion.

This vain hope arises because these critics do not understand that the Church’s ban on artificial birth control is not a disciplinary matter, as are, for example, Friday abstinence, the observance of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, and the celibacy of the clergy. In the case of birth control the Church is interpreting both the natural moral law and Sacred Scripture. When she does this, she acts only as a teacher, not as a lawmaker. Since God, not the Church, is the author of the law, the Church cannot change it.

As I said previously, “an *essential* claim of the Catholic Church is that when it *does* take a definite doctrinal stand it cannot be in error.” The Catholic Church would collapse if it ever changed in essence one of its doctrines. However, “over a period of 20 centuries the Church has never made an essential change in any of its doctrines,” and it never will.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: In several recent issues of *Science* (Vol. 130, Sept. 4 and Nov. 13, 1959, pp. 559, 560, and 1302, 1362, 1364) there appeared a review and discussions of Alvah W. Sulloway’s *Birth Control and Catholic Doctrine*. Finally, J. Kenneth O’Loane presented a lengthy rebuttal, from which this quotation is taken.]

### **344. Birthdays, Not a Semitic Custom**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 249. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Birthdays were not generally celebrated among Semites... Keeping such holidays was rather an Aryan custom. Herodotus (1:133) says that it was the one day that every Persian honored most and it was celebrated by both Greeks and Romans, especially by the latter during the early Empire when the oft discredited *natalicia* (natal entertainments) are mentioned by various Augustan writers,<sup>2</sup> [Note 2: See Ovid *Tristia* 3:12, 2 and 5:5, 1; Martial *Epigr.* 8:64, 4; etc.] when patrons received gifts from their clients in honor of

their “Genius.” We learn from Josephus<sup>3</sup> [Note 3: *Jewish War* 7:3, 1 (37–40).] that the Emperor Titus after the fall of Jerusalem celebrated the eighteenth birthday of his brother Domitian with great pomp when over twenty-five hundred Jewish captives were slain in fights with beasts or with one another, and that later at Berytus (Beirut) he celebrated the sixty-first birthday of his father with still greater pomp.

### 345. Bishop, Universal, Views of Gregory I

SOURCE: Gregory the Great, *Epistles*, in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, pp. 179, 222, 240, 241, 170, 226, 2d pagination.

*To Euglogius, Bishop of Alexandria, and Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch (bk. 5, epistle 43)*

[p. 179] This name of Universality was offered by the holy synod of Chalcedon to the pontiff of the Apostolic See which by the providence of God I serve. But no one of my predecessors has ever consented to use this so profane a title; since, forsooth, if one Patriarch is called Universal, the name of Patriarch in the case of the rest is derogated. But far be this, far be it from the mind of a Christian, that any one should wish to seize for himself that whereby he might seem in the least degree to lessen the honour of his brethren. While, then, we are unwilling to receive this honour when offered to us, think how disgraceful it is for any one to have wished to usurp it to himself perforce.

Wherefore let not your Holiness in your epistles ever call any one Universal.

*To Anastasius, Bishop of Antioch (bk. 7, epistle 27)*

[p. 222] You have made use of imperial language in your letters, since there is a very close relationship between love and power. For both presume in a princely way; both ever speak with authority.

And indeed on the receipt of the synodical epistle of our brother and fellow-bishop Cyriacus it was not worth my while to make a difficulty on account of the profane title at the risk of disturbing the unity of holy Church: but nevertheless I took care to admonish him with respect to this same superstitious and proud title, saying that he could not have peace with us unless he corrected the elation of the aforesaid expression, which the first apostate invented. You, however, ought not to say that this is a matter of no consequence, since, if we bear it with equanimity, we are corrupting the faith of the Universal Church; for you know how many not only heretics but heresiarchs have issued from the Constantinopolitan Church. And, not to speak of the injury done to your dignity, if one bishop is called Universal, the Universal Church comes to ruin, if the one who is universal falls. But far, far be this levity from my ears. Yet I trust in Almighty God that what He has promised He will soon fulfil; *Whosoever exalteth himself shall be humbled* (Luke xiv. 11).

*To Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria (bk. 8, epistle 30)*

[p. 240] Your Blessedness has also been careful to declare that you do not now make use of proud titles, which have sprung from a root of vanity, in writing to certain persons, and [p. 241] you address me saying, *As you have commanded*. This word, *command*, I beg you to remove from my hearing, since I know who I am, and who you are. For in position you are my brethren, in character my fathers. I did not, then, command, but was desirous of indicating what seemed to be profitable. Yet I do not find that your Blessedness has been willing to remember perfectly this very thing that I brought to your recollection. For I said that neither to me nor to any one else ought you to write anything of the kind; and lo, in the preface of the epistle which you have thought fit to make use of a proud appellation, calling me Universal Pope. But I beg your most sweet Holiness to do this no more.



*To Emperor Mauricius Augustus (bk. 5, epistle 20; bk. 7, epistle 33)*

[p. 170] Who is this that, against the evangelical ordinances, against the decrees of canons, presumes to usurp to himself a new name? Would indeed that one by himself he were, if he could be without any lessening of others,—he that covets to be universal... If then any one in that Church takes to himself that name, whereby he makes himself the head of all the good, it follows that the Universal Church falls from its standing (which God forbid), when he who is called Universal falls. But far from Christian hearts be that name of blasphemy, in which the honour of all priests is taken away, while it is madly arrogated to himself by one.

[p. 226] Now I confidently say that whosoever calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest, is in his elation the precursor of Antichrist, because he proudly puts himself above all others. Nor is it by dissimilar pride that he is led into error; for, as that perverse one wishes to appear as God above all men, so whosoever this one is who covets being called sole priest, he extols himself above all other priests. But, since the Truth says, *Every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled* (Luke xiv. 11; xviii. 14), I know that every kind of elation is the sooner burst as it is the more inflated.

### **346. Blue Laws, Against Blasphemy (Maryland, 1649)**

SOURCE: William Hand Browne, *Archives of Maryland*, Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland, January 1637/8–September 1664 (Baltimore: Maryland Historical Society, 1883), pp. 244, 245.

[p. 244] That whatsoever pson or psons within this Province and the Islands thereunto belonging shall from henceforth blaspheme God, that is Curse him, or deny our Saviour Jesus Christ to bee the sonne of God, or shall deny the holy Trinity the ffather sonne and holy Ghost, or the Godhead of any of the said Three psons of the Trinity or the Vnity of the Godhead, or shall use or utter any reproachful Speeches, words or language concerning the said Holy Trinity, or any of the said three psons thereof, shalbe punished with death and confiscation or forfeiture of all his or her lands and goods to the Lord Proprietary and his heires. And bee it also Enacted by the Authority and with the advise and assent aforesaid. That whatsoever pson or psons shall from henceforth use or utter any reproachful words or Speeches concerning the blessed Virgin Mary the Mother of our Saviour or the holy Apostles or Evangelists or any of them shall in such case for the first offence forfeit to the said Lord Proprietary and his heirs Lords and Proprietaries of this Province the sume of ffive pound Sterling or the value thereof to be Levved on the goods and chattells of every such pson soe offending, but in case such Offender or Offenders, shall not then have goods and chattells sufficient for the satisfyeing of such forfeiture, or that the sume bee not otherwise speedily satisfied that then such Offender or Offenders shalbe publicly whipt and bee imprisoned during the pleasure of the Lord Proprietary or the Leive or cheife Governor of this Province for the time being. And that every such Offender or Offenders for every second offence shall forfeit tenne pound sterling or the value thereof to bee levyed as aforesaid, or in case such offender or Offenders shall not then haue goods and chattells within this Province sufficient for that purpose then to bee publicly and severely whipt and [p. 245] imprisoned as before is expressed. And that every pson or psons before mentioned offending herein the third time, shall for such third offence forfeit all his lands and Goods and bee for ever banished and expelled out of this Province.

### **347. Blue Laws, Against Blasphemy (Virginia, 1610–1611)**

SOURCE: *For the Colony in Virginea Britannia. Lawes Divine, Morall and Martiall, c.* [first established by Sir Thomas Gates, 1610; exemplified and enlarged by Sir Thomas Dale, 1611], edited by William Strachey,

London, 1612. In Peter Force, *Tracts and Other Papers, Relating Principally to ... the Colonies in North America* (Washington: William Q. Force, 1844), Vol. 3, No. 2, p. 10.

That no man blaspheme Gods holy name upon paine of death, or use unlawful oathes, taking the name of God in vaine, curse, or banne, upon paine of severe punishment for the first offence so committed, and for the second, to have a bodkin thrust through his tongue, and if he continue the blaspheming of Gods holy name, for the third time so offending, he shall be brought to a martiall court, and there receive censure of death for his offence. [See No. 1655n.]

### **348. Blue Laws, Against Swearing (New Haven Colony, 1656)**

SOURCE: *New-Haven's Settling in New-England. And Some Lawes for Government*: Published for the Use of that Colony (London: Printed by M.S. for Livewell Chapman, at the Crowne in Popes-head-Alley, 1656), p. 99.

Be it Enacted by the Governour, Council and Representatives, in General Court Assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That if any person within this Colony shall Swear Rashly and Vainly, either by the Holy Name of God, of any other Oath: Or shall Sinfully and Wickedly Curse any person or persons; such person shall forfeit to the Treasury of the County wherein he liveth for every such offence, the Sum of *Ten Shillings*: And it shall be in the power of any Assistant, or Justice of the Peace, by Warrant to the Constable, to call such person or persons before him, and upon just proof to pass Sentence according to Law, and levy the said penalty according to the usual order of Justice. And if such person or persons be not able, or shall refuse to pay the aforesaid fine, he or they shall be set in the Stocks, not exceeding three Hours, and not less than one Hour.

### **349. Blue Laws—Church Attendance Required (New Haven Colony)**

SOURCE: Charles J. Hoadly, *Records of the Colony or Jurisdiction of New Haven, From May, 1653, to the Union, Together With the New Haven Code of 1656* (Hartford: Case, Lockwood and Company, 1858), p. 588.

And it is further Ordered, That wheresoever the Ministry of the word is established within this Jurisdiction, according to the Order of the Gospel, every person according to the mind of God, shall duly resort and attend thereunto, upon the Lords dayes at least, and also upon dayes of publick Fasting, or Thanksgiving, Ordered to be gen[39]-erally kept and observed. And if any person within this Jurisdiction, shall without just and necessary cause, absent or withdraw from the same, he shall after due means of conviction used, for every such sinfull miscarriage, forfeit five shillings to the Plantation, to be levied as other Fines.

### **350. Blue Laws, in American Colonies**

SOURCE: Walter F. Prince, "An Examination of Peter's 'Blue Laws,'" in *Annual Report of the American Historical Association, for the Year 1898*. U.S. 55th Congress, 3d sess., H. R. Document No. 295 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1899), pp. 97, 99.

[p. 97] The most famous portion of Peter's book is, of course, that which treats of the blue laws. It is that which rouses in its adversaries the bitterest agonies of disgust. For sixty years patriotic souls have assailed the authenticity of these laws, and the nays have had it by a large majority. "The false blue laws invented by the Rev. Samuel Peters" are words which confront us from a title page. "The so-called blue laws of New Haven never had any existence except in the imagination of Samuel Peters," says a historian of Connecticut. "Peters not only invented the blue law code, but he forged legal cases for its application," another writer declares. "The greater part of these probably never had an existence, as standing laws or otherwise," chimes in another, more moderately...

- [p. 99] 1. Over one half of Peters's "Blue Laws" did exist in New Haven, expressly or in the form of judicial customs under the common law.
2. More than four-fifths of them existed, in the same fashion, in one or more of the colonies of New England.
3. Were the "Blue Laws" shown to be forgeries, Peters could not be made to shoulder the whole burden of guilt, since he derived nearly two-thirds of them directly from other writers on New England history.

### **351. Blue Laws—Quaker Meetings Forbidden (Virginia, 1663)**

SOURCE: 15th Charles II, September, 1663, Act I, *An act prohibiting the unlawfull assembling of Quakers*, in William Waller Hening, *Statutes at Large, ... Virginia* (New York: R & W & G. Bartow, 1823), Vol. 2, pp. 180, 181.

[p. 180] *Be it enacted by this present grand assembly and the authority thereof* that if any person or persons commonly called Quakers, or any other seperatists whatsoever in this colony shall at any time after the publishing of this act in the severall respective counties departe from the [p. 181] place of their severall habitations and assemble themselves to the number of five or more of the age of sixteene yeares or upwards at any one tyme in any place under pretence of joyning in a religious worship not authorized by the laws ... of England nor this country that then in all and every such cases the party soe offending being thereof lawfully convict by the verdict of twelve men, or by his owne confession, or by notorious evidence of the fact, shall for the ffirst offence fforfeite and pay two hundred pounds of tobacco, and if any such person or persons being once convicted shall againe offend therein, and shall in forme aforesaid be thereof lawfully convicted shall for the second offence forfeite and pay five hundred pounds of tobacco to be levyed by distresse and ... sale of the goods of the party soe convicted, by warrant from any one of the justices before whome they shalbe soe convicted rendering the overplus to the owners (if any be,) and for want of such distresse or for want of ability of any person among them to pay the said fine or fines then it shalbe lawfull to levy and recover the same from the rest of the Quakers or other seperatists or any one of them then present, that are of greater ability to pay the said fine or fines; and if any person after he or she in forme aforesaid hath bin twice convicted of any of the said offences shall offend the third time and be thereof lawfully convicted, that then every person soe offending and convict as aforesaid shall for his or her third offence be banished this colony of Virginia to the places the governor and councill shall appoint.

6

### **352. Brethren (German Baptists, or Dunkers)**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 275, 276.

[p. 275] *History*. Among the various communities which arose toward the close of the seventeenth century for the purpose of emphasizing the inner life of the Christian above creed and dogma, ritual and form, and ceremony and church polity, one of the most influential, though not widely known, was that of the Pietists of Germany. They did not arise as protestants against Catholicism, but rather as protestants against what they considered the barrenness of Protestantism itself. With no purpose of organizing a sect,

---

<sup>6</sup>Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

they created no violent upheaval, but started a healthy wave of spiritual action within the state churches already organized.

Among their leaders were Philip Jacob Spener and August Herman Francke, who together organized and supervised the mission, industrial, and orphan school at Halle. They gave a great impulse to the critical study of the Bible, struck a plane of moderation in theology, revived an interest in church history, and left a lasting testimony in at least one organization, the Church of the Brethren.

Among the students at the Halle School, was Ernst Christoph Hochmann, who, after varying experiences of expulsion, arrest, ascetic life, and confinement in Castle Detmold, retired to Schwarzenau, where he came into intimate association with Alexander Mack, with whom he went on various preaching tours. In 1708, at Schwarzenau, eight of these Pietists went from the house of Alexander Mack to the River Eder. One of them, chosen by lot, led Alexander Mack into the water and immersed him three times in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Then Alexander Mack baptized the other seven and these eight, probably the first to receive trine immersion in the history of the Protestant Church, organized a new congregation which became the basis of the Täufer, Tunkers or Dunkers, Dompelaars, German Baptist Brethren, or Church of the Brethren, as they have been variously called, as a separate church.

The members of the new organization waived the question of apostolic succession, subscribed to no written creed, differed from other Pietists in that they were not averse to church organization, did not abandon the ordinances which Christianity, as a whole, held to be necessary for salvation, and in general gave evidence that they were men of intelligence and steadfastness. Gradually they worked out their doctrine, polity, and practice, following in many respects the same general line as the Quakers, Mennonites, and similar bodies, though they had no association with them, and are to be held as entirely distinct.

The church in Schwarzenau grew, and other congregations were organized in the Palatinate, at Marienborn, Crefeld, and Epstein in Switzerland, and in West Friesland; all suffered, at the hands of the state churches of Germany, Holland, and Switzerland, the hardships which have been the usual lot of independents and separatists. It was from Crefeld that the first Brethren, under the leadership of Peter Becker, sailed for America, settling in Germantown, Pa., in 1719. The next year Alexander Mack, with the remaining members of the Schwarzenau community, fled to Westervain in West Friesland, and in 1729, with 59 families, or 126 souls, crossed the Atlantic, landing in Philadelphia on September 15. The fate of the Brethren who did not come to America is not known. In all probability the greater number migrated, and thus the nucleus of the church was removed from European to American soil.

After the Brethren came to America the details of the organization were developed and individual congregations increased in number—first in the immediate vicinity of Philadelphia; then in New Jersey, southern Pennsylvania, northern Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas; then reaching westward over the old Braddock road, immediately after the Revolution, to western Pennsylvania, and from the Carolinas into Kentucky, they were among the first to enter the Ohio and Mississippi valleys, and from 1790 to 1825 the great central plain was rapidly populated by Brethren.

The Brethren of colonial times (then known generally as Dunkers) were for the most part German or Dutch farmers, although they engaged in some other occupations,

particularly weaving. They retained their own language, and this created a prejudice against them on the part of their English neighbors, who looked upon them as illiterate, although the Saur presses of Germantown, Pa., [p. 276] were famous in American colonial days. One private library contains over 400 different imprints of these presses, and their output of papers, almanacs, Bibles, and religious and secular work gives evidence not only of a flourishing business, but of a literary appreciation. This would seem to call for the organization of schools, but, aside from the interest of certain members in the founding of Germantown Academy, there is no early school history to record.

There was also a widespread, though unjust, feeling that socially and politically they belonged with the party that had opposed the Revolution, and the result was a mutual dislike, which was probably increased by the fact that, though not essentially selfish, they kept very much to themselves, mingled little with the world, and took little part in the general movements of the times.

The Brethren shared the experience of other religious bodies organized in the early history of this country. As conditions changed they developed different practices and to some extent different conceptions, which resulted in the formation of separate communities. The first to withdraw were John Conrad Beissel and his followers,<sup>1</sup> [Note 1: German Seventh Day Baptists, now Seventh Day Baptists (German, 1728).] who founded, in 1728, the famous monastic community at Ephrata, Pa. In 1848, in Indiana, George Patton, Peter Eyman, and others organized a small group.<sup>2</sup> [Note 2: Church of God (New Dunkers).] From that time there was no further division until 1881, when a comparatively small company withdrew<sup>3</sup> [Note 3: Old Order German Baptist Brethren.] in protest against certain modifications which they felt to be inconsistent with their early history. The next year another division took place,<sup>4</sup> [Note 4: The Brethren Church (Progressive Dunkers).] based chiefly upon objection to the form of government which had gradually developed within the larger body. As the years have passed there has grown up a feeling that, with a little more patience on all sides, this division might have been avoided. Recently greetings from the conferences of The Brethren Church and Church of the Brethren have been exchanged, and efforts have been made to unite these two bodies. In some localities the union is all but effected [not united in 1959].

*Doctrine.* The Church of the Brethren in general terms is classed as orthodox trinitarian.

Baptism is by trine forward immersion, the person baptized being confirmed while kneeling in the water. The rite of foot washing and the love feast or agape immediately precede the communion or eucharist, the entire service being observed in the evening. Sisters are expected to be "veiled" during prayer, and especially at communion services. In case of illness, anointing with oil in the name of the Lord is administered as a means of reconsecration of spirit and healing of the mind and body. The rule of the eighteenth chapter of Matthew with respect to differences between members is observed. Plain attire, excluding jewelry for adornment, is advocated. The civil law is resorted to but little. Taking an oath is forbidden, all affidavits being made by affirmation. Nonresistance is taught, and all communications are asked to be noncombatants, not because of personal fear nor out of a desire to be disloyal citizens, but because war is outlawed by the teaching and example of Jesus. Any connection, direct or indirect, with the liquor business is prohibited, and there is a corresponding insistence upon total abstinence.

The ideal in all these ceremonies and beliefs is the reproduction and perpetuation of the life and activities of the primitive Christians, and, while its effect is manifest in a somewhat stern and legal type of religious life, mysticism or the Pietistic temper has modified it in the direction of a quiet moderation in all things.

*Organization.* The polity of the church corresponds more nearly to the Presbyterian than to any other specific ecclesiastical form. The local congregation, usually presided over by the bishop of that body, is governed by the council of all the members. [The polity of the Progressives (the Brethren Church) is congregational.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership: Church of the Brethren (1959), 201,219; Brethren Church (Progressive) (1959), 25,198; other Brethren bodies: Brethren Church (Ashland, Ohio) (1958), 19,474; Old German Baptist Brethren (1959), 4,002; Church of God (New Dunkards) (1958), 667 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

---

<sup>7</sup>Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.