

### **1111. Paganism, Described as Satan's Counterfeit of Christianity**

SOURCE: Tertullian, *On Prescription Against Heretics*, chap. 40, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, pp. 262, 263.

[p. 262] The devil, ... by the mystic rites of his idols, vies even with the essential portions of the sacraments of God. He, too, baptizes some—that is, his own believers and faithful followers; he promises the putting away of sins by a laver (of his own); and if my memory still serves me, Mithra there, (in the kingdom of Satan,) sets his marks on the foreheads of his soldiers; celebrates also the oblation of bread, and introduces an image of a resurrec- [p. 263] tion, and before a sword wreathes a crown. What also must we say to (Satan's) limiting his chief priest [the Roman *flamen Dialis*] to a single marriage? He, too, has his virgins; he, too, has his proficients in continence.

### **1112. Paganism, Roman, Suppressed by Theodosius I**

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 28, Vol. 3 (London: Methuen & Co., 1897), pp. 188, 208.

[p. 188] The ruin of Paganism, in the age of Theodosius I [A.D. 379–395], is perhaps the only example of the total extirpation of any ancient and popular superstition; and may therefore deserve to be considered as a singular event in the history of the human mind. The Christians, more especially the clergy, had impatiently supported the prudent delays of Constantine and the equal toleration of the elder Valentinian; nor could they deem their conquest perfect or secure, as long as their adversaries were permitted to exist...

[p. 208] The generation that arose in the world after the promulgation of the Imperial laws [forbidding the pagan worship] was attracted within the pale of the Catholic Church: and so rapid, yet so gentle, was the fall of Paganism that only twenty-eight years after the death of Theodosius the faint and minute vestiges were no longer visible to the eye of the legislator.

### **1113. Papacy, Absolutism of, Unsound Foundation for**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, p. 180–183.

[p. 180] The idea of Papal absolutism and Infallibility, like that of the sinlessness of Mary, can be traced to apocryphal origin. It is found first in the second century, in the pseudo-Clementine Homilies, which contain a singular system of speculative Ebionism, and represent James of Jerusalem, the brother of the Lord, as the Bishop of Bishops, the centre of Christendom, and the general Vicar of Christ; he is the last arbiter, from whom there is no appeal; to him even Peter must give an account of his labors, and to him the sermons of Peter were sent for safe keeping.

In the Catholic Church the same idea, but transferred to the Bishop of Rome, is first clearly expressed in the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, that huge forgery of Papal letters, which appeared in the middle of the ninth century, and had for its object the completion of the independence of the Episcopal hierarchy from the State, and the absolute power of the Popes, as the legislators and judges of all Christendom. Here the most extravagant claims are put into the mouths of the early Popes, from Clement (91) to Damasus (384), in the barbarous French Latin of the Middle Ages, and with such numerous and glaring anachronisms as to force the conviction of fraud even upon Roman Catholic scholars. [p. 181] One of these sayings is: 'The Roman Church remains to the end free from stain of heresy.' Soon afterwards arose, in the same hierarchical interest, the legend of the donation of Constantine and his baptism by Pope Silvester, interpolations of the writings of the Fathers, especially Cyprian and Augustine, and a variety of fictions embodied in

the *Gesta Liberii* and the *Liber Pontificalis*, and sanctioned by Gratianus (about 1150) in his *Decretum*, or collection of canons, which (as the first part of the *Corpus juris canonici*) became the code of laws for the whole Western Church, and exerted an extraordinary influence. By this series of pious frauds the mediaeval Papacy, which was the growth of ages, was represented to the faith of the Church as a primitive institution of Christ, clothed with absolute and perpetual authority.

The Popes since Nicholas I. (858–867), who exceeded all his predecessors in the boldness of his designs, freely used what the spirit of a hierarchical, superstitious, and uncritical age furnished them. They quoted the fictitious letters of their predecessors as genuine, the Sardican canon on appeals as a canon of Nicaea, and the interpolated sixth canon of Nicaea, ‘the Roman Church always had the primacy,’ of which there is not a syllable in the original; and nobody doubted them. Papal absolutism was in full vigor from Gregory VII. to Boniface VIII. Scholastic divines, even Thomas Aquinas, deceived by these literary forgeries, began to defend Papal absolutism over the whole Church, and the Councils of Lyons (1274) and of Florence (1439) sanctioned it, although the Greeks soon afterwards rejected the false union based upon such assumption.

But absolute power, especially of a spiritual kind, is invariably intoxicating and demoralizing to any mortal man who possesses it. God Almighty alone can bear it, and even he allows freedom to his rational creatures. The reminiscence of the monstrous period when the Papacy was a football in the hands of bold and dissolute women (904–962), or when mere boys, like Benedict IX. (1033), polluted the Papal crown with the filth of unnatural vices, could not be quite forgotten. The scandal of the Papal schism (1378–1409), when two and even three rival Popes excommunicated and cursed each other, and laid all Western Christendom under the ban, excited the moral indignation of all good men in Christendom, and called forth, in the beginning of the fifteenth century, the three Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, [p. 182] which loudly demanded a reformation of the Church, in the head as well as in the members, and asserted the superiority of a Council over the Pope.

The Council of Constance (1414–1418), the most numerous ever seen in the West, deposed two Popes—John XXIII. (the infamous Balthasar Cossa, who had been recognized by the majority of the Church), on the charge of a series of crimes (May 29, 1415), and Benedict XIII., as a heretic who sinned against the unity of the Church (July 26, 1417), and elected a new Pope, Martin V. (Nov. 11, [1417]), who had given his adhesion to the Council, though after his accession to power he found ways and means to defeat its real object, i.e., the reformation of the Church.

This Council was a complete triumph of the Episcopal system, and the Papal absolutists and Infallibilists are here forced to the logical dilemma of either admitting the validity of the Council or invalidating the election of Martin V. and his successors. Either course is fatal to their system. Hence there has never been an *authoritative* decision on the oecumenicity of this Council, and the only subterfuge is to say that the whole case is an extraordinary exception; but this, after all, involves the admission that there is a higher power in the Church over the Papacy.

The Reformation shook the whole Papacy to its foundation, but could not overthrow it. A powerful reaction followed, headed by the Jesuits. Their General, Lainez, strongly advocated Papal Infallibility in the Council of Trent, and declared that the Church could

not err only because the Pope could not err. But the Council left the question undecided, and the Roman Catechism ascribes infallibility simply to ‘the Catholic Church,’ without defining its seat. Bellarmin advocated and formularized the doctrine, stating it as an almost general opinion that the Pope could not publicly teach a heretical dogma, and as a probable and pious opinion that Providence will guard him even against private heresy. Yet the same Bellarmin was witness to the innumerable blunders of the edition of the Latin Vulgate prepared by Sixtus V., corrected by his own hand, and issued by him as the only true and authentic text of the sacred Scriptures, with the stereotyped forms [p. 183] of anathema upon all who should venture to change a single word; and Bellarmin himself gave the advice that all copies should be called in, and a new edition printed with a lying statement in the preface making the printers the scape-goats for the errors of the Pope! This whole business of the Vulgate is sufficient to explode Papal Infallibility; for it touches the very source of divine revelation. Other Italian divines, like Alphonsus Liguori, and Jesuitical text-books, unblushingly use long-exploded mediaeval fictions and interpolations as a groundwork of Papal absolutism and Infallibility.

It is not necessary to follow the progress of the controversy between the Episcopal and the Papal systems during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is sufficient to say that the greatest Catholic divines of France and Germany, including Bossuet and Möhler, together with many from other countries, down to the 88 protesting Bishops in the Vatican Council, were anti-Infallibilists; and that popular Catechisms of the Roman Church, extensively used till 1870, expressly denied the doctrine, which is now set up as an article of faith necessary to eternal salvation.

#### **1114. Papacy—As Various Defined**

SOURCE: *A Catholic Dictionary*, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.; 1958), p. 366. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

- Papacy (Low Lat. *papa*, pope; late Lat. from Gk. *pappas*, father). i. The office of pope (*q. v.*)
- ii. The system of ecclesiastical government in which supreme authority is vested in the pope.
  - iii. The series of popes taken collectively.
  - iv. The period of office of any one pope.

#### **1115. Papacy—Bishop of Rome, First Aggressiveness of**

SOURCE: Charles Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims* (11th ed.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1920), pp. 95, 96. Used by permission.

[p. 95] It is towards the end of the second century, when the line of Roman bishops comes into clearer historical light, that we begin to discern dimly the first beginnings of their claim to be successors of St. Peter; and it is in A.D. 196, in the person of Victor, that we have our first anticipation of the aggressive spirit which is to be a distinguishing characteristic of the see of Rome in later ages. Victor ventured in a domineering spirit to excommunicate the Asiatic Churches who held to their Johannine tradition and insisted on keeping Easter on the day of the Jewish passover, whatever day of the [p. 96] week that might be. This arbitrary act on Victor’s part brought down upon him the ‘sharp rebukes’ of a number of bishops, and amongst them of the great St. Irenaeus, who contended that variety in ecclesiastical custom had never hitherto been a bar to fellowship, because such ‘difference only serves to commend the unity of the faith.’ Victor stood reproved. His excommunication failed. It was a mere ‘attempt’—not in the

sense that he did not actually issue the sentence, for Eusebius tells us that he did; but simply because it was ignored, and the question of Easter observance remained an open one till the Council of Nicaea closed it.

### **1116. Papacy—Bishop of Rome Freed by Removal of Capital to Constantinople, Catholic View on**

SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), pp. 11–13. [FRS No. 36.]

[p. 11] But from the hour when Constantine, in the language of the Roman law, “*Deo jubente*,” by the command of God, translated the seat of empire to Constantinople, from that moment there never reigned [p. 12] in Rome a temporal prince to whom the Bishops of Rome owed a permanent allegiance. From that hour God Himself liberated His Church [see No. 1137]. It was from the first involved in the principles of the supernatural sovereignty of the Church on earth, that it should be one day free from all temporal allegiance, though as yet its liberation was not accomplished. David possessed the promise of the kingdom of Israel; but he waited long. Jeroboam had the promise of the ten tribes; but he was a usurper, because he grasped it before the time. The Church followed not the example of Jeroboam, but that of David, whose Son it its own divine Head. It waited until such time as God should break its bonds asunder, and should liberate it from subjection to civil powers, and enthrone it in the possession of a temporal sovereignty of its own. Therefore, in that day when the first Christian emperor withdrew himself into the far East, he abandoned Rome and Italy; and the “donation” of Constantine, as it is called, expresses not a fact, but a principle. Constantine signed no instrument of donation; but the manner of conceiving and of speaking, in those simple ages, so represented the providential fact of the donation of God. God gave to the Vicar of His Son the possession of the city in which thirty of his predecessors had sealed their testimony with their blood. The donation of Constantine consisted in the simple providential fact, that he departed from Rome to Constantinople, moved by an impulse from God Himself.

### **1117. Papacy—Bishop of Rome Gains Supremacy**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), pp. 285, 286.

[p. 285] The patriarch of Constantinople, however, remained virtually only *primus* [p. 286] *inter pares* [first among equals], and has never exercised a papal supremacy over his colleagues in the East, like that of the pope over the metropolitans of the West; still less has he arrogated, like his rival in ancient Rome, the sole dominion of the entire church. Toward the bishop of Rome he claimed only equality of rights and co-ordinate dignity.

In this long contest between the two leading patriarchs of Christendom, the patriarch of Rome at last carried the day. The monarchical tendency of the hierarchy was much stronger in the West than in the East, and was urging a universal monarchy in the church.

### **1118. Papacy—Bishop of Rome Heir of Imperial Rome**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 287.

Then, too, considered even in a political point of view, old Rome had a far longer and grander imperial tradition to show, and was identified in memory with the bloom of the empire; while New Rome [Constantinople] marked the beginning of its decline. When the Western empire fell into the hands of the barbarians, the Roman bishop was the only

surviving heir of this imperial past, or, in the well-known dictum of Hobbes, “the ghost of the deceased Roman empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof.”

### **1119. Papacy—Bishop of Rome in the Seat of the Caesars**

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 168, 169. Used by permission.

[p. 168] The removal of the capital of the Empire from Rome to Constantinople in 330, left the Western Church, practically free from imperial power, to develop its own form of organisation. The Bishop of Rome, in the seat of the Caesars [see No. 1359], was now the greatest man in the West, and was soon forced to become the political as well as the spiritual head. To the Western world Rome was still the political capital—hence the whole habit of mind, all ambition, pride, and sense of glory, and every social prejudice favoured the evolution of the great city into the ecclesiastical capital. Civil as well as religious disputes were referred to the [p. 169] successor of Peter for settlement. Again and again, when barbarians attacked Rome, he was compelled to actually assume military leadership. Eastern Emperors frequently recognized the high claims of the Popes in order to gain their assistance. It is not difficult to understand how, under these responsibilities, the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, established in the pre-Constantine period, was emphasized and magnified after 313 [Edict of Milan]. The importance of this fact must not be overlooked. The organisation of the Church was thus put on the same divine basis as the revelation of Christianity. This idea once accepted led inevitably to the mediaeval Papacy.

### **1120. Papacy — Bishop of Rome, Peter’s Successor (Jerome on)**

SOURCE: *The Letters of St. Jerome*, Letter 15, To Pope Damasus, secs. 1, 2, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 6, p. 18.

Since the East, shattered as it is by the long-standing feuds, subsisting between its peoples, is bit by bit tearing into shreds the seamless vest of the Lord, ... I think it my duty to consult the chair of Peter...

Yet, though your greatness terrifies me, your kindness attracts me. From the priest I demand the safe-keeping of the victim, from the shepherd the protection due to the sheep. Away with all that is overweening; let the state of Roman majesty withdraw. My words are spoken to the successor of the fisherman, to the disciple of the cross. As I follow no leader save Christ, so I communicate with none but your blessedness, that is with the chair of Peter. For this, I know, is the rock on which the church is built! This is the house where alone the paschal lamb can be rightly eaten. This is the ark of Noah, and he who is not found in it shall perish when the flood prevails.

### **1121. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—“Another God on Earth”**

SOURCE: Christopher Marcellus, Oration in the Fifth Lateran Council, Session IV (1512), in Mansi *SC*, Vol. 32, col. 761. Latin.

For thou art the shepherd, thou art the physician, thou art the director, thou art the husbandman; finally, thou art another God on earth.

### **1122. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—Decisions Same as God’s**

SOURCE: Augustinus Triumphus, *Summa de Potestate Ecclesiastica* (“Summary Concerning Ecclesiastical Power”) (Augustae Vindelicorum [Augsburg]: [Johannes Schüssler], 1483), questio 6, “De Papalis Sentencie Apellatione,” fol. [61 v]. Latin.

The second reason is accepted on the part of the pope. For the pope alone is said to be the vicar of God; wherefore only what is bound or loosed by him is held to be bound and loosed by God Himself. Therefore the decision of the Pope and the decision of God

constitute one decision, just as the opinion of the Pope and of his assistant are the same. Since, therefore, an appeal is always made from an inferior judge to a superior, just as no one is greater than himself, so no appeal holds when made from the Pope to God, because there is one consistory of the Pope himself and of God Himself, of which consistory the Pope himself is the key-bearer and the doorkeeper. Therefore no one can appeal from the Pope to God, as no one can enter into the consistory of God without the mediation of the Pope, who is the key-bearer and the doorkeeper of the consistory of eternal life; and as no one can appeal to himself, because there is one decision and one court [curia] of God and of the Pope.

### **1123. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—Power to Modify Divine Laws**

SOURCE: Lucius Ferraris, “Papa,” art. 2, in his *Prompta Bibliotheca* (“Handy Library”), Vol. 6 (Venetiis [Venice]: Gaspar Storti, 1772), p. 29. Latin.

The pope is of so great authority and power that he can modify, explain, or interpret even divine laws... Petrus de Ancharano [d. 1416] very clearly asserts this in *Consil.* 373, no. 3 verso: “The pope can modify divine law, since his power is not of man, but of God, and he acts in the place of God upon earth, with the fullest power of binding and loosing his sheep.”

### **1124. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—“Primacy Over World”**

SOURCE: Council of Florence, Session XXV (July 6, 1439), Definitio, in Mansi *SC*, Vol. 31, col. 1031. Latin.

We define that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff holds the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is [1] the successor of the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles; and [2] the true vicar of Christ, [3] the head of the whole church, and [4] the father and doctor of all Christians; and that to him, in the blessed Peter, was given, by our Lord Jesus Christ, full power to feed, rule, and govern the universal church, as is contained also in the acts of the ecumenical councils, and in the sacred canons.

### **1125. Papacy, Claims Made for the Pope—Triple Kingship**

SOURCE: Lucius Ferraris, “Papa,” art. 2, in his *Prompta Bibliotheca* (“Handy Library”), Vol. 6 (Venetiis [Venice]: Gaspar Storti, 1772), p. 26. Latin.

Hence the Pope is crowned with a triple crown, as king of heaven and of earth and of the lower regions [*inferorum*].

### **1126. Papacy—Claims Made for the Pope—“Vicar of the Son of God”**

SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), pp. 46, 140, 141.

[p. 46] The highest power in the world, the Vicar of the incarnate Son of God, ... sat in his tribunal...

[p. 140] So in like manner they say now, See this Catholic Church, this Church of God, feeble and weak, rejected even by the very nations called Catholic. There is Catholic France, and Catholic Germany, and Catholic Italy, giving up this exploded figment of the temporal power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. And [p. 141] so, because the Church seems weak, and the Vicar of the Son of God is renewing the Passion of his Master upon earth, therefore we are scandalised, therefore we turn our faces from him.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Manning is writing in English, but in Latin “Vicar of the Son of God” is *Vicarius Filii Dei*, as the phrase occurs in the Donation of Constantine, where it is applied to Peter.]

### 1127. Papacy, Claims of—Bishop of Rome Peter's Successor (Leo I)

SOURCE: Pope Leo I, Extracts trans. in Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 85, 86. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 by Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[Translator's note; p. 85] Leo I (440–61) made frequent use of the Petrine theory. In brief this theory is that to Peter as the prince of the apostles was committed the supreme power over the church. To him the keys were intrusted in a special manner. In this consisted his primacy, his superiority over the other apostles. This primacy or first rank he communicated to his successors, the bishops of Rome, who, by virtue of being his successors, held the same primacy over the church and over all other bishops as Peter held over the other apostles. The passage on which this theory is based is found in *Matt. 16:18* f: "And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

We offer the following detached passages from the works of Leo I to illustrate his conception of the theory.

[Migne, Vol. 64] Col. 628. Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world, caused his truth to be promulgated through the apostles. And while this duty was placed on all the apostles, the Lord made St. Peter the head of them all, that from him as from their head his gifts should flow out into all the body. So that if anyone separates himself from St. Peter he should know that he has no share in the divine blessing...

Col. 995. Constantinople has its own glory and by the mercy of God has become the seat of the empire. But secular matters are based on one thing, ecclesiastical matters on another. For nothing will stand which is not built on the rock [Peter] which the Lord laid in the foundation [Matt. 16:18]... Your city is royal, but you cannot make it [p. 86] apostolic [as Rome is, because its church was founded by St. Peter].

Col. 1031. You will learn with what reverence the bishop of Rome treats the rules and canons of the church if you read my letters by which I resisted the ambition of the patriarch of Constantinople, and you will see also that I am the guardian of the catholic faith and of the decrees of the church fathers...

Col. 881. Believing that it is reasonable and just that as the holy Roman church, through St. Peter, the prince of the apostles, is the head of all the churches of the whole world, etc.

Col. 147. This festival should be so celebrated that in my humble person he [Peter] should be seen and honored who has the care over all the shepherds and the sheep committed to him, and whose dignity is not lacking in me, his heir, although I am unworthy.

### 1128. Papacy, Claims of—Dictates of Hildebrand (Gregory VII)

SOURCE: Gregory VII, *Dictatus Papae* ("Dictates of the Pope"; sometimes called the Dictates of Hildebrand), Latin text in Karl Hofmann, *Der "Dictatus Papae" Gregors VII* (Paderborn [Germany]: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1933), p. 11.

1. That the Roman Church was founded by the Lord alone.
2. That the Roman Pontiff alone is justly called universal.
3. That he alone can depose bishops or restore them...
9. That all princes should kiss the feet of the pope alone...
12. That it is lawful for him to depose emperors...
18. That his sentence ought not to be reviewed by any one; and he alone can review [the decisions] of all.
19. That he ought to be judged by no one...

22. That the Roman Church never erred; nor will it, according to Scripture, ever err...

27. That he can absolve subjects from their allegiance to unrighteous [rulers].

### 1129. Papacy, Claims of—"Every Human Creature" Subject to

SOURCE: Pope Boniface VIII, Bull *Unam Sanctam*, 1302, in *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 3 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 189–), No. 6, pp. 20–23 (from Latin text of Mury, *Revue des Questions Historiques*, Vol. 46, pp. 225, 256, based on the facsimile from the Papal Regesta).

[Translator's note; p. 20] The bull *Unam Sanctam*, while an obscurely worded document, furnishes a convenient example of the reasoning of those who strove to exalt the papal power to the highest point. The theory of the two swords is taken from Saint Bernard (Epist. CCLVI.), other portions almost literally from Aegidius Romanus, a well known political writer of the time, who is supposed by some to have drafted the bull itself. The more comprehensive claims of the bull have been so attenuated by the official interpretation of succeeding popes that the claim directly to control the secular government is surrendered...

Although the authenticity of the bull has been questioned, it is recorded in the Papal Registers, is appended to the civil law in the *Extravagantes*, and was formally sanctioned by Leo X. in the Fifth Lateran Council. An interesting discussion of the bull and its origin is to be found in the *Revue des Questions Historiques* for 1879, vol. 26, pp. 91ff.

That there is one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church we are impelled by our faith to believe and to hold—this we do firmly believe and openly confess—and outside of this there is neither salvation or remission of sins, as the bridegroom proclaims in Canticles, "My dove, my undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother; she is the choice one of her that bare her." The Church represents one mystic body and of this body Christ is the head; of Christ, indeed, God is the head. In it is one Lord, and one faith, and one baptism. In the time of the flood, there was one ark of Noah, pre-figuring the one Church, finished in one cubit, having one Noah as steersman and commander. Outside of this, all things upon the face of the earth were, as we read, destroyed. This Church we venerate and this alone, the Lord saying through his prophets, "Deliver my soul, O God, from the sword; my darling from the power of the dog." He prays thus for the soul, that is for Himself, as head, and also for the body which He calls one, namely, the Church on account of the unity of the bridegroom, of the faith, of the sacraments, and of the charity of the Church. It is that seamless coat of the Lord, which was not rent, but fell by lot. Therefore, in this one and only Church, there is one body and one head,—not two heads as if it were a monster—namely, Christ and Christ's Vicar, Peter and Peter's successors, for the Lord said to Peter himself, "Feed my sheep:" *my* sheep, he said, using a general term and not designating these or those sheep, so that we must believe that all the sheep were committed to him. If, then, the Greeks, or others, shall say that they were not entrusted to Peter and his successors, they must perforce admit that they are not of Christ's sheep, as the Lord says in John, "there is one fold, and one shepherd."

In this Church and in its power are two swords, to wit, a spiritual and a temporal, and this we are taught by the words of the Gospel, for when the Apostles said, "Behold, here are two swords" (in the Church, namely, since the Apostles were speaking), the Lord did not reply that it was too many, but enough. And surely he who claims that the temporal sword is not in the power of Peter has but ill understood the word of our Lord when he said, "Put up thy sword in its scabbard." Both, therefore, the spiritual and the material swords, are in the power of the Church, the latter indeed to be used for the Church, the former by the Church, the one by the priest, the other by the hand of kings and soldiers, but by the will and sufferance of the priest. It is fitting, moreover, that one sword should

be under the other, and the temporal authority subject to the spiritual power. For [p. 22] when the Apostle said, “there is no power but of God and the powers that are of God are ordained,” they would not be ordained \* [Note \*: I.e., disposed in an orderly manner.] unless one sword were under the other, and one, as inferior, was brought back by the other to the highest place.† [Note †: Mr. Henderson suggests (Select Hist. Documents, 436) “were guided by the other to the performance of the most exalted deeds.” That is, at least, intelligible, while the literal translation here given and the numerous French and German renderings cited by Mury, *Revue des Questions Historiques*, vol. 26, pp. 107, 108, are none of them clear.] For, according to the Holy Dionysius, the law of divinity is to lead the lowest through the intermediate to the highest. Therefore, according to the law of the universe, things are not reduced to order directly, and upon the same footing, but the lowest through the intermediate, and the inferior through the superior. It behooves us, therefore, the more freely to confess that the spiritual power excels in dignity and nobility any form whatsoever of earthly power, as spiritual interests exceed the temporal in importance. All this we see fairly from the giving of tithes, from the benediction and sanctification, from the recognition of this power and the control of these same things. For the truth bearing witness, it is for the spiritual power to establish the earthly power and judge it, if it be not good. Thus, in the case of the Church and the power of the Church, the prophecy of Jeremiah is fulfilled: “See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms”—and so forth. Therefore, if the earthly power shall err, it shall be judged by the spiritual power; if the lesser spiritual power err, it shall be judged by the higher. But if the supreme power err, it can be judged by God alone and not by man, the apostles bearing witness saying, the spiritual man judges all things but he himself is judged by no one. Hence this power, although given to man and exercised by man, is not human, but rather a divine power, given by the divine lips to Peter, and founded on a rock for Him and his successors in Him [Christ] whom he confessed, the Lord saying to Peter himself, “Whatsoever thou shalt bind,” etc. Whoever, therefore, shall resist this power, ordained by God, resists the ordination of God, unless there should be two beginnings, as the Manichaeans imagine. But this we judge to be false and heretical, since, by the testimony of Moses, not in the *beginnings*, but in the *beginning*, God created the heaven and the earth. We, moreover, proclaim, declare [p. 23] and pronounce that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human being to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.\* [Note \*: This famous concluding sentence has been robbed of all political significance by the interpretation of Leo X., who declared that “*every human being*” meant “*all Christian believers*,” which reduces the meaning to a commonplace of Catholic theology.]

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The Latin text (in David S. Schaff, *The Middle Ages* [Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 5. New York: Scribner, 1910], part 2, p. 28) has *omni humanae creaturae* (“every human creature”) and it is so translated in *The Papal Encyclicals in Their Historical Context*, ed. by Anne Fremantle (New York: Putnam, 1956), p. 74.]

### 1130. Papacy, Claims of — “I Am Caesar” (Boniface VIII)

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), p. 413. Used by permission.

The papal theory ... made the Pope alone God’s representative on earth and maintained that the Emperor received his right to rule from St. Peter’s successor... It was upheld by Nicholas I., Hildebrand, Alexander III., Innocent III., and culminated with Boniface VIII. at the jubilee of 1300 when, seated on the throne of Constantine, girded

with the imperial sword, wearing a crown, and waving a sceptre, he shouted to the throng of loyal pilgrims: “I am Caesar—I am Emperor.”

### **1131. Papacy, Claims of—Obedience to Pope as to God (Leo XIII)**

SOURCE: Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter, “On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens,” dated January 10, 1890, trans. in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903), p. 193.

But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself.

### **1132. Papacy, Claims of—Pope in Place of God on Earth (Leo XIII)**

SOURCE: Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter “The Reunion of Christendom,” dated June 20, 1894, trans. in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903), p. 304.

We [the pope] hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty.

### **1133. Papacy, Claims of, to Universal Sovereignty**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), p. 120. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

What the papacy aimed at was not simply to *be* a temporal power by reason of sovereignty over a little Italian state, but to exercise a universal sovereignty over all sovereigns by reason of the spiritual office of the pope, who was to be the master and arbiter of all other temporal authorities.

The development of that ideal, the partial achievement of it, and some of the reactions against it are what we must now consider. Lest this should seem to the modern reader a thrashing over of old straw and a discussion of dead issues, there should perhaps be inserted here a reminder that all the popes of the last six centuries have worn the triple tiara. According to present-day Roman Catholic authorities, its three crowns signify “universal episcopate, supremacy of jurisdiction, and universal supremacy.” In the coronation of all popes—including Pius XII, on March 12, 19, 1939 [and presumably any thereafter]—the tiara is placed on the candidate’s head with the words: “Receive the tiara adorned with three crowns and know that thou art Father of princes and kings, Ruler of the world, Vicar of our Savior Jesus Christ.” If this phraseology had not been sanctified by long usage, it would not have been coined in this generation to express the relation of the pope to the political and social order; but it would not have been created in the first place if it had not meant then what it says—“Ruler of the world.”

### **1134. Papacy—Code of Justinian Recognizes Roman Pope’s Headship Over All the Churches (A.D. 533)**

SOURCE: Justinian, Letter to Pope John, incorporated in the letter of Pope John to the emperor in The Code of Justinian, Book I, title 1, 8 (numbered title 1, 4 in S. P. Scott’s English version), *The Civil Law*, Vol. 12, pp. 11–13. Copyright 1932 by The Central Trust Company, Cincinnati. Used by permission of Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, as one of the copyright owners, and John M. Rankin, as trustee, and the beneficiaries of the trust created under the Last Will & Testament of Elizabeth W. Scott, deceased.

[p. 11] The following is the text of the letter of the Emperor Justinian, Victorious, Pious, Happy, Renowned, Triumphant, always Augustus, to John, Patriarch, and most Holy Archbishop of the fair City of Rome:

With honor to the Apostolic See, and to Your Holiness, which is, and always has been remembered in Our prayers, both now and formerly, and honoring your happiness, as is proper in the case of one who is considered as a father, We hasten to bring to the knowledge of Your Holiness everything relating to the condition of the Church, as We have always had the greatest desire to preserve the unity of your Apostolic See, and the condition of the Holy Churches of God, as they [p. 12] exist at the present time, that they may remain without disturbance or opposition. Therefore, we have exerted Ourselves to unite all the priests of the East and subject them to the See of Your Holiness, and hence the questions which have at present

arisen, although they are manifest and free from doubt, and, according to the doctrine of your Apostolic See, are constantly firmly observed and preached by all priests, We have still considered it necessary that they should be brought to the attention of Your Holiness. For we do not suffer anything which has reference to the state of the Church, even though what causes the difficulty may be clear and free from doubt, to be discussed without being brought to the notice of Your Holiness, because you are the head of all the Holy Churches, for We shall exert Ourselves in every way (as has already been stated), to increase the honor and authority of your See...

[p. 13] (3) Moreover, we recognize four Sacred Councils, that is to say, the one composed of three hundred and eighteen Holy Fathers who assembled in the City of Nicea; and that of the hundred and fifty Holy Fathers who met in this Imperial City; and that of the Holy Fathers who first congregated at Ephesus; and that of the Holy Fathers who met at Chalcedony [i.e. Chalcedon], as your Apostolic See teaches and proclaims. Hence, all priests who follow the doctrine of your Apostolic See believe, confess, and preach these things.

(4) Wherefore We have hastened to bring to the notice of Your Holiness, through the most blessed Bishops Hypatius and Demetrius (so it may not be concealed from Your Holiness), that these tenets are denied by some few wicked and judaizing monks, who have adopted the perfidious doctrines of Nestor.

(5) Therefore We request your paternal affection, that you, by your letters, inform Us and the Most Holy Bishop of this Fair City, and your brother the Patriarch, who himself has written by the same messengers to Your Holiness, eager in all things to follow the Apostolic See of Your Blessedness, in order that you may make it clear to Us that Your Holiness acknowledges all the matters which have been set forth above, and condemns the perfidy of those who, in the manner of Jews, have dared to deny the true Faith. For in this way the love of all persons for you, and the authority of your See will increase, and the unity of the Holy Church will be preserved unimpaired, when all the most blessed bishops learn through you and from those who have been dispatched by you, the true doctrines of Your Holiness. Moreover, We beg Your Blessedness, to pray for Us, and to obtain the beneficence of God in Our behalf.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Evidently this letter of Justinian to the pope must have been sent before the 26th of March, 533, for he mentions it in a letter of that date to Epiphanius, Archbishop of Constantinople: "The same emperor [Justinian] to Epiphanius the most holy and blessed archbishop of this royal city and the ecumenical patriarch... We have published a sacred edict, which also Your Holiness knows, through which We have refuted the madness of the heretics, not at all through changing, or planning to change or through neglecting the ecclesiastical status which has obtained, with the help of God, up to now, which also your Blessedness knows, but through everything preserving the unity of the sacred churches with the most holy pope and patriarch of the older Rome, to whom We have written similar things regarding this. For neither do We permit that anything which pertains to the state of the church not be referred to His Blessedness, as being head of all the most holy priests of God, and since as often as heretics have sprung up in these regions, they have been eliminated by the sentence and right judgment of that venerable see" (trans. from the Greek text in the Code of Justinian, book 1, title 1, 7, in *Corpus Iuris Civilis* Kruger's ed., vol. 2 [Berlin: Weidmann, 1954], p. 8).]

### **1135. Papacy—Constitution of Justinian Decrees Pope of Rome First Pontiff**

SOURCE: Justinian, 131st Novella (New Constitution), *chaps.* 1, 2, in *The Civil Law*, trans. by S. p. Scott, Vol. 17, p. 125. Copyright 1932 by The Central Trust Company, Cincinnati. Used by permission of Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia, as one of the copyright owners, and John M. Rankin, as trustee, and the beneficiaries of the trust created under the Last Will & Testament of Elizabeth W. Scott, deceased.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST NEW CONSTITUTION.

The Emperor Justinian to Peter, Most Glorious Imperial Praetorian Prefect.

#### *PREFACE.*

We enact the present law with reference to ecclesiastical rules and privileges and other subjects in which holy churches and religious establishments are intrusted.

#### *CHAPTER I.*

CONCERNING FOUR HOLY COUNCILS.

Therefore We order that the sacred, ecclesiastical rules which were adopted and confirmed by the four Holy Councils, that is to say, that of the three hundred and eighteen bishops held at Nicea, that of the one hundred and fifty bishops held at Constantinople, the first one of Ephesus, where Nestorius was condemned, and the one assembled at Chalcedon, where Eutyches and Nestorius were anathematized, shall be considered as laws. We accept the dogmas of these four Councils as sacred writings, and observe their rules as legally effective.

## CHAPTER II.

### CONCERNING THE PRECEDENCE OF PARIARCHS.

Hence, in accordance with the provisions of these Councils, We order that the Most Holy Pope of ancient Rome shall hold the first rank of all the Pontiffs, but the Most Blessed Archbishop of Constantinople, or New Rome, shall occupy the second place after the Holy Apostolic See of ancient Rome, which shall take precedence over all other sees.

#### **1136. Papacy—Different Order of Popes After 537**

SOURCE: Charles B. Mont and G. Monod, *Medieval Europe From 395 to 1270* (New York: Henry Holt, 1902), pp. 120, 121.

[p. 120] Down to the sixth century all popes are declared saints in the martyrologies. Vigilius (537–555) is the first of a series of popes who no longer [p. 121] bear this title, which is henceforth sparingly conferred. From this time on the popes, more and more involved in worldly events, no longer belong solely to the Church; they are men of the state, and then rulers of the state. Gregory [I] the Great, who merited canonisation, began the evolution which opened the way to such high destinies for the bishopric of Rome.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Some writers hold that the beginning of Vigilius' legitimate pontificate should be reckoned from 538 rather than 537, because his deposed predecessor, Silverius, did not die until June, 538. Thus held Archibald Bower (*The History of the Popes*, Vol. I, 1847 ed., p. 349) and Philip Schaff (*History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3, 1902 ed., p. 327). However, *The Catholic Encyclopedia* and other modern Catholic reference works give 537.]

#### **1137. Papacy—Donation (Forged) of Constantine Cited as Basis of Territorial Sovereignty**

SOURCE: Christopher B. Coleman, *The Treatise of Lorenzo Valla on the Donation of Constantine*, pp. 1–4, 11, 13, 17 (including translation from the text of the Donation in the Decretum of Gratian, or Concordia Discordantium Canonum, Part I, Distinctio 96, chap. 14). Copyright 1922 by Yale University Press, New Haven. Used by permission.

[p. 1] The Donation of Constantine [is] ... the most famous forgery in European history.

The Donation of Constantine (*Constitutum Constantini*), written probably not long after the middle of the eighth century, became widely known through its incorporation in the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (about 847–853). Parts of it were included in most of the medieval collections of canon law; Anselm's, Deusdedit's, and Gratian's great work (the Decretum, or Concordia discordantium canonum). It purports to reproduce a legal document in which the Emperor Constantine the Great, reciting his baptism and the cure of his leprosy at the hands of Sylvester, Bishop of Rome 314–336, confirmed the privilege of that pontiff as head of all the clergy and supreme over the other four patriarchates; conferred upon him extensive imperial property in various parts of the world, especially the imperial Lateran palace, and the imperial diadem and tiara, and other imperial insignia; granted the Roman clergy the rank of the highest Roman orders and their [p. 2] privileges; gave Sylvester and his successors freedom in consecrating men for certain orders of the clergy; it tells how he, Constantine, recognized the superior

dignity of the Pope by holding the bridle of his horse; grants Sylvester Rome, all of Italy, and the western provinces, to remain forever under the control of the Roman See; and states his own determination to retire to Byzantium in order that the presence of an earthly emperor may not embarrass ecclesiastical authority. This remarkable document was almost universally accepted as genuine from the ninth to the fifteenth century.

The question of the position of the bishop of Rome in the Christian Church lacks but a few generations of being as old as Christianity itself. His relation to secular governments became an acute problem as soon as the imperial government broke down in Italy, and has remained so to the present moment. For centuries the Papacy was the strongest institution in western Europe. While its control at any one time rested principally on the power it actually possessed and on the ability of its representatives, legal theories and historical documents played a not inconsiderable part in its rise and decline. Of these documents the Donation of Constantine was perhaps the most spectacular, even though it was not the most important. It was cited by no less than ten Popes of whom we know, to mention no lesser writers, in contentions for the recognition of papal control, and contributed not a little to the prestige of the Papacy. On the other hand, when its spuriousness became known, the reaction against it, as in Luther's case, contributed powerfully to the revolt from Rome.... [p. 3] Valla's treatise ... in effect established for the world generally the proof of the falsity of the Donation. Moreover, for the first time, he used effectively the method of studying the usage of words in the variations of their meaning and application, and other devices of internal criticism which are the tools of historical criticism today. So, while Valla's little book may seem slight beside later masterpieces of investigation and beside systematic treatises in larger fields, it is none the less a landmark in the rise of a new science...

Valla wrote his Discourse on the Forgery of the alleged Donation of Constantine (*Declamatio de falso credita et ementita donatione Constantini*, also referred to as *Libellus*, and *Oratio*) in 1440, when he was secretary to Alfonso, king of Aragon, Sicily, and Naples. It may well be considered as part of the campaign which that king was conducting against Pope Eugenius IV in furtherance of his claims to Italian territories...

[p. 11] The Donation of Constantine [text]...

The Emperor Constantine the fourth day after this baptism conferred this privilege on the Pontiff of the Roman church, that in the whole Roman world priests should regard him as [p. 13] their head, as judges do the king... As the Blessed Peter is seen to have been constituted vicar of the Son of God [Latin, *Vicarius Filii Dei*] on the earth, so the Pontiffs who are the representatives of that same chief of the apostles, should obtain from us and our empire the power of a supremacy greater than the clemency of our earthly imperial serenity is seen to have conceded to it, choosing that same chief of the apostles and his vicars to be our constant intercessors with God. And to the extent of our earthly imperial power, we have decreed that his holy Roman church shall be honored with veneration, and that more than our empire and earthly throne the most sacred seat of the Blessed Peter shall be gloriously exalted, we giving to it power, and dignity of glory, and vigor, and honor imperial. And we ordain and decree that he shall have the supremacy as well over the four principal seats, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, as also over all the churches of God in the whole earth. And the Pontiff, who at the time shall be at the head of the holy Roman church itself, shall be more exalted than, and chief over, all the priests of the whole world, and according to his judgment everything which is provided for the service of God and for the stability of the faith of Christians is to be administered... [p. 17] Wherefore, in order that the supreme pontificate may not deteriorate, but may rather be adorned with glory and power even more than is the dignity of an earthly ruler; behold, we give over and relinquish to the aforesaid our most blessed Pontiff, Sylvester, the universal Pope, as well our palace, as has been said, as also the city of Rome, and all the provinces, places and cities of Italy and the western regions, and we decree by this our godlike and pragmatic sanction that they are to

be controlled by him and by his successors, and we grant that they shall remain under the law of the holy Roman church.

### **1138. Papacy—Donation of Pippin (Pepin) Bestows Territorial Sovereignty (A.D. 756)**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 94, 95. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 94] Pippin revisited Italy at the pope's invitation, took the exarchate of Ravenna away from the king of the Lombards, and gave it to the pope.

[p. 95] What Pippin actually did was to give him the keys of the city and a formal deed of gift for them, and these together were taken to Rome and laid on the tomb of St. Peter...

This was the beginning of the temporal sovereignty of the papacy. The year was probably 756. The questions are: Just what did the pope and his successors get from Pippin, and how valid was the title? After the Lombards had captured Ravenna (five years before the "donation") there was no exarch, because the Eastern emperor never authorized the king of the Lombards to act as his representative. Since there was no exarch there was no exarchate. The Lombard king simply took a piece of territory by the sword and his only certificate of title was the fact of military conquest. All that Pippin could take from him, and consequently all that he could transfer to the pope, was the sovereign rule over the seized territory. But what territory? Of course it included the city of Ravenna and its vicinity. The fact that the city had long been the seat of the emperor's lieutenant, or exarch, for the administration of as much of Italy as he could dominate, is irrelevant in this connection, because Pippin, never having been exarch, could not transfer the exarch's authority (whatever it was). No sort of legality or "legitimacy" attached to any of these transfers. The famous Donation of Pippin was simply the act of transferring to the pope his title, such as it was, to the conquered territory—Ravenna and an adjacent district called the Pentapolis. But it did give the pope the new status of sovereign over something, and that claim to papal sovereignty was soon to attach itself, on flimsy but sufficient grounds, to a larger and more important area, to Rome and the extensive States of the Church in central Italy. As to Ravenna, it soon broke away and became an independent state, then was under the sway of Venice for a long time, and did not again become a part of the papal dominion until Julius II, the "Pope in armor," sent his own army against it early in the sixteenth century.

### **1139. Papacy—Donatio of Pippin (Pepin)—Territorial Sovereignty**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 4 (New York: Scribner, 1903), pp. 234, 235.

[p. 234] To such a height of blasphemous assumption had the papacy risen already as to identify itself with the kingdom of Christ and to claim to be the dispenser of temporal prosperity and eternal salvation...

[p. 235] But by this gift of a foreign conqueror he [the pope] became a temporal sovereign over a large part of Italy, while claiming to be the successor of Peter who had neither silver nor gold, and the vicar of Christ who said: "My kingdom is not of this world." The temporal power made the papacy independent in the exercise of its jurisdiction, but at the expense of its spiritual character.

### **1140. Papacy—Donation of Pippin (Pepin), Territory Granted by**

SOURCE: Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 104, 105 (trans. from Duchesne, *Liber Pont.*, I, p. 454). Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons, renewal

copyright 1933 by Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[p. 104] The most Christian king of the Franks [Pippin] despatched his counsellor Fulrad, venerable abbot and priest, [p. 105] to receive these cities, and then he himself straightway returned to France with his army. The aforesaid Fulrad met the representatives of King Aistulf at Ravenna, and went with them through the various cities of the Pentapolis and of Emilia, receiving their submission and taking hostages from each and bearing away with him their chief men and the keys of their gates. Then he went to Rome, and placed the keys of Ravenna and of the other cities of the exarchate along with the grant of them which the king had made, in the confession of St. Peter,<sup>1</sup> [Note 1: The grave of St. Peter is under the high altar of St. Peter's in Rome. In front of the grave and on the same level with it is a large open space to which one descends by a flight of steps. This open space in front of the tomb is called the "confession of St. Peter."] thus handing them over to the apostle of God [Peter] and to his vicar the holy pope and to all his successors to be held and controlled forever. These are the cities: Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Conca, Fano, Cesena, Sinigaglia, Forlimpopoli, Forli with the fortress of Sussubium, Montefeltre, Acerreagium, Monte Lucati, Serra, San Marino, Bobbio, Urbino, Cagli, Luciola, Gubbio, Comacle; and also the city of Narni, which in former years had been taken from the duchy of Spoleto by the Romans.

#### **1141. Papacy—Donation of Pippin (Pepin), Upward Step in Power**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 119, 120. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 119] The two centuries of the crusades were approximately the period in which the papacy was rising to the dangerous summit of its worldly power and was beginning to experience the ebbing of its political authority though not of its claims to exercise it... Before the Donation of Pippin (756) the pope was the proprietor of vast estates. In the absence of competent civil authorities, he had the responsibility for carrying on the functions of government over a considerable area. After the Donation, he was one of the sovereign powers of Europe. This was a step in the evolution of the papal power, but it was only in- [p. 120] cidentally related to the development of the kind of power which was most significant [the exercise of a universal sovereignty over all sovereigns].

#### **1142. Papacy, Empire of, From Ruins of Roman Empire**

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), p. 150. Used by permission.

The Roman Christian Church was a church of world-wide importance and power, and her bishop the most influential. Out of the ruins of political Rome, arose the great moral Empire in the "giant form" of the Roman Church. In the marvellous rise of the Roman Church is seen in strong relief the majestic office of the Bishop of Rome.

#### **1143. Papacy, Empire of, Successor to Roman Empire**

SOURCE: [Joseph Turmel] *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages*, by André Lagarde [pseudonym] (New York: Scribner, 1915), pp. v, vi. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. v] The Empire was falling into decay. The Barbarians knew that its life was failing, that the old organism was worn out, and they hastened to take possession of the remains. From every direction they came for the spoils. The Saxons and the Angles settled in Great Britain; the Franks invaded [p. vi] Northern Gaul; the Visigoths made Spain and the region south of the Loire their own; the Burgundians took possession of the upper valley of the Rhone; the Vandals made conquests in Africa. The Ostrogoths and

Lombards were waiting for their turn to come. Among these new invaders, some were heretics, others were pagans. What is to become of the church? Are its days numbered, and is the Empire to bring it down as its companion into an open tomb?

No, the Church will not descend into the tomb. It will survive the Empire. It will have to pass through days of distress. It will witness calamity after calamity, ruins heaped upon ruins. But in the midst of the greatest sadness, it will receive precious consolations. One after another, these barbarian peoples will submit to its laws, and will count it a glory to be the Church's children. The frontiers of the Church will be extended; its institutions, for a moment shaken by the Barbarians, will be consolidated, developed, and will adapt themselves to their surroundings. The papacy, most sorely tried of all, will make a new advance. At length a second empire will arise, and of this empire the Pope will be the master—more than this, he will be the master of Europe. He will dictate his orders to kings who will obey them.

#### **1144. Papacy, Great Builders of**

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. as indicated below. Used by permission.

[a. *Leo I (440–461)*]

[p. 182] “The first Pope in the proper sense of the word” was Leo I., called the Great (440–461)... [p. 183] Heresies rent the East and ignorance was fast covering the West. Western Christendom must be consolidated and disciplined so that it could meet the crudeness and heresy of the powerful invaders and overcome both. The See of St. Peter must replace the tottering imperial power...

Leo possessed those qualifications which made him the master spirit of his age and the “Founder of the mediaeval Papacy.” Lofty in his aims, severe and pure in life, of indomitable courage and perseverance, inspired by a fanatical belief in the Petrine theory, uncompromisingly orthodox, the great first theologian in the Roman Chair, he made the first clear-cut exposition of the extreme limits and prerogatives of the mediaeval Papacy...

[p. 184] Possessed of a capacity for complex rule, an extraordinary organiser and administrator, he used all his ability to make Christianity and the Papacy the one great world power. Twice he saved Rome from the barbarians, once in 452 when Attila, King of the Huns, was persuaded to withdraw without attacking the city, and again in 455 when the Vandal leader, Genseric, was induced to spare the capital from fire and murder. He drove heresy out of Italy and suppressed it in Spain. He ... even asserted his supremacy over the Eastern Church.

[b. *Gregory I, the Great (590–604)*]

[p. 185] If Leo drew the outline of the mediaeval Papacy, Gregory made it a living power. He issued the first declaration of independence and assumed actual jurisdiction over the whole Western Church...

[p. 188] Gregory's policy was to uphold and extend the Petrine theory to the utmost, although personally refusing the title of “Universal Bishop.” ...

[p. 189] Under Gregory's able management papal power was consolidated and made supreme in Western Europe. He systematized papal theology, and perfected and beautified the Church liturgy... [p. 190] From priest to bishop he corrected the clergy and urged upon them celibacy. He restored discipline throughout the Church and patronised all sorts of charity... Monasticism, which he himself had adopted with all his heart, he encouraged and improved by restoring the early rigid discipline...

[p. 191] In addition to these multitudinous duties, he was virtual King of Italy... He held the haughty Lombards in check and converted them to Christianity. He extended his authority over Africa, Spain, Gaul, England, and Ireland and even claimed jurisdiction over the East. He was the first Pope to become in act and in influence, if not in name, the temporal sovereign of the West...

[p. 192] When Gregory the Great closed his remarkable career (604) the Papacy of the Middle Ages had been [p. 193] born and in form resembled the Empire. The head of the Church was known as "Pope." Because of his peculiar personal holiness he could be judged by none, though himself judge of all. The hierarchy of officers had been practically completed. The laity was distinctly cut off from the clergy, and deprived of powers exercised in the first and second centuries. The election of the clergy had changed from a democratic to an aristocratic process. There was a marked evolution in rites and ceremonies.

[c. Gregory VII (1073)]

[p. 445] In 1073 the Church had been raised from the lowest condition to a comparatively high moral plane by the imperial reforms, the labours of earnest German Popes, the Clugniac reformation, and the Hildebrandine Popes...

For twenty-five years Hildebrand had been the power behind the papal throne. He had largely moulded the policy of eight successive Popes...

[p. 448] The papal philosophy of Gregory VII. [Hildebrand] was based upon the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals [see No. 884]. His conception of the Pope is summed up in the famous *Dictatus Papae* [see No. 1128] in which he makes the successor of St. Peter God's representative on earth, the absolute sovereign of the Church, and the supreme feudal lord of the world. This ideal he sought to realise in every particular. The clergy, according to his theory, were wholly dependent upon the Pope's will and must be absolutely free from every vice and worldly influence in order that they might labour only to save men's souls. Hence, he believed in the great need of reformation and in the correction of all abuses. The laity, from Emperor to slave, were entirely subjected to the Pope and his clergy in both temporal and spiritual matters, and therefore must render absolute obedience to the commands of the Church...

[p. 449] In his first efforts to realise his lofty ideal, Gregory VII. desired to unite all Christendom under the suzerainty of the Pope and through this submission to conquer the world for God...

[p. 469] The Church to him was a grand secular power, resting on spiritual foundations, which had to employ worldly means against the other secular powers. Europe was a chessboard and with the hand of a skilled master he moved kings, queens, knights, and bishops. His schemes were worthy of the plotter—his courage became defiance in danger—his forces were handled with consummate skill—his fatal thrusts were driven home with his teeth clenched—if he seemed to yield it was only to gain a greater advantage. As Pope he was over all, the source of all law, judged by none, and responsible to God alone. Under this conviction, intensified as the years passed, he lived in perpetual conflict, and died a refugee from the capital of his great ecclesiastical Empire...

[p. 470] Gregory VII. was the creator of the political Papacy of the Middle Ages because he was the first who dared to completely enforce the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. He found the Pope elected by the Emperor, the Roman clergy, and the people; he left the

election in the hands of an ecclesiastical College of Cardinals. He found the Papacy dependent upon the Empire; he made it independent of the Empire and above it. He declared the states of Europe to be fiefs of St. Peter and demanded the oath of fealty from their rulers. He found the clergy, high and low, dependent allies of secular princes and kings; he emancipated them and subjected them to his own will. He reorganised the Church from top to bottom by remodelling the papal curia, by establishing the College of Cardinals, by employing papal legates, by thwarting national churches, by controlling synods and councils, and by managing all Church property directly. He was the first to enforce the theory that the Pope could depose and confirm or reject kings and Emperors. He attempted to reform the abuses in the Church and to purify the clergy. Only partial success attended these efforts, but triumph was to come later on as a result of his labours. His endeavour to realise his theocracy was grand but impracticable as proved by its failure. It was like forcing a dream to be true; yet Innocent III. almost succeeded in western Europe a little more than a century later. The impress of Gregory VII.'s gigantic ability was left upon his own age and upon all succeeding ages.

*[d. Innocent III (1198–1216)]*

[p. 549] The first step in Innocent's plan was to make himself the political head of Europe. In Italy he first made himself absolute sovereign of Rome by removing all vestiges of imperial rule... [p. 550] From Rome he gradually extended his sway over the rest of Italy... His leadership was generally recognised and he was called "The Father of His Country." "Innocent III. was the first Pope who claimed and exercised the rights of an Italian Prince." When Emperor Otto IV., ceded all the lands claimed by the Papacy under grants from former rulers, an indisputable title to the papal states was established...

[p. 562] The Lateran Council in 1215 defined heresy and formulated complete regulations for its suppression.

Not only was Innocent III a great defender of Church dogmas, a master-organiser of the hierarchy, and an administrator without a peer in Church history, but he was also a far-reaching and sincerely intelligent reformer. The judicial reforms were necessary to round out Innocent's theory of Church government...

[p. 563] He endeavoured to abolish all those debilitating corruptions which prevented the realisation of his ideal priesthood; namely, pluralism, luxury, rapacity, pride, arrogance, and other evils...

[p. 564] The doctrinal changes instituted by Innocent III. were likewise important. The dogma of transubstantiation was canonised by the Lateran Council in 1215. Before that time there had been many and divergent views concerning this important subject. [See Nos. 1732–1738.] ... Heresy was more clearly defined than ever and the Inquisition was canonised. At the same time the unity of the Church on its doctrinal side was given greater emphasis...

[p. 565] Innocent III. as head of the great Church easily outranked every ruler of his day and stands high among the greatest leaders of the Middle Ages and of all ages...

[p. 566] No other wearer of the papal tiara has left behind him so many results pregnant with good and ill for the future of the Church. Under him the Papacy reached the culmination of its secular power and prerogatives. The principles of sacerdotal government [p. 567] were fully and intelligently elaborated. The code of ecclesiastical law was completed and enforced. All the Christian princes of Europe were brought to recognise the overlordship of the successor of St. Peter. All the clergy obeyed his will as

the one supreme law. Heresy was washed out in blood. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and the dreams of Hildebrand had been realised. Yet in this very greatness, wealth, and strength, were the germs of weakness and disease which were eventually to overthrow the great structure reared by Innocent III. and his predecessors.

### **1145. Papacy, Gregory I, the Great (590–604), Greatness of**

SOURCE: F. J. Foakes-Jackson, "The New West and Gregory the Great," in the composite work *An Outline of Christianity* (New York: Bethlehem Publishers, 1926), Vol. 2, p. 153.

Towards the close of the sixth century the Roman Church was ruled by Gregory I, a pope (590–604) who, if his personal character and the circumstances of his age be taken into account, is perhaps the greatest of all those who filled the chair of St. Peter...

### **1146. Papacy—Hierarchy Perfected in 13th Century**

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 575, 576. Used by permission.

[p. 575] During this period [the thirteenth century] the organisation of the papal hierarchy was perfected. At the head stood the all-powerful and absolute Pope as God's agent on earth; hence, at least in theory and claim, he was the ruler of the whole world in temporal and spiritual affairs. He was the defender of Christianity, the Church, and the clergy in all respects. He was the supreme censor of morals in Christendom and the head of a great spiritual despotism. He was the source of all earthly justice and the final court of appeal in all cases. Any person, whether priest or layman, could appeal to him at any stage in the trial of a great many important cases. He was the supreme lawgiver on earth, hence he called all councils and confirmed or rejected their decrees. [p. 576] He might, if he so wished, set aside any law of the Church, no matter how ancient, so long as it was not directly ordained by the Bible or by nature. He could also make exceptions to purely human laws and these exceptions were known as dispensations. He had the sole authority to transfer or depose bishops and other Church officers. He was the creator of cardinals and ecclesiastical honours of all kinds. He was the exclusive possessor of the universal right of absolution, dispensation, and canonisation. He was the grantor of all Church benefices. He was the superintendent of the whole financial system of the Church and of all taxes. He had control over the whole force of the clergy in Christendom, because he conferred the *pallium*, the archbishop's badge of office. In his hands were kept the terrible thunders of the Church to enforce obedience to papal law, namely, excommunication and the interdict.

### **1147. Papacy, "Holy Synod of Constance" Demands Obedience of (1415)**

SOURCE: Council of Constance, *trans.* in Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 328, 329. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 by Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[p. 328] This holy synod of Constance, being a general council, and legally assembled in the Holy Spirit for the praise of God [p. 329] and for ending the present schism, and for the union and reformation of the church of God in its head and in its members, in order more easily, more securely, more completely, and more fully to bring about the union and reformation of the church of God, ordains, declares, and decrees as follows: And first it declares that this synod, legally assembled, is a general council, and represents the catholic church militant and has its authority directly from Christ; and everybody, of whatever rank or dignity, including also the pope, is bound to obey this council in those things which pertain to the faith, to the ending of this schism, and to a

general reformation of the church in its head and members. Likewise it declares that if anyone, of whatever rank, condition, or dignity, including also the pope, shall refuse to obey the commands, statutes, ordinances, or orders of this holy council, or of any other holy council properly assembled, in regard to the ending of the schism and to the reformation of the church, he shall be subject to the proper punishment; and unless he repents, he shall be duly punished; and if necessary, recourse shall be had to other aids of justice.

### **1148. Papacy—King and Subject Judged by Pope**

SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), p. 46.

The deposing power of the Pope,—what was it but that supreme arbitration whereby the highest power in the world, the Vicar of the incarnate Son of God, anointed high priest, and supreme temporal ruler, sat in his tribunal, impartially to judge between nation and nation, between people and prince, between sovereign and subject? The deposing power grew up by the providential action of God in the world; to subjects obedience, and princes clemency.

### **1149. Papacy—King Versus Pope, Alternating Dominance**

SOURCE: Carl Conrad Eckhardt, *The Papacy and World-Affairs* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 1. Copyright 1937 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

Under the Roman Empire the popes had no temporal powers. But when the Roman Empire had disintegrated and its place had been taken by a number of rude, barbarous kingdoms, the Roman Catholic church not only became independent of the states in religious affairs but dominated secular affairs as well. At times, under such rulers as Charlemagne (768–814), Otto the Great (936–73), and Henry III (1039–56), the civil power controlled the church to some extent; but in general, under the weak political system of feudalism, the well-organized, unified, and centralized church, with the pope at its head, was not only independent in ecclesiastical affairs but also controlled civil affairs. The church interfered in secular affairs on the basis of its theory of the relation of church and state, which was formulated in substance by Augustine (354–430) and given wider and more definite application by such popes as Gregory VII (1073–85), Innocent III (1198–1216), Boniface VIII (1294–1303), and others.

### **1150. Papacy—King Versus Pope—Controversy With Emperor Henry IV**

SOURCE: Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 146, 155–159. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 by Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[Translator's note; p. 146] Gregory VII met with vigorous opposition from the German clergy as well as from the king when he attempted to enforce his laws against simony and the marriage of the clergy... Gregory ... defended his decrees against simony and the marriage of the clergy, and announced his determination to hold fast to them and to compel the whole world to accept them...

Henry's answer to this message and letter was given at a national synod at Worms, Jan. 24, 1076. This synod deposed Gregory and ... Gregory replied by excommunicating and deposing the king...

[p. 155] THE FIRST DEPOSITION AND EXCOMMUNICATION OF HENRY IV BY GREGORY VII, 1076.

Greg. VII. Reg., III, no. 10 a; Jaffé, II, pp. 223 ff; Doeberl, III, no. 9...

St. Peter, prince of the apostles, incline thine ear unto me, I beseech thee, and hear me, thy servant, whom thou hast nourished from mine infancy and hast delivered from

mine enemies that hate me for my fidelity to thee. Thou art my witness, as are also my mistress, the mother of God, and St. Paul thy brother, and all the other saints, that thy holy Roman church called me to its government against my own will, and that I did not gain thy throne by violence; [p. 156] that I would rather have ended my days in exile than have obtained thy place by fraud or for worldly ambition. It is not by my efforts, but by thy grace, that I am set to rule over the Christian world which was specially intrusted to thee by Christ. It is by thy grace and as thy representative that God has given to me the power to bind and to loose in heaven and in earth. Confident of my integrity and authority, I now declare in the name of omnipotent God, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that Henry, son of the emperor Henry, is deprived of his kingdom of Germany and Italy; I do this by thy authority and in defence of the honor of thy church, because he has rebelled against it. He who attempts to destroy the honor of the church should be deprived of such honor as he may have held. He has refused to obey as a Christian should, he has not returned to God from whom he had wandered, he has had dealings with excommunicated persons, he has done many iniquities, he has despised the warnings which, as thou art witness, I sent to him for his salvation, he has cut himself off from thy church, and has attempted to rend it asunder; therefore, by thy authority, I place him under the curse. It is in thy name that I curse him, that all people may know that thou art Peter, and upon thy rock the Son of the living God has built his church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it...

[Translator's note:] Various parts of Germany were already in revolt against Henry IV, and the immediate effect of the papal excommunication was to strengthen the rebellious party. Being almost deserted, Henry found himself unable to refuse the demands of the rebels. He agreed to submit to Gregory in all things, and rescinded the edicts by which he had deposed him. He also called on all his subjects to submit to the pope...

[p. 157] LETTER OF GREGORY VII TO THE GERMAN PRINCES CONCERNING THE PENANCE OF HENRY IV AT CANOSSA, CA. JANUARY 28, 1077.

Greg. VII. Reg., IV, nos. 12, 12 a; Jaffé, II, pp. 256 ff; Doeberl, III, no. 13...

[Translator's note; p. 158] ... Fearing that he would be permanently deposed if the pope should come to Germany and sit with his rebellious subjects in judgment on him, he [Henry] determined to forestall matters by going to see the pope in Italy. So he fled from Speier and hastened as rapidly as possible into Italy. He came to Canossa, where he humbled himself before Gregory and received absolution. It was at least a diplomatic triumph for Henry, because he had kept the pope from coming to Germany and uniting with his rebellious nobles, who would have labored hard to secure the permanent deposition of Henry. The final decision of the matter was indeed left to the pope and the diet which was to be held in Germany, but the pope did not go to Germany, and Henry was able to point to the fact that he had received papal absolution...

Gregory, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to all the archbishops, bishops, dukes, counts, and other princes of the German kingdom, defenders of the Christian faith, greeting and apostolic benediction.

Since you have made common cause with us and shared our perils in the recent controversy, we have thought it only right that you should be informed of the recent course of events, how king Henry came to Italy to do penance, and how we were led to grant him absolution.

According to the agreement made with your representatives we had come to Lombardy and were there awaiting those whom you were to send to escort us into your land. But after the time set was already passed, we received word that it was at that time impossible to send an escort, because of many obstacles that stood in the way, and we were greatly exercised at this and in grave doubt as to what we ought to do. In the

meantime we learned that the king was approaching. Now before he entered Italy he had sent to us and had offered to make complete satisfaction for his fault, [p. 159] promising to reform and henceforth to obey us in all things, provided we would give him our absolution and blessing. We hesitated for some time, taking occasion in the course of the negotiations to reprove him sharply for his former sins. Finally he came in person to Canossa, where we were staying, bringing with him only a small retinue and manifesting no hostile intentions. Once arrived, he presented himself at the gate of the castle, barefoot and clad only in wretched woollen garments, beseeching us with tears to grant him absolution and forgiveness. This he continued to do for three days, until all those about us were moved to compassion at his plight and interceded for him with tears and prayers. Indeed, they marvelled at our hardness of heart, some even complaining that our action savored rather of heartless tyranny than of chastening severity. At length his persistent declarations of repentance and the supplications of all who were there with us overcame our reluctance, and we removed the excommunication from him and received him again into the bosom of the holy mother church. But first he took the oath which we have subjoined to this letter, the abbot of Cluny, the countess Matilda, the countess Adelaide, and many other ecclesiastic and secular princes going surety for him. Now that this arrangement has been reached to the common advantage of the church and the empire, we purpose coming to visit you in your own land as soon as possible. For, as you will perceive from the conditions stated in the oath, the matter is not to be regarded as settled until we have held consultation with you. Therefore we urge you to maintain that fidelity and love of justice which first prompted your action. We have not bound ourself to anything, except that we assured the king that he might depend upon us to aid him in everything that looked to his salvation and honor.

### **1151. Papacy—King Versus Pope—Gregory and Henry at Canossa (1077)**

SOURCE: Louis L. Snyder, ed., *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 31–33. Copyright © 1958 by Rutgers, The State University. Used by permission.

[p. 31] The central governing institution for the better part of the Middle Ages was the imperial-papal partnership, in which the German kings played an important role. Both sides claimed to be entitled to the dominant place: The German kings insisted that they were the Holy Roman Emperors, and the Pope claimed temporal as well as spiritual powers.

[p. 32] The issue came to a head during the pontificate of Gregory VII (1073–1085), who, until his election to the papacy, bore the name of Hildebrand. One of the most celebrated of all popes, Gregory was small and unattractive in person, but he possessed a genius for leadership and a mastery of statecraft rivaling Napoleon's. Advocating an elaborate theory of papal absolutism, he applied himself diligently to the task of achieving a theocratic society, with himself at the head. In his *Dictatus Papae* he declared that "the Pope is the only person whose feet are kissed by all Princes." Only churchmen, he contended, should confer the symbols of ecclesiastical authority on elected bishops.

At this time Henry IV, Emperor of Germany (1056–1106), decided to test the theory of papal overlordship. Gregory warned him to "treat with more honor the head of the Church, that is, St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles." Henry, thereupon, wrote a stinging and discourteous reply, beginning:

Henry, King not by usurpation, but through holy ordination of God, to Hildebrand, at present not Pope but false monk. This is the salutation you deserve, for you have never held any office in the Church without making it a source of confusion and a curse to Christian men, instead of an honor and a blessing.

The letter ended with the words: "I, Henry, King by the grace of God, do say unto thee: 'Come down, come down, and be damned through all the ages' "

The ambitious and energetic Gregory realized that this was a struggle to the end. In a brilliant gamble that the public would support him, he countered by excommunicating the recalcitrant German king [see No. 1150]. The German feudal and ecclesiastical lords, most of whom were envious of Henry and desired a limitation of his power, promptly advised him that unless he were freed within a year from the anathema of excommunication, he would be deposed. Fully cognizant of the meaning of the ultimatum, Henry swallowed his pride and agreed to make amends.

As the year 1076 drew to a close Henry set out upon a journey to Italy to come to terms with Gregory. In January, 1077, he reached the small town of Canossa, where Gregory was stopping at the castle of the Countess of Tuscany on his way to Germany [p. 33] to attend a German council. For three days and three nights Henry stood outside the castle, stripped clear of all his regalia, "wretched, barefooted, and clad in wool," waiting for the forgiveness of the Pope. The spectacle of the mightiest king in Christendom humbling himself in this sensational fashion was one to amaze the whole Christian world—king, lord, and peasant alike.

Canossa marked a high-water mark of papal power in the Middle Ages. Henry had shrewdly impaled Gregory on the horns of a dilemma. Should the pontiff ignore him and assume the dictatorship of German affairs, or should he receive him as a penitent and grant him absolution? As a good Catholic, there was only one course open to Gregory. Henry, on the other hand, had to forget his pride if he wished to rebuild his fortunes.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: For Gregory VII's own account of the submission at Canossa, see No. 1150.]

### **1152. Papacy—King Versus Pope—Interdict, Example of**

SOURCE: *Translation and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189-]), pp. 29, 30.

[p. 29] INTERDICT ON FRANCE IN 1200.

Martène, *Thesaurus Anecdote*, IV, p. 147. Latin.

[Translator's note:] In 1193 Philip Augustus married Ingeburg of Denmark, but divorced her on the very day following the ceremony. Pope Innocent III. refused to sanction the decree, and when, three years later, Philip married Agnes of Meran he found the whole power of Rome directed against him. He refused to yield, and finally in 1200 the pope laid all France under the interdict from January to September, when the king was forced to give way. See Geraud, "Ingeburge de Danemark," in *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, T. I., 2d series, pp. 1-27 and 93-118.

Let all the churches be closed; let no one be admitted to them except to baptize infants; let them not be otherwise opened except for the purpose of lighting the lamps, or when the priest shall come for the Eucharist and holy water for the use of the sick. We permit mass to be celebrated once a week on Friday early in the morning to consecrate the Host for the use of the sick, but only one clerk is to be admitted to assist the priest. Let the clergy preach on Sunday in the vestibules of the churches, and in place of the mass let them disseminate the word of God. Let them recite the canonical hours outside the churches, where the people do not hear them; if they recite an epistle or a gospel let them beware lest the laity hear them; and let them not permit the dead to be interred, nor their bodies to be placed unburied in the cemeteries. Let them, moreover, say to the laity that they sin and transgress grievously by burying bodies in the earth, even in

unconsecrated ground, for in so doing they arrogate to themselves an office pertaining to others. Let them forbid their parishioners to enter churches that may be open in the king's territory, and let them not bless the wallets of pilgrims except outside the churches. Let them not celebrate the offices in Passion week, but refrain even till Easter day, and then let them celebrate in private, no one being admitted except the assisting priest, as above directed; let no one communicate even at Easter, except he be sick and in danger of death. During the same week, or on Palm Sunday, let them announce to their parishioners that they may assemble on Easter morning before the church and there have permission to eat flesh and consecrated bread. Women are expressly forbidden to be admitted into the churches for purification, but are to be warned to gather their neighbors together on the day of purification and pray outside the church, nor may the women who are to be purified enter even to raise their children to the sacred font of baptism until they are admitted by the priest after [p. 30] the expiration of the interdict. Let the priest confess all who desire it in the portico of the church; if the church have no portico we direct that in bad or rainy weather, and not otherwise, the nearest door of the church may be opened and confessions heard on its threshold (all being excluded except the one who is to confess) so that the priest and penitent can be heard by those who are outside the church.\* [Note \*: Geraud remarks that this was almost equivalent to a formal prohibition of confession.] If, however, the weather be fair, let the confession be heard in front of the closed doors. Let no vessels of holy water be placed outside of the church, nor shall the priests carry them anywhere, for all the sacraments of the church beyond these two which were reserved † [Note †: I.e., infant baptism and the viaticum.] are absolutely prohibited. Extreme unction, which is a holy sacrament, may not be given.

1

### 1153. Papacy—King Versus Pope—John of England Submits, 1213

SOURCE: King John of England, Declaration of Submission, *trans.* in Henry Bettenson, ed., *Documents of the Christian Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 231, 232. Used by permission.

[Introductory note; p. 231] In 1209 Innocent excommunicated John. When this failed of the desired effect he declared John deposed in 1212 and invited the French king to invade the country. Thereupon John submitted and made this declaration to the papal legate Pandulf, at Dover, 15 May 1213; the act of surrender was renewed at London before Nicholas, Bishop of Tusculum, where the homage was performed. It is unknown whether the surrender was suggested from Rome, or offered by John.

John, by the grace of God king of England, lord of Ireland, duke of Normandy and Aquitaine, earl of Anjou... We, having offended God and our mother the holy Church in many things, and being on that account known to need the Divine mercy, ... offer and freely grant to God and His holy apostles Peter and Paul, and the holy Roman Church, our mother, and to our lord the Pope Innocent and his catholic successors, the whole realm of England and the whole realm of Ireland with all their rights and appurtenances, for the remission of our sins and those of all our race, as well quick as dead; and from now receiving back and holding these, as a feudal dependant, from God and the Roman Church, ... do and swear fealty for them to the aforesaid our lord the Pope Innocent and his catholic successors and the Roman [p. 232] Church... Moreover, in proof of this our perpetual obligation and concession, we will and establish that from the proper and

---

<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.

special revenues of our realms aforesaid, ... the Roman Church receive 1000 marks sterling each year, ... 700 to wit for the realm of England, and 300 for the realm of Ireland; saving to us and our heirs, our rights, liberties, and royalties. All which, as aforesaid, we willing them to be ratified and confirmed in perpetuity bind ourselves and our successors not to contravene. [Latin from Stubbs, W., *Select Charters*, 9th rev. ed. H. W. C. Davies. Oxford, 1913.]

### **1154. Papacy—King Versus Pope—John’s Overlord, Innocent III, Annuls the Magna Charta**

SOURCE: A. C. Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 554, 555. Used by permission.

[p. 554] When the English barons wrested from the stubborn king the great Magna Charta in 1215, Pope Innocent III. championed the cause of the king, his vassal, against the barons. He called a council, annulled the Magna Charta, issued a manifesto against the barons, and ordered the bishops to excommunicate them. He suspended Archbishop Langton from office for siding with the barons against the king and directly appointed [p. 555] the Archbishop of York.

### **1155. Papacy—Low Ebb in 18th Century**

SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 25–27. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 25] We should not seek to minimise the importance of the decline of the great Catholic empires; but we should recognise that something subtler and deeper than any shift in world political power was operating against the Church in the eighteenth century. This was the growth of Erastianism (named from the Swiss theologian, Erastus), or, as the French thinkers called it, *Etatism*, the enlarged sense of the omnicompetence of the State to control all aspects of a country’s life, including its religion. The Church called this Gallicanism...

The exalted and new notion which the eighteenth century entertained of the functions of the State was bound to lead it into conflict with the claims of the Church. If the prince was now to be the “father of his people,” if, with Louis XIV, he was to cry *l’Etat, c’est moi* then it [p. 26] followed that he would resent much more keenly any interference from Rome (for instance in the appointment of bishops) and that many aspects of life which had hitherto belonged to the spiritual sphere (such as marriage, education, or charity) would come increasingly under state control...

But, although that great Pope Innocent XI (1676–89) had withstood Louis XIV at the height of his power on the matter of episcopal appointments in France, no eighteenth-century Pope measured up to Innocent’s stature, and the position of the papacy, and with it the vitality and influence of the spiritual power, declined ominously.

Two events, both belonging to the second half of the eighteenth century, illustrate all too clearly the new weakness that had overtaken the papacy. In 1782 Pope Pius VI made the journey to Vienna to try to persuade the Emperor Joseph II to desist from his ecclesiastical policies... That Pius made the journey, and that he failed in his mission, were perhaps equally significant; the papacy was now very near its nadir.

But the other event had the more lasting consequences; this was the suppression of the Jesuits throughout the world, by Pope Clement XIV in the year 1773 ... [p. 27] “for

the sake of peace, . . . and because the Society can no longer attain the aims for which it was founded, and on secret grounds which We enclose in our heart.”

### **1156. Papacy—Low Ebb of Power in Late 18th Century**

SOURCE: K[arl] R[udolf] Hagenbach, *History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries*, trans. by John F. Hurst (New York: Scribner, 1869), Vol. 2, p. 432.

Pope Pius VI, whom the changed times did not permit to summon heretical sovereigns to the threshold of the Apostolic church, was compelled—since all written attempts had failed—to use the last resort of a journey to Vienna, in the year 1782. An old man, of handsome appearance and form, and, though unhealthy, yet eloquent and gifted with a melodious voice, he was self-sufficient enough to suppose that important results could follow this journey. But he achieved no more than to be treated with great respect, and to leave behind with the people, on whom he had pronounced his blessing, an imposing impression. He did not rescue a single cloister whose downfall had been determined.

### **1157. Papacy, Opposition to, in French Revolution**

SOURCE: [John Emerich Edward Dalberg] Acton, *Lord Acton on the States of the Church* (reprint; Portsmouth, R.I.: F. E. Lally, 1940), p. 26.

She [the Church] had resisted the outward assault of the Protestant Reformation to be sapped by the Revolution which had its seat in Catholic countries, and extensively prevailed in the Church herself. The spirit of opposition to the Holy See grew in energy, and the opposition to its system and ideas spread still more widely.

### **1158. Papacy, Pius VI Marks Low Ebb of, at End of 18th Century**

SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 37, 38, 52. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 37] Rome had not hitherto been confronted, without prior consultation, with anything like this entire reorganization of the French Church, this turning of the hierarchy of her authority upside down, this spoliation presented as a *fait accompli*. It was [p. 38] more than even Pius VI, an elderly and conciliatory pontiff, whose reign came at the conclusion of a long period of decline in the power and prestige of Rome, was prepared to accept. On July 10, 1790, he wrote to Louis XVI telling him he should not approve the new laws. But the Pope’s letter arrived on July 23, and the King had [already] approved the Civil Constitution. . .

[p. 52] And, if Rome was to blame [for French Catholic disunity during the Revolution], this was less because Pius VI was infirm of purpose than because in the eighteenth century the authority, throughout Europe, of the Holy See had sunk lower than at any time since the confused years before the advent of Hildebrand in the eleventh century.

### **1159. Papacy—Plans of French to End the Papacy (1797)**

SOURCE: Archibald Alison, *History of Europe*, Vol. 1, chap. 26 (New York: Harper, 1852), pp. 543, 544.

[p. 543] One of the first measures of the new gov- [p. 544] ernment [the Directory] was to despatch an order to Joseph Bonaparte at Rome, to promote, by all the means in his power, the approaching revolution in the papal states; and, above all things, to take care that, at the pope’s death [he was ill, 1797], no successor should be elected to the chair of St. Peter.

### **1160. Papacy, Plans of the French to Destroy (1798)**

SOURCE: George Trevor, *Rome: From the Fall of the Western Empire* (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1868), pp. 439, 440.

[p. 439] The object of the French directory was the destruction of the pontifical government, as the irreconcilable enemy of the republic... The aged pope [Pius VI] was summoned to surrender the temporal government; on his refusal, he was dragged from the altar... His rings were torn from his fingers, and finally, after declaring the temporal power abolished, the victors carried [p. 440] the pope prisoner into Tuscany, whence he never returned (1798).

The Papal States, converted into the *Roman Republic*, were declared to be in perpetual alliance with France, but the French general was the real master at Rome... The territorial possessions of the clergy and monks were declared national property, and their former owners cast into prison. The papacy was extinct: not a vestige of its existence remained; and among all the Roman Catholic powers not a finger was stirred in its defence. The Eternal City had no longer prince or pontiff; its bishop was a dying captive in foreign lands; and the decree was already announced that no successor would be allowed in his place.

### **1161. Papacy — Pope, Captivity of (1798)—Account of Events, Feb. 10–25**

SOURCE: John Adolphus, *The History of France*, Vol. 2 (London: George Kearsley, 1803), pp. 364–369.

[p. 364] Berthier advanced to the city by forced marches; summoned the castle of St. Angelo [Feb. 10th.], allowing only four hours for its evacuation by the papal troops; the convicts were set at liberty; the gates of the city secured by the French; the pope, all the cardinals except three, and the whole people of Rome, made prisoners at discretion...

[p. 365] Shortly afterwards [Feb. 15th.], Berthier made his triumphal entry into Rome; and a tree of liberty being planted on the capitol, ... a proclamation was issued, declaring ... a free and independent republic, under the special protection of the French army. A provisional government was acknowledged, as established by the sovereign people; and every other temporal authority emanating from the pope was suppressed, nor was he any longer to exercise any function... [p. 366] The territory of the Roman republic was declared to comprehend all that remained under the temporal authority of the pope after the treaty of Campo Formio...

[p. 367] As a refinement in the art of insult, the day selected for planting the tree of liberty and deposing the pontiff was the anniversary of his accession to the sovereignty; and while he was, according to custom, celebrating divine service in the Sistine chapel and receiving the congratulations of the cardinals, Haller, the commissary-general of the French army, and Cervoni, abruptly rushed in, and announced the termination of his authority. The pope had scarcely recovered from the shock of this intelligence, when Cervoni offered him a national cockade, which he rejected with dignity; and he heard with fortitude that his Swiss guards were dismissed, and republican soldiers placed in their stead. Pursuing [p. 368] the same style of mockery, the invaders compelled the cardinals to perform a grand mass and Te Deum, to thank God for events which they could not fail most severely to deplore; public preachers were employed to reconcile the people to the change, and to argue from Scripture that, as disciples of reason and votaries of religion, they were bound to submit to whatever form of government it had pleased Providence to set over them...

Whether retained by force, deluded by promises, or rendered inert by age, the pope remained, after the abrogation of his authority, a prisoner in his own [p. 369] palace. The

French first seized on it as barracks, and in less than a week confined him to his own rooms, putting the seal of confiscation on all his effects. Even the furniture of his apartments was at length contemplated with a greedy eye, and the unfortunate pontiff was removed from Rome to Sienna [Feb. 20th to 25th.], where he was received with consolatory sympathy by the Augustine monks, and lodged in their convent\*. [Note \*: ... He was removed, according to the caprice or policy of his persecutors, at all hours in the night and day, to many cities in Italy, where he was exhibited in chains, and at length confined in a fortress at the top of the Alps, where, under the old French government, it was sometimes customary to send regiments by way of punishment. In the course of the ensuing year it was deemed necessary to remove him to Valence, where he terminated his days amid the horrors of neglect and insult...]

### **1162. Papacy — Pope, Captivity of (1798)—Dissolution of Pope's Rule, Feb. 15**

SOURCE: Richard Duppa, *A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government. 1798* (2d ed.; London: G. G. and J. Robinson, 1799), pp. 46, 47.

[p. 46] That the head of the church might be made to feel with more poignancy his humiliating situation, the day chosen for planting the tree of liberty on the capitol was the anniversary of his election to the sovereignty [Feb. 15]. Whilst he was, according to custom, in the Sistine chapel, celebrating his accession to the papal chair, and receiving the congratulations of the Cardinals, Citizen Haller, the commissary-general, and Cervoni, who then commanded the French troops within the city, gratified themselves in a peculiar triumph over this unfortunate potentate. During that ceremony they both entered the chapel, and Haller announced to the sovereign Pontiff on his throne, that his reign was at an end.

[p. 47] The poor old man seemed shocked at the abruptness of this unexpected notice, but soon recovered himself with becoming fortitude; and when General Cervoni, adding ridicule to oppression, presented him the national cockade, he rejected it with a dignity that shewed he was still superior to his misfortunes. At the same time that his Holiness received this notice of the dissolution of his power, his Swiss guards were dismissed, and Republican soldiers put in their place.

### **1163. Papacy — Pope, Captivity of (1798)—Exile (Feb. 20) and Death (1799)**

SOURCE: R[ichard] Duppa, *A Brief Account of the Subversion of the Papal Government. 1798* (3d ed., London: John Murray, 1807), pp. 50–52, 54.

[p. 50] The time, however, was arrived, when it became more desirable to send him [the Pope] entirely out of the way, in order that his effects might be disposed of with a better grace...

[p. 51] It was decreed that he should go; and on the morning of the 20th of February, about seven o'clock, he left Rome, accompanied by three coaches of his own suite, and a body of French cavalry, to escort him safe into Tuscany; and on the 25th arrived at Siena, where he was requested to remain till further orders. Here he was received into the monastery of S. Barbara of the order of S. Augustin, whose members sorrowfully wel- [p. 52] comed him at the gate, and offered all that their Convent could bestow, to console him under his misfortunes.

An earthquake having taken place at Siena in the month of May, the Pope was removed to a Carthusian Convent within two miles of Florence...

[p. 54] He was suffered to remain in the Carthusian Convent until the 27th of March, 1799. He was then removed to Parma; from whence he was conducted to Briançon in France, and afterward to Valence, where he died on the 29th of August of the same year.

#### **1164. Papacy — Pope, Captivity of (1798), Thought a Death Blow to the Papacy**

SOURCE: Joseph Rickaby, "The Modern Papacy," in *Lectures on the History of Religions*, Vol. 3, [lecture 24, p. 1] (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1910). Used by permission.

When, in 1797, Pope Pius VI. fell grievously ill, Napoleon gave orders that in the event of his death no successor should be elected to his office, and that the Papacy should be discontinued.

But the Pope recovered; the peace was soon broken; Berthier entered Rome on 10th February 1798, and proclaimed a Republic. The aged Pontiff refused to violate his oath by recognizing it, and was hurried from prison to prison into France. Broken with fatigue and sorrows, he died ... [in] August 1799, in the French fortress of Valence, aged 82 years. No wonder that half Europe thought Napoleon's veto would be obeyed, and that with the Pope the Papacy was dead.

#### **1165. Papacy—Pope, Captivity of (1798), Thought Fatal to the Church**

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, pp. 147, 148.

[p. 147] The tricoloured flag floated on the top of the Castle of St. Angelo. The successor of St. [p. 148] Peter was carried away captive by the unbelievers. He died a prisoner in their hands; and even the honours of sepulture were long withheld from his remains.

It is not strange that, in the year 1799, even sagacious observers should have thought that, at length, the hour of the Church of Rome was come. An infidel power ascendant, the Pope dying in captivity, the most illustrious prelates of France living in a foreign country on Protestant alms, the noblest edifices which the munificence of former ages had consecrated to the worship of God turned into temples of Victory, or into banqueting-houses for political societies, or into Theophilanthropic chapels, such signs might well be supposed to indicate the approaching end of that long domination.

But the end was not yet. Again doomed to death, the milk-white hind was still fated not to die. Even before the funeral rites had been performed over the ashes of Pius the Sixth, a great reaction had commenced, which, after the lapse of more than forty years, appears to be still [in 1840] in progress.

#### **1166. Papacy, Restored a Few Months After Exiled Pope's Death**

SOURCE: Arthur Robert Pennington, *Epochs of the Papacy* (London: George Bell and Sons, 1881), pp. 450, 452.

[p. 450] Many of the men in those days [of 1798] imagined that the dominion of the Pope had come to an end, and that the knell of the temporal power was then sounding among the nations. This supposition, however, proved to be erroneous. The French republicans were very anxious that Rome should not have another Pope. But as the reverses of the revolutionary armies had left Southern Italy to its ancient masters, the cardinals were able to proceed to an election at Venice. They elected, on March 14th, 1800, Barnabas Chiaromonti, who assumed the name of Pius VII.

The first transaction of this Pope was a negotiation with the government of France, of which Napoleon Buonaparte was the First Consul...

[p. 452] He [Napoleon] felt that, as the large majority of the inhabitants of France knew no other form of faith than Romanism, it must become the established religion of the country. Accordingly we find that he now began negotiations with the Pope, which issued in a Concordat in July, 1801, whereby the Roman Catholic religion was once more established in France. He also left Pius in possession of his Italian principality.

### **1167. Papacy, Restored From Desperate Position by Concordat With Napoleon (1801)**

SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 60, 61. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 60] It is important to remember how desperate was the position from which the Concordat with Napoleon saved the Catholic Church; it may be that it was one more ominous than any to which she had been driven throughout the centuries of her history, since the time of the persecutions under the Roman Empire. Harassed in the land of France, traditionally her “eldest daughter,” it was the same story in Belgium (now [since 1793] annexed to France), in the Rhineland (also annexed), in Italy, controlled by anticlericals dependent upon France, in England and Ireland, where the movement for Catholic emancipation had been rejected by King George III, in Poland, partitioned by non-Catholic powers. Even in Austria, where “Josephism” survived, the Church was far from free, while the governments in Portugal and Spain were anti-clerical. The Concordat which Pius VII signed with Napoleon, followed as it was by another in Italy, and by provisional arrangements in Germany, ... served the immediate and vital purpose of enabling the life of the Church to be lived in relative security over much of Europe...

However, ... in publishing the Concordat, in April 1802, the First Consul published alongside it, without any previous consultation with Rome, what were called the “Organic Articles,” designed to regulate the administration of the Church in France. His excuse was that he was [p. 61] only publishing the police regulations which the Concordat had allowed him to make for the maintenance of public order, but a glance at the articles in question shows ... that he was, in fact, concerned to subject the Church, even in matters evidently spiritual, to the control of the State.

### **1168. Papacy—Treaty of 1801 With Napoleon**

SOURCE: E. de Pressensé, *The Church and the French Revolution*, trans. by John Stroyan (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1869), pp. 454, 455.

[p. 454] Thus was concluded this famous Concordat, the principal clauses of which we reproduce:—

“The Government of the Republic acknowledges that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, is the religion of the great majority of the French. His Holiness equally acknowledges that this same religion has drawn, and still expects at this moment the greatest good and *éclat* from the establishment of the Catholic worship in France, and the particular profession which the First Consul of the Republic makes of it. Consequently, after this mutual acknowledgment, as well for the good of religion as for the maintenance of internal tranquillity, they have agreed to this which follows: Article 1st, ‘The Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion, shall be freely exercised in France. Its worship shall be public, conformed to the police regulations which the Government shall judge necessary for the public tranquillity.’ [”] Then follows the article which announces the new circumscription of the dioceses, and demands of the French incumbents a friendly

resignation, if they do not wish that the government of the bishoprics should be authoritatively provided for by new incumbents. Article 4 was thus worded:—

[p. 455] “The First Consul of the Republic shall nominate, within the three months which shall follow the publication of the bull of His Holiness, to the archbishoprics and bishoprics of the new circumscription. His Holiness will confer the canonical institution, according to the forms established with regard to France, before the change of Government.” Article 6 reduces the political engagements of the new bishops to a simple oath of fidelity to the Government. It was understood that, if in their diocese or elsewhere, there was formed any plot to the prejudice of the State, they should give notice of it to the Government. Article 10 declared that the bishops shall nominate to the cures, but that their choice shall fall only on persons approved by the Government.

The last articles stipulate that, for the sake of peace and the happy re-establishment of the Catholic religion, His Holiness shall not in any way disturb the acquirers of alienated ecclesiastical property; that the Government shall secure to the bishops and parish priests a suitable maintenance; and, in fine, that it shall possess the same rights and prerogatives enjoyed by the ancient Government. A last clause declared that a new Convention should be necessary, in case that one of the successors of the First Consul should be Protestant.

Thus the Papacy obtained, despite itself, it is true, the exorbitant right of deposing the bishops, but in return, the civil power nominates the new incumbents under the reserve of the confirmation of the Papal bulls.

### **1169. Papacy—Treaty of the Lateran (With Mussolini), 1929**

SOURCE: *A Catholic Dictionary*, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.; 1958), p. 282. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

*Lateran, the Treaty of the.* A treaty made between the Holy See (Pope Pius XI) and the Kingdom of Italy (King Victor Emmanuel III) on Feb. 11, 1929, and ratified on the following June 8, whereby “was adequately assured to the Holy See all that was necessary to provide due liberty and independence for the spiritual government of the diocese of Rome and of the Catholic Church in Italy and throughout the world. It therefore declared the ‘Roman Question’ ... to be definitely and irrevocably settled and done away with and recognized the Kingdom of Italy under the dynasty of the House of Savoy and with Rome as its capital” (art. 26). By this treaty Italy recognizes the *de iure* and *de facto* international sovereignty of the Holy See with its absolute sole jurisdiction over a state called the City of the Vatican ... and guarantees its freedom and independence; certain public services (railway, post-office, etc.) are supplied by Italy; the person of the pope is inviolable and sacred, and cardinals enjoy the honours of princes of royal blood, and wherever resident in Rome are Vatican citizens; certain other ecclesiastics residing outside the City are given immunities; the Vatican and Italy have ordinary diplomatic relations; in a particular case or as a general rule the Italian government will see to the punishment in its own territory of crimes committed in the City, which in turn will extradite immigrant Italians accused of acts considered criminal by both states; ecclesiastical sentences on clergy and religious in spiritual and disciplinary matters shall have full juridical effect in Italy; the Holy See wishes to remain outside the rivalries and conferences of other states, unless appealed to in its spiritual capacity; the Vatican City is therefore a permanently neutral and inviolable territory; the Law of Guarantees ... and cognate legislation is abrogated, etc. Associated with this treaty was a domestic concordat and a financial convention whereby the Italian state paid

to the Holy See the sum of 81/3 million pounds in cash and 11 million pounds in Italian state bonds, which was accepted in restitution for material damage consequent on the loss of the States of the Church... The treaty and concordat were incorporated in the constitution of the new Italian republic after World-War II.

### **1170. Papacy—Treaty With Mussolini Heals Wound, 1929**

SOURCE: *San Francisco Chronicle*, Tuesday, Feb. 12, 1929, p. 1. Used by permission. [FRS No. 8.]

[Headlines:] Mussolini and Gasparri Sign Historic Roman Pact ...  
Heal Wound of Many Years ...

Rome, Feb. 11 (AP)—The Roman question tonight was a thing of the past and the Vatican was at peace with Italy. The formal accomplishment of this today was the exchange of signatures in the historic Palace of St. John lateran by two noteworthy plenipotentiaries, Cardinal Gasparri for Pope Pius XI and Premier Mussolini for King Victor Emmanuel III.

In affixing the autographs to the memorable document, healing the wound which has festered since 1870, extreme cordiality was displayed on both sides.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The "Roman question" was occasioned by the pope's retiring indoors in protest as the voluntary "prisoner of the Vatican" in 1870, when the newly unified Kingdom of Italy took over the papal territories. No pope since 1870 had put his foot outside the Vatican until this pact of 1929 gave Pius XI sovereign status as ruler over tiny Vatican City.]

### **1171. Papacy — Vatican Intellectual Policy**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Ordeal of Christianity* (New York: Association Press, 1957), pp. 44–46. Copyright 1957 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

[p. 44] But *Humani Generis*, the encyclical of 1950, is in many respects the most revealing document on the intellectual policy of the modern papacy. It lays down the limits inside which Roman Church scholarship must operate. Prof. Georges A. Barrois, once a Dominican on the faculty of colleges in France and the Catholic University at Washington, D.C., who is now a professor at Princeton Theological Seminary, has pointed out that *Humani Generis* was produced to crack down on the recent suggestions of certain Catholic scholars—especially a number of Dominicans and Jesuits in France—looking toward a redefinition of the church's conception of dogma, tradition, and theology. To understand how brusquely all such innovations in thought are condemned and how strictly the control of the pope over the limits of research and speculation is asserted, one must read the full text of this too little known document. Unfortunately, it has appeared in English translation only once, so far as I know, in this country—in the *New York Times* of Aug. 22, 1950—and Prof. Barrois says that this version for reasons unknown omits two important paragraphs.

[p. 45] In this encyclical Pius XII professes sympathy with the work of scholars, but insists this must not go beyond what the Vatican says is permissible. When certain French Dominicans proposed that dogma and theology be seen as products of the time in which they emerge and interpreted in this light—divine truth being, indeed, eternal, but man's perception inevitably limited by his finite nature—and when certain French Jesuits proposed that the church go back to the tradition of the very early church fathers (and I do not need to point out what *that* would do to the three recently proclaimed dogmas of Papal Infallibility, the Immaculate Conception, and the Assumption of the Virgin), they were wandering into forbidden territory. One proof that they were so doing, the encyclical holds, is to be seen in their increasing friendliness with theologians of non-

Roman churches. This trend toward a common position on important questions of Christian teaching the pope condemns as the work of misguided advocates of what he calls “irenics”—in itself a revealing commentary on the papacy’s oft-declared desire for Christian reunion.

In conclusion, this encyclical resorts to a specific illustration to show Catholic scholars what the limits are within which they must confine their work. The first three chapters of Genesis, it says, must be accepted as literally and historically true. The creation and fall happened exactly as reported there. There is no myth; and, if the sacred writer did employ some metaphor, that does not affect the historical accuracy of the whole account. Since the pope says this is truth—historic and scientific as well as theological truth—it becomes for every Catholic scholar what some philosophers call a “given.”

The present pope’s allocution to his bishops is notable for two things: its flat assertion that the church has authority to settle issues of politics, economics, and social relationships entirely outside the issues Pius XII says men call “matters strictly religious,” and, in the second place, its scarcely veiled warning to Catholic laity against wandering outside papally prescribed boundaries either in their thinking or writing.

### **1172. Passover, Edict on, From Persian King to Jews in Egypt**

SOURCE: A. Cowley, ed. and trans., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923), No. 21, pp. 62, 63. Used by permission.

[p. 62] It was Ezra who made modern Judaism, by instituting (or re-instituting) the ceremonial law and formulating regulations for the national festivals. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah show this as clearly as the earlier literature shows the lack of them. The reason why he was able to enforce the Law and thus prevent its falling (again?) into neglect, is that he had the support of the Persian king. Why this was so, what caused the Persian kings to take so much interest in the Jews, whether it was part of a general policy of religious tolerance or was due to special circumstances, must remain matters of speculation. The fact at any rate is evident from what we are told of Cyrus (e.g. in Isaiah 45<sup>1+</sup>), Cambyses in pap. 30<sup>13, 14</sup> and Darius here. What has hitherto seemed incredible is that they should have concerned themselves with details of ceremonial, as in the letter of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7, but the present papyrus [no. 21, quoted below] (and the style of other letters in this collection) removes all reason for doubting the genuineness of the Persian letters in Ezra... Whether the instruction as to the manner of keeping the festival come directly from the king, or are issued by Hananiah on his own authority, depends mainly on the meaning of חנניאל in 1.3... As to Hananiah, there is no evidence for identifying him with any person of that name mentioned in the book of Nehemiah. His arrival in Egypt (38<sup>7</sup>) seems to have led to trouble. Was this due to his stirring up religious zeal or national feeling in the colony and encouraging animal sacrifices which were resented by the Egyptian? And was this the cause of the destruction of the temple soon after (no. 30)?

The papyrus is written on both sides, 11. 1–7 on the obverse, 11. 8–11 on the reverse—an insignificant document for so important a communication... [p. 63] [Papyrus no. 21:] <sup>1</sup>To my brethren, <sup>2</sup>Yedoniah and his colleagues the Jewish garrison, your brother Hananiah. The welfare of my brethren may the gods seek. <sup>3</sup>Now this year, the 5th year of King Darius, word was sent from the king to Arsames, saying: <sup>4</sup>In the month of Tybi (?) let there be a Passover for the Jewish garrison. Now you accordingly count fourteenM

<sup>5</sup>days of the month Nisan and keep the Passover, and from the 15th day to the 21st day of Nisan <sup>6</sup>(are) seven days of Unleavened bread. Be clean and take heed. Do no work <sup>7</sup>on the 15th day and on the 21st day. Also drink no beer, and anything at all in which there is leaven <sup>8</sup>do not eat, from the 15th day from sunset till the 21st day of Nisan, seven <sup>9</sup>days, let it not be seen among you; do not bring (it) into your dwellings, but seal (it) up during those days. <sup>10</sup>Let this be done as Darius the king commanded. (Address.) <sup>11</sup>To my brethren Yedoniah and his colleagues the Jewish garrison, your brother Hananiah.

### 1173. Passover—Manner of Observance in Mishnaic Times

SOURCE: *Mishnah Pesahim* (sections as indicated), trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), *Pesahim* (folios and pages as indicated). Used by permission.

#### a. *Mishnah 10.1, in Talmud 99b, p. 532*

On the eve of Passover close to *minḥah* a man must not eat until nightfall. Even the poorest man in Israel must not eat [on the night of Passover] until he reclines; and they should give him not less than four cups [of wine], and even [if he receives relief] from the charity plate.

#### b. *Mishnah 10.2, in Talmud 114a, p. 586*

They filled the first cup for him; Beth Shammai maintain: He recites a blessing for the day [first], and then recites a blessing over the wine; while Beth Hillel rule: He recites a blessing over the wine [first], and then recites a blessing for the day.

#### c. *Mishnah 10.3, in Talmud 114a, p. 587*

They then set [it] before him. He dips the lettuce before yet he has reached the aftercourse of the bread. They set before him *mazzah*, lettuce [*ḥazareth*,] and *ḥaroseth* and two dishes, though the *haroseth* is not compulsory. R. Eleazar son of R. Zadok said: It is compulsory. And in the Temple they used to bring the body of the Passover-offering before him.

#### d. *Mishnah 10.4, in Talmud 116a, p. 594*

They filled a second cup for him. At this stage the son questions his father; if the son is unintelligent, his father instructs him [to ask]: ‘Why is this night different from all [other] nights. for on all [other] nights we eat leavened and unleavened bread, whereas on this night [we eat] only [un]leavened bread; on all other nights we eat all kinds of herbs, on this night bitter herbs; on all other nights we eat meat roast, stewed or boiled, on this night, roast only. On all other nights we dip once, but on this night we dip twice.’ And according to the son’s intelligence his father instructs him. He commences with shame and concludes with praise; and expounds from ‘a wandering Aramean was my father’ until he completes the whole section.

#### e. *Mishnah 10.5, 6, in Talmud 116a, 116b, pp. 595, 596*

[116a; p. 595] Gamaliel used to say: Whoever does not make mention of [116b] these three things on Passover does not discharge his duty, and these are they: The Passover-offering, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs. The Passover-offering is [sacrificed] because the Omnipresent passed over the houses of our fathers in Egypt, as it is said, then ye shall say: It is the sacrifice of the Lord’s Passover, for that He passed over etc. The unleavened bread is [eaten] because our fathers were redeemed from Egypt, as it is said, and they baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt etc.

The bitter herb is [eaten] because the Egyptians embittered the lives of our fathers in Egypt, as it is said, and they made their lives bitter etc. In every generation a man is bound to regard himself as though he personally had gone forth from Egypt, because it is said, and thou shalt tell thy son in that day, saying: It is because of that which the Lord did for me when I came forth out of Egypt. Therefore it is our duty to thank, praise, [p. 596] laud, glorify, exalt, honour, bless, extol, and adore Him who wrought all these miracles for our fathers and ourselves; He brought us forth from bondage into freedom, from sorrow into joy, from mourning into festivity, from darkness into great light, and from servitude into redemption. Therefore let us say before Him, Hallelujah How far does one recite it? Beth Shammai maintain: Until ‘as a joyous mother of children,’ while Beth Hillel say: Until ‘the flint into a fountain of waters,’ and he concludes with [a formula of] redemption. R. Tarfon used to say ‘Who redeemed us and redeemed our fathers from Egypt’ but he did not conclude [with a blessing]. R. Akiba said: ‘So may the Lord our God and the God of our father suffer us to reach other seasons and festivals which come towards us for peace, rejoicing in the rebuilding of Thy city and glad in Thy service, and there we will partake of the sacrifices and the Passover-offerings’ etc. As far as ‘blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast redeemed Israel.’

*f. Mishnah 10.7, in Talmud 117b, p. 605*

They filled the third cup for him. He then recites grace after meals. Over the fourth [cup] he concludes the *Hallel*, and recites the grace of song. Between these cups he may drink if he wishes; between the third and the fourth he may not drink.

*g. Mishnah 10.8, in Talmud 119b, p. 617*

One may not conclude after the Paschal meal [by saying], ‘Now to the entertainment [apikoman].’

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Brackets, except those for page and folio numbers, are in the source.]

### **1174. Passover — Time of Slaying Lamb in Christ’s Day**

SOURCE: Josephus *War* vi. 9. 3; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, *Vol. 3* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 499. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Accordingly, on the occasion of the feast called Passover, at which they sacrifice from the ninth to the eleventh hour, and a little fraternity, as it were, gathers round each sacrifice, of not fewer than ten persons (feasting alone not being permitted), while the companies often include as many as twenty, the victims were counted and amounted to two hundred and fifty-five thousand six hundred; allowing an average of ten diners to each victim, we obtain a total of two million seven hundred thousand, all pure and holy.

### **1175. Penance, Council of Trent on**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIV (Nov. 25, 1551), On the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, can. 1, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 115. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

If anyone saith that in the Catholic Church Penance is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord for reconciling the faithful unto God, as often as they fall into sin after baptism; let him be anathema.

### **1176. Pentecostal Bodies—Pentecostal Church of God of America, Inc.**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, *Vol. 2*, part 2, p. 1353.

*History.* The denomination known as the Pentecostal Church of God of America, Incorporated, is not so very old as an organization but in beliefs and principles it dates back to the early days of Pentecost of the twentieth century, when a great pentecostal revival began about the year 1901. Shortly after this first great pentecostal outpouring the

message of pentecost was spread over the country. Groups of people were forming churches and calls of help were being made, and it became evident that some general supervision of the work was necessary.

Several organizations were formed, the Pentecostal Church of God being among the first, but it was not until 1936 that the Pentecostal Church of God was incorporated in the State of Missouri.

*Doctrine.* This denomination believes that the Bible is the inspired Word of God, the product of holy men of old who spoke and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, and accepts the New Testament as its guide in matters pertaining to conduct and doctrine. It believes that there is one God, and He is manifested in three personalities—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, being coequal. Salvation is the gift of God to man, separate from works and the law, and is made operative by grace through faith in Jesus Christ. The new birth is necessary to all men.

God, through the Holy Spirit, definitely calls such as He desires to serve as ministers and specifically endues the one called with talents and gifts for that office. This church does not emphasize systematic theology.

Water baptism is by immersion in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The baptism of the Holy Spirit is a gift from God as promised through the Lord Jesus Christ to all believers in this dispensation; it is received subsequent to the new birth and is accompanied with the speaking in other tongues as the Holy Spirit gives utterance, as the initial sign and evidence.

Healing is for the physical ills of the human body and is wrought by the power of God through the prayer of faith and the laying on of hands...

This denomination believes in the resurrection of the just and the premillennial return of Christ. The one who physically dies in sin is hopelessly and eternally lost.

They believe that the Government is ordained of God and are thankful for the protection and the freedom to worship God, but as the Bible says, “Thou shalt not kill,” they will be glad to be of service to the Government in any way consistent with noncombative service.

*Organization.* The denomination has a representative and congregational form of government.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1958), 103,500 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257).]

### **1177. Pentecostal Bodies** — United Pentecostal Church, Inc.

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1328, 1329, 1335, 1336.

[a. *Former Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ*]

[p. 1328] *History.* The Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ is the continuation of the great revival that began at Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost, A.D. 33, and is founded upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner Stone (Acts 2:1–42). Although the true followers have been little known, yet from that time until now there have always been earnest contenders “for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints” (Jude 3).

At various intervals throughout the past centuries, the followers of the apostolic faith and doctrine have become prominent through great revivals that have appeared in Great Britain, the United States, and Canada.

In the days of Tertullian (A.D. 207), Chrysostom (fourth century), Christians of the thirteenth century, the early Quakers, Wesley, Whitefield, and Irving the gifts and

manifestations of the apostolic church were much in evidence as the revival spirit swept over the country.

In Kansas (1901) the revival broke forth and moved southward to Texas, being known locally only, but finally reached Los Angeles, Calif. (1906), from whence it spread throughout the whole earth, entering into nearly every nation under heaven, penetrating the heathen darkness of India, China, Africa, and the isles of the sea, fulfilling the commission of our Lord: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature" (Mark 16:15–20), and proclaiming the soon coming of the Lord.

So great was the awakening that in a few years in nearly every town of any size whatever there were witnesses to the Pentecostal outpouring of the spirit (Luke 24:48), and soon there began to appear in different localities places of worship, wherein the gifts of the Spirit were manifested, designating themselves by such names as The Apostolic Faith Mission, Pentecostal Mission, Apostolic Faith Assembly, Full Gospel Assembly or Mission, Assembly of God, etc., their one common aim being to "earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints" in the days of the apostles, taking the Bible as their creed, discipline, and rule of order and charter.

The chief aim is to glorify God our Saviour, even Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works; that we should show forth the praises of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvelous light; and that we may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom we shine as lights in the world, holding forth the Word of Life, to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide their feet into the way of peace (Tit. 2:13).

*Doctrine.* Our creed, discipline, rules of order, and doctrine are based on the Word of God as taught and revealed by the Holy Ghost.

We believe that all scripture is given by inspiration of God; that the only grounds upon which God will accept a sinner is repentance from the heart for the sins which he has committed; that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be observed; that the ordinance of foot washing is as much a divine command as any other New Testament ordinance, and Jesus gave us an example that we should do even as He had done; that Jesus is to come to earth again in person, a doctrine clearly set forth in apostolic times; that tithes and free-will offerings are God's plan to carry on His work; that all civil magistrates are ordained of God for peace, safety, and the welfare of all people, therefore, it is our duty to be in obedience to all requirements of the laws that are not contrary to the Word of God; that the people of God should have no connection whatever with labor unions, secret societies, or any other organization wherein there is a fellowship with unbelievers, bound by any oath; that the time draweth near for the coming of the Lord to make a change in the present order of things, and at that time all the righteous dead shall rise from their graves, [p. 1329] and we who are alive and living righteous before God shall be translated or "caught up" to meet the Lord in the air; that the distress upon the earth is the "beginning of sorrows" and will become more intense until there "shall be a time of trouble such as there never was since there was a nation even to that same time," and that period of "tribulation" will be followed by the dawn of a better day on earth; that for 1,000 years there shall be "peace on earth and good will toward men"; that in order to escape the judgment of God and to have the hope of enjoying the glory of life eternal, one

must be thoroughly saved from his sins, wholly sanctified unto God and filled with the Holy Ghost; and when 1,000 years are finished there shall be a resurrection of the dead, who shall be summoned before the Great White Throne for their final judgment. Basically, our stand on the marriage and divorce issue is, that judgment begins at the house of God; but since the complications of individual cases are so many and so varied, we believe that no blanket rule can be made to apply to every case, and we feel we should leave the individual cases to the prayerful judgment of those having jurisdiction over them.

Our duty is to lift up the fallen, visit the sick, strengthen the weak, encourage the faint-hearted, comfort the feeble-minded, point the lost to the way of salvation, and urge all believers to seek a spirit-filled life (Eph. 5:18), and prepare for the coming of the Lord (Jas. 1:27).

Moreover, it is our indispensable duty, as partakers of the “royal priesthood” (I Peter 2:9), to offer supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks for all men; for kings, presidents, governors, magistrates, and all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty ([I] Tim. 2:1–4). And to submit ourselves to “every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake; whether it be the king, as supreme, or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well,” so long as these ordinances do not infringe upon the liberty of service toward God according to the dictates of the heart of conscience (I Peter 2:13–17).

*Organization.* Each annual session of this body is known as the General Assembly of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ...

Each local church manages its own affairs so long as such local proceedings are done in harmony with the General Assembly...

*[b. The Former Pentecostal Church, Inc.]*

[p. 1335] *History.* In the beginning of this latter rain outpouring, as it is known among our particular group, there was no organization of any size, all were zealous to see the gospel spread, and they did not take time to organize. But in the year 1914 a conference was called at Hot Springs, Ark., during which a General Council of the Assemblies of God was formed. Later, because of what many believed to be new revelation of doctrine, this group was divided and two or three other smaller groups soon formed, among them being what is known as the Pentecostal Assemblies of the World, composed of all nationalities. Believing this to hinder our organized effort to evangelize the world, from this group The Pentecostal Church, Inc., was formed, composed of white brethren only. Although we believe that all men are equal in the sight of God, we do not believe that a mixed group can reach every nationality in a successful manner. Therefore, it is our policy to endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace with all Spirit-filled children of God until we all come to the unity of the faith once preached by Jesus Christ and His Apostles.

*Doctrine.* We believe the Bible to be the inspired Word of God, insofar as it is correctly translated from the original writings (II Tim. 3:16).

“For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse” (Romans 1:20).

There is one everliving eternal God, who is a Spirit. (Isa. 44:6–8; Mark 12:29; John 4:24; I Cor. 8:6.) He manifested Himself in the Old Testament in various ways and under different names, such as God Elohim, God Almighty, El Shaddai, the “I AM THAT I AM,” Jehovah, and especially Jehovah Lord, the redemptive Name.

In the New Testament this one true God was manifest in the flesh or in His Son, Jesus Christ, for, “when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law”; “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them”; “\*\*\* for in Him (Jesus) dweleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.” “For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell”; “\*\*\* and without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory.”

Man is triune spirit, soul, and body. God is triune, a trinity—three manifestations of one God, not three eternal distinct persons or Gods, as that is tritheism.

Jesus in His humanity, was man; in His deity, was God. His flesh was the Lamb or sacrifice of God (Heb. 10:10–20).

The Son of God is the only hope of the world. The Man, Jesus, is the mediator between God and man (I Tim. 2:5).

God is a multiple. That is, He has many names, offices, titles, many manifestations, such as God, Son of God, Son of Man, Lord of All, King, Shepherd, Priest, Holy One, Lamb, Alpha and Omega. He is all and in all. Amen.

In the beginning God created man innocent, pure, and holy; but through the sin of disobedience, Adam and Eve fell from their holy state, and God excluded them from Eden. Hence, by one man’s disobedience, sin entered into the world. (Gen. 1:27; Rom. 5:12; Eph. 2:13).

Conversion or forgiveness of sins comes by repentance toward God through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, by confessing and forsaking our sins.

Immersion in water is for converted believers, who have turned from their sins and the love of the world, and should be administered by a duly authorized minister of the Gospel by authority, and in the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, according to the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5), thus fulfilling Matt. 28:19.

Baptism in the Holy Spirit is for all believers, and is obtained by obedience (Acts 2:38; 5:31, 32); by asking for (Luke 11:13); by tarrying for (Luke 24:49); by faith (Gal. 3:14); and is accompanied by speaking with other tongues as the Spirit gives utterance.

Healing for the body was purchased by our Saviour, Jesus Christ, for “With His stripes we are healed” (Isa. 53:5); and intended for recognition and practice [p. 1336] by the church. “For they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover” (Mark 16:18); and “\*\*\* if you are sick, call for the elders of the church,” as in James 5:14.

On the night of our Lord’s betrayal, He ate the Passover Supper with His Apostles. He took bread and wine and blessed it, instituting the communion, saying, “This do in remembrance of me.” (Luke 22:19). Paul instructed the church how to observe it. (I Cor. 11:23, 24.) There is a great spiritual significance in the partaking of the sacrament; also there is a natural side. We see this by the use of the literal bread and fruit of the vine.

The first example of foot washing was given by our Lord. (St. John 13:2–14.) To be blessed, it is well to do what He suggest (St. John 13:15–17; I Tim. 5:9, 10).

Godly living should characterize the life of every child of the Lord, and he or she should live according to the pattern and example given in the Word of God (Rom. 6:6; Titus 2:11, 12; I Peter 2:21–23); otherwise we shall not escape the judgment of the great day (Heb. 12:14; 1 Peter 1:15–17).

For a person to remain saved he must abide in the grace of God—grace means favor. A person sinning against God loses the favor or grace of God, and continuing to sin (without repentance) will eventually be cast into the lake of fire. God is able to keep us from falling, but we must keep ourselves in the love of God. (Jude 21.) The book of Jude tells us about the backsliders and their reward.

We understand the Scripture to teach restoration of all things, as was spoken by the mouth of the Holy Prophets since the world began; but we cannot find where the devil, his angels, and all sinners are included (Rev. 20:10).

We recognize the institution of human government as being of divine ordination and in doing so affirm unswerving loyalty to the Government of the United States; however, we take a definite position regarding the bearing of arms or the taking of human life. As followers of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, we believe in the implicit obedience to His commandments and precepts, which instruct us as follows: “Thou shalt not kill” (Ex. 20:13); “That ye resist not evil” (Matt. 5:39); “Follow peace with all men” (Heb. 12:14); etc. These we believe and interpret to mean Christians shall not shed blood nor take human life. [Compare the position of the Friends (Quakers), No. 779.]

Therefore, we propose to fulfill all the obligations of loyal, American citizenship but are constrained to declare against participating in war, armed insurrection, property destruction, and aiding or abetting in, or the actual destruction of, human life.

Furthermore, we cannot conscientiously affiliate with any union, boycott, or organization which will force or bind any of its members to belong to any organization, perform any duties contrary to their conscience, or receive any mark without their right to affirm or reject same.

“Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.” (Matt. 5:32; Matt. 19:9.) When this sin has been committed the innocent party may be free to remarry only in the Lord. It being our desire to raise a higher standard for the ministry, we recommend that they do not marry again.

We believe tithing is God’s financial plan to provide for His work, and has been since the days of Abraham. Tithing came with faith under Abraham; Moses’ law enjoined it, and Israel practiced it, when she was right with God; Jesus endorsed it (Matt. 23:23), and Paul said to lay by in store as God has prospered you. Do not rob God of His portion, viz, tithes and offerings...

That Jesus is coming again the second time in person, just as He went away, is clearly set forth by the Lord Jesus Himself and was preached and taught in the early Christian church by the Apostles; hence the children of God today are earnestly with hope looking forward to the glorious event. (Matt. 24; Acts 1:11; 3:19–21; I Cor. 11:26; Phil. 3:20, 21; 1 Thes. 4:14–17; Titus 2:13, 14.)

We believe there shall be a “great tribulation,” which will be followed by the dawn of a better day on earth; and that for 1,000 years there shall be “Peace on earth, and goodwill toward men.” (Isa. 65:17–25; Dan. 7:27; Micah 4:1, 2; Heb. 2:14; Matt. 5:5; Rom. 11:25–27; Rev. 20:1–5.)

When the 1,000 years are finished there shall be a resurrection of all the dead, who will be summoned before the Great White Throne for their final judgment, and all whose names are not found written in the Book of Life shall be cast into the lake of fire, burning with brimstone, which God hath prepared for the devil and his angels; Satan himself being cast in first. (Matt. 25:41; Rev. 20:7–15; 21:8.)

[EDITORS' NOTE: In 1945 the Pentecostal Assemblies of Jesus Christ and the Pentecostal Church, Inc., united to form the United Pentecostal Church, Inc.; the membership of the combined body in 1958 was 160,000 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 86, 257).]

2

### **1178. Pergamum, a Center of Idolatry**

SOURCE: Tacitus *Annals* iv. 37; translated by John Jackson, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 65, 67. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 65] Since the deified Augustus had not forbidden [p. 67] the construction of a temple at Pergamum to himself and the City of Rome, ... I [Tiberius] followed the precedent already sealed by his approval, with all the more readiness that with worship of myself was associated veneration of the senate. But, though once to have accepted may be pardonable, yet to be consecrated in the image of deity through all the provinces would be vanity and arrogance.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Obviously, as the translator's note (p. 66) points out, the Pergamum temple to Augustus, authorized in 29 B.C., "is instanced by Tiberius as marking the definite inauguration of emperor worship in the provinces: see ...; D[io] Cass[ius] LI. 20." That was the first worship of a Roman emperor during his lifetime; in Rome itself emperors were not considered deified until after death. Since the enforcement of emperor worship was a principal cause of the persecution of Christians, some have seen in this the background of the characterization of Pergamum as the city "where Satan's seat is" (*Rev. 2:13*). Others find in "Satan's seat" an allusion to Pergamum's famed temple of Asclepius, the god of medicine and healing, in whose cult serpents were prominent; or, more often, to the great Altar of Zeus in that city (see *SDA-Com* 7:95, 96).]

### **1179. Persecution, Always Wrong**

SOURCE: Thomas Clarke, *History of Intolerance*, Vol. 1 (Waterford, England: printed by John Bull, book seller, for J. R. Birnie, R. Farrell, and S. Phelan, etc., 1819), p. 3.

There are many who do not seem to be sensible that all violence in religion is irreligious, and that whoever is wrong, the persecutor cannot be right.

### **1180. Persecution, as Defined by Pope Pelagius I**

SOURCE: Pope Pelagius I, Epistle 2 (formerly 3) to Narses, in *MPL*, Vol. 69, col. 1848.

Let not the idle talk of men hinder you, saying that the Church persecutes while she either restrains what is committed or seeks the salvation of souls. The circulators of rumor of this kind are wrong. No one persecutes except the one who forces to evil. Truly, now, he who either punishes the evil deed or prohibits its being done, he does not persecute, but loves. For if, as they think, no one is to be restrained from evil nor drawn back from evil to good, human and divine laws must be made void (laws) which decree both punishment for the evil ones and reward for the good at the recommendation of justice. Moreover both the authority of canonical Scripture and the truth of the rules of the Fathers teach us that schism is evil and that men of this kind ought to be repressed by outside forces.

---

<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.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Pope Pelagius wrote "Narses, who seems to have shrunk from using violence, urging him to have no scruples in the matter. These letters are an unqualified defence of the principle of persecution" (James Barmby, "Pelagius I," in William Smith and Henry Wace, eds., *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. 4, [London: John Murray, 1887], p. 297).]

### **1181. Persecution, Attitude at Root of**

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Sir James Mackintosh," in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. I, pp. 333, 334.

[p. 333] The doctrine which, from the very first origin of religious dissensions, has been held by all bigots of all sects, when condensed into a few words, and stripped of rhetorical disguise, is simply this: I am in the right, and you are in the wrong. When you are the stronger you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I [p. 334] shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.

### **1182. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Nero, 54–68), 64**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 168, 169. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 168] The year of Nero's fire and the subsequent persecution of the Christians introduced Christianity to world notice although for long thereafter it remained a secret society under police surveillance. The disastrous fire began at the southeastern corner of the Circus Maximus, an area filled with inflammable wooden shops, on July 18, 64 and, accelerated by wind, burned for six days and nights and again, later, raged for two days, completely destroying three of the fourteen *regiones* of the city... [Tacitus] recounts how Nero, when he learned at Antium that the fire was nearing his palace—the *domus*

*transitoria* (so-named from its passageway)—returned to the city and aided the distressed by opening to them the Campus Martius, the house and gardens of Agrippa, the Pantheon, and his own gardens across the Tiber, and by lowering the price of grain. Still, because of his well-known crimes, the rumor spread that he had instigated the fire either to get space for his proposed "Golden House" or, his imagination being fired by the sublimity of the terrible scene, to give him an opportunity to watch it from his private theater or the Tower of Maecenas where he might sing his aria on the subject of the Destruction of Troy. But his *Troica*, unfortunately for this story, was first read in public a year later. To kill the rumor he placed the blame on the unpopular Christians...

In any case the mob, enraged not only by the loss of their homes but by the destruction of temples, statues, and other treasures of the Roman past, found a convenient scapegoat in the Christians, now distinguished from Jews, while the Empress Poppaea Sabina, a convert to Judaism, protected the latter. The Christians were particularly unpopular because of their prophesy [*sic*] of a final world conflagration on Christ's return. Tacitus says "vast numbers were convicted not so much on the count of arson as for their hatred of the human race"—since Jewish misanthropy was proverbial...

[p. 169] Tacitus tells realistically how "they were covered with wild beasts' skins and torn to death by dogs or were fastened on crosses and, when daylight failed, were burned to serve as lamps at night." This was in connection with Nero's "spectacle" in his Circus where he appeared in the habit of a charioteer or mounted on his car. Tacitus adds that, despite their deserved punishment, a sentiment of pity arose because of the belief that they were being sacrificed not for the State's welfare but because of one man's ferocity.

The site of this first Christian persecution was, as Tacitus tells us, in Nero's gardens beyond the Tiber. Here in an area at the foot of the Vatican Hill Nero held his chariot

racers. To the north lay the temple areas of Cybele and Mithra while on the *spina* of the Circus itself stood the red granite obelisk transported by Caligula from Heliopolis in Egypt, which today stands in the center of St. Peter's Piazza.

Juvenal, Tacitus' contemporary (*ca.* 60–140), alludes to the persecution twice. In Satire 1 (155–57) he speaks of burning live bodies and dragging them across the arena, while in 8 (235) he mentions the *tunica molesta* (shirt of evil), in which, lined with pitch, the victims were burned—the ordinary punishment at Rome for incendiaries. The earliest Christian writer to refer to the persecution was Melito, bishop of Sardis (*ca.* 170), a fragment of whose letter to Antoninus preserved by Eusebius couples Nero and Domitian as the only emperors who had slandered Christianity. Eusebius also says Nero was “the first of the emperors to be pointed out as a foe of divine religion.”

[EDITORS' NOTE: Nero's predecessor Claudius exiled Jewish Christians, with other Jews in Rome, because of “Chrestus” (Suetonius *Lives of the Caesars* v. 25. 4)—possibly “Christus.” See *SDACom* 6:359.]

### 1183. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Nero)

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 3, 5, 6.

[p. 3] [a.] Tertullian's Statement.

*Liber apologeticus*, ch. 5. Opera, ed. Oehler (Leipzig, 1853), Vol. I, p. 130 sq. Latin...

Nero was the first to rage with the imperial sword against this sect, then rising rapidly in Rome. But we even glory in such an author of our condemnation. For anyone who knows him cannot but see that nothing but what was pre-eminently good was condemned by Nero...

[p. 5] [b.] Account by Suetonius.

*Vita Neronis*, XVI; ed. Carl Roth, Leipzig (1891), p. 176 sq. Latin.

In his reign many things were severely censured and suppressed and many also instituted... Christians, a class of men of a new and vicious superstition, were subjected to severe punishments...

[c.] Account by Clement [of Rome].

First Epistle to the Corinthians, ch. V, VI, VII. (*Patres Apostoli.*, ed. Cotelerius, Antwerp, 1700.) Greek.

V. But to leave ancient examples, let us come to the recent champions...

Peter by unjust envy endured not one or two, but many sufferings; and so, made a martyr, he departed to the place of glory due him. On account of envy Paul obtained the reward of patience, after he had been seven times in bonds, and had been whipped and stoned. He preached in the East and in the West and received the glorious reward of his faith. He taught the whole world righteousness, and coming to the extreme West he suffered martyrdom...

VI. Unto these men of holy lives was joined a vast multitude of the elect who, suffering much disgrace and many torments on account of envy, were a most noble example for us. On account of envy, women were tormented; Danaides and Dirce, when they suffered severe and unjust punishments, persevered in their constant faith, and though [p. 6] weak in body received a glorious reward.

[d.] Account by Sulpicius Severus.

Chron. II. 29. Opera, ed. C. Halm, (1864). Corp. Script. Ecc. Lat. (Vienna), I. p. 83. Latin.

Then he began to rage against the Christians. Afterwards he even made laws forbidding the religion, and published edicts, ordering that Christianity should not exist. At this time Paul and Peter were condemned; one of them was beheaded. Peter was crucified.

#### **1184. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Domitian, 81–96)**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 170. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Domitian, at the close of the first century (81–96), is credited by Christian writers with persecuting the followers of their religion. He championed the imperial cult to the exclusion of all others except that of Isis-Serapis to whom he erected a temple. For a century men had voluntarily taken an oath by the “Genius” of the Emperor but Domitian was the first to make it a real test of “personal” loyalty by compelling men to swear by it in all public documents. This caused trouble for both Jews and Christians since they alone refused to sanction his divinity... The Emperor’s cousin, Flavius Clemens, consul of the year 95, and his wife Domitilla were condemned because they favored either Christianity or, perhaps, Judaism. One was executed and the other banished, though Domitian had named their sons his heirs. He condemned others also though he instituted no general persecution. Eusebius says he ordered the execution of the surviving family of Joseph and Mary and had the two grandsons of Judas (Jude), brother of Jesus, brought before him, but on finding that they were simple-minded let them go.

#### **1185. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Trajan, 98–117), c. 112.**

a. Pliny (the Younger), Governor of Pontus and Bithynia, to the Emperor Trajan

SOURCE: Pliny the Younger *Letters* x. 96, translated by William Melmoth, revised by W. M. L. Hutchinson, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), pp. 401, 403, 405. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 401] It is a rule, Sir, which I inviolably observe, to refer myself to you in all my doubts; for who is more capable of guiding my uncertainty or informing my ignorance? Having never been present at any trials of the Christians, I am unacquainted with the method and limits to be observed either in examining or punishing them. Whether any difference is to be made on account of age, or no distinction allowed between the youngest and the adult; whether repentance admits to a pardon, or if a man has been once a Christian it avails him nothing to recant; whether the mere profession of Christianity, albeit without crimes, or only the crimes associated therewith are punishable—in all these points I am greatly doubtful.

In the meanwhile, the method I have observed towards those who have been denounced to me as Christians is this: I interrogated them whether they were Christians; if they confessed it I repeated the question twice again, adding the threat of capital punishment; if they still persevered, I ordered them to be executed. For whatever the nature of their creed might be, I could at least feel no doubt that [p. 403] contumacy and inflexible obstinacy deserved chastisement. There were others also possessed with the same infatuation, but being citizens of Rome, I directed them to be carried thither.

These accusations spread (as is usually the case) from the mere fact of the matter being investigated and several forms of the mischief came to light. A placard was put up, without any signature, accusing a large number of persons by name. Those who denied they were, or had ever been, Christians, who repeated after me an invocation to the Gods, and offered adoration, with wine and frankincense, to your image, which I had ordered to be brought for that purpose, together with those of the Gods, and who finally cursed

Christ—none of which acts, it is said, those who are really Christians can be forced into performing—these I thought it proper to discharge. Others who were named by that informer at first confessed themselves Christians, and then denied it; true, they had been of that persuasion but they had quitted it, some three years, others many years, and a few as much as twenty-five years ago. They all worshipped your statue and the images of the Gods, and cursed Christ.

They affirmed, however, the whole of their guilt, or their error, was, that they were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before it was light, when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god, and bound themselves by a solemn oath, not to any wicked deeds, but never to commit any fraud, theft or adultery, never to falsify their word, nor deny a trust when they [p. 405] should be called upon to deliver it up; after which it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to partake of food—but food of an ordinary and innocent kind. Even this practice, however, they had abandoned after the publication of my edict, by which, according to your orders, I had forbidden political associations. I judged it so much the more necessary to extract the real truth, with the assistance of torture, from two female slaves, who were styled *deaconesses*: but I could discover nothing more than depraved and excessive superstition.

I therefore adjourned the proceedings, and betook myself at once to your counsel. For the matter seemed to me well worth referring to you—especially considering the numbers endangered. Persons of all ranks and ages, and of both sexes are, and will be, involved in the prosecution. For this contagious superstition is not confined to the cities only, but has spread through the villages and rural districts; it seems possible, however, to check and cure it. 'Tis certain at least that the temples, which had been almost deserted, begin now to be frequented; and the sacred festivals, after a long intermission, are again revived; while there is a general demand for sacrificial animals, which for some time past have met with but few purchasers. From hence it is easy to imagine what multitudes may be reclaimed from this error, if a door be left open to repentance.

*b. The Emperor's Reply*

SOURCE: Trajan, Letter to Pliny the Younger, quoted in Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 2 (8th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1903), pp. 46, 47.

[p. 46] You have adopted the right course, my friend, with regard to the Christians; for no universal rule, to be applied to all cases, can be laid down in this matter. They should not be searched for; but when accused and convicted, they should be punished; yet if any one denies that he has been a Christian, and proves it by action, namely, [p. 47] by worshipping our gods, he is to be pardoned upon his repentance, even though suspicion may still cleave to him from his antecedents. But anonymous accusations must not be admitted in any criminal process; it sets a bad example, and is contrary to our age.

**1186. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Hadrian, 117–138)**

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), p. 10.

*Rescript of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus.*

*Justin Martyr, Opera. ed. Otto, Jena (1842), I, p. 273 sq. Greek.*

I have received the letter written to me by your predecessor, Serenus Granianus, a most excellent man; and it does not seem well to pass over this report in silence, lest both the innocent be confounded and an occasion for robbery be given to false accusers. Accordingly, if the inhabitants are able to sustain their accusations openly against Christians, so as to charge them with something before the tribunal, I do not forbid them

to do this. But I do not permit mere tumultuous cries and acclamations to be used, for it is much more equitable that if anyone wishes to make accusation, you should know the charges. If, therefore, anyone charges and proves that the men designated have done anything contrary to the laws, you are to fix penalties in proportion to their transgressions. By Hercules, you shall take special care, if, out of calumny, anyone prosecutes one of them, to inflict on the accuser a more severe punishment for his villainy.

**1187. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Marcus Aurelius, 161–180), 177, 180**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 171–173. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 171] Trajan's policy of clemency lasted until the reign of Marcus Aurelius (161–180) and with that exception until the middle of the third century and the formidable persecution of Decius...

In the reign of Marcus Aurelius, the Stoic emperor, the Christian Church emerges again into the clear light of history, since it then suffered persecution in various parts of the Empire. This has caused many to denounce Marcus although his hostility to the Christians was merely the logical result of his training, since from boyhood he had been taught to regard the imperial cult and the imperial ideal as identical and to feel that Christianity opposed them. He seems to have ordered various governors to punish "sacrilege" which he regarded as the great crime of the Christians. In reference to the persecution in Gaul in 177 Eusebius says that the governor there had written for advice and the emperor's reply was that "they should be tortured to death, but that if any should recant they should be let go." Consequently, refractory citizens were to be beheaded and [p. 172] others sent to the beasts, i.e., the traditional methods of punishing citizens and non-citizens respectively. Marcus knew little about the Christians as he spent most of his reign engrossed in the war with the Quadi and Marcomanni on the Danube and was seldom in the capital. In his *Meditations* he mentions the Christians only once in reference to their "obstinacy" (XI:3). While some have explained that harsh indictment as an interpolation it was rather in harmony with the usual reaction of the better classes of the day. For the Christians by then were dangerous since they taught a corporate unity above that of the State. This seems sufficient reason why the best of emperors instituted a grave persecution...

Eusebius says Justin Martyr met his death at Rome in his reign and there were also martyrdoms in Pergamum, Africa and, above all, in Gaul where in 177 forty-eight Christians were killed, the only large-scale persecution of the second century. Eusebius, on the basis of a letter sent by the Gallic churches of Lugdunum (Lyon) and Vienna (Vienne) to the churches of Asia and Phrygia, details the tortures, imprisonments, and deaths at Lyon. Such martyrs were first excluded from houses, baths, markets, and all public places; then tortured and imprisoned and finally led into the Forum to be publicly interrogated by the tribune in the absence of the governor and, when the latter returned, brought before him where they were called parricides and cannibals and were again tortured with fiendish ingenuity. One of them, Blandina (17–19; 40–42; 55–56), was tortured by relays night and day till her body was torn apart but still breathed. Then she was bound to a stake in the arena and exposed to the wild beasts. When these refused to touch her she was again imprisoned and, finally, after scourging and again being offered

to the beasts, she, still breathing, was roasted and thrown into a net to be tossed by bulls, and finally died. Some of the dead were kept for days from burial, but at last the bodies had to be burned and the ashes thrown into the Rhone.

There is also an official narrative of the trials of Christians from Scillium in Numidian Africa before a Roman proconsul at Carthage in documents which can be dated 180, i.e., the last year of the reign of Marcus. Here the proconsul Saturninus asked the accused “to return to a right mind,” i.e., swear by the Emperor’s “genius,” when one of them answered: “I do not recognize the empire of this world, but rather I serve that God [p. 173] whom no man has seen nor can see”; and another: “We have none other to fear save the Lord our God who is in heaven.” Refusing a thirty-day reprieve they all, twelve in number, were sentenced “to suffer by the sword.” With such treasonable answers, there could be no other solution possible.

### **1188. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Marcus Aurelius, 161–180), 177**

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 11–19.

[p. 11] The Persecution at Lyons and Vienne.

Eusebius: *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Book V. ch. I, 3 ff. (ed. Dindorf, Vol. IV, Leipzig, 1871, pp. 183–198). Greek.

The servants of Christ, living at Vienne and Lyons in Gaul, to the brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia who have the same faith and hope of redemption that we have, peace, grace and glory from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord...

The magnitude of the tribulation here, the great fury of the heathen against the saints, and how much the blessed martyrs endured, we cannot fully recount, nor indeed is it possible to express these in writing. For with all his might the adversary broke loose upon us, showing even now how unrestrained his future coming would be. He tried every means of training and exercising his followers against the servants of God, so that not only were we excluded from houses, baths and markets, but also forbidden, every one of us, to appear in any place whatsoever.

But the grace of God fought against the adversary, rescued the weak, and arrayed firm pillars, able through patience to withstand every attack of the Evil One...

First, indeed, they endured nobly the sufferings heaped upon them by the general populace: clamors, blows, being dragged along, robberies, stonings, imprisonments, and all that an enraged mob loves to inflict on opponents and enemies. Then they were taken to the forum by the chiliarch and the ordained authorities of the city and were examined in the presence of the whole multitude. Having confessed, they were imprisoned until the arrival of the governor. When they were afterwards brought before him and he treated us with all manner of cruelty, Vettius Epagathus, one of the brethren, filled with love for God and his neighbor, interfered... [He] could not endure the [p. 12] unrighteous judgment against us, but was filled with indignation and demanded that he should be permitted to testify in behalf of the brethren, that there was no atheism nor impiety in us. Those about the tribunal cried out against him, and with reason, for he was a man of mark; and the governor denied his just request, but asked only this one question, if he also was a Christian; and on his confessing this most distinctly, placed him also in the number of the martyrs...

They with all eagerness finished the confession of martyrdom. But some appeared unprepared and untrained and still weak, unable to endure the strain of a great contest. Of these about ten became apostates, who caused us great pain and excessive sorrow, and weakened the zeal of the others who had not yet been seized, and who, although suffering all kinds of evil, were constantly with the martyrs and did not abandon them. Then indeed all were in great fear on account of the uncertainty of the confession, not fearing the sufferings to be endured, but looking to the end and fearing lest some one should apostatize. Yet those who were worthy were seized each day, filling up their number, so that all the zealous and those through whom especially our affairs had been managed were gathered together from the two churches. And some of our servants who were heathens were seized because the governor had ordered that we should all be examined in public.

These, by the wiles of Satan, fearing the tortures which they saw the saints suffering and urged by the soldiers to do this, accused us falsely of Thyestean banquets and Oedipodean incests and of deeds which it is not lawful for us to speak or think of, and which we do not believe men ever committed. When these accusations were reported all raged like wild beasts against us, so that even those who had previously restrained themselves on account of kinship, then became exceedingly enraged and gnashed their teeth against us...

[p. 13] The whole rage of the people, governor and soldiers was aroused exceedingly against Sanctus, deacon from Vienne, and against Maturus, a recent convert but a noble combatant, and against Attalus, a native of Pergamus, who had always been a pillar and a foundation in that place, and against Blandina through whom Christ showed that what appears mean, deformed and contemptible to men is of great glory with God through love for Him, shown in power and not boasting in appearance. For while we all, together with her mistress on earth, who was herself also one of the combatants among the martyrs, feared lest in the strife she should be unable to make her confession on account of her bodily weakness, Blandina was filled with such power that she was delivered and raised above those who took turns in torturing her in every manner from dawn till evening; and they confessed that they were defeated and had nothing more which they could do to her. They marvelled at her endurance, for her whole body was mangled and broken; and they testified that one form of torture was sufficient to destroy life, to say nothing of so many and so great tortures. But the blessed one, like a noble athlete, renewed her strength in the confession; and her comfort, refreshment and relief from suffering was in saying, "I am a Christian" and "Nothing vile is done by us."

Sanctus also himself, marvellously and beyond all men, endured nobly all human outrages, while the wicked hoped by the duration and severity of the tortures to wring from him something which he ought not to utter, he withstood them with such firmness, that he did not even tell his own name nor the nation nor the city whence he came, nor whether he was a bondsman or free, but to all questions he replied in the Roman tongue, "I am a Christian." ...

[p. 14] But the devil, thinking he had already consumed a certain Biblias, one of those who had recanted, wishing also to condemn her on account of blasphemy, led her to torture to compel her, as she was already feeble and weak, to utter impious things concerning us. But she recovered herself in her suffering and, as if aroused from a deep sleep and reminded by the present anguish of the eternal torture in hell, she contradicted

the blasphemers, saying: "How could they eat children for whom it is not lawful even to taste the blood of irrational animals?" And after that she confessed herself a Christian and was placed in the order of the martyrs...

The blessed Pothinus, who had been entrusted with the office of bishop in Lyons, was dragged to the tribunal. He was over ninety years of age and very weak in body, breathing with difficulty on account of his physical weakness, but invigorated with spiritual zeal because of [p. 15] his intense eagerness for martyrdom...

On being asked by the governor who was the god of the Christians, he said, "If you are worthy you shall know." Then he was dragged off harshly and endured many blows. Those near him struck him with their hands and feet in every manner, regardless of his age; those at a distance threw at him whatever they had in their hands; all thinking that they would sin extremely and be guilty of great impiety if any insult to him was omitted, for they thought thus to avenge their own gods. And scarcely breathing he was cast into prison and died after two days...

[p. 16] Maturus, Sanctus, Blandina and Attalus were therefore led to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre and, in order to give to the heathen public a spectacle of cruelty, a day was especially appointed for our people to fight with the wild beasts. Accordingly Maturus and Sanctus again passed through the whole torture in the amphitheatre...

But Blandina suspended on a stake was exposed as food for the wild beasts which should fall upon her. Because she seemed to be suspended in the manner of a cross and because of her earnest prayers, she encouraged the contestants greatly. They looking upon her in her conflict, beheld with their eyes, through their sister, Him who had suffered for them in order to persuade those who trust in Him that everyone who suffers for the glory of Christ has eternal fellowship with the living God. And as none of the beasts touched her at that time, she was taken down from the stake and led away again to the prison, to be preserved for another contest...

[p. 17] The greater part of those who had been apostates retraced their steps, were again conceived, again endowed with life, and learned to confess. And now living and strengthened they went to the tribunal, while God, who desireth not the death of a sinner, but mercifully inviteth to repentance, regarded them kindly, in order that they might again be questioned by the governor. For Caesar had written that these should be put to death, but if any should deny they should be dismissed. At the beginning of the festival held there, which is attended by throngs of people from all nations, the governor had the blessed ones brought to the judgment-seat to be a show and spectacle for the multitude. Therefore he examined them again, and as many as seemed to be Roman citizens he had beheaded, the others he sent to the wild beasts...

[p. 18] After all of these, on the last day of the contests, Blandina was again brought in together with Ponticus, a boy of about fifteen. These had been brought every day to witness the sufferings of the others, and had been urged to swear by the idols. But as they had remained firm and had despised the idols, the multitude was furious against them, so that they had no compassion for the youth of the boy nor the sex of the woman. But they subjected them to all the sufferings and led them through the whole round of torture, repeatedly urging them to swear, but not being able to accomplish this. For Ponticus, supported by his sister, so that even the heathen saw that she was encouraging and strengthening him, gave up his life after having nobly endured every torture... [Blandina] was thrown before a wild bull. She was well tossed about by the animal, but she did not

feel her sufferings on account of her hope, trust and communion with Christ, and at last she [p. 19] too died...

The bodies of the martyrs after having been exposed and exhibited in every manner for six days, were afterwards burned and reduced to ashes by the lawless men and thrown in the river Rhone which flows close by, so that no remnants of them might still be seen on the earth. And they did this as if they were able to overcome God and prevent their coming to life again, in order, as some said, "that they may have no hope of a resurrection, trusting in which they bring to us a certain foreign and strange religion, and despise awful punishments and are ready with joy to suffer death. Now let us see whether they will rise again, and if their God is able to aid them and rescue them from our hands."

**1189. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Septimius Severus, 193–211), 197, 198, 211**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 174. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Septimius [Severus] was the first emperor to assume the title *dominus* and the first to rely on the army for support. Although he personally favored the Christians (at least until 202), there were persecutions by provincial officials during his reign in Egypt—Alexandria and the Thebaid—and in the province of Africa in 197–198 and again in 211. The former called forth Tertullian's defense of Christianity, the *Apologeticus*, in 197 and perhaps his *Ad Martyres*.

**1190. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Septimius Severus, 193–211), 202**

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 20, 21.

[p. 20] [a.] The Rescript of Septimius Severus [202].

Spartian, *Vita Sept. Sev.* Ch. 17 (*Script. Hist. August.*, ed. Jordan et Essenhardt, I, p. 13). Latin.

Under threat of severe punishment he forbade men to become Jews. Moreover, he decreed the same in the case of Christians.

[b.] *Account by Tertullian.*

*Ad Scapulam*, 4 (I, p. 547 sq. ed. Oehler). Latin.

Even Severus himself, father of Antoninus, was mindful of the Christians. For the Christian Proculus, who was called Torpacion, procurator of Euhodias, and who had once wrought a cure for him with ointment, Severus sought out and kept in the palace until the time of his death. Antoninus, who was nourished on Christian milk, was very well acquainted with this man. The most noble women and men, whom Severus knew belonged to this sect, he not only did not harm, but he even [p. 21] set forth the truth by his own testimony and openly restored them to us from the raging populace.

[c.] *Account by Eusebius.*

*Hist. Ecc.*, Bk. VI, ch. I, ed. Dindorf, Vol. IV, p[p]. 239–40. Greek.

When Severus set in motion a persecution against the churches, brilliant testimonies were given everywhere by the athletes of religion. Especially did these abound in Alexandria, whither athletes of God were sent in accordance with their worth, from Egypt and all Thebais, as if to a very great contest, and where they obtained their crowns from God through their most patient endurance of various tortures and kinds of death. Among

these was Leonides, who was called the father of Origen, and who was beheaded, leaving his son still a young boy...

**1191. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Maximinus Thrax, 235–238)**

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), p. 21.

*Account by Eusebius.*

Hist. Ecc., Bk. VI, ch. 28, ed. Dindorf, Vol. IV, p. 273. Greek.

Maximinus Caesar succeeded to Alexander, Emperor of the Romans, who had ruled thirteen years. On account of his hatred for the household of Alexander, which contained many believers, he began a persecution, but commanded that the rulers of the churches alone should be put to death, on the ground that they were the authors of the teaching of the Gospels...

**1192. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Decius, 249–251)**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 177. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Decius (249–251), a man of the old Roman type ... tarnished his name by carrying out the worst persecution of the century. A year before his proclamation he tried to compel Christians to sacrifice to the Roman gods. The persecution following was not motivated so much by his personal hostility to the Church as by his program of restoring the ancient institutions and religion of Rome which he felt was impossible if Christianity, an *imperium in imperio* as it really was, continued. By Decius' time the Church contained nobles, the wealthy and educated classes. The emperor's claim to divinity was hateful to the Christians. Thus Decius made his persecution a test of loyalty and began it against the Church leaders. On January 20, 250, he imprisoned the Roman bishop, Fabianus, and for fifteen months there was a break in the "apostolic succession" until, during a lull in the persecution, Cornelius succeeded (251–253) only to be expelled by Decius' successor, Trebonianus Gallus (251–253).

By June 250 the persecution had become more severe; decrees were then sent out to the provinces that all, even priests of the pagan cults and children, must appear before committees of five and demonstrate their loyalty to the religion of Rome and receive a certificate—*libellus*—or suffer death. Many such *libelli*, dating from June twelfth to July fifteenth, have been found on papyrus in the Fayûm in Egypt, in which Christians swore that they had made offerings to the Roman gods. A typical one, found in 1893, was issued to one Aurelius Diogenes of Alexander Island, a man of seventy-two, who swore: "I have always sacrificed to the gods; and now, in your presence, and according to the terms of the edict, I have sacrificed, and [poured libations] and [tasted] the sacrificial victims, and I ask you to append your signature." Eusebius tells how Origen was imprisoned and tortured but was finally set free although he soon died of his sufferings. Porphyry, the Neo-Platonist and enemy of Christianity who died about 304, says thousands were slain. At the close of this eventful year the war against the Goths started again and Decius was slain in the following year, his death probably forestalling further persecution. It did not injure the Church greatly even though his successor Gallus continued it but his short reign made it ineffective. He did not renew Decius' decree which had imposed "universal sacrifices."

**1193. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Valerian, 253–260), c. 257–259**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 177, 178. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 177] Valerian, formerly Decius' censor, on his accession was at first friendly to Christianity, but later was influenced against it by Macrianus, ruler of the Egyptian Synagogue. He was delayed in renewing Decius' persecu- [p. 178] tion by the military crisis, but later, to cover up his defeats at the hands of the Goths, he followed Nero's example of shifting the blame and popular ill-feeling against himself to the Christians. He began his persecutions with the higher clergy and on pain of death forbade Christian meetings and especially the entrance into cemeteries, around which since the days of the catacombs it had been customary to group workshops and Church administrative buildings. Later, many of the higher clergy and laity were executed and their property confiscated, among the former the Roman bishop Xystus (Sixtus) II (257–258).

The persecution seems to have lasted during parts of three years, but was ended around 259–260 with Valerian's capture by the Parthian king Sapor I.

#### **1194. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Valerian, 253–260), c. 258**

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [185–]), pp. 22–25.

[p. 22] [a.] Cyprian's Letter.

Epist. 80. Opera, ed. G. Hartel, II, p. 839 sq. (Corp. Script. Ecc. Lat. III, 1871.) Latin.

Those have returned whom I had sent to the City to discover and report to us as to the nature of the truth of the rescript concerning us. For many, various and uncertain were the rumors circulated. But the truth of the matter is this: Valerian had sent a rescript to the senate, that bishops, presbyters and deacons should be punished immediately, but that senators, nobles, and Roman knights should be degraded from their dignity, and furthermore despoiled of their goods, and if, after they had been deprived of their property, they should persist in being Christians, they too should be beheaded. Matrons should be deprived of their goods and sent into exile. Those of Caesar's household, whoever had confessed formerly or should confess now, should have their property confiscated and should be sent in chains by assignment to Caesar's estates. To his discourse, moreover, the Emperor Valerian added a copy of the letter which he sent to the governors of the provinces concerning us. This letter we hope daily will arrive, prepared according to the strength of the faith, ready to endure martyrdom, and expecting by the might and grace of God the crown of eternal life. Be it known to you, moreover, that Xistus was executed in the cemetery on the eighth before the Ides of August, and together with him four deacons. Indeed, the prefects in the city insist daily on this persecution. If any are brought before them, they are punished and their goods confiscated to the treasury.

I beg that this may be made known through you to the rest of our [p. 23] associates, so that everywhere by their encouragement the brotherhood may be strengthened and prepared for the spiritual conflict, that each of us may not think more of death than of immortality, and that, consecrated to the Lord, in full faith and all virtue, they may rejoice rather than fear in this confession in which they know that, as soldiers of God and Christ, they will not be destroyed but be crowned. I hope that you, dearest brother, will ever be strong in the Lord.

[b.] *The Martyrdom of Cyprian.*

Acta Proconsularia Cypriani. Opera, ed. G. Hartel, III, p. cx sqq. (Corp. Script. Ecc. Lat. III, 1871.) Latin.

In the fourth consulship of the Emperor Valerian and the third of Gallienus, on the third before the Kalends of September, in the council chamber of Carthage, Paternus, the proconsul, said to Bishop Cyprian: "The most sacred Emperors, Valerian and Gallienus, have thought fit to give me a letter according to which they have ordered that those, who do not practice the Roman religion, should recognize the Roman rites. I have asked, therefore, concerning your name; what do you answer me?" Bishop Cyprian said: "I am a Christian and a bishop. I have known no other gods except the true and only God, who made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is. To this God we Christians yield ourselves; to Him we pray by day and night for you, for all men, and for the safety of the Emperors themselves." Paternus, the proconsul, said: "Do you, then, persist in this purpose?" Bishop Cyprian replied: "A good purpose, which has known God, cannot be changed." Paternus, the proconsul, said: "Will you be able to depart into exile, then, to the city of Curubitana (Curubis) according to the decree of Valerian and Gallienus?" Bishop Cyprian said: "I depart." Paternus, the proconsul, said: "They have thought fit to write to me concerning not only bishops, but also presbyters. I wish, therefore, to learn from you who the presbyters are who abide in the city." Bishop Cyprian replied: "By your laws you have rightly and profitably decreed that there should be no informers; and hence they cannot be betrayed and denounced by me. But in their own cities they will be found." ...

[p. 24] Then Paternus, the proconsul, ordered the blessed bishop Cyprian to be led into exile. When he had remain[ed] there for a long time, the proconsul Galerius Maximus succeeded the proconsul Aspasius Paternus and ordered the holy bishop Cyprian to be recalled from exile and brought before him... And when he had been brought, Galerius Maximus, the proconsul, said to Bishop Cyprian: "You are Thascius Cyprian?" Bishop Cyprian replied: "I am." Galerius Maximus, the proconsul, said: "The most sacred Emperors have commanded you to sacrifice." Bishop Cyprian said: "I [p. 25] will not." Galerius Maximus said: "Reflect on it." Bishop Cyprian replied: "Do what you are ordered to do. In such a just case there is no need of reflection."

Galerius Maximus, having spoken with the council, pronounced the sentence weakly and reluctantly in the following words: "For a long time you have lived in sacrilege, you have gathered about you many associates in your impious conspiracy, you have put yourself in hostility to the Roman gods and to the sacred rites, nor could the pious and most sacred princes, Valerian and Gallienus, Emperors, and Valerian, the most noble Caesar, bring you back to the practice of their worship. And therefore, since you are found to be the author of the vilest crimes, and the standard bearer, you shall be a warning to those whom you have gathered about you in your crime; by your blood, discipline shall be established." And having said this he read out the decree from his tablet: "We command that Thascius Cyprian be executed by the sword." Bishop Cyprian said: "Thank God."

After this sentence the crowd of brethren kept saying: "And we will be beheaded with him." On account of this a commotion arose among the brethren and a great crowd followed him. And thus Cyprian was brought in to the country near Sexti; here he laid aside his red cloak, kneeled on the ground, and prostrated himself before the Lord in prayer. And when he had laid aside his priestly robe and given it to the deacons, he stood in his linen under-garments, and waited for the executioner. Moreover, when the executioner had come, he ordered his followers to give this executioner twenty-five

pieces of gold... Thus the blessed Cyprian died, and his body was placed near at hand on account of the curiosity of the heathen. Hence, being borne away in the night with tapers and torches, it was brought with prayers and great triumph to the courts of the procurator Macrobius Candidianus, which are on the Via Mappaliensis, near the fish ponds. Moreover, after a few days, Galerius Maximus, the proconsul, died.

### **1195. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Aurelian, 270–275)**

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), p. 26.

#### *Decree of Aurelian.*

Passio S. Symphoriani Martyris, ch. 2 (Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum Sincera*, Amsterdam, 1713, p. 80. Reprinted in Preuschen, *Analecta*.) Latin.

The Emperor Aurelian to all his administrators and governors. We have learned that the precepts of the laws are violated by those who in our times call themselves Christians. Punish those who are arrested with divers tortures, unless they sacrifice to our gods, until the difficulty mentioned may be righted, and vengeance, satisfied by the extirpation of the crime, may have an end.

### **1196. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Diocletian, 284–305, and Others), 303–311**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 180, 181. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 180] He [Diocletian], like Decius and Aurelius before him, felt that Christianity was a menace and that the State must either destroy or yield to it, and in consequence instituted the most ruthless persecution which lasted long after his abdication in 305, i.e. from 303 to 311. By his time Christianity was the strongest organized group in the State numbering, perhaps, a tenth of the population and as much as one-half of that in Asia Minor. For, as Harnack has said, it was “a religion of towns and cities.” Its numbers, therefore, even if in a minority, exerted a disproportionate influence. The new despot, albeit naturally tolerant and, in addition, married to a Christian wife and having a Christian daughter, was aroused against the Christians by his brutal Caesar Galerius (292–305) who had advanced through the army and was instigated by the Neo-Platonists. He succeeded Diocletian after the latter’s abdication. To him Diocletian, unfortunately, left the management of the persecution. It is on his shoulders, therefore, that the chief blame rests.

There is no contemporary history of the persecution and no official text of the three decrees issued in the years 303–304 but we can follow the main events in the summary of Eusebius written two decades after it began and in the *De mortibus persecutorum* (314–315). The first edict, followed in rapid sequence by the others, was issued on February 23, 303 and ordered all Christian churches and places of assembly closed, the Scriptures and liturgical books publicly burned, Church officials expelled from office and deprived of immunity from torture and all Christians placed outside the law, i.e., without recourse to the courts. For it was decided to crush Christianity at one blow at the annual festival of the *Terminalia* on that date, a festival believed to have been instituted by Numa. At the time when imperial agents had begun the destruction of the cathedral at Nicomedia two mysterious fires occurred in the palace. These, Lactantius says, were instigated by Galerius while the latter said it was the work of the Christians. A reign of terror ensued. In the words of Eusebius “whole families and in heaps, were in some cases butchered

with the sword; while [p. 181] others were perfected by fire, when it is recorded that men and women leaped upon the pyre with a divine eagerness....” By a second edict issued when it was rumored that the Christians were trying to overthrow the government in the district of Melitene in Armenia Secunda and in Syria it was ordered that bishops, priests, and deacons be imprisoned. As a result the prisons were so crowded that no space was left for ordinary criminals. It was at this time (304) that Diocletian went to Rome to celebrate his *vicennalia*, an occasion on which it was customary for an emperor to release criminals by general amnesty. Liberty therefore was then promised to those who would sacrifice to the Roman gods, otherwise they would be mutilated. Diocletian became ill in Rome and was so broken in health on his return to Nicomedia that it was rumored he had died. Galerius took the opportunity to issue the third edict in 304 which ordered all to sacrifice on pain of death.

Eusebius grows eloquent in describing the tortures inflicted on Christians in Tyre, Palestine, and especially in the Egyptian Thebaid—where bodies were torn with sharp shards, women completely nude were fastened by one foot and swung aloft with heads downward, and men were tied by their legs to the bent branches of trees in Persian fashion which when released tore them asunder. In Egypt as many as one hundred victims perished in a day and the slaughter was kept up intermittently for years. But it is doubtful if the persecution was carried out on the scale reported by the Church historian for its ruthlessness depended largely on the feelings of the rulers of the tetrarchy, two of whom, Maxentius (306–312) and Constantine in the West, seem to have ordered no deaths. The fact that the populace was somewhat friendly toward the Christians also mitigated its severity even in the East. Diocletian’s abdication in 305 was in part the sequel of Galerius’ victory.

When the latter became Augustus the Eastern Caesar, his nephew, Maximinus Daia (305–308), subsequently the emperor Galerius Valerius Maximinus (308–313), decreed in 306 that all provincial governors should enforce sacrifice on all and the persecution in the East began anew with greater ferocity. In 309 Daia as co-emperor again promulgated an edict that pagan temples be rebuilt and that all must share in the rites of sacrifice. Finally, the elder Galerius fell ill at Serdica (Sofia) and, whether conscience-stricken at the approach of death as the pious Eusebius thought or because of the persuasions of his colleagues Licinius and Constantine, issued his palinode on April 30, 311—the famous Edict of Toleration. The persecution, apart from sporadic outbreaks kept up in the East by Daia, ceased.

3

### **1197. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (Under Diocletian, 284–305, and Others), 303–313**

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints From the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, [189–]), pp. 26–28.

[Translator’s introductory note; p. 26] This last persecution was the longest and the most severe. It covered approximately a period of ten years, which, however, was interrupted by civil wars, brought on by the establishment of the tetrarchy, and by the edict of toleration, granted by Galerius on his death bed. It

---

<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.

was in Syria and Egypt that the persecution took its worst form. In the west the force of the decrees was mitigated, especially in the dominion of Constans.

We have two authorities for the period, Eusebius and Lactantius, both contemporaries and eye-witnesses, the one in Phoenicia and Egypt, and the other in Nicodemia itself. From the two we get many details of the events leading up to the promulgation of the decrees, as well as of the horrors and cruelty attending their execution.

Eusebius says (Book VIII, 10) that the calamities [*sic*] of the times were brought on the Church as a judgment from God, since hypocrisy, rivalry and dissension had grown up in the Church as a result of excessive liberty and great wealth.

Both in the case of the edict of toleration by Galerius and that by Constantine and Licinius, the original Latin text is to be found in Lactantius, and merely a Greek translation in Eusebius, (H. E., Bk. VIII, 17, and X, 5)...

#### Edicts of Diocletian Against the Christians.

Eusebius, Hist. Ec, Book VIII, ch. 2, ch. 6 at end, and De Mart. Palest. ch. 3, ch. 4, and ch. 9 (ed. Dindorf, Vol. IV, p[p]. 351, 357, 386, 390, 402). Greek.

(Hist. Ecc. viii 2.) This was the nineteenth year of the reign of [p. 27] Diocletian, in Dystrus (which the Romans call March), when the feast of the Saviour's passion was near at hand, and royal edicts were published everywhere, commanding that the churches should be razed to the ground, the Scriptures destroyed by fire, those who held positions of honor degraded, and the household servants, if they persisted in the Christian profession, be deprived of their liberty.

And such was the first decree against us. But issuing other decrees not long after, the Emperor commanded that all the rulers of the churches in every place should be first put in prison and afterwards compelled by every device to offer sacrifice.

(Hist. Ecc. viii 6.) Then as the first decrees were followed by others commanding that those in prison should be set free, if they would offer sacrifice, but that those who refused should be tormented with countless tortures; who could again at that time count the multitude of martyrs throughout each province, and especially throughout Africa and among the race of the Moors, in Thebais and throughout Egypt, from which having already gone into other cities and provinces, they became illustrious in their martyrdoms!

(De Mart. Pal. ch. 3.) During the second year the war against us increased greatly. Urbanus was then governor of the province and imperial edicts were first issued to him, in which it was commanded that all the people throughout the city should sacrifice and pour out libations to the idols.....

(De Mart. Pal. ch. 4.)... .. For in the second attack upon us by Maximinus, in the third year of the persecution against us, edicts of the tyrant were issued for the first time, that all the people should offer sacrifice and that the rulers of the city should see to this diligently and zealously. Heralds went through the whole city of Caesarea, by the orders of the governor, summoning men, women and children to the temples of the idols, and in addition the chiliarchs were calling upon each one by name from a roll.

(De Mart. Pal. ch. 9)..... All at once decrees of Maximinus again got abroad against us everywhere throughout the province. The governors, and in addition the military prefects, incited by edicts, letters and public ordinances the magistrates, together with the generals and the city clerks in all the cities, to fulfill the imperial edicts which [p. 28] commanded that the altars of the idols should be rebuilt with all zeal; and that all the men, together with the women and children, even infants at the breast, should offer sacrifice and pour out libations; and these urged them anxiously, carefully to make the people taste of the sacrifices; and that the viands in the market should be polluted by the

libations of the sacrifices; and that watches should be stationed before the baths, so as to defile those who washed in these with the all-abominable sacrifices.....

### **1198. Persecution, by Pagan Rome (303–313)—Contemporary Account**

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* viii. 15. 1; viii. 16. 1–3; translated by J. E. L. Oulton, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 313, 315. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 313] In fact, during the whole period of ten years of persecution there was no respite in their plotting and warfare against each other...

Such was the state of affairs that continued throughout the whole persecution; which came completely to an end, by the grace of God, in the tenth year, though indeed it began to abate after the eighth year... But this was not due to any human agency nor to the pity, as one [p. 315] might say, or humanity of the rulers. Far from it. For from the beginning up to that time they were daily plotting further and severer measures against us; from time to time they were inventing fresh assaults upon us by means of still more varied devices. But it was due to the manifestation of the Divine Providence itself, which, while it became reconciled to the people, attacked the perpetrator of these evils, and was wroth with him as the chief author of the wickedness of the persecution as a whole. For verily, though it was destined that these things should come to pass as a divine judgment, yet the Scripture says, “Woe, through whomsoever the offence cometh.” A divinely-sent punishment, I say, executed vengeance upon him, beginning at his very flesh and proceeding to the soul.

### **1199. Persecution, by Pagan Rome, Ended (311, 313)**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 182, 183. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 182] The edict [of Toleration, 311] was published in the name of Galerius, Licinius, and Constantine, the original Latin text being preserved in Lactantius’ treatise mentioned [translated in No. 1310]...

Two years later another edict signed by Licinius and Constantine is supposed to have been issued at Milan, known as the “Edict of Milan,” its purpose being to reemphasize and amplify the earlier one. But it is doubtful if such an “edict” was ever issued since nothing has survived except a letter addressed by Licinius in that year to a governor ordering that it be made known to his province. This may have been written at Milan referring to the Edict already discussed. It should, therefore, be called only a rescript of the former, which was intended for the East. Some historians therefore following the lead of Otto Seeck have denied its existence, except as a repetition of the Edict of 311, while others have argued that the text of the edict found in Lactantius’ work, together with a slightly different Greek translation preserved by Eusebius [see translation in No. 1311], does form an edict because its text is too formal and explicit to admit of doubt. But it seems more probable that Constantine and Licinius on meeting at Milan in 313 agreed on the future policy of toleration for both the West and East and that later Licinius drew up a rescript of instructions for governors, which amounted to the republication of the edict of 311.

### **1200. Persecution, by Pagan Rome, Over Emperor Worship**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 29–32. 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 29] Such persecution of Christians as there was in the first three centuries resulted in most instances from difficulties over emperor worship. As has been said, the grip of

the old Roman gods was slackening throughout the period of the empire. The Romans were normally tolerant in regard to religion, chiefly through indifference. But from Augustus on there rose a cult of homage to the emperor proclaimed a god. Temples were built in all the principal cities of the empire to this living divinity, and in these stood the altars on which the loyal citizen was required to sprinkle incense [p. 30] to the emperor's Genius. To the Roman authorities, this was more an act of patriotism than of religion. Or perhaps it should be called a religious act performed as a proof of patriotism...

On the whole, Roman policy was remarkably tolerant in dealing with the religions encountered as the legions overran that world around the Mediterranean. If the national religions of the conquered countries would add homage to the emperor to their other rites, Rome almost never interfered. On the contrary, it was more likely to find a place for the foreign religion in the swarm of new deities whose cults were brought to Rome. And in one notable instance, Rome even dropped the requirement of emperor worship. The Jews, with their fanatical loyalty to their One True God, and their readiness to turn their land into a blood-soaked waste before they would acknowledge any other deity, were exempted.

If Rome was willing to make an exception in the case of the Jews, why was it not willing likewise to exempt Christians from spilling incense on the altars of the divine emperors? ... The Christians, on the other hand, were ceaseless proselytes. They were avowedly out to make Christians of the entire population of the empire, and the rapidity of their spread showed that this was no idle dream. Not only did they, like the Jews, refuse to worship the emperor as a living god, but they were doing their utmost to [p. 31] induce every subject of the emperor to join them in that same refusal.

The problem for the empire, in other words, was more political than religious. While sacrifice to the Genius of the emperor remained the test of patriotism, could the state authorities afford to wink at the contumacy of these unpatriotic Christians? ...

The Roman proconsuls and local magistrates were not looking for trouble; when their jurisdictions were peaceful they were glad to leave well enough alone. At the same time, the Christians went out of their way to try to prove that they were good citizens. They lived quiet, moral, indeed model lives. The epistles read in their meetings, written by Paul and other leaders, admonished them to render proper obedience to those in civil authority. If they would not pray *to* the emperor by scattering incense on his altars, they never failed to pray *for* him in their meetings. In every respect except that single matter of incense-burning they were exemplary citizens...

[p. 32] Christians were openly recalcitrant when it came to participating in this one prescribed loyalty test. For this reason they were always, legally considered, in contempt of Caesar and therefore liable to punishment. But by the middle of the second century no official who considered persecuting them could be sure how close to his own household the purge might come. So Rome, on the whole, moved cautiously...

Nevertheless, there were martyrs, and their blood, as the familiar saying put it, was the seed of the church... There were enough who sealed their faith with martyrdom to make a deep impression on pagan observers.

### **1201. Persecution, by Pagan Rome, Reasons for**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 184, 185. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 184] The chief cause of hostility in an Empire which allowed all forms of religion if only their devotees also supported the State-cult and Roman institutions may be laid to the intolerance of the Christians themselves...

Polytheism is naturally tolerant and hospitable to alien faiths and this had grown in the later period of religious syncretism. Rome placed no barriers to any religion which was willing to compromise with that of the State. Its citizens were willing to try any religion or philosophy in seeking salvation. Christianity, on the other hand, increased the intolerance which it inherited from Judaism bringing the same odium on its members as had once been visited on the Jews. It declared its doctrines to be the only righteous ones, remained exclusive, and demanded of every candidate for admission the unconditional surrender of his past. It aroused not only hostility, but, when attacked, fanatical devotion.

The greatest ill-feeling against the Christians was aroused by their refusal to place incense in the incense-burner on the emperor's statue, the symbol of the imperial cult and of loyalty to the emperor—an act no more difficult to observe than the modern custom of saluting a national flag. Like the Jews they refused to share in the official festivals, especially in the triumphs of returning generals and, until Saxa Rubra in 312, to join willingly the Roman armies, a refusal regarded as treasonable since the ultimate duty of citizenship was the defense of the State. Further, they, like the Jews, held aloof from public amusements of circus and arena and refused to illuminate their houses and to hang garlands over their doors on festal occasions. Consequently, they were regarded as a group which refused to bear the full responsibility of citizenship. Their secret meetings were illegal, but the Church had become the largest secret society in the Empire where secret religious assemblies, *hetaeriae*, as Trajan called them in his letter to Pliny (X:43, 1), were banned on political grounds. Pliny said "their worst crime was their meeting at stated times for religious service," merely because such meetings were secret...

[p. 185] One of the worst of Christian crimes was interference with vested economic interests—always dangerous... Pliny said that the temples of Bithynia were deserted and that there were no purchasers of sacrificial animals.

It is, therefore, no wonder that the masses were motivated in their hostility, religiously, socially, economically; and the government, politically. It is, rather, surprising that the Christians did not rouse greater hostility.

## **1202. Persecution, of Heretics, All Except Trinitarian Catholics, by Catholic Roman Emperors**

SOURCE: *Theodosian Code* 16.1.2, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 440. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

Law of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius [I], Feb. 28, 380.

It is Our will that all the peoples who are ruled by the administration of Our Clemency shall practice that religion which the divine Peter the Apostle transmitted to the Romans, as the religion which he introduced makes clear even unto this day. It is evident that this is the religion that is followed by the Pontiff Damasus and by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic sanctity; that is, according to the apostolic discipline and the evangelic doctrine, we shall believe in the single Deity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, under the concept of equal majesty and of the Holy Trinity.

I. We command that those persons who follow this rule shall embrace the name of Catholic Christians. The rest, however, whom We adjudge demented and insane, shall sustain the infamy of heretical dogmas, their meeting places shall not receive the name of

churches, and they shall be smitten first by divine vengeance and secondly by the retribution of Our own initiative, which We shall assume in accordance with the divine judgment.

### **1203. Persecution, of Heretics and Pagans by Christians After Church's Triumph**

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), pp. 104, 105. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

[p. 104] Henceforth Christianity won its way partially by [p. 105] persecution and by attempting to exterminate heretics and Pagans. It became easier to be a Christian than to remain a Pagan or a Jew; and safer to be orthodox than to risk being guilty of thinking. Conscientious objectors were henceforth treated as Christians had formerly been treated for their 'sheer obstinacy.' No one could have dreamed that the Christians, who had themselves suffered so much from persecution and protested so vehemently against the injustice and futility of persecution, would so quickly have turned persecutors and surpassed their Pagan predecessors in fanatical savagery and efficiency, utterly oblivious of the Beatitude of the Divine Master (Matt. v. 10, 44, 45). It became ominous for subsequent history that the first General Council of the Church [at Nicaea, 325] was signalized by bitter excommunications and banishments. Christians, having acquired the art of disposing of hostile criticism by searching out and burning the objectionable books of their Pagan adversaries, learned to apply the same method to the works of such groups of Christians as were not in power or in favour for the time; when this method proved unsatisfactory, they found it expedient to burn their bodies.

### **1204. Persecution, of Heretics (Arians) by Catholics, and Arian Retaliation**

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 39, Vol. 4 (London: Methuen & Co., 1898), pp. 196, 197.

[p. 196] The religious toleration which Theodoric had the glory of introducing into the Christian world was painful and offensive to the orthodox zeal of the Italians...

[p. 197] [But the emperor's persecution of Arianism at last] awakened the just resentment of Theodoric, who claimed for his distressed brethren of the East the same indulgence which he had so long granted to the Catholics of his dominions... And a mandate was prepared in Italy, to prohibit, after a stated day, the exercise of the Catholic worship. By the bigotry of his subjects and enemies, the most tolerant of princes was driven to the brink of persecution.

### **1205. Persecution, of Heretics (Arians) by Justinian**

SOURCE: Charles Diehl, "Justinian's Government in the East." chap. 2 in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926), p. 44. Used by permission.

Religious intolerance accompanied the imperial restoration [by Justinian] in the West. In Africa, as in Italy, Arians were spoiled for the benefit of Catholics, their churches were destroyed or ruined, and their lands confiscated.

### **1206. Persecution, of Heretics, Constitutes a Departure From Early Church Teachings**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, p. 198. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

Tertullian in the first years of the third century had said it was "a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his own convictions; it is assuredly no part of religion forcibly to impose religion, to which free

will and not force should lead us.”<sup>22</sup> [Note 22: *Ad scapulum* 2...] A century later Lactantius, then tutor of Crispus in Gaul (ca. 313), expressed a similar thought: “Religion cannot be imposed by force; if you wish to defend religion by bloodshed and by torture and by guilt, it will no longer be defended, but will be polluted and profaned.”<sup>23</sup> [Note 23: *Divinae institutiones* 1–7; 5, 2...] But this excellent spirit now largely disappeared. St. Chrysostom, who was contemporary with the intolerant Gratian and Theodosius, while approving the denial of the right of assembly to heretics still recommended that Christian love be shown them.<sup>24</sup> [Note 24: *Homilies* XXIX, XLVI (latter, *In Matthaeum*).] But, after Theodosius had made Christianity the sole faith of the State, St. Augustine became reconciled to forced conformity with Catholicism though saying it was “better that men should be brought to serve God by instruction than by fear of punishment,” adding, however, that the latter method must not be neglected.<sup>25</sup> [Note 25: *Epist.* 185.] Pope Leo the Great (440–461), according to Bishop Creighton, “accepted as a duty the suppression of heresy and raised no objection to legislation which treated heresy as a crime against civil society, and declared it punishable with death.”

### **1207. Persecution, of Heretics, Responsibility of Church for**

SOURCE: Henry Charles Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, Vol. 1 (New York: Harper, 1888), pp. 214, 215.

[p. 214] If the Church thus still shrank from shedding blood, it had by this time reached the point of using all other means without scruple to enforce conformity. Early in the fifth century we find Chrysostom teaching that heresy must be suppressed, heretics silenced and prevented from ensnaring others, and their conventicles broken up, but that the death-penalty is unlawful. About the same time St. Augustin entreats the Prefect of Africa not to put any Donatists to death because, if he does so, no ecclesiastic can make complaint of them, for they will prefer to suffer death themselves rather than be the cause of it to others. Yet Augustin approved of the imperial laws which banished and fined them and deprived them of their churches and of testamentary power, and he consoled them by telling them that God did not wish them to perish in antagonism to Catholic unity. To constrain any one from evil to good, he argued, was not oppression, but charity; and when the unlucky schismatics urged that no one ought to be coerced in his faith, he freely admitted it as a general principle, but added that sin and infidelity must be punished.

Step by step the inevitable progress was made, and men easily found specious arguments to justify the indulgence of their passions. The fiery Jerome, when his wrath was excited by Vigilantius forbidding the adoration of relics, expressed his wonder that the bishop of the hardy heretic had not destroyed him in the flesh for the benefit of his soul, and argued that piety and zeal for God [p. 215] could not be cruelty; rigor, in fact, he argues in another place, is the most genuine mercy, since temporal punishment may avert eternal perdition. It was only sixty-two years after the slaughter of Priscillian and his followers had excited so much horror, that Leo. I., when the heresy seemed to be reviving, in 447, not only justified the act, but declared that if the followers of heresy so damnable were allowed to live there would be an end of human and divine law. The final step had been taken, and the Church was definitely pledged to the suppression of heresy at whatever cost. It is impossible not to attribute to ecclesiastical influence the successive edicts by which, from the time of Theodosius the Great, persistence in heresy was punished with death.

## 1208. Persecution, of Pagans by Christian Roman Emperors

SOURCE: Arthur E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (4th ed.), pp. 501, 502. Copyright 1955 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

[p. 501] Constantine I sought to convert all of his subjects to Christianity and to make it the sole official religion of the Empire, although for political reasons he did not place any severe restrictions upon the practice of pagan cults. His sons, Constantius and Constans, however, initiated the Christian persecution of paganism. They prohibited public sacrifices, forbade the adoration of statues of the gods, removed these from temples, closed many of the latter and turned them over to the Christian clergy. Nevertheless, they continued to appoint pagans to high administrative offices. Under Julian the anti-pagan laws were abrogated, restrictions were placed upon Christians, and a vain attempt made to create a pagan state church. But this pagan reaction ended with Julian's death and his successors, Jovian, Valentinian I, and Valens, although they re-established Christianity in its former status, adhered to a policy of toleration of paganism much in the spirit of Constantine I.

With Gratian and Theodosius I the official persecution of paganism was renewed. Theodosius was the first emperor to refuse to accept the title of pontifex maximus at his accession, and he probably influenced his colleague Gratian to abandon his use of it. In 382 A.D. Gratian withdrew all official recognition of pagan worship, deprived the Roman priesthoods of public support, confiscated temple properties, and abolished the privilege of pagan priests. At the same time he removed from the Senate house in Rome the altar and statue of Victory which Julian had replaced after its removal by Constantius. For many of the senators, this altar was the symbol of the life of the state itself, and their spokesman Symmachus made an eloquent plea for its restoration. But under the influence of his Christian advisors, Gratian remained obdurate. Later appeals to Valentinian II and Theodosius were equally in vain. Although the brief reign of Eugenius produced a revival of pagan influence in Rome, the cause of paganism was lost already in the imperial city. After his victory over Arbogast and Eugenius, Theodosius pardoned their supporters in the Roman Senate on [p. 502] condition that they accepted Christianity. In the fifth century, the Senate was thoroughly Christian.

As early as 380 A.D. Theodosius had ordered all his subjects to accept the Christian creed formulated at the Council of Nicaea in 325. In 391, he ordered the destruction of the image and temple of Sarapis in Alexandria, a step which sounded the death knell of paganism in the eastern part of the Empire. The following year he unconditionally forbade pagan worship under the penalties for treason and sacrilege. Theodosius II continued the vigorous persecution of the pagans. Adherence to pagan beliefs was declared criminal, and in the Theodosian code laws against pagans are included among the laws regulating civic life. Under the same emperor, in 415 A.D., the pagan lady Hypatia, a noted philosopher and mathematician, was murdered by a fanatical Christian mob in Alexandria.

Still many prominent persons continued to be secret devotees of pagan beliefs and pagan philosophy was taught in the schools of Athens until they were closed by Justinian. The acceptance of Christianity was more rapid and complete in the cities than throughout the countryside. This gave rise to the use of the term pagan (from the Latin *paganus*, "rural" in the sense of "barbarian") to designate non-Christians; a usage which had become official by 370 A.D. Between the fifth and the ninth centuries, however, paganism virtually disappeared within the boundaries of the Empire [see No. 476].

### **1209. Persecution, of Pagans by Christian Roman Emperors—Edicts**

SOURCE: *Theodosian Code* 16.7.1, 16.10.4, trans. by Clyde Pharr, pp. 465, 472. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 465] *a.* Law of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius [I] (16.7.1), May 2, 381.

Those Christians who have become pagans shall be deprived of the power and right to make testaments, and every testament of such decedent, if there is a testament, shall be rescinded by the annulment of its foundation...

*b.* Law of Constantius and Constans (16.10.4), Dec. 1, 346

[p. 472] It is Our pleasure that the temples shall be immediately closed in all places and in all cities, and access to them forbidden, so as to deny to all abandoned men the opportunity to commit sin. It is also Our will that all men shall abstain from sacrifices. But if perchance any man should perpetrate any such criminality, he shall be struck down with the avenging sword. We also decree that the property of a man thus executed shall be vindicated to the fisc. The governors of the provinces shall be similarly punished if they should neglect to avenge such crimes.

### **1210. Persecution, of Protestant Dissenters and Catholics by Protestants**

SOURCE: W. E. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (reprint; New York: Braziller, 1955), Vol. 2, p. 46. [See FRS 93.]

But while the preëminent atrocity of the persecutions of the Church of Rome is fully admitted, nothing can be more grossly disingenuous or untrue than to represent persecution as her peculiar taint. She persecuted to the full extent of the power of her clergy, and that power was very great. The persecution of which every Protestant Church was guilty, was measured by the same rule, but clerical influence in Protestant countries was comparatively weak. The Protestant persecutions were never so sanguinary as those of the Catholics, but the principle was affirmed quite as strongly, was acted on quite as constantly, and was defended quite as pertinaciously by the clergy. In Germany, at the time of the protestation of Spires, when the name of Protestant was assumed, the Lutheran princes absolutely prohibited the celebration of mass within their dominions. In England a similar measure was passed as early as Edward VI... The Presbyterians through a long succession of reigns were imprisoned, branded, mutilated, scourged, and exposed in the pillory. Many Catholics under false pretences were tortured and hung. Anabaptists and Arians were burnt alive.

### **1211. Persecution, of Protestants by Protestants, Flimsy Excuse for**

SOURCE: Thomas Shepard (1605–1649), quoted in Charles Francis Adams, *Massachusetts: Its Historians and Its History* (2d ed.; Boston: Houghton, 1894), p. 23.

As for New England, we never banished any for their consciences, but for sinning against conscience, after due means of conviction.

### **1212. Persecution — Roman Church Has Shed More Blood Than Any Other Institution**

SOURCE: W. E. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (reprint; New York: Braziller, 1955), Vol. 2, pp. 40–45. [See FRS 93.]

[p. 40] That the Church of Rome has shed more innocent blood than any other institution that has ever existed among mankind, will be questioned by no Protestant who has a competent knowledge of history. The memorials, indeed, of many of her persecutions are now so scanty, that it is impossible to form a complete conception of the multitude of her victims, and it is quite certain that no powers of imagination can adequately realise their sufferings. Llorente, who had free access to the archives of the

Spanish Inquisition [see No. 882] assures us that by that tribunal alone more than 31,000 persons were burnt, and more than 290,000 condemned to punishments less severe than death. The number of those who were put to [p. 41] death for their religion in the Netherlands alone, in the reign of Charles V., has been estimated by a very high authority at 50,000, and at least half as many perished under his son. And when to these memorable instances we add the innumerable less conspicuous executions that took place, from the victims of Charlemagne to the free-thinkers of the seventeenth century; when we recollect that after the mission of Dominic the area of the persecution comprised nearly the whole of Christendom, and that its triumph was in many districts so complete as to destroy every memorial of the contest; the most callous nature must recoil with horror from the spectacle. For these atrocities were not perpetrated in the brief paroxysms of a reign of terror, or by the hands of obscure sectaries, but were inflicted by a triumphant Church, with every circumstance of solemnity and deliberation. Nor did the victims perish by a brief and painless death, but by one which was carefully selected as among the most poignant that man can suffer. They were usually burnt alive. They were burnt alive not unfrequently by a slow fire. They [p. 42] were burnt alive after their constancy had been tried by the most excruciating agonies that minds fertile in torture could devise. This was the physical torment inflicted on those [p. 43] who dared to exercise their reason in the pursuit of truth; but what language can describe, and what imagination can conceive, the mental suffering that accompanied it? For in those days the family was divided against itself. The ray of conviction often fell upon a single member, leaving all others untouched. The victims who died for heresy were not, like those who died for witchcraft, solitary and doting women, but were usually men in the midst of active life, and often in the first flush of youthful enthusiasm, and those who loved them best were firmly convinced that their agonies upon earth were but the prelude of eternal agonies hereafter. This was especially the case with weak women, who feel most acutely the sufferings of others, and around whose minds the clergy had most successfully wound their toils. It is horrible, it is appalling to reflect what the mother, the wife, the sister, the daughter of the heretic must have suffered from this teaching. She saw the body of him who was dearer to her than life, dislocated and writhing and quivering with pain; she watched the slow fire creeping from limb to limb till it had swathed him in a sheet of agony; and when at last the scream of anguish had died away, and the tortured body was at rest, she was told that all this was acceptable to the God she served, and was but a faint image of the sufferings He would inflict through eternity upon the dead. Nothing was wanting to give emphasis to the doctrine. It rang from every pulpit. It was painted over [p. 44] every altar. The Spanish heretic was led to the flames in a dress covered with representations of devils and of frightful tortures, to remind the spectators to the very last of the doom that awaited him.

All this is very horrible, but it is only a small part of the misery which the persecuting spirit of Rome has produced. For, judging by the ordinary measure of human courage, for every man who dared to avow his principles at the stake, there must have been multitudes who believed that by such an avowal alone they could save their souls, but who were nevertheless scared either by the prospect of their own sufferings or of the destitution of their children, who passed [p. 45] their lives in one long series of hypocritical observances and studied falsehoods, and at last, with minds degraded by habitual deception, sank hopeless and terror-stricken into the grave. And besides all these things,

we have to remember that the spirit which was manifested in acts of detailed persecution had often swept over a far wider sphere, and produced sufferings not perhaps so excruciating, but far more extensive. We have to recollect those frightful massacres, perhaps the most fearful the world has ever seen: the massacre of the Albigenses which a pope had instigated, or the massacre of St. Bartholomew for which a pope returned solemn thanks to Heaven... When we consider all these things, it can surely be no exaggeration to say that the Church of Rome has inflicted a greater amount of unmerited suffering than any other religion that has ever existed.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The church inflicted these penalties in the sense of handing over the culprits to the secular power after conviction, observing the technicality of not literally executing the sentence, though the judges were required to carry out the execution. See Nos. 830, 835n.]

### **1213. Perseverance of the Saints, Council of Trent on**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VI (Jan. 13, 1547), Decree Concerning Justification, chap. 13, trans. in H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, pp. 38, 39. Copyright 1941 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

[p. 38] Similarly with regard to the gift of perseverance, of which it is written: *He that shall persevere to the end, he shall be saved*, which cannot be obtained from anyone except from Him who is able to make him stand who stands, that he may stand perseveringly, and to raise him who falls, let no one promise himself herein something as certain with an absolute certainty, though all ought to place and repose the firmest hope in God's help. For God, unless men themselves fail in His grace, as *he has begun a good work, so will he perfect it, working to will and to accomplish*. Nevertheless, let those who think themselves to stand, take heed lest they fall, and with fear and trembling work out their salvation, in labors, in watchings, in almsdeeds, in prayer, in [p. 39] fastings and chastity. For knowing that they are born again unto the hope of glory, and not as yet unto glory, they ought to fear for the combat that yet remains with the flesh, with the world and with the devil, in which they cannot be victorious unless they be with the grace of God obedient to the Apostle who says: *We are debtors, not to the flesh, to live according to the flesh; for if you live according to the flesh, you shall die, but if by the spirit you mortify the deeds of the flesh, you shall live*.

### **1214. Persia—Early Religion of, Without Temples**

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, p. 28. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

Except for the sacred fire [see No. 1815] the Iranians felt no need of temples and altars. Moreover, their minds could conceive the divine beings independent of any symbols such as statues. Sacrifices were offered Ahura on the bare mountain peaks, beautiful only when covered with snow, and thus close to the generally cloudless sky. Crowned with myrtle, the sacrificer led the victim to an open place ritually pure, where he invoked by name the god, cut up the victim, and boiled the flesh. The pieces were piled upon a carpet of tenderest herbs, preferably alfalfa; a Magian then chanted a hymn which related the traditional origin of the gods. Afterward the sacrificer took away the flesh to do with it what he pleased. Such is the account of the contemporary Herodotus.

### **1215. Persia, Power Such That None "Might Stand Before Him" (Dan. 8:4)**

SOURCE: *Xenophon Cyropaedia* i. 1. 5; translated by Walter Miller, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 9. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

He [Cyrus] was able to cover so vast a region with the fear which he inspired, that he struck all men with terror and no one tried to withstand him; and he was able to awaken in all so lively a desire to please him, that they always wished to be guided by his will. Moreover, the tribes that he brought into subjection to himself were so many that it is a difficult matter even to travel to them all, in whatever direction one begin one's journey from the palace, whether toward the east or the west, toward the north or the south.

### **1216. Persia—Smerdis (Gaumata) and Darius I**

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 107, 108. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

[p. 107] In 522, at the age of twenty-eight, Darius was king's spearbearer in Egypt. Before the year was ended, Darius was king.

How so young a man reached so exalted a position while both father and grandfather were still living is explained in the autobiography in the following manner. There was a man of his family, Cambyses by name, son of Cyrus, who was king. Cambyses had a brother, Bardiya by name, of the same father and mother. Afterward Cambyses slew that brother, but it was not known to the people that Bardiya was slain. After Cambyses went to Egypt, the people became rebellious; the Lie was great in the lands. Afterward a Magian (Magush), Gaumata by name, arose and falsely claimed to be that [p. 108] Bardiya. He arose from Pishiyavada of Mount Arakadrish on March 11, 522. All the people abandoned Cambyses and went over to the pretender. On July 1 he took for himself the kingdom. Afterward Cambyses died by his own hand.

Now that kingdom had belonged from ancient times to the family of Darius. No man, even one of his own family, was able to take the kingdom from that Gaumata. People feared exceedingly lest he slay the many who had known the true Bardiya and so could prove the falsity of Gaumata's claim. No one in fact dared say anything against him until Darius arrived. Since we last hear of him as spearbearer to Cambyses in Egypt, obviously Darius must have left the army in Palestine as soon as the death of the former monarch was known and must have hastened at once to Media to press his claim to the vacant throne.

By the favor of Ahuramazda and with the aid of six other conspirators, Darius slew that Gaumata and his allies at the fort Sikayauvatish in the Median district of Nisaya on September 29, 522. By the favor of Ahuramazda, Darius became king. Later on in the autobiography Darius names the others of the "Seven," the conspirators who took part in the killing: Vindafarna (Intaphrenes), son of Vayaspara; Utana (Otanés), son of Thukhra; Gaubaruva (Gobryas), son of Marduniya (Mardonius); Vidarna (Hydarnes), son of Bagabigna; Bagabukhsha (Megabyzus), son of Datuhya; and Ardumanish, son of Vahauka. "You who shall be king hereafter, preserve well the family of these men."

Darius restored the power taken from his family. He established it on its former foundations. He rebuilt the temples Gaumata had destroyed. To the freemen he restored the pasturelands and to the nobles the cattle herds and peasants which the Magian had seized. He labored until it was as if Gaumata had never taken away the family house. Such was the official version, presented in the autobiography and advertised to the world on the Behistun rock.

### **1217. Persian Empire — Cyrus to Xerxes**

SOURCE: Ira Maurice Price and others, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, pp. 335, 336. Copyright 1958 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 335] Cyrus died in 530 B.C., probably while on some eastern campaign and was succeeded by his son, Cambyses II. This ambitious young man, to make secure his crown, murdered his brother and sister. After eight years of apparent success, he died in 522 B.C. For eight months a usurper, Gaumata [the Magian, pretending to be Smerdis, son of Cyrus], held the throne, but was finally slain, and Darius Hystaspes (522–486 B.C.) seized the crown. It was under the early years of his administration that the Jews at Jerusalem completed and dedicated their Temple (516 B.C.). During these years Darius suppressed revolts and uprisings in all parts of his realm. He then carried his conquests as far as Scythia in Europe [p. 336] (508 B.C.). He fully equipped two great expeditions for invading Greece, but both failed, the second at the famous battle of Marathon (490 B.C.). A third expedition was planned, but a revolt in Egypt (487 B.C.) and his own death (486 B.C.) intervened.

He was the greatest king who ever sat on Persia's throne, both as regards conquests and power of administration. He was succeeded by Xerxes I, supposed to be a remote kin of Cyrus, the conqueror of Babylon.

Xerxes' first great work was the subjugation of Egypt (486 B.C.). After chastising rebels in Babylonia, he turned his attention to the still unconquered state of Greece. He called together his nobles and counselors from all parts of the empire, as a kind of council of war. The conclusion of their deliberations was that the most elaborate preparations should be made, and that Greece should be brought to their feet. Careful and complete provisions were made throughout four years. The army was thoroughly organized, and the commissary department adequately supplied. In 480 B.C. the army started on its long campaign, aided by a large and well-equipped fleet. It crossed the Hellespont on a bridge of double boats and pushed through Macedonia down to Greece. Through Thermopylae it poured over the bodies of the brave 300 Spartans until Athens was captured and burnt. The Persian fleet, disabled by storms, was finally destroyed by the Greeks at the battle of Salamis (September 23, 480 B.C.). The land force retreated to Thessaly, where a picked army remained over winter. In the spring it resumed active offensive operations and recaptured Attica. The Spartans raised a large army, crossed the isthmus, and forced the Persians to retire into Boeotia. On September 25, 479 B.C., the Persian host was completely routed at Plataea, and returned in humiliation to Asia, never again to invade European Greece.

### **1218. Persian Empire, Extent of**

SOURCE: H. G. Wells, *The Outline of History*, pp. 274, 275. Copyright 1920 and 1921 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and by H. G. Wells. Used by permission of Prof. G. p. Wells.

[p. 274] The empire of Darius I was larger than any one of the pre- [p. 275] ceding empires whose growth we have traced. It included all Asia Minor and Syria, that is to say, the ancient Lydian and Hittite empires, all the old Assyrian and Babylonian empires, Egypt, the Caucasus and Caspian regions, Media, Persia, and it extended, perhaps, into India to the Indus. The nomadic Arabians alone of all the peoples of what is nowadays called the Near East, did not pay tribute to the satraps (provincial governors) of Darius. The organization of this great empire seems to have been on a much higher level of efficiency than any of its precursors. Great arterial roads joined province to province, and there was a system of royal posts; at stated intervals post horses stood always ready to carry the government messenger, or the traveller if he had a government permit, on to the next stage of his journey. Apart from this imperial right-of-way and the payment of tribute, the local governments possessed a very considerable amount of local freedom.

They were restrained from internecine conflict, which was all to their own good. And at first the Greek cities of the mainland of Asia paid the tribute and shared in this Persian Peace.

### **1219. Persian Empire — Goal of Xerxes, to “Stir Up All Against the Realm of Grecia”**

SOURCE: *Herodotus* vii. 19–21; translated by A. D. Godley, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 333, 335. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 333] 19. Xerxes dealt with the mustering of his army [against Greece], searching out every part of the continent.

[p. 335] 20. For full four years from the conquest of Egypt he was equipping his host and preparing all that was needful therefor; and ere the fifth year was completed he set forth on his march with the might of a great multitude. Of all armaments whereof we have knowledge this was by much the greatest, insomuch that none were aught in comparison of it, neither the armament that Darius led against the Scythians, nor the host of the Scythians when in pursuit of the Cimmerians they brake into Media and subdued and ruled wellnigh all the upper lands of Asia...

21. For what nation did not Xerxes lead from Asia against Hellas? What water did not fall short of the needs of his host, save only the great rivers? Some supplied him with ships, some were enrolled in his infantry, some were charged with the provision of horsemen, others of horse-bearing transports to follow the army, and others again of warships for the bridges, or of food and ships.

[EDITORS' NOTE: On this unsuccessful campaign of Xerxes, see *SDACom* 3:459, 460.]

### **1220. Persian Empire—Great Wealth of Xerxes (Dan. 11:2)**

SOURCE: *Herodotus* vii. 27; translated by A. D. Godley, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 341, 343. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 341] Pythius thus offering money, Xerxes asked the Persians that were about him who this [p. 343] Pythius was that offered it and how much wealth he possessed: “O king,” said they, “this is he who gave your father Darius that gift of a golden plane-tree and vine; and now he is, next to yourself, the richest man of whom we have knowledge.”

### **1221. Persian Empire, Invasion and Conquest of, by Alexander**

SOURCE: Will Durant, *Our Oriental Heritage* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1954), pp. 383–385. Copyright 1934 by Will Durant. Used by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc., and George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London.

[p. 383] When the two armies met at Issus Alexander had no more than 30,000 followers; but Darius, with all the stupidity that destiny could require, had chosen a field in which only a small part of his multitude could fight at one time. When the slaughter was over the Macedonians had lost some 450, the Persians 110,000 men, most of these being slain in wild retreat; Alexander, in reckless pursuit, crossed a stream on a bridge of Persian corpses. Darius fled ignominiously...

The young conqueror turned aside now with what seemed foolhardy leisureliness to establish his control over all of western Asia; he did not wish to advance farther without organizing his conquests and building a secure line of communications. The citizens of Babylon, like those of [p. 384] Jerusalem, came out *en masse* to welcome him, offering him their city and their gold; he accepted these graciously, and pleased them by restoring the temples which the unwise Xerxes had destroyed...

Meanwhile Alexander had taken Tyre, and annexed Egypt; now he marched back across the great empire, straight to its distant capitals. In twenty days from Babylon his army reached Susa, and took it without resistance; thence it advanced ... quickly to Persepolis...

Darius had gathered, chiefly from his eastern provinces, a new army of a million men... Alexander, with 7,000 cavalry and 40,000 infantry, met the motley mob at [p. 385] Gaugamela,\* [Note \*: A town sixty miles from the Arbela which gave the battle its name.] and by superior weapons, generalship and courage destroyed it in a day. Darius again chose the better part of valor, but his generals, disgusted with this second flight, murdered him in his tent. Alexander put to death such of the assassins as he could find, sent the body of Darius in state to Persepolis, and ordered it to be buried in the manner of the Achaemenid kings. The Persian people flocked readily to the standard of the conquerer, charmed by his generosity and his youth. Alexander organized Persia into a province of the Macedonian Empire, left a strong garrison to guard it, and marched on to India.

### **1222. Persian Empire, Last King of, Defeated at Arbela (Gaugamela)**

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

Gaugamela [Arbela, 331 B.C.] was truly a decisive battle. By his flight [from Alexander the Great] Darius had surrendered all claim to the Persian throne. To be sure, months would elapse before his death could be announced and his corpse find burial—not in the half-finished tomb he had begun to the south of the Persepolis terrace, but high up the cliff in the graves of his predecessors. Other months must elapse while Bessus the Bactrian satrap fought on to confirm his claim to the title of the fourth Artaxerxes. It would be years before the Iranian Plateau was pacified. But the great war was ended, and Alexander would be accepted as himself a great Persian monarch by the majority of his subjects.

One final scene was needed to round out the crusade. Arbela was the capital of the region in which the decisive battle had been fought; although seventy-five miles distant from the field, it was generally assigned the honor of naming the battle, for Gau Gamela was an unknown known hamlet. The near-by mountain was called Nicatorium, “Mount Victory.” From Arbela—named, the Greeks said, from its founder Arbelus, son of Athmoneus—the army turned southward. The Caprus or Lower Zab was crossed, and the naphtha font in the land of Artacene—where today the Mosul oil fields are an object of dispute and where to our own time the fires leap up when the soil is slightly scratched—was visited. Then came the shrine of Anaea or Anahita, Sandracae, where was a palace of the first Darius, Cyparisson, and the crossing of the Gyndes or Diyala on the road to Babylon.

### **1223. Persian Empire—Passing of Dominion to Alexander**

SOURCE: George Rawlinson, *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, [190–]), Vol. 3, pp. 538, 539.

[p. 538] It is needless to pursue further the dissolution of the Empire. The fatal blow was struck at Arbela—all the rest was but the long death-agony. At Arbela the crown of Cyrus passed to the Macedonian; the Fifth Monarchy came to an end. The HE-GOAT, with the notable horn between his eyes, had come [p. 539] from the west to the ram which had two horns, and had run into him with the fury of his power. He had come close to him,

and, moved with choler, had smitten the ram and broken his two horns—there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he had cast him down to the ground.

#### 1224. Peter, and the Rock, Differing Views on

4

SOURCE: Peter Richard Kenrick, Speech of, in *An Inside View of the Vatican Council*, ed. by Leonard Woolsey Bacon (New York: American Tract Society, [1872]), pp. 107–109.

[p. 107] The rule of Biblical interpretation imposed upon us is this: that the Scriptures are not to be interpreted contrary to the unanimous consent of the fathers. It is doubtful whether any instance of that unanimous consent is to be found. But this failing, the rule seems to lay down for us the law of following, in their interpretation of Scripture, the major number of the fathers, that might seem to approach unanimity. Accepting this rule, we are compelled to abandon the usual modern exposition of the words, “On this rock I build my church.”

In a remarkable pamphlet “printed in *fac-simile* of manuscript,” and presented to the fathers almost two months ago, we find five different interpretations of the word *rock*, in the place cited; “the first of which declares” (I transcribe the words) “that the church was built on *Peter*; and this interpretation is followed by *seventeen* fathers—among them, by Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Hilary, Cyril of Alexandria, Leo the Great, Augustine.

“The second interpretation understands from [p. 108] these words, ‘On this rock I build my church,’ that the church was built on *all* the apostles, whom Peter represented by virtue of the primary. And this opinion is followed by *eight* fathers—among them, Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret.

“The third interpretation asserts that the words, ‘On this rock,’ etc., are to be understood of the *faith* which Peter had professed—that this faith, this profession of faith, by which we believe Christ to be the Son of the living God is the everlasting and immovable foundation of the church. This interpretation is the weightiest of all, since it is followed by *forty-four* fathers and doctors; among them, from the East, are Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Theophylact; from the West, Hilary, Ambrose, Leo the Great; from Africa, Augustine.

“The fourth interpretation declares that the words, ‘On this rock,’ etc., are to be understood of that rock which Peter had confessed, that is, *Christ*—the church was built upon Christ. This interpretation is followed by *sixteen* fathers and doctors.

“The fifth interpretation of the fathers understands by the name of *the rock*, the *faithful* themselves, who, believing Christ to be the Son of God, are constituted living stones out of which the church is built.”

Thus far the author of the pamphlet aforesaid, in which may be read the words of the fathers and doctors whom he cites.

From this it follows, either that no argument at [p. 109] all, or one of the slenderest probability, is to be derived from the words, “On this rock will I build my church,” in support of the primacy. Unless it is certain that by *the rock* is to be understood the apostle Peter in and not in his capacity as the chief apostle speaking for them all, the word supplies no argument whatever, I do not say in proof of papal infallibility, but even in

---

<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.

support of the *primacy* of the bishop of Rome. If we are bound to follow the majority of the fathers in this thing, then we are bound to hold for certain that by *the rock* should be understood the faith professed by Peter, not Peter professing the faith.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Archbishop Kenrick, one of the bishops opposed to the declaration of papal infallibility at the Vatican Council, wrote his speech but had no opportunity to deliver it. See No. 870n.]

### **1225. Peter, Not the Rock**

SOURCE: Melvin Grove Kyle, *Mooring-Masts of Revelation*, p. 157. Copyright 1933 by Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. Used by permission.

Here, at the head waters of the Jordan, Christ uttered the words of institution of the Church which should be impregnable even against the gates of hell. There was the great cliff, the foundations of the mountain; here, where the river was born in a moment, were a multitude of stones. Standing amidst those stones He said "Thou art *Petros*" (a stone), as one of these pieces of the great cliff, "and unto this *petra*," (the cliff itself) "I will found my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

### **1226. Peter, Not the Rock, but Christ (Gregory VII)**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 303.

It is remarkable that the reference of the *rock* to *Christ*, which Augustine especially defended with great earnestness, was acknowledged even by the greatest pope of the middle ages, Gregory VII., in the famous inscription he sent with a crown to the emperor Rudolph: "*Petra* [i. e., Christ] *dedit Petro* [i. e., to the apostle], *Petrus* [the pope] *diadema Rudolpho*."

### **1227. Peter, Not the Rock on Which the Church Is Built (the Venerable Bede)**

SOURCE: Bede, the Venerable, *In Matthaei Evangelium Expositio*, iii. 16, comment on [Matt. 16:\[18\]](#), in [MPL](#), Vol. 92, cols. 78, 79. Latin.

[col. 78] *And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church*. Metaphorically it is said to him: *Upon this rock*, that is the Saviour [col. 79] whom you have confessed, the church is built, [the Saviour] who has given to the faithful confessor a participation in His name... *And whatsoever thou shalt bind*, etc. This power without doubt is given to all the apostles, to whom by Him after the resurrection it was said generally, *Receive [ye] the Holy Spirit*, etc. (John 20). And in fact to the bishops and priests, and to every church, is committed the same function, although certain of them, not understanding rightly, think that they are able to condemn the innocent and to absolve the guilty, which they are not at all able [to do], but attempting [it], to deprive themselves of the power granted [them].

### **1228. Peter—Significance of Name (Bede's View)**

SOURCE: Bede, the Venerable, *In Marci Evangelium Expositio*, i. 3, comment on [Mark 2](#), in [MPL](#), Vol. 92, col. 160. Latin.

Peter therefore is the same in Greek or Latin as Cephas in Syriac, and in each language the name is derived from "rock"; there is no doubt but that [it is] that [rock] concerning which Paul says: *And that Rock was Christ* (1 Cor. 10). For just as Christ, the true Light, granted to the apostles that they might be called the light of the world, thus also upon Simon, who believed in Christ the Rock [Latin, *petra*], He bestowed the name of Peter [Latin, *petrus*]. On another occasion, alluding to this etymology, He said: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church* (Matt. 16).

### **1229. Pilate, Pontius, Date**

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* xviii. 4. 2, in *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans. by William Whiston (Cincinnati: H. S. & J. Applegate, 1850), p. 365.

The Samaritan senate sent an embassy to Vitellius, a man that had been consul, and who was now president of Syria, and accused Pilate of the murder of those that were killed, for that they did not go to Tirathaba in order to revolt from the Romans, but to escape the violence of Pilate. So Vitellius sent Marcellus, a friend of his, to take care of the affairs of Judea, and ordered Pilate to go to Rome, to answer before the emperor to the accusations of the Jews. So Pilate, when he had tarried ten years in Judea, made haste to Rome, and this in obedience to the orders of Vitellius, which he durst not contradict; but before he could get to Rome, Tiberius was dead.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Tiberius died in March, A.D. 37; hence Pilate's governorship (Luke 3:1) must be dated c. 26–36. Many apocryphal documents have been attributed to Pilate; none are genuine. Josephus' mention (chap. 3, sec. 3) of Pilate's crucifying Jesus is probably genuine, though his description of Jesus must have been altered by Christians. See *SDACom* 5:95.]

### 1230. Planets, Names of

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 27.

Now, after the fourth century ... these ancient [descriptive planetary] names ... are gradually ousted from use. The planets become [for the Greeks] the stars of Hermes, Aphrodite, Ares, Zeus, Kronos ... [known to us by their Latin names Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn]. Now this seems due to the fact that in Babylonia these same planets were dedicated respectively to Nebo, Ishtar, Nergal, Marduk, and Ninib... The ideas of Semitic starworship, have come in here, for the ancient mythology of Hellas did not put the stars under the patronage of the Olympians nor establish any connection between them. Thus the names of the planets which we employ to-day, are an English translation of a Latin translation of a Greek translation of a Babylonian nomenclature.

### 1231. Planets—Venus, Planet of the Goddess Ishtar

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic [Mythology]* (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), pp. 24, 25. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York.

[p. 24] Venus is both morning and evening star, Phosphorus and Hesperus, and various titles of the Arabian Allat, such as Sa'd 'Uzzā, have dual forms, Sa'dān, 'Uzzā, "the two planets Venus." In Babylonia the morning star is called the "male Venus," and the evening star the "female Venus." But in both aspects Ishtar is always a goddess in Babylonian mythology. She is sometimes described by "Ishtar of Agade" as morning star, and "Ishtar of Erech" as evening star. A long metrical poem describes Ishtar:

"At sunrise she is mistress (*bêlit*), at sunset she is votaress." [p. 25] Mythology set in here at an early period and determined Ishtar, and consequently the western goddesses Astarte, Allat, as a double character. As morning star she is goddess of War (in the West 'Anat), and as evening star patroness of love and harlotry. For this reason the western goddesses of Fate were worshipped on house-tops, where baked cakes were offered to them, an obviously astral cult, and it could be served by women only. So important did the favour of the goddess of this lucky planet seem to the Arabians and Aramaeans that they frequently made human sacrifices to her. Particularly beautiful are the Sumerian and Babylonian hymns addressed to the "Queen of Heaven."

### 1232. Planets, Worship of—Prayer to Saturn

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 90.

In the astrological system each day [of the week] was sacred to a planet. It is probable that the worshipper prayed prayer to the presiding star of each day in turn. We still possess the text of these prayers addressed to the planets in the East as in the West. We have some in Greek, but of a late date, and the most curious are those of the pagans of Harran near Edessa, which an Arabic writer has transmitted to us in great detail. Thus, for instance, to call upon Saturn it was necessary to await the favourable moment, to don black vestments, to approach the sacred place humbly, like a man sunk in sorrow, to burn a perfume composed of incense and opium mixed with grease and the urine of a goat, then, at the moment when the smoke arose, to raise the eyes to the star and say:

“Lord, whose name is august, whose power is widespread, whose spirit sublime, O Lord Saturn the cold, the dry, the dark, the harmful, . . . crafty sire who knowest all wiles, who art deceitful, sage, understanding, who causest prosperity or ruin, happy or unhappy is he whom thou makest such. I adjure thee, O primeval Father, by thy great mercies, and thy noble qualities, to do for me this and that!”

### **1233. Prayer, Posture in — Kneeling Practiced Less Frequently**

SOURCE: Thomas Albert Stafford, *Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1942), p. 131, 132. Copyright 1942 by Whitmore & Stone. Used by permission.

[p. 131] In a great many churches of the evangelical denominations, the members of the congregation no [p. 132] longer bow the head for a moment of individual prayer after entering church, nor do they kneel during the offering of prayer. *O tempora! O mores!* alas! that these two most excellent customs, so long practiced by our fathers, seem no longer to be in favor.

While we are on the subject of kneeling, let it be said that the lack of sufficient room between pews, as now ordinarily placed, discourages the practice, because seating capacity has been considered first. Perhaps, too, the Puritan aversion to kneeling still exerts a lingering influence that dies hard. Kneeling promotes a pervasive feeling of reverence. God can hear our sincerely uttered prayers in any posture, but the sense of humility symbolized by kneeling is conducive to the best attitude within ourselves.

### **1234. Predestination, Predestination, Calvin on**

SOURCE: John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, bk. 3, chap. 21, trans. by John Allen (4th American ed., rev.; Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, 1843), Vol. 2, pp. 140, 141.

[p. 140] The covenant of life not being equally preached to all, and among those to whom it is preached not always finding the same reception, this diversity discovers the wonderful depth of the Divine judgment. Nor is it to be doubted that this variety also follows, subject to the decision of God’s eternal election. If it be evidently the result of the Divine will, that salvation is freely offered to some, and others are prevented from attaining it,—this immediately gives rise to important and difficult questions, which are incapable of any other explication, than by the establishment of pious minds in what ought to be received concerning election and predestination—a question, in the opinion of many, full of perplexity; for they consider nothing more unreasonable, than that, of the common mass of mankind, some should be predestinated to salvation, and others to destruction. But how unreasonably they perplex themselves will afterwards appear from the sequel of our discourse. Besides, the very obscurity which excites such dread, not only displays the utility of this doctrine, but shows it to be productive of the most delightful benefit. We shall never be clearly convinced as we ought to be, that our salvation flows from the fountain of God’s free mercy, till we are acquainted with his

eternal election, which illustrates the grace of God by this comparison, that he adopts not all promiscuously to the hope of salvation, but gives to some what he refuses to others. Ignorance of this principle evidently detracts from the Divine glory, and diminishes real humility. But according to Paul, what is so necessary to be known, never can be known, unless God, without any regard to works, chooses those whom he has decreed.

### **1235. Predestination, Council of Trent on**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VI (Jan. 13, 1547), Decree Concerning Justification, chap. 12, trans. in H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, p. 38. Copyright 1941 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

No one, moreover, so long as he lives this mortal life, ought in regard to the sacred mystery of divine predestination, so far presume as to state with absolute certainty that he is among the number of the predestined, as if it were true that the one justified either cannot sin any more, or, if he does sin, that he ought to promise himself an assured repentance. For except by special revelation, it cannot be known whom God has chosen to Himself.

### **1236. Predestination, Fatalism and Inaction Not Produced by**

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, *The Bible Speaks to You* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955), p. 83. Copyright 1955 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

At the time of the Protestant Reformation, for example, the Calvinists were the people who took predestination most seriously. But there were no more active and responsible individuals in that entire period than the Calvinists. Why? Because they were convinced that God had chosen them to do his work, and that therefore nothing, absolutely nothing, could defeat them. Who could stand against the Lord's elect? Consequently they had a vigor that was marvelous (and sometimes terrifying) to behold. A seventeenth century writer put it clearly: "I had rather meet coming against me a whole regiment with drawn swords than one lone Calvinists convinced that he is doing the will of God."

### **1237. Predestination, Westminster Confession Position on, No Longer Held by Presbyterian Churches**

SOURCE: George S. Hendery, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1960), pp. 51–53. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

[p. 51] The awesome doctrine of the "double decree," or "double predestination," which has often been regarded as the distinctive feature of the Reformed faith, is no longer held by the Presbyterian Churches in the form in which it is set forth in this chapter. This is one of the points at which several of these Churches have adopted declaratory statements regarding the sense in which they accept the formulation of the doctrine of the Confession. The doctrine still has its defenders among devotees of traditional orthodoxy, but not even among them is it cherished with any degree of enthusiasm. And in the preaching and teaching of the Churches generally it would seem that the recommendation, given in Paragraph 8 [of the Westminster Confession, chapter 3], that the subject be handled with special caution, has been taken to mean that it should be passed over in complete silence...

Four reasons [as to why the doctrine as presented in the Westminster Confession is no longer acceptable] may be given:

- (1) The first is rather general, but not without some weight. No reader who compares the statement of the doctrine in the Confession with the Biblical passages on which it is ostensibly founded can fail to notice a profound difference in tone between them. This is especially evident if we take the two passages, Ephesians 1:3–14 and Romans 8:29–30,

which together furnish practically all the terms employed in the formulation of the doctrine (with one significant exception which will be noted later): both breathe an air of exultant joy; both exemplify what has been called “truth that sings.” The chapter in the Confession, by contrast, breathes an air of dread and doom, and it ends with the [p. 52] advice to handle the subject with extreme caution. There is no suggestion of caution in Ephesians 1 and Romans 8; there, if ever, the apostle is letting himself go.

(2) The idea that God has foreordained the reprobate to everlasting death, which is the chief stumbling-stone, leans heavily on the passage in Romans 9:19–23, which speaks of “vessels of wrath fitted to destruction”; but the passage will not bear the interpretation that has been imposed on it...

[p. 53] (3) If the question be asked, How did the Biblical testimony to the resourcefulness of grace come to be transformed into the theological doctrine of double predestination? the answer would seem to be that those who framed the doctrine were misled by a false model. The clue is to be found in the term which they used to entitle the doctrine and which dominates their interpretation of it, namely, “decree.” This term is absent from the New Testament passages which deal with election. “Decree” belongs to the language of the Old Testament, where it is used with reference to God six times; in four places it is used in connection with what are now commonly called laws of nature (Job 28:26; Ps. 148:6; Prov. 8:29; Jer. 5:22), in one place its meaning is uncertain (Zeph. 2:2), and in only one does it refer to election—in that case the election of the Messianic king (Ps. 2:7). The absence of the word from the New Testament is no accident; for it suggests a fixed and unalterable enactment, which is not appropriate to what the men of the New Testament had come to know of the freedom of the grace of God in Jesus Christ. The New Testament term is “purpose.”

### **1238. Presbyterian Bodies—General Statement**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1381, 1382.

[p. 1381] *History*.—The Presbyterian Reformed churches in existence today throughout the world perpetuate those features, doctrinal and governmental, of the Protestant Reformation of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, which were emphasized by John Calvin and his associates, particularly in Switzerland, France, Holland, the Palatinate, England, Scotland, and Ireland. These churches number more than 125 distinct denominations with a total constituency of at least 60,000,000 and represent the largest Protestant church group under the same form of government. The doctrinal and ecclesiastical system developed at Geneva, modified somewhat in Holland and in France and transferred to Scotland, became solidified there largely under the influence of John Knox in 1560 and found a practical and thoroughly logical presentation in the Westminster Assembly, London, England, 1645–49. This was not a distinctively Presbyterian body. Called by act of Parliament to consider the state of the entire country in matters of religion, it represented in its membership all English-speaking Christians, although the Anglicans took no active part in its deliberations. It had no ecclesiastical authority, yet its deliverances on doctrine have furnished the basis both for Presbyterian and many non-Presbyterian bodies; and the form of ecclesiastical government it recommended has gone far beyond the country where it was formulated and has had a marked influence not only on church life, but in civil and national development. In England it fostered the development of the Independents who afterwards became the Congregationalists. In Scotland, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it resulted in

the development of several Presbyterian bodies, each insisting upon some specific administrative phase; and one of its strongholds was the north of Ireland, where so many Scotch found a more congenial home for the time being, until they should cross the Atlantic.

The distinctively Presbyterian churches of the United States trace their origin chiefly to Great Britain. Whatever of English and Welsh Presbyterianism there was in the Colonies, together with the few French Protestant, or Huguenot, churches, combined at an early date with the Scotch and Scotch-Irish elements to form the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, from which the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church in the United States afterwards separated. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church, representing the Calvinistic Methodist of Wales, was united in 1920 with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

Five Presbyterian denominations are directly connected with the Secession and Relief movements of the church in Scotland in the eighteenth century: The United Presbyterian Church of North America; known also as the Associate Synod of North America, known also as the Associate Presbyterian Church; the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, formerly the Associate Reformed Synod of the South; the Synod and the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church.

In close harmony with these distinctively Presbyterian churches are the Reformed churches, traceable to the influence of immigration from the Continent of Europe: The Reformed Church in America (Dutch) and the Christian Reformed Church, both of which originated in Holland; the Reformed Church in the United [p. 1382] States (German) now the Evangelical and Reformed Church, whose beginnings were in Switzerland and Germany; and the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America, representing the State Reformed Church of Hungary. All of these, Presbyterian and Reformed, substantially agree in government, and all maintain similar principles of the Calvinistic system, whether expressed in the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Canons of the Synod of Dort, or the Heidelberg Catechism. The Alliance of Reformed Churches throughout the world holding the Presbyterian system, whose special purpose is to secure cooperation by the different denominations in general church work, has grown out of this concord, as has also the Council of the Reformed Churches in the United States, holding the Presbyterian system, organized for the same general purpose.

*Doctrine and organization.*—Presbyterianism as a doctrinal system has as its fundamental principles the undivided sovereignty of God in His universe, the sovereignty of Christ in salvation, the sovereignty of the Scriptures in faith and conduct, and the sovereignty of the Scriptures of the individual conscience in the interpretation of the Word of God. As a polity, it recognizes Christ as the only head of the church and the source of all power, and the people of Christ as entitled under their Lord to participation in the government and action of the church. As polity and as doctrine, it maintains the right of private judgment in matters of religion, the membership in the Church Universal of all who profess the true religion, the validity of church organization, and the power of each association of organizations to prescribe its own terms of communion. It further holds that ministers are peers one of another, and that church authority is positively vested, not in individuals, such as bishops or presbyters, but in representative courts, including the session, the presbytery, and the synod; and in the case of some bodies, especially the larger ones, the general assembly. This principle of coordinate

representative authority, by which the individual member of the church has his own share in the conduct of that church, while at the same time he recognizes not merely the headship of Christ but the fellowship in Christ, has given to the system a peculiar hold wherever there has been representative government and has exerted a strong influence modifying both individualistic and hierarchical tendencies. Its advocates call attention to the resemblance between its polity and the political constitution of the United States, in which country it has had its strongest influence, its courts corresponding closely to the local, State, and national organizations.

*Statistics.*— ... Certain changes are to be noted. The union between the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, under discussion in 1906, was consummated, but a considerable number of the Cumberland Presbyterian churches refused to adopt the plan and continued the old organization...

The Associate Synod of North America (Associate Presbyterian Church) and Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church are now known as The Synod of the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America and the General Synod of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, respectively. The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, a new body reported for the first time in 1936, was formed by a group which withdrew from the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For later Presbyterian mergers and a proposal of further mergers, with other bodies, see Nos. 664, 665, 1241.]

### **1239. Presbyterians — Cumberland Presbyterian Church**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1416–1418.

[p. 1416] *History.* The opening years of the nineteenth century witnessed a remarkable religious awakening in various parts of the United States. Revivals were numerous and in certain sections were accompanied by strange “bodily exercises.” The leader of the revival in the “Cumberland country” in Kentucky and Tennessee was Rev. James McGready, a Presbyterian minister, and a member of the Synod of Kentucky. He and other ministers conducting the services felt constrained to call the attention of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church to the peculiar manifestations. The assembly, in reply, recognizing that, although the movement had been accompanied by “extraordinary effects on the body,” it had accomplished great good, admonished those in charge of the work of the danger of excesses, and expressed the opinion that these effects may be in a considerable degree produced by natural causes. As the revival work progressed, these physical manifestations became so marked as to create an unfavorable reaction, and some Presbyterian ministers set themselves against the entire movement. Others favored it, on the ground that various communities in which it was carried on were indeed transformed. The division in sentiment resulted finally in two distinct parties, revival and antirevival, the one inclined to regard the bodily exercises as a sign of divine approval, the other unable to see any good in the work because of the extravagances.

At the first meeting of the Synod of Kentucky in 1802 the southwestern portion of the Presbytery of Transylvania, including the Cumberland country, was constituted the Presbytery of Cumberland. As the revival, which had started in the Transylvania Presbytery, spread to the various small settlements in this section, the demand for ministers became greater than the supply, and the revival party, which controlled the new presbytery, believed that the emergency, as well as precedent, justified them in introducing into the ministry men who had not had the usual academic and theological training. A few such were inducted into the ministry, and others were set apart as

“exhorters.” In addition to this, those thus inducted into the ministry were permitted, if they so desired, to adopt the Westminster Confession “as far as they deemed it agreeable to the Word of God,” the reservation having special reference to “the idea of fatality, which,” as they later expressed it, “seems to be taught under the mysterious doctrine of predestination.”

The antirevival party objected both to the admission into the ministry of men who were not up to the usual literary and theological standard and to the permission of this reservation in regard to doctrine; they took the whole matter to the Synod of Kentucky, which in 1805 appointed a commission to confer with the members of the Cumberland Presbytery and adjudicate on their presbyterial proceedings. The commission met in December 1805 assumed full synodical power, against the protest of the revival party, and reached the conclusion, in reference to the men who had been inducted into the ministry by the Presbytery of Cumberland, that the majority of them were “not only illiterate, but erroneous in sentiment”; and solemnly prohibited them “from exhorting, preaching, and administering ordinances in consequence of any authority which they have obtained from the Cumberland Presbytery, until they submit to our jurisdiction, and undergo the requisite examination.”

Rev. James McGready, Rev. Samuel McAdow, and three others were also cited to appear at the next meeting of the synod. The synod in 1806 sanctioned the proceedings of the commission, dissolved the Presbytery of Cumberland, attached its members to the Presbytery of Transylvania, and directed that body to deal with “the recusant [nonconforming] members.” In May 1809 the General Assembly confirmed the action of the synod.

Meanwhile the revival party formed a council for the special care of the weak churches and preaching centers, over 30 in number, which were in sympathy with them. On receipt of news of the assembly’s action, at a meeting of this council in October 1809 the formation of an independent presbytery was strongly urged. This, however, was impracticable, as the elders, who made up the great majority of the council, could not participate in such an organization, and of the ministers only two favored the action, whereas at least three were necessary to [p. 1417] the constitution of a new presbytery. Rev. James McGready, the leader of the revival, and generally looked upon as the father of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, never favored it and never identified himself with the independent body. Others also had withdrawn from the council, and it was finally decided to adjourn to March 20, 1810, after which meeting every member would be free to act as he pleased, unless in the meantime a way should be found to constitute an independent presbytery. This was accomplished, and on February 4, 1810, an independent presbytery was constituted by Rev. Finis Ewing, Rev. Samuel King, and Rev. Samuel McAdow, at the home of the latter in Dickson County, Tenn. The name of the dissolved presbytery, Cumberland, was adopted, a licentiate, Mr. McLean, was ordained, and a compact allowing reservation in creed subscription was entered into.

At the adjourned meeting of the council nearly all the churches in the Cumberland country adhered to the new presbytery, but they were weak, and at most could not have represented more than a few hundred members. While the new movement was launched as an independent presbytery, the wish and hope of those connected with it was not that it should become a separate denomination, but that it might be reunited with the Synod of Kentucky. The organization, however, grew rapidly, and in the course of a few years it

became apparent that a new denomination had entered upon its career. At first it was referred to as “the members of the Cumberland Presbytery.” As the denominational idea became more apparent, it was called the “Cumberland Presbyterian,” the next step being to call it the “Cumberland Presbyterian Church.”

In October 1813 the Presbytery of Cumberland, or General Presbytery, was divided into three presbyteries, and a general synod was constituted. This continued to be the supreme judicatory until 1828, when there was a reorganization. In place of the general synod, four synods were constituted and a general assembly, which met in 1829. At this time there were 18 presbyteries, representing the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Illinois, Missouri, and Alabama. By 1853 the church had 20 synods, 79 presbyteries, and 1,250 churches with a membership estimated at 100,000. The first fairly accurate statistics were gathered in 1875, and showed 2,158 churches, 1,232 ministers, 98,242 communicants, and congregational property valued at \$2,069,000.

The fact that the strength of the church was in the border States made it inevitable that the slavery question should become prominent. During the discussions preceding the Civil War, the assembly took the position that the church of God is a spiritual body whose jurisdiction extends only to matters of faith and morals and has no power to legislate upon subjects upon which Christ and His apostles did not legislate. During the war commissioners from the southern presbyteries did not meet with the General Assembly, and that body in 1864 adopted strong resolutions against disunion. After the war the southern members again attended, and, being in the majority, rescinded these resolutions. For a time it seemed as if division was inevitable; it was, however, averted, and the church remained one. Then came the question of the Negro churches, resulting in a mutual agreement for the establishment of the Colored Cumberland Presbyterian Church, as affording to the Negroes the opportunities they needed most for church development.

There have been various propositions for union with other churches—the Presbyterian Church in the United States, the Presbyterian Church in United States of America, The Evangelical Lutheran Church, and the Methodist Protestant Church. The chief cause of failure, in the last instance, seems to have been the divergence between the two bodies in regard to the doctrine of the “perseverance of believers,” the Cumberland Assembly being unwilling to accept the full Arminian position taken by the Methodist Protestant Church.

When the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America had completed its revision of the Confession of Faith and had taken essentially the position called for by the Cumberland Church in its early history, the question arose again of the union of the two bodies, and in 1903 both General Assemblies appointed committees on fraternity and union. These held a joint meeting and formulated a basis of union which was approved by the General Assemblies in 1904 and was ratified by a majority of the presbyteries of each body in the succeeding year, when the General Assemblies took action for the organic union of the two churches. Meanwhile considerable opposition had arisen in the Cumberland Church, and a protest had been filed against the constitutionality of the assembly’s action. [p. 1418] The civil court, to which the matter was referred, held that action to be legal; and when it became evident that it would be carried through, another movement was started by the opposition in the Cumberland Church, “to enjoin the General Assembly \* \* \* from taking the final steps to merge or unite, or consolidate the

Cumberland Presbyterian Church with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.” The court refused the injunction and the General Assembly, by a vote of 162 to 105, approved the report and “adjourned sine die as a separate assembly, to meet in and as a part of the One Hundred and Nineteenth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.” The opposition then filed a protest, and determined to “continue and perpetuate the General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church as same was constituted and organized on May 17, 1906,” and declared itself “to be the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, the repository of its established faith, the owners of its property, and the protectors of its trust.” It held that all offices had been vacated, appointed men to fill the vacancies in the boards, rescinded “the action and announcements” of the General Assembly, and adjourned to meet in Dickson County, Tenn., the birthplace of the denomination. Suits were brought in a number of courts with regard to church property, with varying results.

*Doctrine.* In doctrine the Cumberland Presbyterian Church is essentially Calvinistic of the more moderate type: that is, it uniformly protested against the doctrine of reprobation, but recognizes fully the sovereignty of God and the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. The Westminster Confession continued to be the creed of the church until 1814, when a revision was made which was designed to be a popular statement of doctrine emphasizing human responsibility, and this was again revised along much the same lines in 1883.

From various causes many have joined the Cumberland Presbyterian Church who were inclined to Arminian statements of doctrine. The result has been that a party has developed within the church which claims that Cumberland Presbyterianism is really the *via media* between Calvinism and Arminianism. While this has not found expression in definite statements of creed, it has modified very materially the position of many churches and even presbyteries, and a considerable part of the opposition to the union with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America appears to have been occasioned by the presence of this element, which looked upon the revision of the Westminster Confession by that church as less thorough and complete than was claimed for it by its advocates.

So far as church membership is concerned, no subscription to the confession is required. Those who are ordained to the ministry, eldership, and diaconate, however, are required to subscribe to the Confession of Faith.

*Organization.* In polity the Cumberland Presbyterian Church has always been thoroughly presbyterian, its government being exercised by the various courts—session, presbytery, synod, and general assembly.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 87,263 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257).]

## **1240. Presbyterians—Presbyterian Church in the United States (“Southern”)**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1443, 1444.

[p. 1443] *History.* Previous to the Civil War the Presbyterian churches in the United States held widely different positions in regard to slavery. The larger denominations did not take positive ground but left local bodies free to act as they judged best. Some of the smaller and stricter churches, however, were stringent in their rules, and even went so far as to exclude slaveholders from their communion. As early as 1818 the General Assembly expressed itself very strongly in denunciation of slavery, but at the same time

recommended consideration toward those so circumstanced as to be unable to carry out the full recommendation of the church. After the separation between the "Old School" and the "New School," the latter was more aggressive, and the New School Assembly, in 1853, called upon its southern presbyteries to report "the real facts in relation to this subject." The result was that several synods and presbyteries, mostly in the border States, seceded and, in 1858, formed the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church.

When the Civil War broke out, the Old School General Assembly, in session in Philadelphia, through what were known as the "Spring resolutions," pledged its whole constituency to the support of the Federal Government in the contest which was then beginning. The southern churches which were connected with the assembly took the ground that this action violated the constitution of the church, in that it assumed to decide a disputed political question, and would inevitably introduce the strife and rancor of political discussion into the church courts. There was also a deep-seated conviction that the difference of opinion as to the status of slavery was radical and irreconcilable. The great majority of the northern churches, whether or not they gave formal expression to their belief, regarded slavery as sinful. The southern churches refused absolutely to "make slaveholding a sin or nonslaveholding a term (condition) of communion." Accordingly, 47 presbyteries formally withdrew from connection with the Old School General Assembly, and their commissioners met in Augusta, Ga., December 4, 1861, and organized the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America.

In 1864 the United Synod and the General Assembly of the Confederate States came together, and in the following year adopted the name "The Presbyterian Church in the United States." This united church was further enlarged by the accession of several bodies which had proclaimed themselves independent of the Northern Assembly, in protest against any political action by an ecclesiastical body. Of these, the largest were the Synod of Kentucky, which joined in 1869, and the Synod of Missouri, which joined in 1874.

As the discussions connected with the Civil War subsided, fraternal relations were established with the northern churches, in 1882, and in 1888 the two General Assemblies held a joint meeting in Philadelphia in celebration of the centenary of the adoption of the constitution of the church. In 1897 they also united in celebrating the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Westminster Assembly, which formulated the Confession of Faith and Catechism of the Church.

Various efforts have been made to bring together these two great sections of the Presbyterian Church. As yet, however, they have not been successful, owing partly to differences in doctrinal emphasis and church conduct, but chiefly to diversity in community and church life. The northern churches make no distinction between white and Negro; the southern churches have adopted a policy of separation, being moved thereto by the conviction that the best development of the Negroes would be secured by the increased responsibility thus laid upon them, and by apprehension that social embarrassment might result from ecclesiastical relations. So far as may be, the Negro members are organized into separate congregations, and these into separate presbyteries, with reference to an ultimate Colored Presbyterian Church. An independent synod was thus set off by the assembly in 1897, but two presbyteries, composed exclusively of Negroes, owing to remoteness, remained as constituent parts of the synods in whose

bounds they are located. However, in 1916, the General Assembly constituted these and two [p. 1444] other Negro presbyteries existing within its territory into a synod composed exclusively of Negro ministers and members, yet being a constituent part of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

*Doctrine and Organization.* In doctrinal matters the church is strictly Calvinistic, adheres closely to the standards, and, while allowing liberty of dissent in minor matters, requires strict creed subscription from all its ministers and office bearers. It particularly excludes from its courts all discussion of political questions, holds to the plenary inspiration of the Bible, and has not abated faith in its inerrancy. It claims that the Scriptures forbid women the public expounding of God's Word, or other functions pertaining to an ordained minister, but admits their services in other lines of Christian work.

In polity the principal distinctive feature is the recognition of ruling elders as entitled to deliver the charge in the installation of a pastor and to serve as moderators of any of the higher courts.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 889, 196 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257).]

### **1241. Presbyterians**—United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

(Formed by the Union of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. ["Northern"] and the United Presbyterian Church of North America)

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1397–1400, 1402, 1434.

[a. The Former Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.]

[p. 1397] *History.* The earliest American Presbyterian churches were established in Virginia, New England, Maryland, and Delaware, and were chiefly of English origin, their pastors being Church of England ministers holding Presbyterian views. In Virginia, in 1611, Rev. Alexander Whitaker was installed as pastor of a church which was governed by himself and a few of the most religious men, and in 1630 Rev. Richard Denton located in Massachusetts, with a church which he had previously served in Yorkshire, England. Between 1642 and 1649 many of the Virginia Puritans were driven out of that colony and found refuge in Maryland and North Carolina; while Denton and his associates found New Amsterdam more friendly than New England. The English Presbyterian element in Maryland and the colonies to the northward was strengthened by the arrival, from 1670 to 1690 of a considerable number of Scotch colonists, the beginnings of a great immigration. There were many Presbyterians among the early settlers of New England, and the church founded at Plymouth in 1620, and other churches in that region, had ruling elders as officers. Several synods were also held, one of which, in 1649, adopted the Westminster Standards for doctrine. English-speaking Presbyterians were first found in New York City in 1643, with Rev. Francis Doughty as their minister, though no church was organized there until 1717. Presbyterian churches of English origin, however, were established earlier [p. 1398] on Long Island [also in New Jersey, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania]... In 1683 the Presbytery of Laggan, Ireland, in response to a letter from William Stevens, a member of the Council of the Colony of Maryland, sent to this country Rev. Francis Makemie, who became the apostle of American Presbyterianism. He gave himself to the work of ecclesiastical organization and at last succeeded in bringing into organic unity the scattered Presbyterian churches throughout the Colonies.

In 1706 ... 7 ministers, representing about 22 congregations, not including the Presbyterians of New England, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, met and organized a presbytery, the first ecclesiastical gathering of an intercolonial and federal character in the country. With the growth of the country and the development of immigration, particularly of Presbyterians from Scotland and the north of Ireland, the number of churches increased so that in September 1716 the presbytery constituted itself a synod with four presbyteries.

In New England, owing to local conditions, the Presbyterian congregations, of which in 1770 there were fully 85, were not connected ecclesiastically with those of the other colonies, but formed in 1775 the Synod of New England, with 3 presbyteries, Londonderry, Palmer, and Salem. In 1782, however, this synod was dissolved, and, for a century, the Presbyterian Church had comparatively few adherents in the stronghold of the Congregationalists.

The General Synod in 1729 passed what is called the "adopting act," by which it was agreed that all the ministers under its jurisdiction should declare their agreement in and approbation of the Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, "as being, in all essential and necessary articles, good forms of sound words, and systems of Christian doctrine," and also "adopt the said Confession as the confession of their faith." In the same year the synod also denied to the civil magistrate power over the church and power to persecute any for their religion.

The general religious movement which characterized the early part of the eighteenth century, and manifested itself in England in Methodism, in Germany in Pietism, and in New England in the Great Awakening, found its expression in the Presbyterian Church in America through Gilbert Tennent, a pastor in Philadelphia. William Tennent, Sr., who, in 1726, had founded, near Philadelphia, an academy for the training of ministers, had aroused much opposition by his statement that the prevailing grade of ministerial quality was not creditable to the Presbyterian Church. His son, Gilbert Tennent, had become convinced of the necessity of personal conversion, and in 1728, a year before the Wesleys organized the "Holy Club" and 6 years before Jonathan Edwards's famous sermon, began a course of preaching of the most searching type. As others joined him, the movement spread; and when Whitefield came to the country in 1739 he found most congenial fellow workers in Gilbert Tennent, William Tennent, Jr., and their associates. They, however, became so severe in their denunciation of "unconverted ministers" as to arouse bitter opposition; and the result was a division, one party, the "New Side," endorsing the revival and insisting that less stress should be laid on college training, and more on the evidence that the candidate was a regenerate man, and called by the Holy Ghost to the ministry; the other, the "Old Side," largely opposing revivals and disposed to insist that none but graduates of British universities or New England colleges should be accepted as candidates for the ministry. There was also division with regard to the interpretation of the Standards, but in 1758 the bodies reunited upon the basis of the Westminster Standards pure and simple. At that date the church consisted of 98 ministers, about 200 congregations, and some 10,000 communicants.

It was during the period of this division that the "New Side" established, in 1746, the College of New Jersey, later Princeton University, for the purpose of securing an educated ministry. In 1768 the college called John Witherspoon from Scotland and installed him as president and professor of divinity... He was one of the leading persons

in the joint mov[e]ment of Presbyterians and Congregationalists from 1766 to 1775 to secure religious liberty and to resist the establishment of the English Episcopal Church as the state church of the Colonies. He was also a member of the Continental Congress, and the only clerical signer of the Declaration of Independence...

[p. 1399] The opening of the Revolutionary War found the Presbyterian Church on the colonial side. The General Synod called upon the churches to uphold, and by every means within their power to promote, the resolutions of Congress. At the close of the war the synod congratulated the churches on the "general and almost universal attachment of the Presbyterian body to the cause of liberty and the rights of mankind." ...

[The Presbyterian Church] had always been ecclesiastically independent, having no organic connection with European or British churches of like faith; but the independence of the United States had created new conditions for the Christian churches as well as for the American people. All denominations were no longer merely tolerated, but were entitled to full civil and religious rights in all the States. In view of these new conditions, the synod, in May 1788, adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and also a constitution consisting of a form of government, a book of discipline, and a directory for worship. Certain changes were made in the Confession, the Catechisms, and the Directory, along the lines of liberty in worship, of freedom in prayer, and above all, of liberty from control by the state. The form of government was altogether a new document and established the General Assembly as the governing body in the church. The first General Assembly met in 1789 in Philadelphia.

The first important movement in the church after the adoption of the constitution was the formulation of a Plan of Union with the Congregational associations of New England. It began with correspondence in 1792, and reached its consummation in the agreements made from 1801 to 1810 between the General Assembly and the associations of Connecticut and of other States. This plan allowed Congregational ministers to serve Presbyterian churches, and vice versa; and also allowed to churches composed of members of both denominations the right of representation in both presbytery and association. It remained in force until 1837, and was useful to both denominations in securing the results of the great revivals of religion throughout the country, and also in furthering the causes of home and foreign missions; but the operation of the plan was attended with increasing difficulty and dissatisfaction, and it was finally abrogated.

What is known as the Cumberland separation took place during this period. The Presbytery of Cumberland ordained to the ministry persons who, in the judgment of the Synod of Kentucky, were not qualified for the office either by learning or by sound doctrine. The controversies between the two judicatories resulted in the dissolution of the presbytery by the synod in 1806, and finally, in 1810, in arrangements for the organization of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

The membership of the church during this period, 1790 to 1837, increased from 18,000 to 220,557, due mainly to a revival of religion, of which camp meetings were one of the main features in western Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky. A seminary of the church was founded at Princeton, N. J. (1812), and most of the missionary and benevolent boards were established.

About the year 1825 controversies arose respecting the Plan of Union and the establishment of denominational agencies for missionary and evangelistic work... In 1831 the Synod of Pittsburgh founded the Western Foreign Missionary Society as a

distinctively denominational agency. The party favoring these agencies and opposed to united work was known as the “Old School,” and that favoring the continuance of the plan as the “New School.” Questions of doctrine were also involved in the controversy, though not to so great a degree as those of denominational policy, and led to the trial of Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, for heresy. The Old School majority in the assembly of 1837 brought the matters at issue to a head by abrogating the Plan of Union, passing resolutions against the interdenominational societies, excising the synods of Utica, Geneva, Genesee, and the Western Reserve, and establishing the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions... When [p. 1400] [the 1838] assembly met, the New School commissioners ... from the four excised synods, organized an assembly of their own in the presence of the sitting assembly, and then withdrew.

For nearly 20 years both branches of the church grew slowly but steadily... The New School assembly of 1853 took strong ground in opposition to slavery, with the result that a number of southern presbyteries withdrew and in 1858 organized the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church. In May 1861 the Old School assembly met at Philadelphia with but 13 commissioners present from the Southern States. Dr. Gardiner Spring, of New York, offered resolutions professing loyalty to the Federal Government, which were passed by a decided majority, although a minority, led by Dr. Charles Hodge, while in favor of the Federal Union, declared that an ecclesiastical judicatory had no right to determine questions of civil allegiance. The “Spring resolutions” were the occasion for the organization of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, which met in general assembly at Augusta, Ga., in December 1861, was enlarged by union in 1864 with the United Synod referred to, and upon the cessation of hostilities in 1865 took the name of the Presbyterian Church in the United States. Its membership was also increased in 1869 and 1874 by the accession of the synods of Kentucky and Missouri, which had protested by “declaration and testimony” against the action of the Old School assembly, as affecting the Christian character of the ministers and members of the southern Presbyterian churches.

The first step toward the reunion of the Old School and New School was taken in 1862, by the establishment of fraternal correspondence between the two general assemblies. The second step was the organization by the New School, in 1863, of its own home mission work, hitherto carried on in connection with the Congregationalists... [In] 1869, at Pittsburgh, Pa., reunion was consummated on “the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards.” ... Since 1870 the church has made steady progress along all lines, and its harmony has been seriously threatened only by the controversy (1891–94) as to the sources of authority in religion and the authority and credibility of the Scriptures, a controversy which, after the trials of Prof. Charles A. Briggs and Henry P. Smith, terminated in the adoption by the General Assembly at Minneapolis, Minn., in 1899, of a unanimous deliverance affirming the loyalty of the church to its historic views on these subjects. In the year 1903 a movement for the revision of the Confession of Faith came to a successful close. This year was also noteworthy for the beginnings of the movement for union with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

This union was brought about in 1906 (although a minority refused to accept it and retained the old name and constitution), and was the third effected on the basis of the Standards, the others being the reunions of 1758 and 1869. In 1906 a Book of Common Worship was prepared and approved by the General Assembly for voluntary use. In 1907

the Council of the Reformed Churches in the United States holding the Presbyterian system was organized, bringing into cooperative relations seven of the churches of the Presbyterian family in the country.

The Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church united with this denomination in 1920. This union brought an accession of 5 synods with 10 presbyteries into the church. In general, these synods preserve their identity by retention of the word "Welsh" as part of their name.

The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America has been identified with every movement for interdenominational fellowship and church union. It was an important factor in 1905 and 1908 in the preliminary arrangements for, and the organization of, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; and has been an active participant in the World Conferences on Faith and Order held at Lausanne, Switzerland, in 1927 and at Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1937; and the World Conferences on Life and Work held at Stockholm, Sweden, in 1925 and at Oxford, England, in 1937. It is now engaged in cooperation with Christian bodies all over the earth in organizing a World Council of Churches...

[p. 1402] The standards of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America are twofold—the standards of doctrine and the standards of government, discipline, and worship. These last are contained in documents known as the "Form of Government," the "Book of Discipline," and the "Directory for Worship," and taken together form the constitution of the church. They were first adopted in 1788, and amendments and additions have been made from time to time, the Book of Discipline being entirely reconstructed in 1884 and extensively revised and rearranged in 1934.

*Doctrine.* The standards of doctrine of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America are the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. These were first adopted in 1729. In 1788 certain amendments to the Confession and Larger Catechism were approved by the General Synod, giving expression to the American doctrine of the independence of the church and of religious opinion from control by the state. In 1886 the clause forbidding marriage with a deceased wife's sister was stricken out, and in 1903 certain alterations were again made, and there were added two chapters, "Of the Holy Spirit," and "Of the Love of God and Missions." A declaratory statement was also adopted setting forth the universality of the gospel offer of salvation, declaring that sinners are condemned only on the ground of their sin, and affirming that all persons dying in infancy are elect and therefore saved. As a whole these standards are distinctly Calvinistic. They emphasize the sovereignty of God in Christ in the salvation of the individual; affirm that each believer's salvation is a part of the eternal divine plan; that salvation is not a reward for faith, but that both faith and salvation are gifts of God; that man is utterly unable to save himself; that regeneration is an act of God and of God alone; and that God enables those whom He regenerates to attain to their eternal salvation.

Discipline is defined in the Book of Discipline as "The exercise of that authority, and the application of that system of laws, which the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed in His church." In practice it is controlled by a policy of guidance and regulation, rather than one of restriction and punishment. Christian liberty is regarded as consistent with the wise administration of Christian law.

The Directory of Worship makes no restriction as to place or form. The church insists upon the supreme importance of the spiritual element, and leaves both ministers and people at full liberty to worship God in accordance with the dictates of their own consciences. The sacraments are administered by ministers only, and ordinarily only ministers and licentiates are authorized to teach officially. A book of common worship was approved by the General Assembly in 1906 for optional use by pastors and congregations, and was revised in 1931.

*Organization.* The ecclesiastical organization of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America is set forth in the Form of Government. It has its two principal factors the ministers as representatives of Christ and the ruling elders as representatives of the people; and these two classes constitute the four judicatories which form the administrative system. These are the session, which governs the congregation; the presbytery, which governs a number of congregations within a limited geographic district; the synod, which governs the congregations within a larger geographic district; and the General Assembly, which is the supreme judicatory...

[*b. The Former United Presbyterian Church in North America*]

[p. 1434] *History.* The most successful attempt at union of the different Presbyterian bodies in the United States which represent the Covenanter and Secession movements in Scotland was that accomplished in 1858, when the greater part of the Associate Synod (Secession) and of the Associate Reformed Synod (Secession and Covenanter) were brought together in the United Presbyterian Church of North America, in the city of Pittsburgh. Whatever was distinctive in the views and usages of the two branches of the church, together with their colleges, seminaries, missionary enterprises, traditions, and records, became the inheritance of the United Church.

*Doctrine.* The United Presbyterian Church accepts the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms as doctrinal standards, amending somewhat the chapters on the power of civil magistrates. In addition, by constitutional action consummated June 2, 1925, it adopted a Confessional Statement made up of 44 articles. This statement contains the substance of the Westminster symbols, together with certain present-day convictions of the United Presbyterian Church. It takes the place of the Judicial Testimony of 1858, and wherever it deviates from the Westminster Standards its declarations prevail. The most noteworthy modifications of the older creedal positions held by the church are the restriction of divorce to marriage unfaithfulness (willful desertion no longer being recognized as a valid cause for divorce), the unequivocal avowal of universal infant salvation, the extension of sacramental privileges to all who have professed their faith in Christ and are leading a Christian life, the withdrawal of any protest against secret oath-bound societies, and the abandonment of the exclusive use of the Psalms in worship. The church maintains its insistence on the plenary, verbal inspiration of Scripture as the rule of faith and practice and takes a strongly conservative stand on all the theological issues of the day. Stress is placed on the old pillar doctrines of grace, wherein are affirmed the sufficiency and fullness of the provision God has made for the need of a fallen race, through the atoning work of Jesus Christ, the eternal and only begotten Son, and the renewing and sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit. Echoing its associate forefathers in Scotland, the United Presbyterian Church teaches that the Gospel contains a free, unlimited offer of salvation to all sinners alike. With regard to the social order, it is definitely asserted in the Confessional Statement that a primary duty of the church is to

give positive witness that the Christian principles of justice and love should have full expression in all relationships whatsoever—personal, industrial, business, civic, national, and international.

*Organization.* In organization and government the church is in accord with other Presbyterian bodies, having the same courts—session, presbytery, synod, and general assembly.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. was formed in 1958 by the union of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the United Presbyterian Church of North America. Membership (1959), 3,145,733 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257). For the action taken in 1961 by the General Assembly toward initiating another merger, see Nos. 664, 665.]

### **1242. Prophecy, Basis of Christian Interpretation of History**

SOURCE: Paul Tillich, *The Interpretation of History*, p. 264. Copyright 1936 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

Christian interpretation of history is possible only on the basis of prophecy, implying consequently a sacramental element—Christ, the center of history, *has come*—and a prophetic element—Christ, the end of history, *is coming*. So the Christian interpretation of history stands between “already” and “not yet”; the explanation of this “intermediate situation” is the main problem of Christian theology today.

### **1243. Prophecy, Fulfilled in New World Discovery, Says Columbus**

SOURCE: Christopher Columbus, *Libro de las Profecias*, ed. by Cesare de Lollis, pp. 80, 82, in *Scritti di Cristoforo Colombo*, Vol. 2 (Roma: Auspice il Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, 1894).

[p. 80] Our Lord purposed to make an evident miracle in this voyage to the Indies, in order to comfort me and others in the other matter of the Holy House [his hoped-for expedition to take Jerusalem from the Moslems]...

With all my navigating since the new age, and the conversations that I might have had with so many people, in so many lands, and of so many sects, ... I hold on only to the Holy and Sacred Scripture, and to some prophetic authority of certain holy persons, who through divine revelation said something about this...

[p. 82] I said already that for the execution of the enterprise to the Indies, I profited from neither reason, nor mathematics, nor world maps; simply what Isaiah said was fulfilled.

### **1244. Prophecy—Fulfillment in History, Including Christian Era**

SOURCE: Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, secs. 28, 32, 33, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 5, p. 210.

28. The golden head of the image and the lioness denoted the Babylonians; the shoulders and arms of silver, and the bear, represented the Persians and Medes; the belly and thighs of brass, and the leopard, meant the Greeks, who held the sovereignty from Alexander's time; the legs of iron, and the beast dreadful and terrible, expressed the Romans, who hold the sovereignty at present; the toes of the feet which were part clay and part iron, and the ten horns, were emblems of the kingdoms that are to rise; the other little horn that grows up among them meant the Antichrist in their midst; the stone that smites the earth and brings judgment upon the world was Christ...

32. Speak with me, O blessed Daniel. Give me full assurance, I beseech thee. Thou dost prophesy concerning the lioness in Babylon; for thou wast a captive there. Thou hast unfolded the future regarding the bear; for thou wast still in the world, and didst see the things come to pass. Then thou speakest to me of the leopard; and whence canst thou know this, for thou art already gone to thy rest? Who instructed thee to announce these

things, but He who formed thee in (from) thy mother's womb? That is God, thou sayest. Thou hast spoken indeed, and that not falsely. The leopard has arisen; the he-goat is come; he hath smitten the ram; he hath broken his horns in pieces; he hath stamped upon him with his feet. He has been exalted by his fall; (the) four horns have come up from under that one. Rejoice, blessed Daniel thou hast not been in error: all these things have come to pass.

33. After this again thou hast told me of the beast dreadful and terrible. "It had iron teeth and claws of brass: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it." Already the iron rules; already it subdues and breaks all in pieces; already it brings all the unwilling into subjection; already we see these things ourselves. Now we glorify God, being instructed by thee.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This historical view of the four empires of [Dan. 2](#) and [7](#) is characteristic of the modern historicist view of prophecy (see Nos. 1257, 1258).]

### **1245. Prophecy, Has Never Ceased Altogether**

SOURCE: C. von Orelli, "Prophecy, Prophets," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* (1934 ed.), Vol. 4, p. 2464. Copyright 1939 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. Used by permission.

But this gift ceased more and more, as the Christian church more and more developed on the historical basis of revelation as completed in Christ. Esp. in spiritually aroused eras in the history of the church, prophecy again puts in its appearance. It has never ceased altogether, but on account of its frequent misuse the gift has become discredited. Jesus Himself warned against false prophets, and during the apostolic times it was often found necessary to urge the importance of trying spirits (1 Jn 4 1; 1 Cor 12 10; 14 29).

### **1246. Prophecy—John Wesley Sees "Considerable" Part as About to Be Fulfilled**

SOURCE: John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes Upon the New Testament* (reprint; London: The Epworth Press, 1952), p. 934, comment on [Rev. 1:3](#).

3. *Happy is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy*—Some have miserably handled book [of Revelation]. Hence others are afraid to touch it; and, while they desire to know all things else, reject only the knowledge of those which God hath shown. They inquire after anything rather than this; as if it were written, 'Happy is he that doth *not* read this prophecy.' Nay, but *happy is he that readeth, and they that hear, and keep the words thereof*—Especially at this time, when so considerable a part of them is on the point of being fulfilled.

### **1247. Prophecy, Principles of Interpretation—Conditional and Literal Elements Differentiated**

SOURCE: C. von Orelli, "Prophecy and the Prophetic Office," *The New Schaff—Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 9, p. 277. Copyright 1911 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

When God lets a prophetic word "fall to the ground" (I Sam. iii. 19), this proves its falsity (Deut. xviii. 21–22). The fulfilment differs, however, according to the character and purpose of the prophecy. Where the emphasis is laid upon the external form and a near term is indicated for a special judgment, whether of an individual or a people, it necessarily follows that the fulfilment must be literal, if the sayings are genuine... But these sayings do not always contain an unalterable judgment of God; indeed, as a rule, the menacing prophecy is intended to produce a change of the people's heart; if this purpose was attained, God's attitude was modified and his sentence was no longer to be executed (as in Jonah's experience with Nineveh, cf. Jonah iv. 2; Jer. xxvi. 18–19).

## 1248. Prophecy, Principles of Interpretation—Conditional and Unconditional Elements

SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1945), pp. 31, 32. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission.

[p. 31] One of the arguments advanced most insistently in support of the complete intelligibility and literal fulfilment of prophecy is the claim that unconditional promises must be literally fulfilled. In making this claim Dispensationalists have the Abrahamic covenant especially in view. They insist that this covenant was “unconditional”; and they set it as such in sharp contrast and even direct antithesis to the Mosaic law. The covenant was unconditional [p. 32] and must be fulfilled to the letter. The law was conditioned by the words, “if ye will obey my voice” (Ex. xix. 5); this condition was broken immediately and repeatedly; consequently the promise attached to the keeping of this law need not be fulfilled. It is largely on this basis that it is claimed that Israel must return to the land of Canaan and possess the whole of it under the unconditional Abrahamic covenant, which we are told she has never yet done. The superior blessedness of this dispensation of promise, as viewed by Dispensationalists, is indicated by Scofield’s words: “The Dispensation of Promise ended when Israel rashly accepted the law (Ex. xix. 8).” The word “rashly” is startlingly significant. It implies either that Israel without due consideration forsook a more favorable for a less favorable status, or that, in accepting the more favorable one, the people did not weigh sufficiently the condition attached to it, did not realize their utter inability to perform it.

This question of the relation of man’s obedience to the fulfillment of God’s covenant is a matter of great importance...

It is to be observed that a condition may be involved in a command or promise without its being specifically stated. This is illustrated by the career of Jonah. Jonah was commanded to preach judgment, unconditioned, unqualified: “Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown.” Yet Jonah later declares, in explanation and extenuation of his disgraceful conduct, that he had assumed from the very first that God would spare the city if the people repented (even at the cost of making Jonah appear to be a false prophet); and the outcome proved the surmise to be correct. The unstated condition was presupposed in the very character of God as a God of mercy and compassion (iv. 2). The judgment on Eli’s house (1 Sam. ii. 30) is a very striking illustration of this principle, which is carefully stated in Jer. xviii. 1–10.

## 1249. Prophecy, Principles of Interpretation—Fulfillment Brings Understanding

SOURCE: Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and the Church* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1945), pp. 25–28, 30. Copyright 1945, 1947 by Oswald T. Allis. Used by permission.

[p. 25] This [insistence on the principle of literal interpretation] raises several questions, most important of which are: the intelligibility of prophecy, the conditional element in prophecy, the relation of the Old Testament to the New Testament, Futurism, and the basic distinction between Israel and the Church.

---

<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.

### *I. The Intelligibility of Prophecy*

The claim that prophecy is to be understood literally raises the question of the intelligibility of prophecy, and bears directly on the problem of the relationship of prophecy to history. If prophecy is to be taken literally, *i.e.*, according to the letter, it would be natural to conclude that its literal meaning must be clear and obvious.

- a. The usual view on this subject has been that prophecy is not intended to be fully understood before its fulfillment, that it is only when God “establishes the word of his servant and fulfils the counsel of his messengers,” that the meaning and import of their words becomes fully manifest. The reason for this is to be found, as Patrick Fairbairn has so admirably pointed out, in the fact that these disclosures of things to come are made known to men by One who has made man and knows his human frailty and how much knowledge of the future is for his good. Prophecy, in the words of Sir Isaac Newton, is not given to make men prophets, but as a witness to God [p. 26] when it is fulfilled. Prophecy is a wonderful combination of the clear and the obscure. Enough of God’s purpose is revealed to act powerfully upon the heart and conscience of those to whom the heavenly message is sent, but not enough to make fatalists of them, to paralyze human effort, or to coerce the human will: enough to prove the message to have been a true word from Him to whom alone the unknown future is fully known, but not enough to enable man to foresee with certainty when and how that purpose is to be realized.
- b. It is the view of Dispensationalists that prophecy is intended to be plain and fully intelligible before its fulfillment. Thus Darby tells us: “I do not admit history to be, in any sense, necessary to the understanding of prophecy.” He even went so far as to say, “I do not want history to tell me Nineveh of Babylon is ruined or Jerusalem in the hands of the Gentiles.” This is a remarkable statement. The usual way of putting it would be this: “Since the prophets definitely foretell that Nineveh and Babylon will be ruined and Jerusalem fall into the hands of the Gentiles, I know that this is sure to take place. That it has already taken place and when and how it took place, is a matter of historical fact, which history, both sacred and profane, must make clear to me.” It is to be noted, therefore, that Darby’s statements are the result of the principle of literalism carried to the extreme in the interpretation of prophecy. This view received almost classic expression in the words of Brookes:

“The language in which prophecy is written is as simple and easy to understand as any other part of the Scriptures, and all that is needed in reading it is a submissive disposition, ready to take God at His word without any theory of our own to establish.”

This view has been more concisely stated in the words, “Prophecy is pre-written history.” If prophecy is written as simply and plainly as history, it should be quite as intelligible as history; and we should have no more difficulty in understanding the prophecies of Isaiah than the history recorded in the Books of the Kings. This view may [p. 27] seem to do great honor to the Bible by insisting that its interpretation is quite independent of the events of history. But it fails to do justice to the fact that God is quite as much the God of history as He is the God of prophecy, and that it is the historical fulfillment of a prophecy which proves that it came from God. This literal view of prophecy also makes its appeal to those who wish to exchange faith for sight, who wish to be able to read the future with clearness and to set up precise prophetic programs regarding things to come, programs which no one can conclusively disprove until the events of history have tested them. The refutation of this conception of the complete intelligibility of prophecy is to be found in the simple and inescapable fact, that it cannot be made to square with the phenomena of

prophecy as they lie before us in Scripture, and in the no less obvious fact that those who insist most emphatically that prophecy is fully intelligible differ among themselves greatly at times as to its meaning. The fallacy in this claim will be clear when due weight is given to the following considerations.

(1) The use of figurative language—symbols, parables, etc.—is far more characteristic of prophecy than of historical narration. Balaam foretold the coming of a star out of Jacob. Daniel spoke of four kings or kingdoms under the figure of an image and also as four wild beasts. Ezekiel has a parable of two great eagles, of a cedar, and of a vine. These are but a few among many examples. Some of these prophecies are interpreted more or less fully in their context, which shows that they are obscure. But some are not interpreted; and those which are explained are often not fully explained...

[p. 28] It is to be remembered that the use of parabolic language serves both to reveal and conceal truth. Nathan's parable of the Ewe Lamb served and was expressly designed to serve the purpose of getting David to condemn himself, without realizing he was doing so. "The man that hath done this shall surely die" was David's verdict. "Thou art the man" was Nathan's utterly unexpected and crushing reply. Jeremiah's vision of the Seething Pot (i. 13) was misinterpreted or deliberately parodied by the leaders of the Jews, and used to support their terrible delusion that Jerusalem was impregnable, an iron pot that could not be broken into (Ezek. xi. 4), which made it necessary for Ezekiel to explain the true meaning of the symbol in words that burn and sear (chap. xxiv). The predictions that Zedekiah should "die in peace" (Jer. xxxiv. 5) and that he should not "see" the land of Babylon (Ezek. xii. 13) require for their proper understanding the brief yet terrible account given in 2 Kgs. xxv. 6f., or they might be completely misunderstood. The interpretation of prophecy is not simple and easy; and it is a mistake to declare that it is.

(2) Not only is the language of prophecy often figurative and parabolic, it also differs from history in its frequent lack of precision and definiteness... "In that day" is one of the most frequently occurring specifications of time in the case of long-range prediction... The phrase is intentionally indefinite...

[p. 30] (3) The same principle applies to prophecies which might be regarded as perfectly simple and plain. Jacob in blessing his sons, declared regarding Simeon and Levi, "I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel." (Gen. xlix. 7.) This is the only one of the blessings which reads like a curse. It is the only one which unites two of Jacob's sons in a common destiny. The reason for this is plain. Jacob expressly alludes to their grievous sin in the matter of Shechem and refers to it as their joint act. How was this prediction fulfilled? In the case of Levi, it was fulfilled in terms of blessing. Because of the obedience of this tribe, when Israel sinned in the matter of the golden calf (Deut. xxxiii. 9, cf. Ex. xxxii. 26f.), Levi was dedicated to the service of the Lord and His sanctuary. Levi received cities in all the tribes and was supported by tithes from all of them. This was a distinction and a glory. Levi was actually divided and scattered. The prophecy was literally fulfilled. But the curse was changed into a blessing, the disgrace became an honor. In the case of Simeon, it was quite different. Simeon decreased greatly in numbers during the forty years of wandering. Simeon, alone of all the tribes, was allotted territory within the bounds of another tribe, Judah. Some members of the tribe seem to have wandered off and joined themselves to the Northern Tribes. Others of them wandered away to the South. Simeon practically disappears from Israel's history. Moses

does not even mention Simeon in his Blessing of the tribes. In Simeon's case the curse remained a curse. Yet who in reading the words of Jacob regarding these two sons could have discovered in its seemingly plain and simple language the vast difference in the import of this prediction for the descendants of these two bloody-handed sons of the patriarch! The prophecy was wonderfully fulfilled; we may even say it was literally fulfilled. But only a study of history enables us to interpret it aright.

### **1250. Prophecy—Relation to Prophet's Character**

SOURCE: C. von Orelli, "Prophecy and the Prophetic Office," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 9, pp. 276, 277. Copyright 1911 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 276] Which side of prophecy should be most prominent depended upon changes in the external aspect of affairs, but also upon the moral level of the people; to a self-righteous people, proud of their good fortune, a judgment must be announced, by means of which God wills to prepare the way for his rule. This phase of prophecy is predominant from Solomon to the exile.: For a chastened and humbled people, however, the consolatory promises of the blessed fruition of God's plans were to be pre- [p. 277] sented. If, therefore, the direction taken by the prophetic sayings depended upon the ethnical needs of each generation, its spiritual height was often conditioned thereby. Even though the prophecies are not a product of the spirit of the age, God's spirit speaks therein first to the community of the present... The personal quality of the individual prophet also influences his prophecy, for his relation to the divine inspirations is not that of a clear mirror from which the divine pictures are reflected. The liveliness and tendency of his imagination, the conceptions with which he was already familiar through his life and calling, appear in his writings.

### **1251. Prophecy—School of Interpretation Differentiated**

SOURCE: Albertus Pieters, *Studies in the Revelation of St. John* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1950), p. 53. Copyright 1943 by Albertus Pieters. Used by permission.

The Preterist says that almost everything in the book of Revelation was fulfilled long ago, the Historicist, that it has been fulfilling all the time, and some of the things foretold are happening in our own day, the Futurist that nothing of that which is prophesied from the beginning of chapter four on has yet taken place, nor can take place until just before the end.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The preterists would be place the fulfillment of practically all, if not all, of Daniel's prophecies in the past, assigning the book most probably to the time of Antiochus IV in the 2d century B.C.]

### **1252. Prophecy —Schools of Interpretation—Futurism and the Book of Revelation**

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 139–141. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 139] The futurist generally believes that all of the visions from Revelation 4:1 to the end of the book are yet to be fulfilled in the period immediately preceding and following the second advent of Christ. The reason for the view is [p. 140] found in the comparison of Revelation 1:1, 19, and 4:1. Revelation 1:1 states that the book as a whole is concerned with "the things which must shortly come to pass," and which are thus identified as belonging to the future as far as the seer is concerned. Revelation 1:19 contains a threefold or perhaps a twofold command:

Write therefore the things which thou sawest, and the things which are, and the things which shall come to pass hereafter;

or, as it is sometimes rendered:

... the things which thou sawest, both the things which are, and the things which shall come to pass hereafter.

In either case, the visions are divided into two general sections: one, the things that fall within the actual lifetime of the seer, the first century, and second, the things which were future to his period.

The introduction to the fourth chapter seemingly identifies the future visions as beginning at that point, for the heavenly voice summoning the seer said:

Come up hither, and I will show thee *the things which must come to pass hereafter*...

Many futurists hold that the period described by this part of Revelation begins with the removal of the church from the world as described in I Corinthians 15:52–54 and in I Thessalonians 4:13–18. Some, like Seiss, argue that the summons to the seer in Revelation 4:1, 2 is the counterpart to the removal of the church. Newell suggests that the more literal translation, “After these things,” would give a clearer understanding of the meaning of the passage, since it would indicate that the events of 4:1 and of the text following came *after* the church age mentioned in 1:9–3:22...

[p. 141] Many if not most futurists interpret Revelation 1:9–3:22 as the historicists do the rest of the book. For the futurists the letters to the churches represent successive periods of church history.

### **1253. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Futurism, Characteristics of**

SOURCE: Albertus Pieters, *Studies in the Revelation of St. John* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1950), pp. 53–57. Copyright 1943 by Albertus Pieters. Used by permission.

[p. 53] The Futurist [says] that nothing of that which is prophesied from the beginning of [Revelation] chapter four on has yet taken place, nor can take place until just before the end.

Futurists tend to be literalists. I do not mean that they do not see any of the symbolic character of the book, but they stick as closely as they can do to the literal meaning. Hence, when they read in the eleventh chapter that the temple is measured, they find here a reason for believing that the actual temple in Jerusalem will be rebuilt; just as some of the Preterists find in the same chapter evidence that when it was written the temple had not yet been destroyed. When the Futurists read in the same chapter of the two witnesses, they do not ask what these symbolize, but who they are, and they come to the conclusion, generally, that these are Enoch and Elijah, who have not yet suffered death. They take the days, also, literally, whence they find that the Beast will have power for three and a half calendar years...

[p. 54] A distinguishing mark of the Futurists is that they all believe in the coming of a personal Antichrist...

Most Futurists are pre-millenarians, or, as I prefer to say, millenarians, that is, they believe that after the Lord Jesus Christ is revealed from heaven, at His Second Advent, the General Judgment will not take place at once, but that there will be a resurrection of the righteous, and after that a blessed reign of Christ on earth [see No. 1073n] for 1,000 years, (or 360,000 years, according to some). Dr. Abraham Kuyper is an outstanding example of a Futurist who is not a millenarian. Historicists are divided on this point. Elliott, Lord, Guinness, and others, are millenarians; Barnes and Carroll are not.

Just as there are two groups of Preterists, a Left Wing and a Right Wing, so there are two sorts of Futurists. The extreme Futurists are the Darbyite dispensationalists, and a slight knowledge of their system is necessary to understand and appreciate their interpretation of the Revelation. This is the system that is set forth in the notes to the “Scofield Bible,” and is taught in most of the “Bible Schools” and [p. 55] “Undenominational Churches” of the United States. It originated with a learned and godly man named John N. Darby, the founder of the group known as Plymouth Brethren.

The most important and distinctive doctrine of the dispensationalists is their view of the kingdom of heaven and the Christian church. They believe that Jesus came to establish a visible rule on this earth, and that this is what John the Baptist referred to when he preached that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. The Jews, however, not being willing to accept the kingdom on Christ’s terms, the offer was withdrawn and the establishment of the kingdom was postponed until the Second Advent. During the interim, Christ established his church, which is not in any sense a fulfilment of the Old Testament promises, but something new, unknown to the prophets, constituting no part of the continuous development of Israel. It is a “parenthesis in history.” It will come to an end in the “Rapture,” whereby is meant the sudden, miraculous removal of all true believers to meet Christ in the air. This will be the first stage of the Second Advent. It will be visible to the believers but not to the world at large. The public, visible stage of the Second Advent will be seven years later and is called “The Revelation.” This period of seven years, they hold, corresponds to the seventieth week of the prophecy in the ninth chapter of Daniel. The sixty-nine weeks ran out at the first coming of Christ, but with the rejection of Christ by the Jews and the postponement of the kingdom, prophetic time ceased to run. As Dr. Ironside puts it: “The prophetic clock stopped at Calvary. Not one tick has been heard since.” (“The Mysteries of God,” p. 54.)

[p. 56] During the said seven years the Antichrist will rule. The Jews being then restored to Palestine, he will make a covenant with them for the restoration of their worship, for seven years. The temple will be rebuilt at Jerusalem, the Ten Tribes regathered, and the sacrificial system reinstated. In the meantime, although all true believers were taken from the earth at the “Rapture,” that startling event will result in many real conversions of those left behind. These believers in Christ will eventually be saved, but they form no part of the “church,” the body of Christ, properly speaking. They are called, in the literature of this group, the “tribulation saints,” because they pass through the tribulation caused by the bad faith of the Antichrist, who will break his covenant with the Jews at the end of three and a half years, and will demand to be worshiped. The refusal of the true Christians and of faithful Jews, although not Christians, will bring upon them this terrible period of persecution. At the end of it, when they are almost overwhelmed, will occur the public manifestation of Christ, the second stage of the Second Advent. He will then destroy the Antichrist and establish his visible earthly kingdom, which will continue for a thousand years...

[p. 57] There are, however, other Futurists, who do not accept dispensationalism, or accept it only with important modifications. Among these is Dr. Henry Frost, who, in his “The Second Coming of Christ,” rejects the distinction between the “Rapture” and the “Revelation,” believing that the church passes through the tribulation.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Pieters names two other nondispensationalist Futurists, Theodor Zahn (*Die Offenbarung des Johannis* [“The Revelation of John”], 1924), and Abraham Kuyper [*The Revelation*

of *St. John*, 1935]. Another who might be mentioned is George Eldon Ladd (*Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, 1952, *The Blessed Hope*, 1956, *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, 1959).]

### **1254. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Futurism, Defined**

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 312, 313, 334, 335. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 312] Not one of the supporters of this [Futurist] approach would claim, that all the contents of the book [of Revelation] were future from the standpoint of the writer of the book. Thiessen himself indicates chap. 4:1 as the place where the Futurist designation becomes appropriate. This is, of course, a minor matter to which every one except a Preterist [p. 313] can agree. The question to which we need an answer is, from whose standpoint the events from chap. 4:1 onward must be conceived to lie still in the future. It would be absurd to accuse the holders of the Futurist view of claiming a radical and insuperable futurity for the events which the book pictures. But if this is not done, then the question arises, how long the designation will be usable. It can not be claimed that the events are future from the standpoint of the holders of the view; there must come a time when they come to pass; and from then onward even the holders of the view will find the designation of their approach to the book no longer usable.

What is intended by the designation [Futurism] is, of course, that the bulk of the pictures of the book refers to the endtime of the rapture of the saints, the antichristian setup of world-dominion, the great tribulation, the public appearance of the Son of Man, and the establishment of the millennial reign, together with the events which will form the transition from that reign to eternity. The continental designation of this view as ‘endgeschichtich’ is far preferable for conveying this meaning...

[p. 334] The modern [Futurist] Premillenarians ... refer the contents of chapter 4 to 19 [of Revelation] to the endtime and skip the period of time which is covered in what we know as the history of the Christian Church. And when the light of John’s prophecy begins to disclose for us the momentous events of the endtime, the rapture of the Church is at hand and is an early number on the program, if it has not already occurred. A church historical explanation of the book of Revelation is for these men and women simply out of the question. It happens, that we also find little or no trace of such an understanding of the Apocalypse among the ancient Premillenarians; [p. 335] but in their case it was largely due to the fact that their was as yet very little of church history and that they expected the near return of the Lord to leave very little room for its expansion.

### **1255. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Futurism Different From Early Church Premillennialism**

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga. *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 313–315. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 313] It makes no sense ... to claim the early Premillenarians for the Futuristic Approach. They most certainly did not think that the events recorded in the Apocalypse were for the most part some two thousand years away from themselves but were definitely of the conviction, that those events were already in the making in their own days. It is quite plain, that till actual events made it impossible to hold on to the view any longer they saw the antichristian world-power in the Roman imperial government. When that government adopted the Christian religion as the official religion of the Empire, the days of that ancient view were numbered. Lactantius, who gave an exposition of that view to Constantine the Great, did so at the last possible moment. Really he was already a few minutes too late. It is as an antiquated view, that it lives on under the Preterist name.

We should be clear on what this means for the true nature of the view of the ancient Futurists. They were premillenarian, as [p. 314] the modern Futurists are; but their futurism did not involve the interpolation of some long church-period between the first advent of Christ and His return; it was simply due to the fact that in their days so little history had as yet come to pass in fulfilment of the Apocalypse. They simply were adherents of a continuous-historical approach. Their approach was all right; was, in fact, the only approach which would naturally suggest itself to a reader of the Apocalypse; especially if he came, as they did, from a reading of the most closely related other apocalyptic writing in the Bible, the book of Daniel. It is safe to say, that all other explanations of the Apocalypse have arisen from the fact that explanations made on the basis of the continuous-historical approach turned out to be unsuccessful.

In their assumption that the events revealed in the pictures of the Apocalypse were in the making, had begun to come about in their own days, the ancient Premillenarians were perfectly correct. The only serious mistake they made was merely, that they expected the events to come to pass in a relatively short time. This expectation they share with the present-day Futurists. But this superficial similarity gives no present-day Futurist a right to claim those ancient Futurists for his modern views. For what separates them is precisely the intervening lapse of time. Now to hold that the bulk of events foretold in the book will come about in a relatively short time, is a radically different procedure, even when that time is held to be imminent. This procedure is marred by some very serious faults, which can on no account be tolerated. They are the implicit denial of the continuity of historical developments, the extraction of the eschatological quality from the course of Christian history so far, and its concentration into a final period of history which thereby is made quite unintelligible for us who are not yet living in it. Of such a disruptive conception of history those ancient fathers were at all events not guilty.

I view the Futurist view as positively harmful as well as fundamentally unsound. On the surface the old view is as little identical with the new as in its roots. The old view expected the anti- [p. 315] christian development from the pagan Roman Empire, and this is something which the new view can not do. It is therefore forced to substitute a revived pagan Roman Empire [see editors' note], and in this it may very well be essentially correct. But its futurism forbids its recognition of the historical continuity between the two empires, and here lies the danger. It closes the eyes of those whom it teaches and leads for the facts and events which are at present transpiring in the sight of everybody, even while Earnest and Frank are illustrating over the radio the force with which those events are impressing themselves upon those students of the Bible who otherwise play fast and loose with its authority but who scrutinize its eschatological aspects.

The likely effects of the Futurist understanding of the Apocalypse therefore tend to be the very opposite of what its advocates seek. They seek to inculcate in people a sense of the significance and the imminence of Christ's return. But they fail to take proper account of the fact that all the events which intervene between His first and His second coming are preparatory for the latter; that in a sense He is coming all the while in those events, and that His visible appearing is in a sense merely the culmination of the process. Thus their presentation of the matter becomes distorted and tends to confuse their disciples as to the real actual and concrete forms which the precursory signs are assuming. The idea of a secret rapture prior to Christ's public manifestation may be evaluated as being compensatory in as far as it keeps expectancy on tiptoe. But in case its underlying

assumption that the believers shall not pass through the great tribulation should prove to be baseless, it merely helps, wherever it is found, to close the eyes of the saints for the very tribulation through which they are passing and to expect instead a future tribulation of such inconceivable dimensions that it can be called eschatological in contrast with the present.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In recent years among futurists there is not the insistence that there was formerly on a literally revived Roman empire.]

### **1256. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Futurism, Rise of**

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 37–40. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 37] Out of this [early 19th-century] revival of interest in prophetic truth came two new interpretations: futurism and “Darbyism.” ... Essential to [origin futurism] is the teaching that the Antichrist will be a satanically inspired world-ruler at the end of the age who would inflict severe persecution upon the Church during the Great Tribulation. At the end of the Tribulation, Christ would return to deliver the Church, punish Antichrist, raise the righteous dead, and establish His millennial kingdom. Darbyism modified this outline of truth by teaching a coming of Christ to rapture the Church before the Tribulation and before His coming in glory to establish the millennial kingdom.

The rediscovery of futurism [see editors' note below] is associated with the names of S. R. Maitland, James Todd, and William Burgh. Before we turn to these men, we should note that a futurist interpretation of prophecy had earlier been recovered within the Roman Catholic Church. It will probably come as a shock to many modern futurists to be told that the first scholar in relatively modern times who returned to the patristic futuristic interpretation was a Spanish Jesuit named Ribera. In 1950, Ribera published a commentary on the Revelation as a counter-interpretation to the prevailing view among Protestants which identified the Papacy with the Antichrist. Ribera applied all of Revelation but the earliest chapters to the end time rather than to the history of the Church. Antichrist would be a single evil person who would be received by the Jews and would [p. 38] rebuild Jerusalem, abolish Christianity, deny Christ, persecute the Church and rule the world for three and a half years. On one subject, Ribera was not a futurist: he followed the Augustinian interpretation of the millennium in making the entire period between the cross and Antichrist. He differed from Augustine in making the “first resurrection” to refer to the heavenly life of the martyrs when they would reign in heaven with Christ throughout the millennium, i.e., the church age. A number of Catholic scholars espoused this futuristic interpretation of Antichrist, among them Bellarmine, the most notable of the Jesuit controversialists and the greatest adversary of the Protestant churches.

This futurist interpretation with its personal Antichrist and three and a half year period of tribulation did not take root in the Protestant church until the early nineteenth century...

[p. 39] These early futurists followed a pattern of prophetic events similar to that found in the early fathers, with the necessary exception that Rome was not the final kingdom. In fact they appeal to the fathers against the popular historical interpretation for support of their basic view. A pretribulation rapture is utterly unknown by these men and while Israel is to be restored, the Gospel which Israel will preach in the millennium is the Gospel of grace, and [p. 40] those who are saved are included in the Church. The

Tribulation concerns both Israel and the Church; in fact, it will be the time of testing an apostate Christianity.

[EDITORS' NOTE: "Rediscovery" implies too much similarity. For the differences between the futurist view and that of the early church, see No. 1255.]

### **1257. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Historical (Historicist) Interpretation**

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 137, 138. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 137] The historicist view, sometimes called the continuous-historical view, contends that Revelation is a symbolic presentation of the entire course of the history of the church from the close of the first century to the end of time. The argument for the view is founded on the fact that two termini are mentioned: the day in which John the seer lived, and the ultimate day of God's victory and the establishment of the Holy City. No point between them can be identified with certainty as making a break in the sequence; therefore the process must be continuous.

[p. 138] By this interpretation the various series of the churches, the seals, the trumpets, and the bowls are made to particular events in the history of the world that are related to the history of the church...

There have ... been many champions of this theory in the ranks of evangelical Christianity from the Reformation down to modern times. Their interpretation has been sufficiently literal to warrant taking the chronology of Revelation seriously. In the various judgments and woes they have seen the rise and fall of nations and the persecutions and warfare of the church. They have generally identified the beast with Rome, political and ecclesiastical, and the harlot Babylon with the apostate church.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Tenney is writing only of Revelation, but the historicist treats the book of Daniel and other prophecies in the same fashion, and seeks fulfillment throughout history of the predictions without confining them, like the preterist, to the past or, like the futurist, to the last times (see No. 1251).]

### **1258. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Historical (Historicist) Method of the Protestant Reformers**

SOURCE: George Eldon Ladd, *The Blessed Hope*, pp. 32–34. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 32] The Reformers took over this type of historical interpretation of prophetic truth and found in the Antichrist a prophecy of the Papacy. Luther at first felt that Revelation was defective in everything which could be called apostolic or prophetic and was offended by the visions and symbols of the book; but he came to feel that the prophecy was an outline of the whole course of church history and that the Papacy was predicted both in chapters 11 and 12 and in the second beast of chapter 13. The number 666 period of papal domination.

This "historical" type of interpretation with its application Antichrist to papal Rome so dominated Protestant study of prophetic truth for three centuries that it has frequently been called "the Protestant" interpretation. Some historical interpreters were premillennialists. They found the history of the Church symbolized in the seals, vials, and trumpets, with the second coming of Christ in chapter 19. After the return of Christ, there would be a millennial reign before the final consummation. We would emphasize that there have been many students of the Word who have been thorough-going premillennialists who shared very little of the outline of prophetic truth which today is called premillennialism. Such were Joseph Mede, Isaac Newton, William Whiston, J.

A. Bengel and Henry Alford. These men, and many others, taught the premillennial return of Christ, but they did not believe in a personal Antichrist who would appear at the end of the age to persecute the saints during a three and a half year period of tribulation. Neither did they believe in what we [the futurists] call “the Great Tribulation.” They believed that the Tribulation extended throughout the history of the Church, and the three and a half years or twelve hundred and sixty were frequently interpreted to mean twelve hundred and sixty years of church history before the end times could arrive...

[p. 33] Many of the great Christians of Reformation and post-Reformation times shared this view of prophetic truth and identified Antichrist with the Roman Papacy. This is a fact which should be well pondered by modern students who insist that a pretribulation eschatology is *essential* to an orthodox theology. Among adherents of this interpretation were the Waldenses, the Hussites, Wyclif, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Melancthon, the Baptist theologian John Gill, the martyrs Cranmer, Tyndale, Latimer and Ridley. John Wesley, following Bengel, thought that the papal Antichrist would be overthrown in 1836 and would be succeeded not only by a millennium but by two millenniums, the first on earth and the second in heaven. Jonathan Edwards [p. 34] held that the fulfillment of the Revelation in the history of the Church was an unanswerable argument for the inspiration of the Scriptures. He held that the 1260 years of Revelation began in 606 A.D. and that he was therefore living in the last days.

Some of these men were premillennialists, but Edwards adopted the Whitbyan postmillennialism. However, they all shared the historical view; none of them was a futurist, looking for a short tribulation with a personal Antichrist just before the return of Christ. Therefore, the idea of a pretribulation rapture had no place in their interpretation of prophecy.

### **1259. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Historical (Historicist) the “Standard Protestant” Interpretation**

SOURCE: Albertus Pieters, *Studies in the Revelation of St. John* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1950), pp. 43, 45, 46. Copyright 1943 by Albertus Pieters. Used by permission.

[p. 43] The interpretation that looks upon the book of Revelation as a forecast, in symbols, of the history of the Christian church, is sometimes called, not without reason, the standard Protestant interpretation. Alford says that it was the view “held by the precursors and upholders of the Reformation, by Wicliffe and his followers in England, by Luther in Germany, Bullinger in Switzerland, Bishop Bale in Ireland, by Fox the martyrologist by Brighthman, Pareus, and early Protestant expositors generally.” ...

[p. 45] Interpreters of this school go into great detail, in comparing the symbols of Revelation with the course of history [see No. 1257]...

[p. 46] A variety of the Historical Interpretation is the “Recapitulationist” view. Those who hold it accept the fundamental “Historicist” principle that the book of Revelation is intended to furnish a panorama of church history, but they do not hold that the story is in continuous chronological order from beginning to end. They think that it is each of which cover[s] the entire period between the first and second advents of Christ.

### **1260. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Preterism**

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, p. 136. Copyright 1956 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The preterist view of interpretation ... holds that Revelation is simply a sketch of the conditions of the empire in the first century, written by some Hebrew Christian who revolted against pagan tyranny. He saw the empire as a gigantic machine, the opponent of

the gospel in the social, political, and religious realms, and bent on stamping out the Christian movement. In the apocalyptic symbols of this book he voiced his protest against the whole system of evil, and his hope of ultimate victory.

The first systematic presentation of the preterist viewpoint originated in the early seventeenth century with Alcazar, a Jesuit friar, whose work was not free from controversial bias. The Reformers had identified Babylon the Roman church, and had succeeded in making the Revelation a powerful controversial weapon in their favor. In order to offset this interpretation, Alcazar attempted to show that Revelation had no application to the future, but that its prophecy could be divided into two major sections (chs. 1–12, 13–19) which dealt respectively with the church's conflict against Judaism and against paganism. Alcazar thus cleverly nullified the attacks upon the Roman church which the Reformers had made so successfully by using the language of Revelation.

Alcazar's suggestion was followed by some Protestant expositors, but the rise the modern preterist school came with the prevalence of the technique of historical criticism. Since preterism did not necessitate any element of predictive prophecy or even any conception of inspiration, it could treat the Revelation simply as a purely natural historical document, embodying the eschatological concepts of its own time.

### **1261. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Preterism Related to Historical Approach**

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, p. 312. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

What, then, is meant by the preterist approach? As things stand, it looks as if rather vague sense as indicating that the party employing the approach so designated holds, that a rather indefinite but rather large portion of its contents refers to the past relative to the time of the writing of the book. There is nothing precise about such a designation. What makes matters worse, is the fact that also all other approaches seem to hold, that the seven churches to whom John already in existence at the time; and also the fact that at least the two Preterists mentioned by name to all appearance accepted a continuous-historical fulfilment of the visions of the book. I need not add, that all other approaches also see some portions of the Apocalypse as still awaiting fulfilment. The preterist approach is simply a modification of the continuous-historical approach.

### **1262. Prophecy—Schools of Interpretation—Spiritual or Idealist View of the Revelation**

SOURCE: Merrill C. Tenney, *Interpreting Revelation*, pp. 143, 144. Copyright 1957 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 143] A fourth interpretation of the Revelation may be called the idealist or spiritualist view. The latter name has no connection with spiritualism as a cult; it means simply that the whole book is interpreted "spiritually." According to this view, the Revelation represents the eternal conflict of good and evil which persists in every age, although here it may have particular application to the period of the church. The symbols have no immediate historic connection with any definite social or political events...

Many idealists could be classed as preterists, since they hold that the imagery of the Apocalypse is taken from its immediate world, and that the prevailing conditions of Domitian's reign are reflected in the symbolic episodes that fill its pages. They refuse to assign to [p. 144] them any literal historical significance for the future, and they deny all

predictive prophecy except in the most general sense of the ultimate triumph of righteousness.

### **1263. Prophets, Tests of, Various**

SOURCE: W. T. Davison, "Prophecy, Prophets," in James Hastings, ed., *Dictionary of the Bible* (1-vol. ed.; 1924), p. 760. Copyright 1909 by Charles Scribner's New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and T. & T. Clark Edinburgh.

But certain tests are suggested. Sometimes (*a*) a sign or wonder was wrought in attestation (Dt 13<sup>1,2</sup>), but even this was not conclusive, and the true prophets seldom relied upon this evidence. Again, (*b*) in Dt 18<sup>21f</sup>. fulfilment of prediction is adduced as a test. Clearly that could not be applied at once, and it would rather be useful afterwards to students of the national history than to kings or people about to enter on a battle or an alliance. But (*c*) the people were expected to use their moral and spiritual insight and distinguish the issues set before them, as a man has to judge for himself in questions of conscience... The difficulty of this process of discrimination was often lightened (*d*) by watching the career of the prophets, as to how far their character bore out their professions, what motives actuated them—whether crooked policy, immediate expediency, or high self-denying principle—and thus in the centuries before Christ, as afterwards, one of the best criteria was, 'by their fruits ye shall know them.'

### **1264. Protestant—Definition and Origin of the Term**

SOURCE: John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, pp. 304, 305. Copyright 1954 John Dillenberger & Claude York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. 304] The duality of protest and affirmative witness can be seen in the term *Protestant* itself. The word first had reference to the "Protestation" of the German evangelical estates in the Diet of Speyer (1529)... Here the meaning was partly that of protest, but from the standpoint of affirmed faith. Few churches ever adopted the name "Protestant." The most commonly adopted designations were rather "evangelical" and "re- [p. 305] formed" (these terms continue to be used especially in the European churches and in Latin America). On the other hand, when the word *Protestant* came into currency in England (in Elizabethan times), its accepted signification was not "objection" but "avowal" or "witness" or "confession" (as the Latin *protestari* meant also "to profess"). And for a century the English "Protestant" church was the Church of England, making its profession of the faith in the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer. Only later did the word "protest" come to have a primarily negative significance, and the term "Protestant" come to refer to non-Roman churches in general.

### **1265. Protestant, Origin of the Name**

SOURCE: F. Kattenbusch, "Protestantism," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 9, pp. 290, 291. Copyright 1911 by Funk & Wagnall Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 290] The name "Protestant" originated from the "protestation" in which the leading German princes friendly to the Reformation united with fourteen cities of Germany on Apr. 25, 1529, against the decree of the Roman majority of the second Diet of Speyer. It was a designation quite colorless from the religious point of view, and was first used as a political epithet by the opponents of those who signed the [p. 291] protest.

### **1266. Protestant Episcopal Church**

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1486–1492.*

[p. 1486] *History.* The interest of the Church of England in America began with the earliest English voyages of discovery. Frobisher (1578) and Drake (1579) had chaplains

with them, interested not merely in the ships' companies, but in the people they found; and the charters of the colonies, started by Sir Humphrey Gilbert (1578 and 1583) and by Sir Walter Raleigh (1584–87) all included, in some form, provision for "public service according to the Church of England." Later enterprises in the first part of the seventeenth century followed the same general policy. Occasional services were conducted at various places, but permanent worship on this side of the Atlantic was begun in 1607, when Rev. Robert [p. 1487] Hunt, underneath a great sail stretched between two old trees, celebrated the Eucharist for the first time at Jamestown, Va. The spirit of the earliest leaders of this colony was one of kindly toleration for all, but with the passing of the colony under the immediate control of the Crown, the harsh tone prevalent in England manifested itself in Virginia, also, in rigid laws in regard to Puritans and Quakers.

The distance from the ecclesiastical authorities, and the growing disposition on the part of the vestries to hire ministers from year to year in order to avoid the sending out of unfit persons by English patrons, brought about an unfortunate condition which the Bishop of London sought to remedy by sending Rev. James Blair as a missionary to the colonies...

In New England isolated attempts at church organization were made, but for many years none proved permanent, since the Puritans applied to the Anglicans the same proscription from which they themselves had fled. With the revocation of the charter of the Massachusetts Colony, a Church of England clergyman was appointed in 1686; and King's Chapel in Boston, the first Episcopal church in New England, was opened in 1689. In 1698 an Episcopal church was established at Newport, R. I., and the same year saw the consecration of Trinity Church in New York City.

In Maryland the Protestant element in the community of St. Mary's erected a chapel and held services according to the rites of the Church of England. The growth of the church was slow, but the arrival in 1700 of Rev. Thomas Bray, the Bishop of London's commissary, gave it new life. His influence was felt also in the other colonies, for it was he who gave the impulse for the organization in England of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which had so large a share in establishing the church in America on a firm foundation.

This society began its work by sending in 1702 a delegation to visit the scattered churches. At that time there does not appear to have been a half dozen clergymen of the Church of England outside of Virginia and Maryland, and the whole number from Maine to Carolina was less than 50. This mission was the beginning of a new era in the history of the Episcopal Church in America. The number of churches was greatly increased, and a far better grade of ministers was secured for them. There were, however, too many of the class who drift to distant sections, and who, removed from ecclesiastical jurisdiction, were more of a hindrance than a help...

A general survey of the situation during the first half of the eighteenth century reveals the causes of the weakness of the church. There was, first, an established church in a few colonies, as, for instance, in Virginia and Maryland, not sufficiently effective to be of positive assistance, but just enough so to arouse the antagonism of the strong dissenting element which feared the introduction of a state church, to avoid which they had left England. There was, secondly, the difficulty of securing competent ministers who were conversant with the needs of the colonies. The impossibility of ordination, except by a tedious and expensive trip to England, deterred many colonial churchmen from

application for orders, and as a result the churches were supplied chiefly from abroad, and this often proved a source of weakness rather than of strength. Throughout the whole period repeated urgent appeals for an episcopate were made, but all failed, owing, probably, in part to ignorance in the Church of England as to the real situation, in part to a failure to realize the missionary power and value of the episcopate, and especially to the persistent opposition to an American episcopate shown by English political leaders, who feared that if the colonies were provided with bishops they would be in a better position to claim their independence.

[p. 1488] Notwithstanding these hindrances, the Church of England enjoyed a slow but steady growth in power up to the Revolutionary War. In the southern colonies it was the predominant church, and people were required by law to contribute to its support, though there was frequently a lack of harmony between clergy and people. In New England and the middle colonies, on the other hand, it was largely an alien institution, opposed by a strong majority of dissenters. Usually it was not strong financially, and its support came largely from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel; but in Maryland and Virginia the churches were maintained by the local governments and were prosperous.

The close of the war found the Episcopal churches thoroughly disorganized. Many of the clergy were loyal to the Crown and left the country, going either to England or to Canada, and of those who remained few conducted any public services, partly for lack of congregations and partly because of the impossibility of conducting the services in full, including the petition for the royal family. Even the semblance of an establishment was no longer maintained, and few, if any, desired one. There was no episcopacy, and not even any association of churches. Furthermore, so intense was the sentiment of state loyalty that there was little recognition of any relation between the churches of different States. The first move toward an organization was the appearance, in 1782, of a pamphlet entitled "The Case of the Episcopal Churches in the United States Considered," written by Rev. William White, of Philadelphia, but published anonymously. In this he urged that, without waiting for a bishop, the churches should unite in some form of association and common government. He also outlined a plan which embodied most of the essential characteristics of the diocesan and general conventions as adopted later.

Meanwhile the Maryland Legislature had, in 1779, passed an act committing to certain vestries, as trustees, the property of the parishes, but also prohibiting general assessments, and affirming the right of each taxpayer to designate the denomination to whose support his contribution should be applied. The next year a conference was called, consisting of 3 clergymen and 24 laymen, and a petition was sent to the legislature asking that the vestries be empowered to raise money for parish uses by pew rents and other means. As it was essential to the petition that the organization have a title, the name Protestant Episcopal Church was suggested as appropriate—the term "Protestant" distinguishing it from the Church of Rome, and the term "Episcopal" distinguishing it from the Presbyterian and Congregational bodies. This name was formally approved by a conference at Annapolis in 1783 and appears to have continued in use until definitely adopted by the General Convention of 1789.

With the close of the war and the desire for a full organization, the Maryland churches elected Dr. William Smith bishop and the Connecticut churches, Dr. Samuel Seabury. No steps were taken by Doctor Smith toward consecration, but Doctor Seabury

went to England and applied to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The latter received him cordially but could not see his way clear to accede to his request under the existing political conditions. Doctor Seabury, therefore, applied to the nonjuring Scottish bishops, who, in November 1784, after some hesitation, consecrated him.

As it became evident that the Episcopal churches of the different States were organizing independently, a movement to constitute an Episcopal Church for the whole United States was inaugurated, largely by the initiative of Dr. William White, at an informal meeting at New Brunswick, N. J., in May 1784. New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania were the only States represented, but correspondence with other States resulted in a convention in New York, in October of the same year, with delegates from 8 States. This was also informal, with no recognized authority, and representing very diverse views, but it adopted, with noteworthy unanimity, a recommendation to the churches, embodying ... fundamental principles [and calling for] ... a general convention...

[p. 1489] When the convention next met, in September 1785, at Philadelphia, 16 clergymen and 24 laymen were present, representing only 7 of the 13 States—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. New England was thus not represented at all, and there were numerous protests from many quarters against the proposed plan of organization. The convention adopted, however, with some modifications, the principles already mentioned and then undertook to draw up a constitution and a liturgy, the latter under the general oversight of Dr. William Smith, and the former under that of Dr. William White...

While no serious disposition to question the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration was manifested, yet the desire was general to be connected with the Church of England rather than with that of Scotland. Accordingly an address to the archbishops and bishops of the former church was prepared, and the State conventions were urged to elect bishops. The reply from England was on the whole favorable, and before the next meeting of the convention, in 1786, New York had elected as its bishop Dr. Samuel Provoost; Pennsylvania, Dr. William White; Maryland, Dr. William Smith; and Virginia, Dr. David Griffith. Of these 4, only Doctor White and Doctor Provoost went to England, where they were consecrated on February 4, 1787. The Episcopal Church was thus equipped to perpetuate its own episcopate at the hands of 3 duly consecrated bishops. Subsequently, Dr. James Madison was elected Bishop of Virginia, and was consecrated in England, so that any objection to the Scottish office was obviated.

In 1789 a union of the different forces was effected and Bishop Seabury joined the other bishops. Two houses were constituted in the General Convention, and the constitution and Book of Common Prayer were adopted. Thus the same year that saw the complete organization of the Federal Government witnessed also the full equipment of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The 4 bishops already mentioned united in 1792 in the consecration of Dr. Thomas John Claggett, as Bishop of Maryland, and thus was inaugurated the distinctively American episcopate.

For 20 years and more the church had to combat various hostile influences. It was widely distrusted as being really an English institution. Its compact organization and its formality of worship repelled many, especially in an age that was peculiarly fond of emotionalism and of an untrammelled freedom in religious as well as social and civil life.

The loss of the Methodist element, which hitherto has been identified with the church, though somewhat loosely, deprived it of some strength. Growth was slow...

In the second decade of the nineteenth century came a change... Little by little the church began to take its place in the development of the Nation. An illustration of the progress made is seen in the fact that the four or five active ministers laboring in Virginia when Bishop Moore came to Richmond in 1814 increased to nearly 100 during the 27 years of his service, and the number of churches increased to 170.

[p. 1490] About 1845, Dr. W. A. Muhlenberg, one of the most remarkable men in the history of the church, came into prominence. He founded the system of church schools, organized the first free church of any importance in New York City, introduced the male choir, sisterhoods, and the fresh-air movement; while his church infirmary suggested to his mind the organization of St. Luke's Hospital, the first church hospital of any Christian communion in the country. He hoped to extend the movement in his own parish to the entire church, transforming it from what he considered a liturgical denomination into a real catholic church. As a result a memorial was drawn up... It had much influence in preparing the way for the issuance of the famous Lambeth Quadrilateral on Church Unity, in 1888, and the movement for the first revision of the American prayer book, completed in 1892.

A generation later, further revision of the prayer book seemed desirable. Accordingly, the General Convention of 1913 appointed the Joint Commission on the Book of Common Prayer... Final approval to the revised book was given by the General Convention of 1928.

The progress of the church, so marked everywhere during the second quarter of the nineteenth century, was abruptly halted by the outbreak of the Civil War. Anticipating the dissolution of the Union, the southern dioceses which were constrained to form a separate ecclesiastical organization held a convention at Columbia, S. C., in 1861. Their general disposition to maintain as close contact as possible with the church in the North resulted in the selection of the name "Protestant Episcopal Church in the Confederate States," and in the adoption of a constitution practically identical with the old one. Throughout the period of hostilities a friendly attitude was carefully maintained on both sides...

[After the war] the progress of the reunited church was promptly resumed...

Although there were naturally different schools of opinion within the church, during the nineteenth century there was only one serious rift to mar the steady progress of the church. This grew out of the question of churchmanship, following the inauguration of the Oxford Movement in England during the second quarter of the century. Discussions on ritual and vestments, "Protestant" and "Catholic," with their attendant doctrinal implications, culminated in the withdrawal from the church in 1873 of a small group of evangelicals under the leadership of Rt. Rev. George D. Cummins, Coadjutor Bishop of Kentucky, who organized the Reformed Episcopal Church...

[p. 1491] The opening years of the twentieth century saw an unprecedented growth in the interest and activities of the Episcopal Church...

The General Convention of 1919 must be regarded as one of the great turning points in the life of the Episcopal Church. A new, permanent, central administration known as the National Council was erected...

One outgrowth of the great missionary conference held in Edinburgh, Scotland in 1910, was the appointment by the General Convention of 1913 of a joint commission for

the purpose of considering questions touching on faith and order, in which all Christian communions should be asked to participate. The commission [p. 1492] invited representatives of a considerable number of churches, including the Roman Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox Churches, to join them, and an advisory committee was formed. The first meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order was held in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1920, the second, in August 1927, at Lausanne, Switzerland, and the third, in August 1937, at Edinburgh, Scotland. Out of this last meeting and the World Conference on Life and Work held in July 1937 at Oxford, England, grew the proposal for the World Council of Churches. A preliminary meeting was held in May 1938 in Utrecht, Holland.

*Doctrine.* The doctrinal symbols of the Protestant Episcopal Church are the Apostles' and Nicene creeds. The Athanasian Creed, one of the symbols of the Church of England, was unanimously rejected by the convention of 1789, chiefly because of its damnatory clauses. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, with the exception of the twenty-first, relating to the authority of the General Council, and with some modifications of the eighth, thirty-fifth, and thirty-sixth articles, were accepted by the convention of 1801 as a general statement of doctrine. Adherence to them as a creed, however, is not required.

The Episcopal Church expects of all its members loyalty to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the one holy Catholic Apostolic Church, in all the essentials, but allows great liberty in non-essentials. There is no inclination to be rigid or to raise difficulties, but the fundamental principles of the church, based upon the Holy Scriptures as the ultimate rule of faith, have been maintained whenever a question has arisen demanding decision.

The clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, instead of signing the Thirty-nine Articles, as is done in the English Church, make the following declaration:

I do believe the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be the Word of God, and to contain all things necessary to salvation, and I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

On this general basis, what is known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral was formulated in England in 1888 for the unity of Christendom:

- (a) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.
- (b) The Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol, and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.
- (c) The two sacraments ordained by Christ himself—baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.
- (d) The historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His church.

In the baptism of children either immersion or pouring is allowed. The child must be presented by sponsors, who may be the parents, who shall answer for the child, accepting the Apostles' Creed, with the implied promise that the child shall be trained to accept the pledges thus made.

For those who have not been baptized in infancy, reception into the church is by baptism, by whatever form may be preferred, and acceptance of the Apostles' Creed. For those who have been baptized, reception is by confirmation by the bishop, after

instruction in the history, worship, and doctrine of the church. Participation in the sacrament of the Holy Communion is, according to the rules of the church, limited to those who have been confirmed, though the custom is now very general of regarding all baptized persons as virtually members of the church, and as such permitted to partake, if they so desire.

*Organization.* The system of ecclesiastical government includes the parish or congregation, the diocese, the province, and the General Convention.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1958), 3,126,662 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257). The General Convention voted, Sept. 23, 1961, to participate in the Presbyterian proposal of a multiple merger (see Nos. 664, 665). However, they stipulated that the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral (see above) be the basis for talks.]

### **1267. Protestantism—Early Triumphs**

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, p. 134.

Within fifty years from the day on which Luther publicly renounced communion with the Papacy, and burned the bull of Leo before the gates of Wittenberg, Protestantism attained its highest ascendancy, an ascendancy which it soon lost, and which it has never regained. Hundreds, who could well remember Brother Martin, a devout Catholic, lived to see the revolution of which he was the chief author, victorious in half the states of Europe. In England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, Livonia, Prussia, Saxony, Hesse, Wurtemberg, the Palatinate, in several cantons of Switzerland, in the Northern Netherlands, the Reformation had completely triumphed; and in all the other countries on this side of the Alps and the Pyrenees, it seemed on the point of triumphing.

### **1268. Protestantism—Post-Reformation Losses**

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, pp. 139–141.

[p. 139] The history of the two succeeding generations is the history of the struggle between Protestantism possessed of the North of Europe, and Catholicism possessed of the South, for the doubtful territory which lay between. All the weapons of carnal and of spiritual warfare were employed. Both sides may boast of great talents and of great virtues. Both have to blush for many follies and crimes. At first, the chances seemed to be decidedly in favour of Protestantism; but the victory remained with the Church of Rome. On every point she was successful. If we overleap another half century, we find her victorious and dominant in France, Belgium, Bavaria, Bohemia, Austria, Poland, and Hungary. Nor has Protestantism, in the course of two hundred years been able to reconquer any portion of what was then lost.

It is, moreover, not to be dissembled that this triumph of the Papacy is to be chiefly attributed, not to the force of arms, but to a great reflux in public opinion...

The war between Luther and Leo was a war between firm faith [p. 140] and unbelief, between zeal and apathy, between energy and indolence, between seriousness and frivolity, between a pure morality and vice. Very different was the war which degenerate Protestantism had to wage against regenerate Catholicism. To the debauchees, the poisoners, the atheists, who had worn the tiara during the generation which preceded the Reformation, had succeeded Popes who, in religious fervour and severe sanctity of manners, might bear a comparison with Cyprian or Ambrose. The order of Jesuits alone could show many men not inferior in sincerity, constancy, courage, and austerity of life, to the apostles of the Reformation. But while danger had thus called forth in the bosom of the Church of Rome many of the highest qualities of the Reformers, the Reformers had

contracted some of the corruptions which had been justly censured in the Church of Rome. They had become lukewarm and worldly. Their great old leaders had been borne to the grave, and had left no successors. Among the Protestant princes there was little or no hearty Protestant feeling...

The whole zeal of the Catholics was directed against the Protestants, while almost the whole zeal of the Protestants was directed against each other. Within the Catholic Church there were no serious disputes on points of doctrine. The decisions of the Council of Trent were received; and the Jansenian controversy had not yet arisen. The whole force of Rome was, therefore, effective for the purpose of carrying on the war against the Reformation. On the other hand, the force which ought to have fought the battle of the Reformation was exhausted in civil conflict. While Jesuit preachers, Jesuit confessors, Jesuit teachers of youth, overspread Europe, eager to expend every faculty of their minds and every drop of their blood in the cause of their Church, Protestant doctors were confuting, and Protestant rulers were punishing, sectaries who were just as good Protestants as themselves...

[p. 141] As the Catholics in zeal and in union had a great advantage over the Protestants, so had they also an infinitely superior organization. In truth, Protestantism, for aggressive purposes, had no organization at all. The Reformed Churches were mere national Churches. The Church of England existed for England alone... The Church of Scotland, in the same manner, existed for Scotland alone. The operations of the Catholic Church, on the other hand, took in the whole world... Our island, the head of the Protestant interest, did not send out a single missionary or a single instructor of youth to the scene of the great spiritual war... The spiritual force of Protestantism was a mere local militia, which might be useful in case of an invasion, but could not be sent abroad, and could therefore make no conquests.

### **1269. Protestantism, Present Trends**

SOURCE: "The New Protestantism," *Time*, 75 (May 30, 1960), 43, 44. Copyright 1960 by Time, Inc., New York; courtesy *Time*.

[p. 43] On certain thin-aired uplands where theologians graze it is growing increasingly difficult to tell a Protestant from a Roman Catholic. To a degree that would have been unthinkable 50 years ago, they [p. 44] read each other's works and build upon each other's researches—though each retains his own faith. In Europe much personal discussion goes on between Roman Catholic and Protestant scholars; Calvinist Theologian Oscar Cullman is welcome at the Vatican, and some of the best studies of Karl Barth have been written by Catholic scholars. In the U.S. there is a growing movement, sparked by Jesuit Father Walter Abbott of the weekly *America*, for the preparation of a common translation of the Bible.

The changes in Protestant thought that lie behind this trend were neatly analyzed last week in the Catholic weekly *Commonweal* by the Rev. Gregory Baum of St. Basil's Seminary in Toronto, Ont.

*New Difficulty.* In North America, during the 19th century and almost up to the present generation, he wrote, there were basically two kinds of Protestants: liberals and fundamentalists. The liberals viewed the New Testament as an amalgam of history and legend in which their scholars searched for "the historical Jesus." ...

Today, Father Baum perceives "a renaissance of Protestant thought." Instead of looking upon the Scriptures as historical material, Protestant thinkers now take them essentially as "the proclamation of the faith of the early Church... What is important, first

of all, is not whether Jesus really said this or that, or really did this or that; what counts is that through the biblical witness the early Church proclaimed its faith in the saving power of Christ...”

This view means that church and tradition have become far more important in Protestant thought, as they have always been in Catholicism. And with this shift, the old-style Catholic arguments against Protestantism “have become somewhat irrelevant, rather empty and even somewhat rationalistic.” ...

The new line “alters the character and flavor of Catholic theological literature. It removes the slightly rationalistic trend of the older approach which created the impression that a man could argue himself into faith, and it imbues the whole of the Catholic teaching with an authentic biblical atmosphere.”

Catholic theologians are looking upon Protestant theologians with a new friendliness and respect. “The change reflects much more than an increase of tolerance; it is rather a consequence of the change that has taken place within Protestantism, change which, on the one hand, leads Protestant theology closer to the tradition of the Church and, on the other, offers, by its profundity, a true challenge to Catholic theology.”

### **1270. Purgatory, and Alleged Power of Good Works**

SOURCE: Joseph Husslein, *The Souls in Purgatory*, p. 32. Copyright 1924 by The America Press, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 126.]

Other good works, too, may be performed for the Poor Souls. Especially approved throughout all the history of the Church has been the offering of alms for their sake. We are told that as water extinguishes fire, so alms destroy sins. Without any doubt, says St. Augustine, “will the departed souls obtain relief when the Sacrifice of the Mediator (*i. e.*, the Holy Mass) is offered for them, or alms are spent in the Church.” (*Enchiridion*, c. 110.) Such alms may of course be given anywhere. “We are too forgetful of our dear departed,” St. Francis de Sales often said.

### **1271. Purgatory, Duration of Purification in, Held Unknown**

SOURCE: Joseph Husslein, *The Souls in Purgatory*, p. 21. Copyright 1924 by The America Press, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 126.]

While Purgatory itself is limited by the last judgment, we cannot speak with equal certainty of the length of time during which individual souls may have to undergo their purification, that they be rendered fit to enter into the sight of the All-Holy God. The duration of Purgatory may extend for some over many years. Of this we are practically certain, since it is the custom of the Church herself to offer up anniversary Masses for individual souls during hundreds of years.

### **1272. Purgatory, Trent Decree Concerning**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXV (Dec. 3 and 4, 1563), Decree Concerning Purgatory, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 165. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the Sacred Writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred councils, and very recently in this oecumenical synod that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the holy synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavour that the sound doctrine concerning Purgatory, transmitted by the holy Fathers and sacred councils, be believed, maintained, taught and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ.

---

<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.