

1273. Reformation, Advance Preparation for

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, "Reformation," *An Religious Encyclopaedia*, ed. by Philip Schaff and others, Vol. 3 (3d ed., rev.; New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1891), p. 2004.

It [the Reformation] was not an abrupt revolution, but had its roots in the middle ages. There were many "reformers before the Reformation," and almost every doctrine of Luther and Calvin had its advocates long before them. The whole struggling of mediaeval Catholicism toward reform and liberty; the long conflict between the German emperors and the popes; the reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel; the Waldenses and Albigenses in France and Northern Italy; Wiclif and the Lollards in England; Hus and the Hussites in Bohemia; Arnold of Brescia, and Savonarola, in Italy; the spiritualistic piety and theology of the mystics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the theological writings of Wesel, Woch, and Wessel, in Germany and the Netherlands; the rise of the national languages and letters in connection with the feeling of national independence; the invention of the printing-press; the revival of letters and classical learning under the direction of Agricola, Reuchlin, and Erasmus,—all these, and similar movements, were preparations for the Reformation. The evangelical churches claim a share in the inheritance of all preceding history, and own their indebtedness to the missionaries, schoolmen, fathers, confessors, and martyrs of former ages, but acknowledge no higher authority than Christ and his inspired organs.

1274. Reformation, Importance in History

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, pp. 204, 205.

[p. 204] The Reformation of the sixteenth century is, next to the introduction of Christianity, the greatest event in history. It was no sudden revolution; for what has no roots in the past can have no permanent effect upon the future. It was prepared by the deeper tendencies and aspirations of previous centuries, and, when finally matured, it burst forth almost simultaneously in all parts of Western Christendom. It was not a superficial amendment, not a mere restoration, but a regeneration; not a return to the Augustinian, or Nicene, or ante-Nicene age, but a vast progress beyond any previous age or condition of the Church since the death of St. John. It went, through the intervening ages of ecclesiasticism, back to the fountain-head of Christianity itself, as it came from the lips of the Son of God and his inspired Apostles... It brought out from this fountain a new phase and type of Christianity, which had never as yet been fully understood and appreciated in the Church at large. It was, in fact, a new proclamation of the free Gospel of St. Paul, as laid down in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. It was grand act of emancipation from the bondage of the mediaeval hierarchy, and an assertion of that freedom wherewith Christ has made us free. It inaugurated the era of manhood and the general priesthood of believers. It taught the direct communion of the believing soul with Christ. It removed the obstructions of legalism, sacerdotalism, and ceremonialism, which, [p. 205] like the traditions of the Pharisees of old, had obscured the genuine Gospel and made void the Word of God.

1275. Reformation—Luther and the Holy Staircase at Rome

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 6 (New York: Scribner, 1901), pp. 128, 129.

[p. 128] When Luther came in sight of the eternal city, he fell upon the earth, raised his hands and exclaimed, "Hail to thee, holy Rome! Thrice holy for the blood of martyrs shed here." He passed the colossal ruins of heathen Rome and the gorgeous palaces of Christian Rome. But he ran, "like a crazy saint," through all the churches and crypts and

catacombs with an [p. 129] unquestioning faith in the legendary traditions about the relics and miracles of martyrs. He wished that his parents were dead that he might help them out of purgatory by reading mass in the most holy place, according to the saying: “Blessed is the mother whose son celebrates mass on Saturday in St. John of the Lateran.” He [Luther] ascended on bended knees the twenty-eight steps of the famous Scala Santa (said to have been transported from the Judgment Hall of Pontius Pilate in Jerusalem), that he might secure the indulgence attached to this ascetic performance since the days of Pope Leo IV. in 850, but at every step the word of the Scripture sounded as a significant protest in his ear: “The just shall live by faith” (Rom 1:17).² [Note 2: This interesting incident rests on the authority of his son Paul, who heard it from the lips of his father in 1544. Modern Popes, Pius VII. and Pius IX., have granted additional indulgences to those who climb up the Scala Santa.]

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Scholars differ as to what Luther said or thought as he climbed these stairs on his knees. See two quotations in *SDACom*, Vol. 7, p. 50.]

1276. Reformation—Luther’s Ninety five Theses

SOURCE: Louis L. Snyder, ed., *Documents of German History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1958), pp. 63–66. Copyright © 1958 by Rutgers, The State University. Used by permission.

[p. 63] *Extracts from Luther’s Ninety-Five Theses, October 31, 1517. Disputation of Dr. Martin Luther Concerning Indulgences*

In the desire and with the purpose of elucidating the truth, a disputation will be held on the underwritten propositions at Wittenberg, under the presidency of the Reverend Father Martin Luther, monk of the order of St. Augustine, Master of Arts and Sacred Theology, and ordinary lecturer in the same at that place. He therefore asks those who cannot be present and discuss the subject with us orally to do so by letter in their absence. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

1. Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ in saying “Repent ye” [*poenitentiam agite*], etc., intended that the whole life of believers should be penitence [*poenitentia*]. [Brackets in Snyder.]
2. This word cannot be understood as sacramental penance, that is, the confession and satisfaction which are performed under the ministry of priests.
3. It does not, on the other hand, refer solely to inward penitence; nay, such inward penitence is naught, unless it outwardly produces various mortifications of the flesh.
4. The penalty [for sin] must thus continue as long as the hatred of self—that is, true inward penitence; namely, till our entrance into the kingdom of heaven.
5. The Pope has neither the will nor the power to remit any penalties except those which he has imposed by his own authority, or by that of the canons.
6. The Pope has no power to remit any guilt, except by declaring and warranting it to have been remitted by God; or at most by remitting cases reserved for himself; in which cases, if his power were despised, guilt would certainly remain.
7. Certainly God remits no man’s guilt without at the same time subjecting him, humbled in all things, to the authority of his representative, the priest...
20. Therefore the Pope, when he speaks of the plenary remission of all penalties, does not mean really of all, but only of those imposed by himself.
21. Thus those preachers of indulgences are in error who say that [p. 64] by the indulgences of the Pope a man is freed and saved from all punishment.

22. For in fact he remits to souls in purgatory no penalty which they would have had to pay in this life according to the canons.
23. If any entire remission of all penalties can be granted to anyone, it is certain that it is granted to none but the most perfect, that is, to very few.
24. Hence the greater part of the people must needs be deceived by this indiscriminate and high-sounding promise of release from penalties...
27. They preach mad, who say that the soul flies out of purgatory as soon as the money thrown into the chest rattles.
28. It is certain that when the money rattles in the chest, avarice and gain may be increased, but the suffrage of the Church depends on the will of God alone...
32. Those who believe that, through letters of pardon, they are made sure of their own salvation, will be eternally damned along with their teachers.
33. We must especially beware of those who say that these pardons from the Pope are that inestimable gift of God by which man is reconciled to God.
34. For the grace conveyed by these pardons has respect only to the penalties of sacramental satisfaction, which are of human appointment.
35. They preach no Christian doctrine, who teach that contrition is not necessary for those who buy souls out of purgatory or buy confessional licenses.
36. Every Christian who feels true compunction has of right plenary remission of pain and guilt, even without letters of pardon.
37. Every true Christian, whether living or dead, has a share in all the benefits of Christ and of the Church ... even without letters of pardon...
39. It is a very difficult thing, even for the most learned theologians, to exalt at the same time, in the eyes of the people, the ample effect of pardons and the necessity of true contrition...
42. Christians should be taught that it is not the mind of the Pope that the buying of pardons is to be in any way compared to works of mercy.
43. Christians should be taught that he who gives to a poor man, or lends to a needy man, does better than if he bought pardons...
50. Christians should be taught that if the Pope were acquainted [p. 65] with the exactions of the preachers of pardons, he would prefer that the basilica of St. Peter should be burnt to ashes, than that it should be built up with the skin, flesh, and bones of his sheep...
52. Vain is the hope of salvation through letters of pardon, even if a commissary—nay, the Pope himself—were to pledge his own soul for them...
56. The treasures of the Church, whence the Pope grants indulgences, are neither sufficiently named nor known among the people of Christ.
57. It is clear that they are at least not temporal treasures, for these are not so readily lavished, but only accumulated, by many of the preachers.
58. Nor are they the merits of Christ and of the saints, for these, independently of the Pope, are always working grace to the inner man, and the cross, death, and hell to the outer man...
62. The true treasure of the Church is the Holy Gospel of the glory and grace of God...
63. This treasure, however, is naturally most hateful, because it makes the first to be last;
64. While the treasure of indulgences is naturally most acceptable, because it makes the last to be first.

65. Hence the treasures of the Gospel are nets, wherewith of old they fished for the men of riches.
66. The treasures of indulgences are nets, wherewith they now fish for of the riches of men...
75. To think that Papal pardons have such power that they could absolve a man even if—by an impossibility—he had violated the Mother of God, is madness.
76. We affirm on the contrary that papal pardons cannot take away even the least of venial sins, as regards its guilt...
81. This license in the preaching of pardons makes it no easy thing, even for learned men, to protect the reverence due to the Pope against the calumnies, or, at all events, the keen questionings of the laity.
82. As, for instance: Why does not the Pope empty purgatory for the sake of his most holy charity and of the supreme necessity of souls—this being the most just of all reasons—if he redeems an infinite number of souls for the sake of that most fatal thing, money, to be spent on building a basilica—this being a very slight reason?
83. Again: Why do funeral masses and anniversary masses for the deceased continue, and why does not the Pope return, or permit [p. 66] the withdrawal of, the funds bequeathed for this purpose, since it is a wrong to pray for those who are already redeemed? ...
86. Again: Why does not the Pope, whose riches are at this day more ample than those of Croesus, build the basilica of St. Peter with his own money rather than with that of poor believers? ...
88. Again: What greater good could the Church receive than if the Pope were to bestow these remissions and participations a hundred times a day, instead of once, as he does now, on any one of the faithful? ...
90. To repress these scruples and arguments of the laity by force alone, and not to solve them by giving reasons, is to expose the Church and the Pope to the ridicule of their enemies, and to make christian men unhappy.
91. If, then, pardons were preached according to the spirit and wish of the Pope, all these questions would be solved with ease; nay, would not exist.
92. Away then with all those prophets who say to the people of Christ: “Peace, peace,” and there is no peace.
93. Blessed be all those prophets who say to the people of Christ: “The cross, the cross,” and there is no cross.
94. Christians should be exhorted to strive to follow Christ their head through pains, deaths, and hells.
95. And thus trust to enter heaven through many tribulations, rather than in the security of peace.

1277. Reformation—Luther’s Reply Before the Diet at Worms on April 18, 1521

SOURCE: Henry Bettenson, ed., *Documents of the Christian* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), pp. 282–285. Used by permission.

[p. 282] The Diet of Worms, 1521

Luther’s Final Answer, 18 April

[Introductory note:] Leo’s excommunication of Luther, in the Bull *Exsurge Domine*, was published in Saxony in the autumn of 1520. But the Elector refused to carry it out. Luther finally repudiated the Pope and [p. 283] burned the Bull publicly. In January 1521 the Pope issued another and stronger Bull, and called upon the Emperor to put it into effect. Charles V wished to secure himself against Francis I by using

the threat of Luther to bring the Pope to heel, and at the same time to assert his independence of the Pope, and to grant Luther a show of justice sufficient to satisfy the anti-papal sentiment in Germany. A diet was summoned, the papal case was stated, and Luther was given his chance to recant. After this final answer of Luther, Charles announced his intention of suppressing heresy and secured his alliance with Leo. The Edict of Worms put Luther under the Imperial ban, and forbade the printing of his works or the proclamation or defense of his opinions.

... [Eck, Official of the Archbishop of Trier, asked Luther.] Do you wish to defend the books which are recognized as your work? Or to retract anything contained in them?

...

... [Luther replied.] Most Serene Lord Emperor, Most Illustrious Princes, Most Gracious Lords ... I beseech you to grant a gracious hearing to my plea, which, I trust, will be a plea of justice and truth; and if through my inexperience I neglect to give to any their proper titles or in any way offend against the etiquette of the court in my manners or behavior, be kind enough to forgive me, I beg, since I am a man who has spent his life not in courts but in the cells of a monastery; a man who can say of himself only this, that to this day I have thought and written in simplicity of heart, solely with a view to the glory of God and the pure instruction of Christ's faithful people...

... Your Imperial Majesty and Your Lordships: I ask you to observe that my books are not all of the same kind.

There are some in which I have dealt with piety in faith and morals with such simplicity and so agreeably with the Gospels that my adversaries themselves are compelled to admit them useful, harmless, and clearly worth reading by Christian. Even the Bull, harsh and cruel though it is, makes some of my books harmless, although it condemns them also, by a judgment downright monstrous. If I should begin to recant here, what, I beseech you, should I be doing [p. 284] but condemning, alone among mortals, that truth which is admitted by friends and foes alike, in an unaided struggle against universal consent?

The second kind consists in those writings leveled against the papacy and the doctrine of the papists, as against those who by their wicked doctrines and precedents have laid waste Christendom by doing harm to the souls and the bodies of men. No one can either deny or conceal this, for universal experience and world-wide grievances are witnesses to the fact that through the Pope's laws and through man-made teachings the consciences of the faithful have been most pitifully ensnared, troubled, and racked in torment, and also that their goods and possessions have been devoured (especially amongst this famous German nation) by unbelievable tyranny, and are to this day being devoured without end in shameful fashion; and that though they themselves by their own laws take care to provide that the Pope's laws and doctrines which are contrary to the Gospel or the teachings of the Fathers are to be considered erroneous and reprobate. If then I recant these, the only effect will be to add strength to such tyranny, to open not the windows but the main doors to such blasphemy, which will thereupon stalk farther and more widely than it has hitherto dared...

The third kind consists of those books which I have written against private individuals, so-called; against those, that is, who have exerted themselves in defense of the Roman tyranny and to the overthrow of that piety which I have taught. I confess that I have been more harsh against them than befits my religious vows and my profession. For I do not make myself out to be any kind of saint, nor am I now contending about my conduct but about Christian doctrine. But it is not in my power to recant them, because

that recantation would give that tyranny and blasphemy an occasion to lord it over those whom I defend and to rage against God's people more violently than ever.

However, since I am a man and not God, I cannot provide my writings with any other defense than that which my [p. 285] Lord Jesus Christ provided for his teaching. When he had been interrogated concerning his teaching before Annas and had received a buffet from a servant, he said: 'If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil.' If the Lord himself, who knew that he could not err, did not refuse to listen to witness against his teaching, even from a worthless slave, how much more ought I, scum that I am, capable of naught but error, to seek and to wait for any who may wish to bear witness against my teaching.

And so, through the mercy of God, I ask Your Imperial Majesty, and Your Illustrious Lordships, or anyone of any degree, to bear witness, to overthrow my errors, to defeat them by writings of the Prophets or by the Gospel; for I shall be most ready, if I be better instructed, to recant any error, and I shall be the first in casting my writings into the fire...

Thereupon the Orator of the Empire, in a tone of upbraiding, said that his answer was not to the point, and that there should be no calling into question of matters on which condemnations and decisions had before been passed by Councils. He was being asked for a plain reply, without subtlety or sophistry, to this question: Was he prepared to recant, or no?

Luther then replied: Your Imperial Majesty and Your Lordships demand a simple answer. Here it is, plain and unvarnished. Unless I am convicted of error by the testimony of Scripture or (since I put no trust in the unsupported authority of Pope or of councils, since it is plain that they have often erred and often contradicted themselves) by manifest reasoning I stand convicted by the Scriptures to which I have appealed, and my conscience is taken captive by God's word, I cannot and will not recant anything, for to act against our conscience is neither safe for us, nor open to us.

On this I take my stand. I can do no other. God help me. Amen.³ [Note 3: The last words are given in German: Hier stehe ich. Ich kann nicht anders. Gott helff mir. Amen.] (*Op. Lat.* vi. 8. Kidd, No. 42.)

[EDITORS' NOTE: Brackets in text on p. 283 are Bettenson's.]

1278. Reformation, Milton on

SOURCE: John Milton, "Of Reformation in England," *The Prose Works of John Milton*, Vol. 2 (London: George Bell and Sons, 1888), pp. 366–368.

[p. 366] When I recall to mind at last, after so many dark ages, wherein the huge overshadowing train of error had almost swept all the stars out of the firmament of the church; how the bright and blissful Reformation (by divine power) struck through [p. 367] the black and settled night of ignorance and antichristian tyranny, methinks a sovereign and reviving joy must needs rush into the bosom of him that reads or hears; and the sweet odour of the returning gospel imbathe his soul with the fragrancy of heaven. Then was the sacred Bible sought out of the dusty corners where profane falsehood and neglect had thrown it, the schools opened, divine and human learning raked out of the embers of forgotten tongues, the princes and cities trooping apace to the new erected banner of salvation; [p. 368] the martyrs, with the unresistable might of weakness, shaking the powers of darkness, and scorning the fiery rage of the old red dragon.

1279. Reformation, Produced Counter Reformation in Catholicism

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, pp. 135–139.

[p. 135] It is not, therefore, strange that the effect of the great outbreak of Protestantism in one part of Christendom should have been to produce an equally violent outbreak of Catholic zeal in another. Two reformations were pushed on at once with equal energy and effect, a reformation of doctrine in the North, a reformation of manners and discipline in the South. In the course of a single generation, the whole spirit of the Church of Rome underwent a change... All the institutions anciently devised for the propagation and defence of the faith were refurbished up and made efficient. Fresh engines of still more formidable power were constructed. Every where old religious communities were remodelled and new religious communities called into existence...

[p. 136] With what vehemence, with what policy, with what exact discipline, with what dauntless courage, with what self-denial, with what forgetfulness of the dearest private ties, with what intense and stubborn devotion to a single end, with what unscrupulous laxity and versatility in the choice of means, the Jesuits fought the battle of their church, is written in every page of the annals of Europe during several generations. In the [p. 137] order of Jesus was concentrated the quintessence of the Catholic spirit; and the history of the order of Jesus is the history of the great Catholic reaction. That order possessed itself at once of all the strongholds which command the public mind, of the pulpit, of the press, of the confessional, of the academies... Nor was it less their office to plot against the thrones and lives of apostate kings, to spread evil rumours, to raise tumults, to inflame civil wars, to arm the hand of the assassin. Inflexible in nothing but in their fidelity to the Church, they were equally ready to appeal in her cause to the spirit of loyalty and ... freedom...

The spirit which appeared so eminently in this order animated the whole Catholic world. The Court of Rome itself was purified. During the generation which preceded the Reformation, that court [the papal court] had been a scandal to the Christian name. Its annals are black with treason, murder, and incest. Even its more respectable members were utterly unfit to be ministers of religion... [p. 138] But when the great stirring of the mind of Europe began, when doctrine after doctrine was assailed, when nation after nation withdrew from communion with the successor of St. Peter, it was felt that the Church could not be safely confided to chiefs whose highest praise was that they were good judges of Latin compositions, of paintings, and of statues, whose severest studies had a pagan character, and who were suspected of laughing in secret at the sacraments which they administered... Men of a very different class now rose to the direction of ecclesiastical affairs, men whose spirit resembled that of Dunstan and of Becket. The Roman Pontiffs exhibited in their own persons all the austerity of the early anchorites of Syria... As was the head, such were the members. The change in the spirit of the Catholic world may be traced in every walk of literature and of art...

But it was not on moral influence alone that the Catholic Church relied. The civil sword in Spain and Italy was unsparingly employed in her support. The Inquisition was armed with new powers and inspired with a new energy. If Protestantism, or the semblance of Protestantism, showed itself in any quarter, it was instantly met, not by petty, teasing persecution, but by persecution of that sort which bows down and crushes all but a very few select spirits...

[p. 139] Thus, while the Protestant reformation proceeded rapidly at one extremity of Europe, the Catholic revival went on as rapidly at the other.

1280. Reformation—Resulting Divisions of Protestantism

SOURCE: Alexander Campbell, *Christian Baptism* (Bethany, Va.: Alexander Campbell, 1853), p. 15.

It [the Reformation] ended in a Protestant hierarchy, and swarms of dissenters. Protestantism has been reformed into Presbyterianism,—that into Congregationalism,—and that into Baptism &c. &c. Methodism has attempted to reform all, but has reformed itself into many forms of Wesleyism... All of them retain in their bosom, in their ecclesiastic organizations, worship, doctrines, and observances, various relics of Popery. They are, at best, but a reformation of Popery, and only reformations in part. The doctrines and traditions of men yet impair the power and progress of the gospel in their hands.

1281. Reformation, Zurich Articles

SOURCE: William A. Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith* (New York: Scribner, 1912), pp. 195, 196. Used by permission of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[p. 195] *The Sixty-seven Articles of Zürich* were prepared for, and maintained at, the great public disputation held in that city in 1523, which virtually decided the repudiation of Rome. They thus correspond to Luther's Theses of six years before. Though not enforced as a standard, they were an epoch-making theological manifesto, and exercised a certain local normative function... The Reformation produced no more impressive or thought-provoking document. Their scope, purport, and form may best be gathered from a few examples in their own words.

1. All who say that the Gospel is nothing without the approval of the Church err and cast reproach upon God.
2. The sum of the Gospel is that our Lord Jesus Christ, the true Son of God, has made known to us the will of His heavenly Father, and redeemed us by His innocence from eternal death and reconciled us to God.
3. Therefore Christ is the only way to salvation for all who were, who are, who shall be.
- 7, 8. Christ is the Head of all believers. All who live in this Head are His members, and children of God. And this is the true Catholic Church, the Communion of saints.
17. Christ is the one eternal High Priest. Therefore those who give themselves out as high priests are opposed to the glory and power of Christ and reject Christ.
18. Christ, who offered Himself once on the Cross, is the sufficient [p. 196] and perpetual sacrifice for the sins of all believers. Therefore the Mass is no sacrifice, but a commemoration of the one sacrifice of the Cross and a seal of the redemption through Christ.
22. Christ is our righteousness. Hence it follows that our works are good so far as they are Christ's, but not good so far as they are our own.
27. All Christians are brethren of Christ, and brethren one with another: therefore they ought not to call any one "father" upon earth. This does away with orders, sects, factions, etc.
34. The so-called spiritual power has no ground for its display in the teaching of Christ.
49. Greater scandal I know not than that priests should be forbidden lawful wedlock but allowed for money to have concubines. Shame on it!
50. God alone forgives sins, and that through Christ Jesus, our Lord, alone.
52. Confession therefore to priest or neighbour ought not to be for remission of sins but for consultation.
57. Holy Scripture knows of no purgatory after this life.
58. The judgment of the deceased is known to God alone.

59. The less that God reveals to us concerning these matters, the less ought they to be searched into by us.
60. If any one in anxiety for the dead beseeches or prays for favour to them from God, I do not condemn him; but to appoint a time concerning it,—a seven-year for a mortal sin,—and to lie for profit, is not human but devilish.
62. Scripture knows no other presbyters or priests than those who proclaim God's word.

1282. Reformed Bodies, General Statement Concerning

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1496, 1497.*

[p. 1496] *General Statement.* The churches, aside from the Lutheran, that were the direct outcome of the Protestant reformation, trace their ecclesiastical origin to republican Switzerland, and those leaders in the cause of representative government, Zwingli, Calvin, and Melancthon. Of these the Swiss, Dutch, and some German churches came to be known as "Reformed," the Scotch and English as Presbyterian, and the French as Huguenot, while those in Bohemia and Hungary preserved their national names.

In the early colonization of America, Dutch and Germans, as well as Scotch and English, were prominent, and as a result there are four Reformed churches, two tracing their origin to Holland, one to the German Palatinate, and one to Hungary. The first church in New Amsterdam was organized by the Dutch in 1628, and for a considerable time the Hollanders were practically limited to that neighborhood. Somewhat later a German colony, driven from the Palatinate by the ruthless persecution of Louis XIV, settled in upper New York and Pennsylvania, and, as it grew, spread westward. Another Dutch immigration, which established its headquarters in Michigan, identified itself with the New York branch, but afterwards a minor part formed its own ecclesiastical organization. The New York branch, known at first as the Reformed Dutch Church, later adopted the title "Reformed Church in America"; similarly, the German Reformed Church became the Reformed Church in the United States. The third body is known as the Christian Reformed Church; while a fourth is styled the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America. This denomination was organized in 1924 by certain congregations which refused to accept the "Tiffin agreement," under whose terms the majority of the churches constituting the former Hungarian Reformed Church in America were formally transferred to the jurisdiction of the Reformed Church in the United States. There are also a small number of congregations called Netherlands Dutch, and Protestant Reformed Churches, and some Hungarian churches, which have no general ecclesiastical organization and are included under the head of Independent churches.

In its earlier history each body clung to its ancestral language, a practice which not infrequently checked a natural growth, although it had the advantage of giving to the newcomers a congenial church life, to which is largely due the fact that these community have grown up loyal to the best interests both of their mother church and of their new country. As conditions changed, the use of English was accepted, and the older churches blended with the general interests of the community.

In their doctrine, polity, and general public life, the Reformed churches remain conservative. New ideas, simply because novel, have not had ready acceptance; yet new forms of organization, such as the various societies for young people and similar enterprises, have found a cordial welcome. In interdenominational relations they have always been friendly, are members of the Alliance of Reformed Churches, and early

inaugurated foreign mission work. They have stood for high standards in education and scholarship and have furnished many men prominent in public life.

In doctrine they are generally Calvinistic. Their Heidelberg catechism emphasizes the general comfort of redemption in Christ, while the Westminster catechism teaches the same and emphasizes the sovereignty of God. The polity is presbyterian, differing from that of the Presbyterian churches only in the names of church offices and some minor details...

In 1926 it was noted that the Hungarian Reformed Church in America had been transferred to the jurisdiction of the [p. 1497] Reformed Church in the United States, with the exception of a few churches which did not approve the merger and organized in 1924 as the Free Magyar Reformed Church in America. Prior to 1936 the Reformed Church in the United States merged with the Evangelical Synod of North America under the name "Evangelical and Reformed Church," [which in turn became a part of the United Church of Christ in 1957].

1283. Reformed Bodies—Christian Reformed Church

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1515, 1516.*

[p. 1515] *History.* In 1846–47 a colony from Holland settled in Michigan and gave the names of their old provinces to their new homes, such as Zeeland, Vriesland, Holland, etc. Those in Iowa chose the significant name of "Pella" for their place of refuge. Practically all joined the Dutch Reformed Church [now the Reformed Church in America] in 1849, but when this union was formed they made an express condition that "they would be most perfectly free at any time they found an ecclesiastical connection opposed to their religious prosperity and enjoyment to bid (the Reformed Church) a fraternal adieu and be by themselves."

After some years a number of the members and two of the ministers of the Michigan congregations considered that various things in the doctrines and discipline of the church they had joined were opposed to their prosperity and enjoyment, and after considerable friction they withdrew April 8, 1857. Delegates from six churches met in Holland, Mich., in May 1857 and effected a separate organization. Two years later the name of "Holland Reformed Church" was adopted as the denominational title, but in 1861 it was changed to "True Dutch Reformed." In 1880 the name "Holland Christian Reformed Church in America" was chosen, but in 1890 the word "Holland" was dropped, and in 1904 the words "in America" were eliminated, so that the official title today is "Christian Reformed Church."

At first the growth was slow. Two of the congregations disappeared from the roll the year after organization, and one of the clergymen returned to the Reformed Church, leaving as sole pastor of the denomination Rev. K. Van den Bosch. Owing to different opinions in regard to ecclesiastical customs, considerable agitation arose among the members. In 1864 Rev. D. J. Van der Werp, an earnest preacher and a talented writer, came from the Netherlands to settle as pastor of the church at Graafschap, Allegan County, Mich. Coming into relations with recent immigrants from the Netherlands and from Germany (Bentheim and East Friesland), and finding many who were dissatisfied with the conditions in the Reformed Church, he succeeded within a few years in [p. 1516] organizing a number of congregations in Wisconsin, Iowa, and Illinois, as well as in Michigan. He also began to train young men for the ministry, thus laying the foundation of the present theological school and Calvin College, which were formally opened in

1876 in Grand Rapids, Mich. In 1868 he began the publication of a biweekly paper, *De Wachter* (The Watchman), and through this medium was able to extend the influence of the movement in many directions.

In 1880 the first home missionary was ordained for the organization of churches among the Reformed Hollanders and East Frisians scattered in different parts of the United States. This home mission work, aided by increasing immigration and a constantly growing number of graduates from the theological school, has been the chief instrument in causing the comparatively rapid growth of the church in recent years.

The denomination was strengthened considerably in 1882 by the accession of half a dozen churches which, with their pastors, had left the Reformed Church because of the refusal of its General Synod to condemn freemasonry and to discipline communicant members who were members of that organization. A further considerable increase came in 1890 when the Classis of Hackensack united with the denomination. This classis was the remnant of the True Reformed Dutch Church, which in 1822 had withdrawn from the General Synod of the Reformed Church in America (then called the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church) because of its alleged departure from Calvinistic teaching and preaching and from the exercise of church discipline.

In their early history the language of the churches was almost exclusively Dutch, but what became known as the “Americanization movement” in Michigan was strengthened by the formation of an English-speaking congregation in Grand Rapids, Mich., and the addition of the Hackensack Classis, which had been using English from the beginning. In the city congregations in all instances the use of English has increased very fast since the World War, so that nearly all conduct their services each Sunday in the English language. All of the Sunday-school work and catechism teaching is, likewise, carried on in English. In Iowa and Minnesota about half a dozen rural churches still make very limited use of the German language...

Doctrine. The creeds of the Christian Reformed Church are those of the Reformed Churches which trace their origin to Holland, namely, the Belgic Confession of Faith, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of Dort.

In the Dutch services, the Psalms are sung exclusively, except that a few “Spiritual Songs” are used as a supplement to the Psalter, and in all congregations a Psalter-Hymnal, published in 1934, and besides the 150 Psalms including 141 hymns, has taken the place of the Psalter version published, in 1912, by a committee of the United Presbyterian Church, based on the labors of a joint committee of nine American and Canadian denominations.

Organization. The church adopted as its constitution the 86 articles of church government (the Church Order) approved by the National Synod of Dort in 1619, insofar as they were suited to American civil conditions. These articles provide for a strictly presbyterian order of polity, including the parity of the ministry and the joint rule of the elders of the different congregations.

The first organization of all the congregations was called a “classis” (presbytery). From 1865 to 1879 general assemblies were held annually. In 1880 the name “synod” was adopted for the annual meeting of all the churches as one body.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Membership (1959), 236,145 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257.)]

1284. Reformed Bodies—Reformed Church in America (Dutch Reformed Church)

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, pp. 1504–1506.*

[p. 1504] *History.* The Reformed Church in America traces its origin to the Reformed Church in Holland. After the Reformation had triumphed in the northern provinces of the Netherlands, Holland became a stronghold of the Protestant faith and a refuge from persecution in other countries. The congregations worshiped at first as “The Churches of the Netherlands under the Cross,” but before 1560 a united organization had been formed, and 1566 and 1568 important synods were in session. The presbyterian form of government, as set forth by Calvin, was adopted; ministers, elders, and deacons were the constituted officers, and, in the local church, formed the consistory. The Belgic Confession of Faith and the Heidelberg Catechism were adopted as the standards of doctrine. A liturgy drawn from early sources and from liturgies in use elsewhere at the time was introduced in the churches. In 1618–19 the canons of the Synod of Dort were also made a doctrinal standard.

The Reformed religion came to New Netherland with the earliest Dutch settlers. “Comforters of the Sick” were commissioned to minister to the spiritual needs of the colonists. They conducted informal religious services until the arrival of the first minister of the New Amsterdam Church, Rev. Jonas Michaelius, on April 7, 1628. In that same year the church, now known as the “Collegiate Church,” the oldest church in the Middle States, was formally organized.

At first the work in America was in charge of the Synod of Holland, or more directly, the Classis of Amsterdam. The ministers, who were few in number, came from Holland. Toward the middle of the eighteenth century the exercise of authority here became the occasion of sharp and protracted controversy, and two parties arose, the Coetus and Conferentie, the issue in the latter part of the century being the entire independence of the American church.

[p. 1505] The education and ordination of ministers were the chief points of controversy. Not enough ministers were coming from Holland. It was a long, difficult, and expensive thing to send young men to Holland for education or for ordination if educated here. Foremost in advocating education and ordination in this country were Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen, who came in 1719–20 to serve the churches in the Raritan Valley, in New Jersey, and his sons, John and Theodorus. Following their efforts and under the immediate leadership of Jacob Rutsen Hardenbergh, then minister of the Raritan Valley churches, and Hendrick Fisher the elder, a college was founded. It was one of the nine colonial colleges and received its first charter in 1766 and its second in 1770 from George III of England. It was located at New Brunswick, N. J., was called Queen’s College; in 1825 its name was changed to Rutgers College. John Henry Livingston was appointed professor of theology in 1784. This was the beginning of the first theological seminary to be established in this country. The founding of the college and the seminary practically coincided with the emerging of the church into its independent American organization.

John Henry Livingston, returning in 1770 from theological study at Utrecht to take charge of the New York church, brought with him a plan of union which formally united the church and made virtually complete the independent authority which had been growing for 20 years. A General Body and five Particular Bodies were created. In 1792 a more formal constitution was adopted, and in 1794 the General Synod was organized. The presbyterian form of government was retained and the three doctrinal standards brought from the Netherlands continued to be the accepted standards of the church. The

liturgy was adopted in 1771, although some changes have been made in it from time to time. The constitution also has been revised at different times, the last extensive revision having been made in 1916. Two names were in use at the time of the adoption of the constitution in 1792—namely, “The Dutch Reformed Church in North America” and “The Reformed Dutch Church in the United States of America.” In 1819 the church was incorporated as “The Reformed Protestant Dutch Church.” In 1867 the name was changed to “The Reformed Church in America.”

The church spread and grew strong in New York and New Jersey. In the middle of the nineteenth century it received an increment of great importance and promise in the large Dutch immigration. This immigration was made up of whole congregations which, with their ministers, sought relief from religious troubles in the homeland. In 1850 the first of these congregations became formally a part of the Reformed Church in America. These people settled in the North and Middle West, beginning in Michigan and Iowa. The coming of such colonists continued, their descendants multiplied, and they spread through these and neighboring States. New congregations were and are still constantly being formed. Thus, in the West, as well as in the East, the strength of the church has increased. An outgrowth of the Dutch settlement and religious life in the West was the founding of Hope College at Holland, Mich., in 1866, and of the Western Theological Seminary. Central College, at Pella, Iowa, became a Reformed Church institution in 1916. The Northwestern Classical Academy, at Orange City, Iowa, added a junior college in 1928.

The earliest efforts of the church toward general extension in domestic mission lines were begun in 1786 when the church at Saratoga petitioned the synod for a minister, and a committee was appointed to devise some plan of preaching the Gospel in destitute localities. This was followed by similar applications from Dutch families in Pennsylvania and Kentucky, while a number of churches in Canada were also cared for. For many years the Classis of Albany acted as agent of the synod in looking after such localities in the North. The Canadian churches were subsequently transferred to the Presbyterians. In 1806 the General Synod assumed the management of all missionary operations, and it continued to send out itinerants, though not a few of the churches planted failed to develop on account of lack of frequent ministrations.

In 1822 several private individuals formed the Missionary Society of the Reformed Dutch Church, which was soon adopted by the synod. A similar organization was started at Albany in 1828, and in 1831 the Board of Domestic Missions was organized. From that time the movement became more aggressive. In 1837 a church was organized in Illinois, followed in a few years by churches in Michigan and Wisconsin. With the development of Dutch immigration in the West, the demand for missionary labor increased, and the board was reorganized in 1849. Five years later the plan of a church building fund to aid needy churches was proposed.

[p. 1506] The foreign missionary interests of the church were of early origin, some of the earliest Dutch ministers engaging also in work for the Indians. In 1796 the New York Missionary Society was formed by members of the Presbyterian, Reformed Dutch, and Baptist churches. This was succeeded in 1816 by the United Missionary Society, which in 1826 was merged in the American Board; but in 1832 a plan was adopted by which the Reformed Church in America, retaining its general connection with that board, conducted its own missions, developing work in India, China, Japan, and later in Arabia.

The necessity for an adequate and adequately trained ministry led very early in the history of the church to the formation of “Cent Societies” and “Education Societies” in individual churches and classes, the purpose of these being in each instance the financial aid of students for the ministry. On May 7, 1828, a group of ministers and elders of the Collegiate Church of New York met and organized “The Education Society of the Reformed Dutch Church” and raised funds for the aid of such students. In 1831 this society was adopted by the General Synod and renamed “The Board of Education of the General Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church,” and it has functioned in this field since that time. The board was incorporated under the laws of the State of New York in 1869. Its functions have been enlarged from time to time. Its activities at present are outlined in the section on “Work.”

Doctrine. The doctrinal standards of the Reformed Church in America are the Belgic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, and the Canons of the Synod of Dort. The church is thus a distinctively Calvinistic body. It has a liturgy for optional use in public worship, with forms of prayer. Some parts of the liturgy, as those for the administration of baptism and the Lord’s Supper and for the ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons, are obligatory; the forms of prayer, the marriage service, etc., are not obligatory. Children are “baptized as heirs of the Kingdom of God and of His Covenant”; adults are baptized (by sprinkling or immersion, as preferred) on profession of repentance for sin and faith in Christ. All baptized persons are considered members of the church, are under its care, and are subject to its government and discipline. No subscription to a specific form of words being required, admission to communion and full membership is on confession of faith before the elders and minister.

Ministers on being ordained are required to subscribe to the standards and polity of the church.

Organization. The polity of the Reformed Church is presbyterian. The government of the local church is under the control of a consistory which is composed of the minister, elders, and deacons...

The classis, which has immediate supervision of the churches and the ministry, consists of all the ministers within a certain district, and an elder from each consistory within that district... The classes of a certain district are combined in a particular synod... The highest court of the church is the General Synod.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Membership (1959), 219,770 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257).]

1285. Religion—American Statistics

SOURCE: Will Herberg, *Protestant—Catholic—Jew*, pp. 235–237. Copyright © 1955 by Will Herberg. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York.

[p. 235] Thus, in a recent quite extensive public opinion poll, some 87 per cent of the American people affirmed their belief in God as “absolutely certain” (10 per cent more were “fairly sure”); the proportion of Catholics “absolutely certain” was 92 per cent, but of Jews, only 70 per cent (“fairly sure,” 7 and 18 per cent respectively). The Protestant figures were identical with the national average.

[p. 236] Again, while 18 per cent of those who identified themselves as Catholics stated that they had not attended church in the three previous months, some 56 per cent of the Jews made this confession. Of Protestants, 32 per cent said they had not been to church in that period, the same proportion as in the national sample. At the other extreme, 62 per cent of the Catholics said that they went to church at least once a week, as against

12 per cent of the Jews, 25 per cent of the Protestants, and 32 per cent of the nation as a whole.

Of Americans as a whole, 75 per cent have stated they regarded religion as “very important”; 83 per cent of the Catholics had this conviction, but only 47 per cent of the Jews. Protestants registered 76 per cent. On the other hand, 37 per cent of the Jews said they regarded religion as “fairly important,” as against 14 per cent of the Catholics, 20 per cent of the Protestants, and 20 per cent of the national sample. The remainder—3 per cent of the Catholics, 4 per cent of the Protestants, 5 per cent of the national sample, but 15 per cent of the Jews—held religion to be “not very important” or not important at all.

About 83 per cent of Americans held the Bible to be the revealed word of God in some sense, and 10 per cent regarded it as merely a “work of literature.” The breakdown shows that the Bible as revelation was affirmed by 88 per cent of the Catholics and 85 per cent of the Protestants, but by only 45 per cent of the Jews—an equal 45 per cent holding it to be merely a great literary work. Even those included in the category of “Others”—those who refused to identify themselves as Protestants, Catholics, or Jews—took a higher view of the Bible; some 52 per cent of them said they regarded it as revelation.

Though 83 per cent of Americans affirmed the Bible to be the revealed word of God, 40 per cent confessed that they read it never or hardly ever; 56 per cent of the Catholics admitted as much, 32 per cent of the Protestants, and 65 per cent of the Jews.

In all of these respects, the pattern is very much the same: [p. 237] Catholics come closest to the religious norm, to what is usually regarded as the beliefs and attitudes proper to religious people; Protestants come next, hewing close to the national average; Jews are most remote. The one exception so far, that Catholics read the Bible considerably less and Protestants considerably more than the national sample, may easily be accounted for by the special traditions of these groups.

1286. Religion, Distribution of, in the U.S., March, 1957

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census, “Religion Reported by the Civilian Population of the United States; March 1957” (its *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 79, February 2, 1958), pp. 1, 2.

[p. 1] Two out of every three persons 14 years old and over in the United States regarded themselves as Protestant and one out of every four as Roman Catholic, according to the results of a sample survey of the civilian population taken by the Bureau of the Census in March 1957. In the survey, the answers to the question “What is your religion?” were obtained on a *voluntary* basis... In replying to the question as asked, many persons, in addition to those who maintain formal affiliation with a religious organization, associated themselves with such a group and reported its name.

Of all persons 14 years old and over in the survey, 96 percent reported a religion, 3 percent stated that they had no religion, and 1 percent made no report on religion. On the basis of the survey returns, it is estimated that in the civilian population 14 years old and over in March 1957 about 79.0 million persons regarded themselves as Protestant, 30.7 million as Roman Catholic, 3.9 million as Jewish, 1.5 million as having some other religion, and 3.2 million as having no religion.

It is further estimated that among those persons 14 years old and over 23.5 million regarded themselves as Baptist, 16.7 million as Methodist, 8.4 million as Lutheran, and 6.7 million as Presbyterian... The remaining 23.7 million Protestants 14 years old and over were distributed among many smaller denominations which are not shown separately in this report.

The figures in this report are subject to sampling variability, which may be relatively large in the case of the smaller figures and small differences between figures...

Color and sex.—More women than men were reported for the major religious groups... This reflects both the larger number of women than men in the total population and the exclusion from the survey [p. 2] of about 2 million members of the Armed Forces... About three times as many men (2.4 million) as women (0.8 million) were reported as having no religion. Whether or not these differences are related to the fact that women generally gave information for the household members is unknown.

About 64 percent of the white population and 88 percent of the nonwhite population were reported as Protestant. About three-fourths of the nonwhites were reported as Baptists or Methodist (61 percent and 17 percent, respectively). About 31 percent of the persons reported as Baptist and 12 percent of those reported as Methodist were nonwhite. Thus, a larger proportion of the nonwhite population than of the white population is concentrated in a few religious groups.

Region of residence.—About 83 percent of the civilian population 14 years old and over in the South in March 1957 was reported as Protestant, compared with about 42 percent of the population in the Northeast and 69 percent in the North Central Region and in the West... In the Northeast, the persons who said they were Roman Catholic comprised about 45 percent of the population of that region and constituted the largest religious group. The population in the Northeast included about 26 percent of the Nation's civilians 14 years old and over as compared with 17 percent of all persons reported as Protestant, 46 percent of those reported as Roman Catholic, 69 percent of those reported as Jewish, 42 percent of the persons reporting some other religion, and 11 percent of the persons reporting no religion. The Northeast had the largest proportion of population reporting a religion, 98 percent.

Urban and rural residence.—There are marked differences in the urban and rural distributions of the religious groups... Although 64 percent of the population 14 years old and over in 1957 lived in urban areas, 96 percent of the persons reported as Jewish, 79 percent of those reported as Roman Catholic, 57 percent of those reported as Protestant, and 54 percent of those reporting no religion lived in urban areas. In urban areas, 59 percent of the population was reported as Protestant, 32 percent as Roman Catholic, 5 percent as Jewish, 2 percent as having some other religion, and 2 percent as having no religion.

Age.—Among persons 14 years old and over, the median age was about 38.7 years for persons reported as Roman Catholic, 40.8 years for those reported as Protestant, 42.0 years for persons reporting no religion, and 44.5 years for persons reported as Jewish... These figures imply that the religious groups with relatively low median ages include above average proportions of young adults and below average proportions of persons in the older ages. The differences in the age distribution of persons in the several religious groups reflect, among other things, differences in the period of immigration of persons (or of their ancestors) and in their birth and death rates over long periods of time. A relatively large proportion of immigrants between 1880 and 1921 came from countries that were predominantly Roman Catholic. Moreover, the nonwhite population has had higher birth and death rates than the white population. The differences also reflect the effect of any shifting of persons from one religion to another during the course of their

lives. The present data show that only a small percentage of the population at each age regard themselves as having no religion.

Religion reported by married couples.—Among all married couples in which one partner was reported as Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Jewish, in 94 percent of the cases the other partner was reported in the same major group. . . . If marriages occurred at random in respect to religion, this proportion would have been 56 percent. Under these circumstances, 44 percent of all couples would have reported the husband and wife in different major religious groups, but the survey found only 6 percent so reported.

Although these figures suggest a major role of religious affiliation or preference in the selection of marriage partners, it is not possible to distinguish those cases in which one of the partners changed his religion to conform to that of the spouse. Moreover, the enumerators were instructed not to assume that all members of a family have the same religion, but it is possible that this instruction may have been overlooked in some cases.

Among married couples in which the husband, or the wife, were reported as Roman Catholic, 22 percent of the husbands or wives reported that they were Protestant or Jewish. For couples in which one spouse was reported as Protestant, 9 percent of the husbands or wives were reported as Roman Catholic or Jewish. For couples in which one spouse was reported as Jewish, 7 percent of the husbands or wives were reported as Protestant or Roman Catholic.

1287. Religion, Modern

1

SOURCE: J. B. Philips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 58, 59. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 58] Many modern Christians are inclined to put God back into the past. How many times in visiting various churches does one hear of what used to happen in the old days! And, since Christians derive a great deal of their inspiration from reading the Bible, they can all too easily envisage God as thoroughly at home in the sacred pages but somehow no part of the modern picture at all. . . . Many Christians today cannot readily conceive of God operating in a world of television, washing machines, atomic fission, automation, psychiatry, electronic brains, glossy magazines, modern music, and jet propulsion. The complication and speed of present-day living make it extremely difficult for the mind to imagine the Biblical God interpenetrating such a system and operating [p. 59] within its pressures. The very word “God” seems out of key and even bizarre in our modern context.

1288. Religion, Modern Attitude Toward Ten Commandments Illustrated

SOURCE: Russell L. Jaberg, “The Modern Ten,” *Christianity Today*, 4 (May 9, 1960), 20. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

Sentimentalism and a lack of appreciation for the authority of the Word of God have wrought some changes in modern attitudes toward principles for living covered by the Ten Commandments. The commandments come out something as follows in our day:

I. *Thou shalt have no other gods before me.* “Religion is all right, but you can’t be fanatical about it.” II. *Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.* “Every man has his own religion; it is all right just so long as he is sincere about it.” III. *Thou shalt not*

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

take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. “I’m sure the Lord knows how vexed I was, for it was enough to make anyone say something.” IV. *Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.* “You ought to go to Church when you can, but I need rest and relaxation and this is the only day I can get them.” V. *Honor thy father and thy mother.* “Parents shouldn’t force their children to do something; they may warp their children’s personalities for life.” VI. *Thou shalt not kill.* “It’s a big world that runs fast and hard; so, someone’s bound to get hurt.” VII. *Thou shalt not commit adultery.* “Love will triumph in the end.” VIII. *Thou shalt not steal.* “Everyone else is getting his. You have to make it for yourself any way you can; just be sure you don’t get caught.” IX. *Thou shalt not bear false witness.* “We were all just sitting around and talking. You know how one word brings on another. No one meant anything by what he said.” X. *Thou shalt not covet.* “As soon as we can trade for a new hardtop and move into that new ranch house, then people will have to look up to us too.”

1289. Religion, Modern—Need for Emphasis on Law

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, “Biblical, Liberal, Catholic,” *The Christian Century*, 77 (Nov. 9, 1960), 1306. Copyright 1960 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

(5) Directly contrary to the trend of recent Protestant theology, in Christian ethics I have moved to a higher appreciation of law and even of a reasonable casuistry. Three kinds of experience are affecting me in this matter. One is a more thorough and sympathetic study of Judaism than I had previously undertaken. Another is life in the first-generation Christian church of Rhodesia, where it is absolutely necessary to have rules of church discipline in order to define the very meaning of the Christian life in the sea of paganism and superstition which surrounds it. The limitations of legalism also are painfully evident there and Galatians is a tract for the times. Yet Galatians 5 with its new law is as necessary as the message of forgiveness, grace and Christian freedom. Finally, having returned to America I find myself asking frequently whether we are so much better situated here where wealth is king and salvation is thought to be by psychological technique or earthly power. The church blends so easily into a culture which is, to say the least, ambiguous that certain eternal laws and the basic principles of Christian ethics need again to be taught with unmistakable clarity and vigor. The need is made the more urgent by the antinomian trend which is so prominent in current theology and by the prevailing moral confusion further confounded by the subtleties and paradoxes of “Christian realism.”

1290. Religion, Modern Return to, and Conformity

SOURCE: Will Herberg, *Protestant—Catholic—Jew*, pp. 54, 69–73. Copyright © 1955 by Will Herberg. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York.

[p. 54] How does it come about that Americans today are, in one way, more religious than they have been for a long time and are becoming increasingly so, and yet, in other ways, are more remote from the centrality of Jewish-Christian faith than perhaps they have ever been? On one level at least, the answer would seem to be that the religious revival under way in this country today—the notable increase in religious identification, affiliation, and membership—is a reflection of the social necessity of “belonging.” ...

[p. 69] People tend more and more to identify and locate themselves socially in terms of three great sub-communities—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish—defined in religious terms. To find a place in American society increasingly means to place oneself in one or another of these [p. 70] religious communities. And although this process of self-

identification and social location is not in itself intrinsically religious, the mere fact that in order to be “something” one must be either a Protestant, a Catholic, or a Jew means that one begins to think of oneself as religiously identified and affiliated...

Another factor of prime sociological importance has worked toward the same end, and that is the basic change in character structure that seems to be under way among certain sections of the American people. The reference here is to the shift from inner-direction to other-direction... [p. 71] The inner-directed man is work-conscious, intent upon achievement, not afraid to stand on his own feet and if necessary against the crowd, interested in “results” not in “personalities.” It is the inner-directed man who has been characteristic of American life and achievement so far.

Lately, however, for reasons that are still obscure though we are beginning to get some inkling of them, there has been emerging on certain levels another character type, described as other-directed. Instead of possessing a built-in gyroscope to keep him true to his course, the other-directed man operates with a kind of built-in radar apparatus which is ceaselessly at work receiving signals from the person’s “peer group” and adjusting him to the situation indicated by these signals... Whereas the inner-directed man, as we have seen, is always ready to stand up against his environment and indeed seems to get a kind of grim satisfaction out of doing so. The “morality” of the inner-directed type becomes “morale” for the other-directed; “character” becomes [p. 72] “personality”; moral indignation and intolerance give way to a kind of all-embracing tolerance—tolerance of everything and everybody except the “unadjusted” and the “anti-social.” ...

It is not difficult to see the current turn to religion and the church as, in part at least, a reflection of the growing other-directedness of our middle-class culture... Being religious and joining a church is, under contemporary American conditions, a fundamental way of “adjusting” and “belonging”; through the built-in radar apparatus of other-direction it becomes almost automatic as an obvious social requirement, like entertaining or culture. The vogue of Van Gogh and Renoir reproductions in the suburban home and the rising church affiliation of the suburban community may not be totally unconnected; both may, without disparagement, be interpreted, in part at least, as the consequence of the craving for adjustment and conformity involved in other-direction...

[p. 73] These more obviously sociological factors ought not, however, to obscure other, perhaps less definable, forces operating at other levels of human life. The contemporary crisis of Western civilization, which has brought a sense of total insecurity to men everywhere, is surely one of the most significant of these...

In this situation of pervasive crisis and danger, religion appeals to many as “synonymous with peace,” indeed as offering the “best hope of peace in the world today”—“peace of mind” for the individual amid the anxieties and confusions of contemporary existence.

1291. Religion, Modern Revival in, and Increased Crime

SOURCE: William Hard, “How Law-abiding Are We—Really?” *Reader’s Digest*, 74 (May, 1959), 39, 40. Copyright 1959 by The Reader’s Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 39] We come to a woeful paradox.

One. There is no doubt that in America we now have a revival of religion. The National Council of the Churches of Christ has reported that our church membership, in proportion to population, was 36 percent in 1900, 49 percent in 1940 and 61 percent in 1957. What a growth in, at any rate, religiosity!

Two. Simultaneously we have the growth of dishonesty and of violence... This growth has included since January 1, 1957, more than 100 bombings or attempted bombings having racial or religious aspects.

Clearly we have achieved a split personality. We are having both a religious revival and a moral decline...

[p. 40] We have churches uttering religion. We need more people *living* religion.

I think it clear that we have not succeeded adequately in fusing "worship" and "the world." We have not succeeded adequately in fusing ritual and righteousness.

The ancient Hebrew prophets, whose sacred texts have the reverence of both Jews and Christians, found many ways of saying to the children of Israel: Ye have multiplied your ceremonies. But ye do not keep my commandments.

1292. Religion, Modern Revival of, in Secularist Framework

SOURCE: Will Herberg, *Protestant—Catholic—Jew*, p. 13. Copyright © 1955 by Will Herberg. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York.

The religious situation in the United States today confronts us with a perplexing problem. "The fact of a religious revival in America cannot be gainsaid," Barbara Ward noted in her recent "Report to Europe on America." ... Whether we judge by religious identification, church membership, or church attendance, whether we go by the best-seller lists, the mass media, or the writings of intellectuals, the conclusion is the same: there is every sign of a notable "turn to religion" among the American people today.

And yet, writing not much before Miss Ward's visit, a perceptive historian of America noted that at the mid-twentieth century, "the trend toward secularism in ideas was not reversed." ... The secularism dominating the American consciousness is not an overt philosophy; it is an underlying, often unconscious, orientation of life and thought, ... pervasive and omnipresent.

1293. Religion, Modern—Secularism Forgets Christ

SOURCE: Will Herberg, *Protestant—Catholic—Jew*, pp. 13–15. Copyright © 1955 by Will Herberg. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York.

[p. 13] When Ignazio Silone, the Italian writer and Socialist, was asked what he felt to be the "most important date in universal history," he replied unhesitatingly: "The twenty-fifth of December in the year zero." But when nearly thirty outstanding Americans were asked not long ago to rate the hundred most significant events in history, first place was given to Columbus' discovery of America, while Christ, His birth or [p. 14] crucifixion, came fourteenth, tied with the discovery of X rays and the Wright brothers' first plane flight. Silone is no orthodox Christian, yet it is evident that he takes his Christianity seriously in a way that the eminent American historians, educators, and journalists, who forgot all about Christ in listing significant events in history, obviously do not. The secularism that pervades the American consciousness is essentially of this kind: it is thinking and living in terms of a framework of reality and value remote from the religious beliefs simultaneously professed...

This is at least part of the picture presented by religion in contemporary America: Christians flocking to church, yet forgetting all about Christ when it comes to naming the most significant events in history; men and women valuing the Bible as revelation, purchasing and distributing it by the millions, yet apparently seldom reading it themselves. Every aspect of contemporary religious life reflects this paradox—pervasive secularism amid mounting religiosity, "the strengthening of the religious structure in spite of increasing secularization." The influx of members into the churches and the increased

readiness of Americans to identify themselves in religious terms certainly appear to stand in contrast to the way Americans seem to think and feel about matters central to the faiths they profess.

[p. 15] The paradox is there, and it would be misleading to try to get rid of it by suppressing one or the other side of the apparent contradiction. It will not do to brush aside the evidences of religious revival by writing off the new religiousness as little more than shallow emotionalism, “escapism,” or mere pretense. The people who join the churches, take part in church activities, send their children to church schools, and gladly identify themselves in religious terms are not fools or hypocrites. They are honest, intelligent people who take their religion quite seriously. Of that there cannot be much doubt.

Nor, on the other hand, can there be much doubt that, by and large, the religion which actually prevails among Americans today has lost much of its authentic Christian (or Jewish) content. Even when they are thinking, feeling, or acting religiously, their thinking, feeling, and acting do not bear an unequivocal relation to the faiths they profess. Americans think, feel, and act in terms quite obviously secularist at the very time that they exhibit every sign of a widespread religious revival. It is this secularism of a religious people, this religiousness in a secularist framework, that constitutes the problem posed by the contemporary religious situation in America.

1294. Religion, Popular, of No Practical Importance

SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *Beyond Personality* (1948), pp. 3, 4. Copyright 1945 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 3] Isn't the popular idea of Christianity just this? That Jesus Christ was a great moral teacher and that if only we took his advice we might be able to establish a better social order and avoid another war? Now, mind you, that is quite true. But it tells you very *little* about Christianity and it has no *practical* importance at all.

It's quite true that if we took Christ's advice we should soon be living in a happier world. You needn't even go as far as Christ. If we did all that Plato or Aristotle or Confucius told us, we'd get on a great deal better than we do. And so what? We never have followed the advice of the great teachers. Why are we likely to begin now? Why are we more likely to follow Christ than any of the others? Because He's the best moral teacher? But that makes it even less likely that we shall follow Him. If we can't take the elementary lessons, is it likely we're going to take the most advanced one? If Christianity only means one more bit of good advice, then Christianity is of no importance. There's been no lack [p. 4] of good advice for the last four thousand years. A bit more makes no difference.

1295. Religion—Predictions Concerning Its Supposed Imminent Disappearance

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 1. Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

Religion would soon disappear among civilized people. This prediction was freely made from the middle to the end of the nineteenth century and later.

“God is dead,” announced Nietzsche's Zarathustra.

“Religion is the opium of the masses,” declared Karl Marx. He assured his readers that all belief in God would disappear when the Communist revolution had done away with the suffering of the poor under capitalist exploitation.

Belief in God was only the rationalization of hidden emotional drives, explained Sigmund Freud. As for Christianity, one could now write its epitaph under the title, *The Future of an Illusion*.

1296. Religion—Trends in American Protestantism

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, 1st ed., pp. 1423, 1424. Copyright 1953 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1423] In spite of dissent and tensions among Protestants there was a growing [p. 1424] unity. This was seen not only in organic unions and co"peration but also in other ways. Forms of worship spread from one denomination to another. Among several of the churches which had been opposed to liturgy traditional features of dignified worship began to be taken over from the Catholic (but not necessarily the Roman Catholic) heritage. "Divided chancels" which accorded a central place to the altar or communion table were substituted for the arrangement which focused attention on the pulpit. Ministers and choirs donned vestments. Books of prayer for use in the public services became common, most of them with forms for the communion which were adaptations of the historic liturgies. More and more hymnals, even of the least co"perative denominations, drew from authors who ranged all the way from Unitarians to Roman Catholics. The observance of Lent, Holy Week, Good Friday, and Whitsunday which a generation earlier would have been shunned as "Popery" spread among churches on the extreme wing of Protestantism. Methods of reaching children, young people, and the laity, including summer assemblies, tended to be the same, regardless of the denomination. From time to time, chiefly on the initiative of Protestants, limited coöperation among Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews was achieved on special projects.

1297. Religion—Vanishing Faith in Future Life

SOURCE: Joseph Fletcher, "The Patient's Right to Die," *Harper's*, 221 (October 1960), 140. Copyright 1960 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

At the level of sheer logic, one of the most curious features of the "theological era" of the past is that most people feared and sought to avoid death at any and every cost, except sometimes for honor's sake. Even though they professed to have faith in personal survival after death, it was their Worst Enemy. Nowadays, when faith is waning not only in the prospect of hell but even of heaven, there is a trend toward accepting death as a part of reality, just as "natural" as life. Churchmen, even clergymen, are dropping the traditional faith in personal survival after death, just as many unbelievers do. Curiously, it is the skeptics about immortality who appear to face death more calmly. They seem somehow less inclined to hang on desperately to life at the cost of indescribable and uncreative suffering for themselves and others.

1298. Religions, False, of the Present Day

SOURCE: Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial*, pp. 236, 237. Copyright 1948 by Oxford University Press, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 236] In our Western world of today, the worship of Leviathan—the self-worship of the tribe—is a religion to which all of us pay some measure of allegiance; and this tribal religion is, of course, sheer idolatry. Communism, which is another of our latter-day religions, is, I think, a leaf taken from the book of Christianity—a leaf torn out and misread. Democracy is another leaf from the book of Christianity, which has also, I fear, been torn out and, while perhaps not misread, has certainly [p. 237] been half emptied of meaning by being divorced from its Christian context and secularized; and we have

obviously, for a number of generations past, been living on spiritual capital, I mean clinging to Christian practice without possessing the Christian belief—and practice unsupported by belief is a wasting asset, as we have suddenly discovered.

1299. Religious Customs, Pagan and Christian

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 197–200, 204–212, 214–217.

[p. 197] I. HOLY WATER

The lustral use of water was familiar to the Romans at an early date...

[p. 198] In some of the Oriental cults established in Rome and elsewhere in Italy holy water had a still more important part. It was for example a feature of the cult of Isis...

Further, we know from Apuleius that baptism by the priest was a prerequisite for initiation into the mysteries of Isis, its purpose being purification and remission of sins...

[p. 199] And the followers of the Mithras cult also practiced baptism...

The ancient Roman custom of touching a baby's forehead and lips with spittle on the day on which it received its name is mentioned by Persius with caustic comment. The purpose of the act apparently was to avert the machinations of witch or demon. A similar use of spittle survives in the baptism service of the Roman Church today, in which the [p. 200] priest touches the ears and nostrils of the candidate for baptism with spittle, using among other phrases the words: *tu autem effugare, diabole...*

[p. 204] 3. BELLS, GONGS, RATTLES

The use of bells in religious services was common in India and China long before it was adopted in Europe. We have, however, some fairly early examples in Greece and Etruria. For we are told that at the sanctuary of Zeus at Dodona bells were rung or gongs sounded; and the tomb of the Etruscan prince Porsenna, near Clusium, was equipped with a number of little bells that vibrated in the wind. On Roman soil we hear of a gong at the second temple of Jupiter Capitolinus, dedicated by Catulus in 69 B.C. Its purpose, like that of the bells at Dodona and on Porsenna's tomb, was probably to frighten away malicious spirits.

Bells were used in some of the foreign cults introduced into Italy... [p. 205] In the cult of Isis the rattle (*sistrum*) was in constant use both in processions and in services at the temple. In these cases also the most probable explanation of the practice is the belief that the sound warded off evil demons...

[p. 206] Of special interest ... is a bell found at Tarragona in Spain. It belonged to one Felix, a slave in a temple of the city, who used it in the rites of the cult of the Emperor (*sacris Augustis*). He may have rung it to indicate the moment of sacrifice or some other important point in the ritual...

And it is likely that in the use of the bell found at Tarragona to which reference has just been made we have the origin of the custom of ringing a small bell (the *sanctus*) at the celebration of the mass. Apparently an analogous use was made of the *sistrum* by the priests of Isis. In the fresco from Herculaneum de- [p. 207] picting the adoration of the holy water the priest and priestess on either side of the officiant are represented as shaking a *sistrum*...

[p. 208] 4. LIGHTS

Lighted lamps and torches appear in various cults and ceremonies of ancient Rome... [p. 209] The polemical writings of Tertullian (about A.D. 200) and Lactantius (about A.D. 300) make it plain that the placing of lights before the images of gods and on votive objects was a common pagan practice.

At first the Christians scrupulously refrained from a ritual use of lights. In their eyes apparently the practice had the taint of paganism. But from the end of the third century their attitude seems to have changed and after the recognition of Christianity by Constantine the symbolical use of lights established itself firmly in many kinds of ceremonies. Candles were burned before images of the Madonna or Christ or the Saints, and were a conspicuous part of numerous ceremonial processions and sacred [p. 210] ceremonies such as baptisms, marriages, and funerals. While some of the Christian writers continued to protest against this pagan element in the Church, others defended it. Lights became and still are an inevitable concomitant of many forms of religious service. Their reintroduction into cult after the primitive simplicity of the first few centuries of Christianity had passed away, was only one phase of that externalism that came to be a notable characteristic of Christianity after and partly as a result of the imperial favor which it attained.

5. *INCENSE ...*

[p. 211] In the days of religious conflict the practice of burning incense distinguished pagans from Christians. Prudentius calls the pagan idolaters "the incense-bearing crowd" (*turifera grex*), and one of the tests imposed on persons suspected of being Christians was the offering of a few grains of incense on the altar of some Roman god...

Perhaps it was the bitter associations of the Christians with incense that inhibited its use by them during the first four centuries of the Church. At any rate there is no evidence of its being employed ritually till nearly the end of the fourth century... [p. 212] Only gradually was its use extended in the west to the celebration of the mass and other solemn services of the Catholic church. This had, however, become the practice by the fourteenth century and now obtains. In the Anglican church the use of incense, which was abolished at the Reformation, was resumed about the middle of the nineteenth century and at present is increasing...

[p. 214] 7. *GARLANDS ...*

In the early days of the Church the garland was a symbol of paganism, as is clear from Tertullian's story of the soldier whose adherence to Christianity was detected through his refusal to wear one... [p. 215] But little by little the attitude of the Christians changed...

The same spirit that in Horace's ode "crowned the little images of the gods with rosemary and myrtle" still finds expression in the images of the Madonna decked with garlands that [p. 216] may be seen along the roads in southern Italy.

8. *TONSURE*

The shaven head was one of the characteristics of the priests of Isis... Tonsure was known to other Oriental religions...

[p. 217] The oft-quoted saying of St. Jerome that Christian priests should not appear with shorn head lest they be confounded with priests of Isis and Serapis or other heathen deities suggests the possibility that Christian clerics had sometimes done so. One gets the same impression from the action of the Council of Carthage (398), which prohibited the

cutting of the beard and hair. It is a mistake to say that the tonsure was not practiced in the fourth century. All that can be safely said is that it was not authorized.

In heathen and Christian rites the significance of the tonsure was the same. It indicated the separation of the devotee from the world and his ascription to divine service.

1300. Religious Liberty, American Founders on

a. George Washington

SOURCE: To the General Committee, Representing the United Baptist Churches in Virginia. May, 1789, in *The Writings of George Washington*, edited by Jared Sparks, Part 5, Vol. 12, p. 155.

Every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.

b. Thomas Jefferson

SOURCE: An Act for establishing Religious Freedom, passed in the Assembly of Virginia in the beginning of the year 1786, in *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, edited by H. A. Washington, Vol. 8, p. 454, Appendix, No. III.

Almighty God hath created the mind free; ... all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the Holy Author of our religion, who being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercions on either, as was in his Almighty power to do.

c. Benjamin Franklin

SOURCE: Letter to Richard Price, Oct. 9, 1780, in *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, edited by Albert Henry Smyth, Vol. 8, p. 154.

When a Religion is good, I conceive that it will support itself; and, when it cannot support itself, and God does not take care to support, so that its Professors are oblig'd to call for the help of the Civil Power, it is a sign, I apprehend, of its being a bad one.

d. James Madison

SOURCE: Letter to Edward Everett, March 19, 1823, in *Letters and Other Writings of James Madison*, Vol. 3, p. 307.

Religion is essentially distinct from civil Government, and exempt from its cognizance; ... a connexion between them is injurious to both.

1301. Religious Liberty—Canadian Bill of Rights

SOURCE: *Statutes of Canada*, 8–9 Elizabeth II (1960), chap. 44, pp. 519–521.

[p. 519] CHAP. 44

An Act for the Recognition and Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

[Assented to 10th August, 1960.]

The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions;

Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law;

And being desirous of enshrining these principles and the human rights and fundamental freedoms derived from them, in a Bill of Rights which shall reflect the respect of Parliament for its constitutional authority and which shall ensure the protection of these rights and freedoms in Canada:

THEREFORE Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

PART I

BILL OF RIGHTS.

1. It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely, (a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law; [p. 520] (b) the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law; (c) freedom of religion; (d) freedom of speech; (e) freedom of assembly and association; and (f) freedom of the press.
2. Every law of Canada shall, unless it is expressly declared by an Act of the Parliament of Canada that it shall operate notwithstanding the *Canadian Bill of Rights*, be so construed and applied as not to abrogate, abridge or infringe or to authorize the abrogation, abridgment or infringement of any of the rights or freedoms herein recognized and declared, and in particular, no law of Canada shall be construed or applied so as to (a) authorize or effect the arbitrary detention, imprisonment or exile of any person; (b) impose or authorize the imposition of cruel and unusual treatment or punishment; (c) deprive a person who has been arrested or detained (i) of the right to be informed promptly of the reason for his arrest or detention, (ii) of the right to retain and instruct counsel without delay, or (iii) of the remedy by way of *habeas corpus* for the determination of the validity of his detention and for his release if the detention is not lawful; (d) authorize a court, tribunal, commission, board or other authority to compel a person to give evidence if he is denied counsel, protection against self incrimination or other constitutional safeguards; (e) deprive a person of the right to a fair hearing in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice for the determination of his rights and obligations; (f) deprive a person charged with a criminal offence of the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, or of the right to reasonable bail without just cause; or (g) deprive a person of the right to the assistance of an interpreter in any proceedings in which he is involved or in which he is a party or a witness, before a court, commission, board or other tribunal, if he does not understand or speak the language in which such proceedings are conducted.
3. The Minister of Justice shall, in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council, examine every proposed regulation submitted in draft form [p. 521] to the Clerk of the Privy Council pursuant to the *Regulations Act* and every Bill introduced in or presented to the House of Commons, in order to ascertain whether any of the provisions thereof are inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of this Part and he shall report any such inconsistency to the House of Commons at the first convenient opportunity.
4. The provisions of this Part shall be known as the *Canadian Bill of Rights*.

PART II

5. (1) Nothing in Part I shall be construed to abrogate or abridge any human right or fundamental freedom not enumerated therein that may have existed in Canada at the commencement of this Act.

1302. Religious Liberty—Catholic Hopes for Tolerance, Reason for

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 51. Used by permission.

But there is also another and still worse totalitarianism [than clericalism], that of the anti-religious totalitarian countries. And in face of this danger, Roman Catholic thinkers ask all Christians to unite their forces in mutual tolerance for the defence of Christendom.

1303. Religious Liberty, Catholic Liberal View on

SOURCE: Max Pribilla, “Dogmatische Intoleranz und bürgerliche Toleranz” (“Dogmatic Intolerance and Civil Tolerance”), *Stimmen der Zeit*, 144 (April, 1949), 39. Used by permission of *Stimmen der Zeit*.

Christianity as a whole is today facing a violent attack which threatens to extinguish all rights of God and of man. At this vital stage it is the compelling duty of all Christians to act together and to unite their forces for the defence of their highest and holiest possession. This presupposes *that the Christian churches and communions should renounce the application of force and outward pressure (in any form) in their mutual competition and settle spiritual issues with spiritual weapons.* But this means that *they should not only retain liberty of religious practice for themselves, but grant it to others as well.*

1304. Religious Liberty, Catholic Liberal Views on, Not Official

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), Preface. Used by permission.

This present study tries to investigate only one Roman Catholic tendency concerning religious liberty: *that which considers freedom of religion as essentially linked with the Christian and evangelical spirit.* As we point out in Chapter III, we do not forget that many Roman Catholics are still resolutely against this doctrinal position, but we think it necessary to stress the momentous importance, within the Roman Catholic Church, of the every day increasing stream in favour of religious liberty. If such an attitude should prevail in Roman Catholic thinking and practice, there is no doubt that new ways would open towards an ecumenical understanding with our Catholic brethren.

1305. Religious Liberty, Catholic Limitation of—Question of a “Right Conscience”

SOURCE: James Cardinal Gibbons, *The Faith of Our Fathers* (92d ed., rev.; Baltimore: John Murphy Company, [192–]), p. 226.

A man enjoys *religious* liberty when he possesses the free right of worshipping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practicing a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God.

1306. Religious Liberty, Catholic Opinion Divided on

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 37. Used by permission.

The right to live in accordance with God’s will means practically the right to live in accordance with one’s own conscience. And that right is called “freedom of conscience.”

...

This right is directed particularly against the authorities in society. Even the authority of the Church is bound up with freedom of conscience. “If the Pope himself were to order me to do something that is against my conscience, I should refuse,” said Cardinal

Buoncompagni, who later became Gregory XIII, in 1565 to Philip II of Spain.³ [Note 3: Cf. LUDWIG VON PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, vol. IX, p. 16.]

For many Roman Catholic theologians, the deep implications of this right to freedom of conscience spring from the fact that such freedom is the social aspect of the metaphysical link between the personality and its transcendental destiny...

Nevertheless, there are still some Roman Catholic theologians who believe that this right to freedom of conscience should not be accorded to the “erring conscience” for the well-known reason that “error has no rights.”

1307. Religious Liberty—Catholic Traditional Intolerance

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), pp. 57, 58. Used by permission.

[p. 57] We have spoken of a new Roman Catholic theory and we added that its defenders do not like the word “new.” As a matter of fact the Catholic defenders of religious liberty, wishing to remain within the traditional orthodoxy of their church, are very much concerned to prove that their doctrine is not *new* at all but, on the contrary, that it has in its favour the most ancient currents of Catholic thought...

What disturbs [these Catholic] defenders of religious freedom is precisely that their adversaries frequently pretend ... that the Roman Catholic Church has already taken its final decision *against* religious liberty...

The arguments brought up to prove that the *real* Roman Catholic tradition and doctrine are against religious freedom are strong enough and not to be refuted easily. They are of two kinds:

(a) First of all, the Roman Catholic Church seems to have always acted, in practice, against the principles of religious liberty. The Inquisition, the historical fact of “Sacral Christendom,” the bloody persecution of heresy, the confabulation of Church and state to oppress [p. 58] non-Catholic citizens, all seem to point toward *an intolerant attitude* which should necessarily correspond to *an intolerant doctrine*.

(b) Secondly, which is worse, there are many *statements of doctrine* by which the Popes seem to have condemned, clearly and without ambiguity, religious liberty.

1308. Religious Liberty, Early Church View of (3d Century)

SOURCE: Tertullian, *To Scapula*, chap. 2, trans. by S. Thelwall in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 105.

It is a fundamental human right, a privilege of nature, that every man should worship according to his own convictions... It is assuredly no part of to compell religion—to which free-will and not force should lead us.

1309. Religious Liberty, Early Church View of (4th Century)

SOURCE: Hilary of Poitiers, *Liber contra Auxentium* (“Book Against Auxentius”), cap. iv, quoted in E. Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, trans. by Bertrand L. Conway (New York: Longmans, 1908), p. 6. Copyright 1907 by Bertrand L. Conway. Used by permission.

I ask you Bishops to tell me, whose favor did the Apostles seek in preaching the Gospel, and on whose power did they rely to preach Jesus Christ? Today, alas! while the power of the State enforces divine faith, men say that Christ is powerless. The Church threatens exile and imprisonment; she in whom men formerly believed while in exile and prison, now wishes to make men believe her by force... What a striking contrast between the Church of the past and the Church of to-day.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Hilary wrote when Arian bishops used the power of the state against Catholics, A.D. 363. Vacandard remarks (on p. 7): “To sum up: As late as the middle of the fourth century and even later,

all the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers who discuss the question of toleration are opposed to the use of force.”]

1310. Religious Liberty, for Christians, Granted by Roman Emperor Galerius (311)

SOURCE: *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press [189–]), pp. 28, 29.

[p. 28] Lactantius, *De Mort. Pers.* ch. 34, 35. Opera, ed. O. F. Fritzsche, II, p. 273. (Bibl. Patr. Ecc. Lat. XI, Leipzig, 1844.)

(Ch. 34.) Among other arrangements which we are always accustomed to make for the prosperity and welfare of the republic, we had desired formerly to bring all things into harmony with the ancient laws and public order of the Romans, and to provide that even the Christians who had left the religion of their fathers should come back to reason; since, indeed, the Christians themselves, for some reason, had followed such a caprice and had fallen into such a folly that they would not obey the institutes of antiquity, which perchance their own ancestors had first established; but at their own will and pleasure, they would thus make laws unto themselves which they should observe and would collect various peoples in divers places in congregations. Finally, when our law had been promulgated to the effect that they should conform to the institutes of antiquity, many were subdued by the fear of danger, many even suffered death. And yet since most of them persevered in their determination, and we saw that they neither paid the reverence and awe due to the gods nor worshipped the God of the Christians, in view of our most mild clemency and the constant habit by which we are accustomed to grant indulgence to all, we thought that we ought to grant our most prompt indulgence also to these, so that they may again be Christians and may hold their conventicles, provided they do nothing contrary to good order. But we shall tell the magistrates in another letter what they ought to do.

Wherefore, for this our indulgence, they ought to pray to their God for our safety, for that of the republic, and for their own, that the republic may continue uninjured on every side, and that they may be able to live securely in their homes.

[p. 29] (ch. 35). This edict is published at Nicomedia on the day before the Kalends of May, in our eighth consulship and the second [consulship] of Maximinus.

1311. Religious Liberty, for Pagans and Christians, Granted by Constantine (313)

SOURCE: Constantine and Licinius, quoted in Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* x. 5. 1–14; translated by J. E. L. Oulton, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 445, 447, 449, 451, 453. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 445] *Copy of Imperial Ordinances translated from the Latin tongue.*¹ [Note 1: ... It is probable that at Milan, in 313 (ix. 11. 9), Constantine and Licinius drew up a norm of instructions to governors which might be copied, with perhaps some variations in detail, and sent to the various provinces. One redaction of that norm was translated by Eusebius, another was transcribed by Lactantius (*De Mortibus Persecutorum* 48).]

In our watchfulness in days gone by that freedom of worship should not be denied, but that each one according to his mind and purpose should have authority given him to care for divine things in the [p. 447] way that pleased him best, we had given orders that both to the Christians [and to all others liberty should be allowed] to keep to the faith of their own sect and worship. But inasmuch as many and various conditions seemed clearly to have been added in that rescript, in which such rights were conceded to the same

persons, it may be that perchance some of them were shortly afterwards repelled from such observance. [Bracketed note in Eusebius.]

When I Constantine Augustus and I Licinius Augustus had come under happy auspices to Milan, and discussed all matters that concerned the public advantage and good, among the other things that seemed to be of benefit to the many,—or rather, first and foremost—we resolved to make such decrees as should secure respect and reverence for the Deity; namely, to grant both to the Christians and to all the free choice of following whatever form of worship they pleased, to the intent that all the divine and heavenly powers that be might be favourable to us and all those living under our authority. Therefore with sound and most upright reasoning we resolved on this counsel: that authority be refused to no one whomsoever to follow and choose the observance or form of worship that Christians use, and that authority be granted to each one to give his mind to that form of worship which he deems suitable to himself, to the intent that the Divinity ... may in all things afford us his wonted care and generosity. It was fitting to send a rescript that this is our pleasure, in order that when those conditions had altogether been [p. 449] removed, which were contained in our former letters sent to thy Devotedness, concerning the Christians, those things also which seemed to be wholly unfortunate and foreign to our clemency might be removed, and that now each one of those who were possessed of the same purpose—namely, to observe the Christians' form of worship—should observe this very thing, freely and simply, without any hindrance. Which things we have resolved, to signify in the fullest manner to thy Carefulness, to the intent that thou mayest know that we have granted to these same Christians free and unrestricted authority to observe their own form of worship. And when thou perceivest that this has been granted unrestrictedly to them by us, thy Devotedness will understand that authority has been given to others also, who wish to follow their own observance and form of worship—a thing clearly suited to the peacefulness of our times—so that each one may have authority to choose and observe whatever form he pleases. This has been done by us, to the intent that we should not seem to have detracted in any way from any rite or form of worship.

And this, moreover, with special regard to the Christians, we resolve: That their places, at which it was their former wont to assemble, concerning which also in the former letter dispatched to thy Devotedness a definite ordinance had been formerly laid down, if any should appear to have bought them either from our treasury or from any other source—that these they should restore to these same Christians without payment or any demand for com- [p. 451] pensation, setting aside all negligence and doubtfulness; and if any chance to have received them by gift, that they should restore them with all speed to these same Christians: provided that if either those who have purchased these same places or those who have received them by gift request aught of our generosity, let them approach the prefect of the district, to the intent that through our kindness thought may be taken for them also. All which things must be handed over to the corporation of the Christians by thy zealous care immediately and without delay.

And inasmuch as these same Christians had not only those places at which it was their wont to assemble, but also are known to have had others, belonging not to individuals among them, but to the lawful property of their corporation, that is, of the Christians, all these, under the provisions of the law set forth above, thou wilt give orders to be restored without any question whatsoever to these same Christians, that is, to their

corporation and assembly; provided always, of course, as aforesaid, that those persons who restore the same without compensation, as we have mentioned above, may look for indemnification, as far as they are concerned, from our generosity.

In all these things thou shouldest use all the diligence in thy power for the above-mentioned corporation of the Christians, that this our command may be fulfilled with all speed, so that in this also, through our kindness, thought may be taken for the common and public peace. For by this method, as we have also said before, the divine [p. 453] care for us which we have already experienced in many matters, will remain steadfast ... continually. And that the form which this our enactment and generosity takes may be brought to the knowledge of all, it is fitting that this which we have written be set forth by thy order and published everywhere, and brought to the knowledge of all, to the intent that the enactment which embodies this our generosity may escape the notice of no one.

1312. Religious Liberty, for Pagans and Christians Under Constantine (313)

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 71, 72. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The Edict of Toleration

[p. 71] The second, and much more serious, mistake about Constantine is the idea that he established Christianity as the empire's official religion and banned pagan worship. What he did was immensely important, but it was not that. What he really did was to proclaim complete religious liberty for both pagans and Christians. Personally he favored Christianity, as has been said earlier, but he decreed that everyone in the empire should be free to worship whatever God or gods he pleased [see Nos. 1310, 1311]. This was exactly what such Christians as Tertullian and Lactantius had been arguing for... Constantine granted their request...

This was a very radical program. One may well question whether Constantine realized how radical it was. It would be centuries before the development of any doctrine of human rights or any principle of religious liberty to support such complete freedom of individual choice in matters of religion. John Locke stated it theoretically in 1689. The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States enacted it into law in 1791. The edict was indeed a landmark in the fortunes of the church, [p. 72] for it ended the age of Christian martyrs and brought the church out of the catacombs. It would have been a turning point in the history of civilization and political theory if its generous provisions had been maintained. In the light of what followed we can now see that it marked only the moment of transition when the moving finger paused briefly at the zero point while shifting from one side to the other on the dial of persecution—from the persecution of orthodox Christians by a pagan state to the persecution of pagans and heretics by orthodox Christians in alliance with the state.

1313. Religious Liberty, in Early Anabaptist Church Articles

SOURCE: David Masson, *The Life of John Milton*, Vol. 3 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1873), p. 101.

There was, however, *one* body or band of Separatists in James's reign who had pushed farther ahead, and grasped the idea of Liberty of Conscience at its very utmost... They were the poor and despised Anglo-Dutch Anabaptists who called John Smyth ... their leader. In a Confession, or Declaration of Faith, put forth in 1611 by the English Baptists in Amsterdam, just after the death of Smyth, this article occurs: "The magistrate is not to meddle with religion, or matters of conscience, nor compel men to this or that

form of religion; because Christ is the King and Lawgiver of the Church and Conscience.” It is believed that this is the first expression of the absolute principle of Liberty of Conscience in the public articles of any body of Christians.

1314. Religious Liberty, in the United States, Taken for Granted

SOURCE: Paul Blanshard, *God and Man in Washington* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960), p. 58 Copyright 1960 by Paul Blanshard. Used by permission.

With only a few technical restrictions, any American can organize a church, teach or preach religion, conduct a religious school, found a religious hospital and publish and distribute literature about his faith without being molested. All these religious freedoms must be extended impartially to all churches or religious schools without discrimination.

Those freedoms seem commonplace enough to most Americans; we tend to take them for granted. Yet they represent one of history’s greatest cultural achievements. They distinguish the American way of life in matters of religion from that of many other nations which consider themselves democratic.

1315. Religious Liberty, John Wesley on

SOURCE: John Wesley, “Advice to the People Called Methodists,” in his *Works* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, [reprint of 1872 ed.]), Vol. 8, p. 357.

Condemn no man for not thinking as you think: Let every one enjoy the full and free liberty of thinking for himself: Let every man use his own judgment, since every man must give an account of himself to God. Abhor every approach, in any kind or degree, to the spirit of persecution. If you cannot reason or persuade a man into the truth, never attempt to force him into it. If love will not compel him to come in, leave him to God, the Judge of all.

1316. Religious Liberty, Roger Williams the Pioneer of, in the New World

SOURCE: Roger Williams, *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution* (London: The Hanserd Knollys Society, 1848), p. 370, note 1.

[It is] a monstrous paradox, that God’s children should persecute God’s children, and that they that hope to live eternally together with Christ Jesus in the heavens, should not suffer each other to live in this common air together, &c. I am informed it was the speech of an honourable knight of the parliament: “What! Christ persecute Christ in New England?”

1317. Religious Liberty—U.S. First Amendment in Its Historical Setting

SOURCE: Justice [Felix] Frankfurter, Separate (concurring) opinion in *McGowan v. Maryland* and three other cases, U.S. Supreme Court, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 420, at pp. 463–467.

[p. 463] Within the discriminating phraseology of the First Amendment, distinction has been drawn between cases raising “establishment” and “free exercise” questions. Any attempt to formulate a bright-line distinction is bound to founder. In view of the competition among religious creeds, whatever “establishes” one sect disadvantages another, and vice versa. But it is possible historically, and therefore helpful analytically—no less for problems arising under the Fourteenth Amendment, illuminated as that Amendment is by our national experience, than for problems arising under the First—to isolate in general terms the two largely overlapping areas of concern reflected in the two constitutional phrases, “establishment” and “free exercise,” and which emerge more [p. 464] or less clearly from the background of events and impulses which gave those phrases birth.

In assuring the free exercise of religion, the Framers of the First Amendment were sensitive to the then recent history of those persecutions and impositions of civil disability with which sectarian majorities in virtually all of the Colonies had visited deviation in the matter of conscience. This protection of unpopular creeds, however, was not to be the full extent of the Amendment's guarantee of freedom from governmental intrusion in matters of faith. The battle in Virginia, hardly four years won, where James Madison had led the forces of disestablishment in successful opposition to Patrick Henry's proposed Assessment Bill levying a general tax for the support of Christian teachers, was a vital and compelling [p. 465] memory in 1789. The lesson of that battle, in the words of Jefferson's Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, whose passage was its verbal embodiment, was "that to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves, is sinful and tyrannical; that even the forcing him to support this or that teacher of his own religious persuasion, is depriving him of the comfortable liberty of giving his contributions to the particular pastor, whose morals he would make his pattern, and whose powers he feels most persuasive to righteousness, and is withdrawing from the ministry those temporal rewards, which proceeding from an approbation of their personal conduct, are an additional incitement to earnest and unremitting labours for the instruction of mankind..."⁵ [Note 5: 12 Hening, Statutes of Virginia (1823), 84, 85.] What Virginia had long practiced, and what Madison, Jefferson and others fought to end, was the extension of civil government's support to religion in a manner which made the two in some degree interdependent, and thus threatened the freedom of each. The purpose of the Establishment Clause was to assure that the national legislature would not exert its power in the service of any purely religious end; that it would not, as Virginia and virtually all of the Colonies had done, make of religion, as religion, an object of legislation.

Of course, the immediate object of the First Amendment's prohibition was the established church as it had been known in England and in most of the Colonies. But with foresight those who drafted and adopted the words: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," did not limit the constitutional proscription to any particular, dated form of state-supported theological venture. The Establishment Clause withdrew from [p. 466] the sphere of legitimate legislative concern and competence a specific, but comprehensive, area of human conduct: man's belief or disbelief in the verity of some transcendental idea and man's expression in action of that belief or disbelief. Congress may not make these matters, as such, the subject of legislation, nor, now, may any legislature in this country. Neither the National Government nor, under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, a State, may, by any device, support belief or the expression of belief for its own sake, whether from conviction of the truth of that belief, or from conviction that by the propagation of that belief the civil welfare of the state is served, or because a majority of its citizens, holding that belief, are offended when all do not hold it.

With regulations which have other objectives the Establishment Clause, and the fundamental separationist concept which it expresses, are not concerned. These regulations may fall afoul of the constitutional guarantee against infringement of the free exercise or observance of religion. Where they do, they must be set aside at the instance of those whose faith they prejudice. But once it is determined that a challenged statute is

supportable as implementing other substantial interests than the promotion of belief, the guarantee prohibiting religious “establishment” is satisfied.

To ask what interest, what objective, legislation serves, of course, is not to psychoanalyze its legislators, but to examine the necessary effects of what they have enacted. If the primary end achieved by a form of regulation is the affirmation or promotion of religious doctrine—primary, in the sense that all secular ends which it purportedly serves are derivative from, not wholly independent of, the advancement of religion—the regulation is beyond the power of the state. This was the case in *McCollum*. Or if a statute furthers both secular and religious ends [p. 467] by means unnecessary to the effectuation of the secular ends alone—where the same secular ends could equally be attained by means which do not have consequences for promotion of religion—the statute cannot stand.

1318. Religious Liberty—U.S. First Amendment Interpreted Broadly

SOURCE: U.S. Supreme Court opinion delivered by Mr. Chief Justice [Earl] Warren, in *McGowan v. Maryland*, October Term, 1960 (May 29, 1961), 366 U.S. 420, at pp. 441–443.

[p. 441] An early commentator opined that the “real object of the [first] amendment was ... to prevent any national ecclesiastical establishment, which should give to an hierarchy the exclusive patronage of the national government.” 3 Story, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, 728. But, the First Amendment, in its final form, [p. 442] did not simply bar a congressional enactment *establishing a church*; it forbade all laws *respecting an establishment of religion*. Thus, this Court has given the Amendment a “broad interpretation ... in the light of its history and the evils it was designed forever to suppress...” *Everson v. Board of Education, supra* [330 U.S. 1], at pp. 14–15. It has found that the First and Fourteenth Amendments afford protection against religious establishment far more extensive than merely to forbid a national or state church. Thus, in *McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U. S. 203, the Court held that the action of a board of education, permitting religious instruction during school hours in public school buildings and requiring those children who chose not to attend to remain in their classrooms, to be contrary to the “Establishment” Clause...

Thus, these broad principles have been set forth by this Court. Those cases dealing with the specific problems arising under the “Establishment” Clause which have reached this Court are few in number. The most extensive discussion of the “Establishment” Clause’s latitude [p. 443] is to be found in *Everson v. Board of Education, supra*, at pp. 15–16 [Court decision]:

“The ‘establishment of religion’ clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor [p. 22] the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or non-attendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a state nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organization or groups and *vice versa*. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect ‘a wall of separation between church and State.’”

1319. Religious Toleration, Catholic Definition of

SOURCE: Editorial, “On Religious Toleration,” *America, National Catholic Weekly Review* (920 Broadway, New York 10, N.Y.), 103 (Sept. 24, 1960), 690–693. Used by permission.

[p. 690] Toleration in general is the forbearance we show to something we regard as evil or inadequate, but which we are unable or unwilling to do away with. Religious toleration is that magnanimity we show toward those of another faith, determining to leave it and its believers untroubled even though we are convinced they profess what is false...

We must carefully note the difference between *theoretical dogmatic tolerance* and *practical civic tolerance* (whether this latter is exercised by the individual or the organized community).

The Catholic position on theoretical dogmatic tolerance is simple: no man, be he doctor, lawyer or Indian chief, can defend this sort of tolerance if he has any regard for truth. Theoretical dogmatic tolerance is nothing else than the affirmation that truth and error are of equal value in a universe where truth, religious or otherwise, either does not exist or is unattainable. If God is eternal Truth, and if He has endowed the mind with a natural inclination to attain His Truth insofar as it is mirrored in creation, then adherence to truth is a universal ethical duty. In this sense, indeed, "error has no right to exist," nor can man's psychological freedom to err be construed as a God-given right to be in the wrong. No sound concept of human liberty [p. 691] can confound this precious prerogative with the license to pursue falsity, either intellectual or moral. The perfection of man's development cannot lie along a road that deviates from eternal Truth and Law; it must be sought in conformity with them.

With logical consistency, therefore, the Catholic Church is unqualifiedly intolerant toward what it believes to be erroneous in faith and morals. For here, above all, is the field where error can jeopardize the salvation of the human soul. Moreover, this is the field in which the Church holds itself uniquely qualified to instruct humanity. For the Catholic Church, religious truth is one, not multiple; the Church alone possesses the full deposit of that truth by divine revelation, together with a divine commission to teach it to all men. It follows as a consequence that in order to be faithful to its essential constitution, the Catholic Church cannot concede that other faiths are theoretically justifiable; hence dogmatic intolerance in matters of religious truth is not merely a right but a sacred duty. Non-Catholics may find the thesis unpalatable, but the Catholic Church cannot reject it except at the cost of itself turning Protestant...

It may be entirely proper to refute error, wherever it appears. But it may be entirely wrong to assault the mind and heart in which error resides, whether or not the error is held in good faith. For when we confront human persons, we are never at liberty to disregard the principles of justice and charity: the inviolability of personality gives a new dimension to the dialogue on toleration.

Even more, when we consider human beings as grouped into the social entities called states, the application of the principles of toleration demands careful estimation of the claims of the common welfare...

As for the nature of practical public toleration, which is our chief concern here, it may be described as that exercise of political wisdom whereby the civil community, in seeking the social good of peace, not only recognizes the right of every citizen to make a sincere interior commitment of faith, but also leaves everyone free to give that faith a suitable external profession and cultus, subject to the essential requirements of public order and morality...

If we confine our attention to this broad ground of principle, it cannot be argued that the Catholic Church is opposed to practical public toleration, above all in the religiously pluralistic and constitutionally structured civil societies which are the emerging political pattern of modern times...

The repression of error, even in matters of religion, is not [p. 692] a good to be sought or achieved at all costs. In a definite historical context, the good of unity in faith may inevitably take second place to the common good of all the members of the commonwealth, simply because the benefits of religious unity cannot be attained without disastrously fracturing the bond of social fellowship...

So much then for the general principles that cover the abstract and practical aspects of religious toleration. All will grant that their application is difficult, and, to confine our attention to Catholicism, we will grant that in the long course of history they have been applied to real-life situations with limited consistency and wisdom. There have been Popes who were politically ambitious, theologians who were narrowly partisan, canonists who were too much influenced by the force of ancient customs. And since, after the Reformation, many Protestants have been on the "receiving end" of what impresses them, often justly, as Catholic bigotry, it is no wonder that they view with suspicion the actual attitudes of the Church toward religious toleration. They sometimes feel that the honeyed words about principles are given the lie by the record of the past and the thrust toward the future.

We will not advance the peaceful dialogue on toleration, it is to be feared, by airing ancient ills whose very recital evokes the uneasy ghosts of mistrust and prejudice. The grosser aspects of the Inquisition are no longer with us, but some of the odor remains, and so it is with many another difficulty that is cast up before us. If our non-Catholic brethren are to entertain any sympathetic appreciation of the new winds that are blowing through the fields of Catholic thinking on the pragmatic aspects of religious toleration, we must endeavor to make a fresh start toward the communication of understanding...

It is possible to cut the Gordian knot in this fashion and thus offer a less controversial basis for discussion of the divisive issue of toleration? We believe that such an approach is possible and that it will appeal to men of good will everywhere. The new basis is to be found in an important address of Pope Pius XII (*Pope Pius XII on the World Community*, The America Press, 25c.)

The late Pontiff was much preoccupied with the need of establishing a truly juridic world community among the society of nations...

While granting the difficulties and complexities that mankind would face in setting up such an organization, Pius XII did not hesitate to advance a *theoretical principle of harmonization* (Italics here and below are ours, not those of the Pope). He expounded it in the document named above, which was addressed to the Fifth National Convention of the Union of Italian Jurists on December 6, 1953:

Within the limits of the possible and lawful, to promote everything that facilitates union and makes it more effective; to remove everything that disturbs it; to tolerate at times that which it is impossible to correct but which, on the other hand, must not be permitted to make shipwreck of the community from which a higher good is hoped for.

Following this, the Pope proceeded to discuss the specific problem of protecting religion and morality in a world community whose member-states ran through the spectrum of belief from Christianity to professed atheism. In this matter, of which a partial aspect is the "practical coexistence of Catholic with non-Catholic states," Pius XII

proposed a *positive law of religious toleration* which was to be given world-wide validity and force:

Within its own territory and for its own citizens, each state will regulate religious and moral affairs by its own laws. *Nevertheless, throughout the whole territory of the international community of states, the citizens of every member-state will be allowed the exercise of their own beliefs and ethical and religious practices*, insofar as these do not contravene the penal laws of the state in which they are residing...

In justifying this sweeping concession to the claims of religious pluralism in a world community of states, Pius XII reviewed the traditional principles of religious toleration that we outlined in the earlier part of this editorial and raised the *crucial question*:

Could it be that in certain circumstances He (God) would not give men any mandate, would not impose any duty, and *would not even communicate the right* to impede or to repress what is erroneous and false?

To this question the Pope gave an affirmative answer: "Such a command is unknown to the common convictions of mankind, to Christian conscience, to the sources of revelation and to the practice of the Church."

The reason why the late Pontiff could commit himself so strongly to this position is to be found in what we emphasized in an earlier part of this essay: the duty of repressing religious and moral errors is not valid absolutely and unconditionally, even though the Church has a divine mandate to "draw to herself and [p. 693] bind together in religious unity the men of all races and of all times." Therefore, without prejudice to the duty of theoretical dogmatic intolerance, the Pope recognized the necessity of the *norm of the common good* for the resolution of questions of fact in the existential order of pluralistic communities:

The duty of repressing moral and religious error cannot therefore be an ultimate norm of action. It must be subordinated to *higher and more general norms*, which *in some circumstances* permit, and even perhaps seem to indicate as the better policy, toleration of error in order to promote *a greater good*. (In this quotation the italics are those of Pius XII.)

The greater good under discussion, of course, is that tremendous complex of spiritual and temporal goods which on the one hand embraces the welfare of the Church and State in every individual commonwealth, and on the other, the well-being of the universal Church and of the nascent world community internationally organized along juridic lines...

Pope Pius XII offered for juridic exploration and implementation a Magna Carta of Religious Liberty that is surely deserving of sympathy. And in proposing his plan, which he insisted was in accord with traditional principles, he did not hesitate to add that "no other norms are valid for the Church except the norms we have just indicated for the Catholic jurist and statesman."

Surely these forthright statements of a recent and most respected Pope should comfort those who are troubled with an obsessive fear that the Church entertains gross political designs upon the nations or upon the American political system in particular. In fact, it is quotations such as the above, together with others that might be drawn from the modern Popes beginning with Leo XIII, that will form the nucleus of a practical theology of toleration and of freedom of conscience that is applicable to the changing conditions of our time.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This extract is a forthright statement. It does not offer religious liberty, but what it advocates is, by definition in the first sentence correctly called toleration—"the forbearance" of "something we regard as evil or inadequate"; not an inalienable right inherent in the individual, but a sufferance that is granted (or withheld) at the discretion of the church or state for the benefit of "the common good," not for the protection of the minority. Religious repression is here not defined as an evil, but as "not a good to be sought or achieved at all costs." Private faith is to be given a "suitable" external profession and worship.

And the best that can be quoted from a papal pronouncement as a “sweeping concession to the claims of religious pluralism” is merely a concession of toleration, at times, of what is impossible to correct, with citizens of various states allowed their own beliefs and practices under the regulation of penal laws. This forthright statement will bear careful study, and should be taken exactly at face value.]

1320. Rewards, Final, of the Righteous and the Wicked (Moslem View)

SOURCE: Koran, Sūra lvi, 1–56, in *The Holy Qur–an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 2, pp. 1484–1490. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 1484] *In the name of God, Most Gracious, Most Merciful.*

1. When the Event Inevitable Cometh to pass,
2. Then will no (soul) Entertain falsehood Concerning its coming.
3. (Many) will it bring low; (Many) will it exalt;
4. When the earth shall be Shaken to its depths,
5. And the mountains shall Be crumbled to atoms,
6. Becoming dust scattered abroad,
7. And ye shall be sorted out Into three classes.
8. Then (there will be) The Companions of The Right Hand;—What will be The

Companions of The Right Hand?

[p. 1485] 9. And the Companions of The Left Hand,—What will be The

Companions of The Left Hand?

10. And those Foremost (In Faith) will be Foremost (in the Hereafter).
11. These will be Those Nearest to God:
12. In Gardens of Bliss:
13. A number of people From those of old,
14. And a few from those Of later times.
15. (They will be) on Thrones Encrusted (with gold And precious stones),
16. Reclining on them, Facing each other.

[p. 1486] 17. Round about them will (serve) Youths of perpetual (freshness),

18. With goblets, (shining) beakers, And cups (filled) out of Clear-flowing

fountains:

19. No after-ache will they Receive therefrom, nor will they Suffer intoxication:
20. And with fruits, Any that they may select;
21. And the flesh of fowls, Any that they may desire.
22. And (there will be) Companions With beautiful, big, And lustrous eyes,—
23. Like unto Pearls Well-guarded.
24. A Reward for the Deeds Of their past (Life).
25. No frivolity will they Hear therein, nor any Taint of ill,—

[p. 1487] 26. Only the saying, “Peace! Peace”.

27. The Companions of The Right Hand,—What will be The Companions of The Right Hand?

28. (They will be) among Lote-trees without thorns,
29. Among Talh trees With flowers (or fruits) Piled one above another,—
30. In shade long-extended,
31. By water flowing constantly,
32. And fruit in abundance.
33. Whose season is not limited, Nor (supply) forbidden,
34. And on Thrones (of Dignity), Raised high.

35. We have created (their Companions) Of special creation.
 [p. 1488] 36. And made them Virgin-pure (and undefiled),—
 37. Beloved (by nature), Equal in age,—
 38. For the Companions Of the Right Hand.

SECTION 2.

39. A (goodly) number From those of old,
 40. And a (goodly) number From those of later times.
 41. The Companions of The Left Hand,—What will be The Companions of The
 Left Hand?
 42. (They will be) in the midst Of a fierce Blast of Fire And in Boiling Water,
 43. And in the shades of Black Smoke:
 44. Nothing (will there be) To refresh, nor to please:
 45. For that they were wont To be indulged, before that,
 [p. 1489] In wealth (and luxury),
 46. And persisted obstinately In wickedness supreme!
 47. And they used to say, “What! when we die And become dust and bones, Shall
 we then indeed Be raised up again?—
 48. “(We) and our fathers of old?”
 49. Say: “Yea, those of old And those of later times,
 50. “All will certainly be Gathered together for the meeting Appointed for a Day
 Well-known.
 51. “Then will ye truly,—O ye that go wrong, And treat (Truth) as Falsehood!—
 52. “Ye will surely taste Of the Tree of Zaqqūm.
 53. “Then will ye fill Your insides therewith,
 54. “And drink Boiling Water On top of it:
 [p. 1490] 55. “Indeed ye shall drink Like diseased camels Raging with thirst!”
 56. Such will be their entertainment On the Day of Requit!

1321. Ring, Engagement, in Ancient Rome

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), p. 29.

Among the Romans ... there was a ceremony of betrothal, which sometimes took place long before the wedding. On this occasion the prospective bridegroom gave his fiancée a ring which she wore on the third finger of her left hand. Sometimes guests were invited, and the bride-to-be received presents.

1322. Ring, Wedding, in Ancient Rome

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), p. 32.

In regard to the giving of a [wedding] ring it seems probable, in spite of Tertullian's comment on the pagan character of the custom, that it was usual among most of the Christians even in his time (about A.D. 200), and it is quite clear that it was a universal practice from the fourth century.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This is what Tertullian says: “Touching the ceremonies, however, of private and social solemnities—as those of the white toga [the garment assumed at manhood by the Roman citizen], of espousals, of nuptials, of name-giving—I should think no danger need be guarded against from the breath of the idolatry which is mixed up with them. For the causes are to be considered to which the ceremony is due. Those above-named I take to be clean in themselves, because neither manly garb, nor the marital ring or union, descends from honours done to any idol” (*On Idolatry*, chap. 16, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 71).]

1323. Ritualism, in the Early Church

SOURCE: H. G. Wells, *The Outline of History*, pp. 514, 515. Copyright 1920 and 1921 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and by H. G. Wells. Used by permission of Prof. G. P. Wells.

[p. 514] Jesus had called men and women to a giant undertaking, to the renunciation of self, to the new birth into the kingdom of love. The line of least resistance for the flagging convert was to intellectualize himself away from this plain doctrine, this stark proposition, into complicated theories and ceremonies—that would leave his essential self alone. How much easier is it to sprinkle oneself with blood than to purge oneself from malice and competition; to eat bread and drink wine and pretend one had absorbed divinity, to give candles rather than the heart, to shave the head and retain the scheming privacy of the brain inside it! The world was full of such evasive philosophy and theological stuff in the opening centuries of the Christian era...

By the fourth century of the Christian era we find all the Christian communities so agitated and exasperated by tortuous and elusive arguments [p. 515] about the nature of God as to be largely negligent of the simpler teachings of charity, service, and brotherhood that Jesus had inculcated.

1324. Robes, Ascension, Himes on

SOURCE: Joshua V. Himes, Letter to the editors, *The Outlook*, 50 (Nov. 24, 1894), 875.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE OUTLOOK:

I have been much interested in the articles lately appearing in *The Outlook* upon the question of ascension robes. I am glad that public interest has been again aroused upon this topic, for it is time it should be settled, and settled right; and nothing is truly settled until it is settled right.

I wish to say that I was intimately associated with William Miller for eleven years, beginning in 1839; that with him I attended hundreds of meetings, laboring with him in public and private, and was with him at his home in the State of New York on the night of the tenth day of the seventh month, when we expected the Lord to come; and, having had a perfect knowledge of everything connected with that work, I *know* the whole story of ascension robes to be a concoction of the enemies of the Adventists, begotten of religious prejudices, and that there is not a scintilla of truth in it. No wonder the writer in *The Outlook* of October 27 did not give his name and address. The statement that “to be prepared, dressed in their ascension robes, was the instruction given by their leaders to the rank and file of the Millerites,” is almost too silly to be noticed. The writer originated, and with others singed, the call for the first Adventist conference, which was held with the church over which he was pastor in Boston, Mass., in 1840.

During those eventful days, from 1840 to 1844, and for several years after, I had charge of all their publishing work, and no man, living or dead, knew better what was taught and done by Adventists than did I. There were some excesses, such as always attend great religious upheavals, but they were not committed by the instruction of their leaders, and the putting on of ascension robes was not one of these excesses.

When these stories first started, and while I was publishing in the interests of the Adventist cause, I kept a standing offer, in the paper of which I was editor, of a large reward for one well-authenticated case where an ascension robe was worn by those looking for the Lord's return. No such proof has ever been forthcoming. It was always rumor, and nothing more. Absolute evidence never has been furnished. It has always been one of those delightful falsehoods which many people have wanted to believe, and hence its popularity and perpetuity until this present day. I have refuted the story hundreds of times, in both the “*Advent Herald*” in Boston, Mass., and in the “*Midnight Cry*” in New York, which had a circulation of tens of thousands of copies; and no accusers ever made

an attempt to defend themselves, although I held my columns open to them to do so. And now, at the age of ninety years, with a full personal experience of those times, before God, who is my Judge, and before whose tribunal I must soon appear, I declare again that the ascension-robe story is a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end, and I am glad of the opportunity to deny it once more before I die.

The preparation urged upon the “rank and file” of those looking for the coming of the Lord was a preparation of heart of and life by a confession of Christ, a forsaking of their sins and living a godly life; and the only robes they were exhorted to put on were the robes of righteousness, obtained by faith in Jesus Christ—garments made white in the blood of the Lamb. Nothing of an outward appearance was ever thought of or mentioned. JOSHUA V. HIMES, Rector St. Andrew’s Episcopal Church, Elk Point, South Dakota

October 29, 1894.

1325. Rome, After Defeat of Carthage, Expands

SOURCE: George Stephen Goodspeed, *A History of the Ancient World* (rev. ed., New York: Scribner, 1912), p. 365.

Hardly had the conflict with Carthage been won, when a war broke out with Macedonia. Thus Rome was involved directly with the politics of the east and could not call a halt until the kingdoms of Macedonia, Syria and Egypt, with the lesser powers of Greece and Asia Minor, became either subjects or allies of Rome. Thus was created an empire around the Mediterranean sea, from the Atlantic to the Euphrates river.

1326. Rome, as Dominant Power in the East by 168 B.C.

SOURCE: Arthur E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (4th ed.), pp. 131, 132. Copyright 1955 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

[p. 131] Finally, in 168, the Romans . . . won a complete victory over Perseus in the battle of Pydna. Perseus took refuge in flight but soon was obliged to give himself up. He was taken to Rome, where he was treated with ignominy and died in captivity. The Macedonian kingdom was at an end: its territory was divided into four autonomous republics, which were forbidden mutual privileges of *commercium* and *conubium*; a yearly tribute of 100 talents was imposed upon [p. 132] them; the royal mines and domains became the property of the Roman state, and for a time the gold and silver mines were shut down . . .

Having disposed of Macedonia, the Romans turned their attention to the other Greek states with the intention of rewarding their friends and punishing their enemies.

1327. Rome, Rome, as Real Sovereign in Eastern Mediterranean

SOURCE: Arthur E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (4th ed.), p. 132. Copyright 1955 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

It was clear [after Pydna] that Rome was the real sovereign in the eastern Mediterranean and that her friends and allies enjoyed only local autonomy, while they were expected to be obedient to the orders of Rome. This is well illustrated by the anecdote of the circle of Popilius. During the Third Macedonian War, Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, King of Syria, had invaded Egypt. After the battle of Pydna a Roman ambassador, Gaius Popilius by name, was sent to make him withdraw. Popilius met Antiochus before Alexandria and delivered the Senate’s message. The king asked for time for consideration; but the Roman, drawing a circle around him in the sand, bade him answer before he left the spot. Antiochus yielded and evacuated Egypt.

1328. Rome, as Successor to Greece by Conquest of Macedonia (Dan. 8:9)

SOURCE: Theodor Mommsen, *The History of Rome*, bk. 3, chap. 10 (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, [1957]), Vol. 2, pp. 508, 518, 519. Used by permission.

[p. 508] Thus [by victory over Perseus, king of Macedonia, battle of Pydna, June 22, 168 B.C.] perished the empire of Alexander the Great, which had subdued and Hellenized the east, 144 [actually 155] years after its founder's death...

[p. 518] All the Hellenistic states had thus been completely subjected to the protectorate of Rome, and the whole empire of Alexander the Great had fallen to the Roman commonwealth just as if the city had inherited it from his heirs. From all sides kings and ambassadors flocked to Rome to congratulate her; and they showed that fawning is never more abject than when kings are in the antechamber...

[p. 519] The moment was at least well chosen for such acts of homage. Polybius dates from the battle of Pydna the full establishment of the universal empire of Rome. It was in fact the last battle in which a civilized state confronted Rome in the field on a footing of equality with her as a great power; all subsequent struggles were rebellions or wars with peoples beyond the pale of the Romano-Greek civilization—with barbarians, as they were called. The whole civilized world thenceforth recognized in the Roman senate the supreme tribunal, whose commission decided in the last resort between kings and nations; and to acquire its language and manners foreign princes and youths of quality resided in Rome.

[EDITORS' NOTE: On the number of years the great historian suffered a slip of the pen: the battle of Pydna occurred in the year 144 of the Seleucid Era, which was not counted from Alexander's death (323 B.C.) but from the year when Seleucus I took over Babylon (312/11 B.C.)]

1329. Rome, Called the "Iron Monarchy"

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 38, general observations at end of chapter, par. 1, Vol. 4 (London: Methuen & Co., 1898), p. 161.

The arms of the republic, sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the Ocean; and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations and their kings, were successively broken by the *iron* monarchy of Rome.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Although Gibbon uses the phrase "iron monarchy," reminiscent of the iron kingdom of Daniel's image, he was aware, as the first sentence shows that Rome was not a monarchy when she expanded her holdings as described. While yet a republic Rome had reached the Atlantic, the Euphrates, and the Rhine, though the legions arrived at the Danube in the reign of Augustus (see *SDADic*, map XIX). It was the Roman *republic* that took over the territories of Alexander's empire; in fact, Augustus became the first emperor at his conquest of Egypt in 31 B.C. Nevertheless the farthest limits of expansion were reached under the subsequent empire period, and thus we can look back and speak of the Roman Empire as the successor of the Greco-Macedonian.]

1330. Rome—Civilizing Influence of Greece

SOURCE: A. E. R. Boak and others, *The Growth of European Civilization* (3d ed., 1946), p. 84. Copyright 1938, 1941, 1943, by F. S. Crofts & Co., Inc., New York. Used by permission of Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

From the opening of the historic period the development of Roman civilization was profoundly affected by foreign influences, in particular by Etruscan and Greek. But whereas the influence of the Etruscans virtually ceased with the expulsion of their kings from Rome, that of the Greek continued with increasing strength throughout the whole of the period of the republic. This Greek influence first made itself felt in Rome indirectly through Etruscan channels; there followed direct contact with Cumae, the most northerly

outpost of Greek colonization in Italy; then with the Greek cities of southern Italy, particularly Tarentum; still later with Syracuse in Sicily; and finally with the Aegean and Asiatic Greeks through the incorporation of European Greece and a large part of the Hellenistic East into the Roman Empire. In addition to the Romans and Italians, who as soldiers, administrators, tax collectors, and business men came to know Greek culture in its native environment, Rome itself from the second century B.C. was thronged with Greek teachers, traders, architects, artists, doctors, and above all, with household slaves, all of whom acted as conscious or unconscious agents in the spread of Hellenism. In these circumstances it was inevitable that the older and more advanced Hellenic civilization should leave an indelible imprint upon the younger and less highly developed culture of Rome. And, in fact, there is hardly a single important aspect of Roman civilization that does not reveal unmistakable traces of imitating or borrowing ideas that originated among the Greeks. With obvious truth the Roman poet Horace could say: "Captive Greece has captured her rude conqueror."

1331. Rome, Divinities of Greece Adopted by

SOURCE: A. E. R. Boak and others, *The Growth of European Civilization* (3d ed., 1946), p. 93. Copyright 1938, 1941, 1943, by F. S. Crofts & Co., Inc., New York. Used by permission of Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Contact with the Greeks led to the introduction of Greek divinities and, of much greater importance, to the identification of the native Italian gods with those of the Greek pantheon, with the result that Greek mythology and forms of artistic representation were taken over wholesale by the Romans.

1332. Rome—Emperor Augustus and the City's Grandeur

SOURCE: Suetonius *Lives of the Caesars* ii. 28; translated by J. C. Rolfe, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 167. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Since the city was not adorned as the dignity of the empire demanded, and was exposed to flood and fire, he [Augustus] so beautified it that he could justly boast that he had found it built of brick and left it in marble.

1333. Rome—Emperor Tiberius Accepts Sovereignty

SOURCE: Dio Cassius *Roman History* lvii. 7; trans. by Earnest Cary, Vol. 7 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), pp. 127, 129. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 127] Now when no further news of any rebellious [p. 129] moves came [after Augustus' death] and the whole Roman world had acquiesced securely in his leadership, Tiberius accepted the rule without further dissimulation.

1334. Rome—Emperor Tiberius Ruler at Time of Christ's Death

SOURCE: Tacitus *Histories* xv. 44; translated by Clifford H. Moore, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 283, 285. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 283] Christus, the founder of the name [Christians], had undergone the death penalty in the reign of Tiberius, by sentence of the procurator Pontius Pilatus, and the pernicious superstition was checked for a moment, only to break out once more, not merely in Judaea, the home of the disease, but in the capital itself, where all things horrible or shameful in the world collect and find a vogue. First, then, the confessed members of the sect were arrested; next, on their disclosures, vast [p. 285] numbers were convicted, not so much on the count of arson as for hatred of the human race.

1335. Rome, Golden-Age Expectations in

SOURCE: Cicero, [Marcus Tullius], *The Republic* iii. 22, translated by Clinton Walker Keyes (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943), p. 211. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

There will not be different laws at Rome and at Athens, or different laws now and in the future, but one eternal and unchangeable law will be valid for all nations and all times, and there will be one master and ruler, that is, God, over us all, for he is the author of this law, its promulgator, and its enforcing judge.

1336. Rome—“Head of the World” an Early Goal

SOURCE: *Livy* v. 51.3; 54.5–7; translated by B. O. Foster, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940), pp. 171, 185. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 171] And although, while the Gauls were victorious and in possession of the entire City [of Rome, 390 B.C.] the Capitol nevertheless and the Citadel were held by the gods and men of Rome, shall we now, when the Romans are victorious and the City is regained, desert even Citadel and Capitol? ...

[p. 185] It is now, Quirites, in its three hundred and sixty-fifth year... Granting that your valour may go elsewhere, yet surely the fortune of this place could not be taken along Here is the Capitol, where men were told, when of old they discovered there a human head, that in that place should be the head of the world and the seat of empire.

1337. Rome, “Nearly the Whole World” Ruled by

SOURCE: Polybius *The Histories* i. 1. 5, 6; 2.7; translated by W. R. Paton, Vol. I (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 3, 5, 7. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 3] For who is so worthless or indolent as not to wish to know by what means and under what system of polity the Romans in [p. 5] less than fifty-three years (220–168 B.C.) have succeeded in subjecting nearly the whole inhabited world to their sole government—a thing unique in history? Or who again is there so passionately devoted to other spectacles or studies as to regard anything as of greater moment than the acquisition of this knowledge? ...

[p. 7] But the Romans have subjected to their rule not portions, but nearly the whole of the world [and possess an empire which is not only immeasurably greater than any which preceded it, but need not fear rivalry in the future].

[EDITORS' NOTE: The brackets in the last sentence appear in the translation.]

1338. Rome, Policy of, as Plutarch Viewed It

SOURCE: Plutarch *Moralia*, “On the Fortune of the Romans,” 11; translated by Frank Cole Babbitt, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), pp. 363, 365. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 363] The smooth flow of events and the impelling swiftness of Rome's progress to so high a pinnacle of power and expansion demonstrates to all who reason aright that the progress of Rome's sovereignty was not brought about by the handiwork and urging of human beings, but was speeded on its way by divine escort and the fair wind of Fortune. Trophy upon trophy arises, triumph meets triumph, and the first blood, while still warm on their arms, is overtaken and washed away by a second flood. They count [p. 365] their victories, not by the multitude of corpses and spoils, but by captive kingdoms, by nations enslaved, by islands and continents added to their mighty realm.

1339. Rome, Policy of, Combination of Clemency and Harshness

SOURCE: *Diodorus of Sicily* xxxii. 4; translated by Francis R. Walton, Vol. 11 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 415, 417. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 415] In more recent times the Romans, when they went in pursuit of world empire, brought it into being by the valour of their arms, then extended its influence far and wide by the kindest possible treatment of the vanquished. So far, indeed, did they abstain from cruelty and revenge on those subjected to them that they appeared to treat them not as enemies, but as if they were benefactors and friends. Whereas the conquered, as former foes, expected to be visited with fearful reprisals, the conquerors left no room for anyone to surpass them in clemency. Some they enrolled as fellow citizens, to some they granted rights of intermarriage, to others they restored their independence, and in no case did they nurse a resentment that was unduly severe. Because of their surpassing humanity, therefore, kings, cities, and whole nations went over to the Roman standard. But once they held sway over virtually the whole inhabited world, they confirmed their power by terrorism and by the destruction of the most eminent cities. Corinth they razed to the ground, the Macedonians (Perseus for example) they rooted out, they razed [p. 417] Carthage and the Celtiberian city of Numantia, and there were many whom they cowed by terror.

1340. Rome—Preparation for the Spread of Christianity

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 185, 186. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 185] The Mediterranean, for centuries the highway [p. 186] of civilization and the clearing-house of ideas, was free from pirates; the great military roads radiating in trunk-lines from the *miliarium aureum* in the Forum to the uttermost parts of the Empire with branch-networks in every province made communication easy and safe. It has been said that private travel in the Antonine Age was not equaled for safety, rapidity and comfort down to the advent of railways and steamships. There were only two principal languages, Latin and Greek, understood by the educated and mercantile classes everywhere. Rome had rid herself of local prejudices, political, social, and especially religious, and the union of many peoples with common sentiments laid the sure basis for a progressive religion. As Ernest Renan wrote:

Think of the apostles in the face of an Asia Minor, a Greece, and Italy divided into a hundred little republics; of a Gaul, a Spain, an Africa, in possession of old national institutions—and it is no longer possible to conceive of their success, or even to understand how their project would have had its birth. The unity of the Empire was the condition precedent to any great religious proselytism which should set itself above nationalities.⁸³ [Note 83: *Lectures on the Influence of the Institutions, Thought, and Culture of Rome on Christianity*, tr. by Charles Beard (4th ed.; London, 1898), pp. 18–19.]

1341. Rome, Prophecies Applied to—“Eternal City,” and Woman of Revelation 17

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

It is worthy of notice, that the post-Nicene, as well as the ante-Nicene fathers, with all their reverence for the Roman see, regarded the heathenish title of Rome, *urbs aeterna*, as blasphemous, with reference to the passage of the woman sitting upon a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, Rev. xvii. 3. The prevailing opinion seems to have been, that Rome and the Roman empire would fall before the advent of Antichrist and the second coming of the Lord.

1342. Rome, Prophecies Applied to—4th Beast (Contemporary View)

SOURCE: Hippolytus, *Treatise on Christ and Antichrist*, secs. 32, 33, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 5, p. 210.

Rejoice, blessed Daniel thou hast not been in error: all these things have come to pass.

33. After this again thou hast told me of the beast dreadful and terrible. “It had iron teeth and claws of brass: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it.” Already the iron rules; already it subdues and breaks all in pieces already it brings all the unwilling into subjection; already we see these things ourselves. Now we glorify God, being instructed by thee.

1343. Rome, Religion of—Astrology and Eastern Cults During the Empire Period

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 50–53.

[p. 50] Towards the commencement of our era, when the peace and unity of the ancient world was assured by the foundation of the Empire, began the development of this great religious movement which little by little was to orientalise Roman paganism. The gods of the nations of the Levant imposed themselves, one after another, on the West. Cybele and Attis were transported [p. 51] from Phrygia, Isis and Serapis travelled thither from Alexandria. Merchants, soldiers, and slaves brought the Baals of Syria and Mithra, an immigrant from the heart of Persia... All of them, no matter what their origin, were influenced in different degrees by astrology and star-worship... Attis, the Anatolian deity of vegetation, ended by becoming a solar god, just like Serapis, the Baals, and Mithra. In very early times, even in Mesopotamia, star-worship was imposed upon Persian Mazdaism... The mysteries of Mithra imported into Europe this composite theology, offspring of the intercourse between Magi and Chaldeans; and the signs of the zodiac, the symbols of the planets, the emblems of the elements, appear time after time on the bas-reliefs, mosaics, and paintings of their subterranean temples... [p. 52] Towards the age of the Severi [astrology] acquired an almost undisputed supremacy even in the Latin world.

Here it no longer presents itself as a learned theory taught by mathematicians, but as a sacred doctrine revealed to the adepts of exotic cults, which have all assumed the form of mysteries...

[p. 53] The triumph of Oriental religions was simultaneously the triumph of astral religion, but to secure recognition by all pagan peoples, it needed an official sanction. The influence which it had acquired among the populace, was finally assured when the emperors lent it an interested support.

1344. Rome, Religion of—Babylonian Sun Cult Made Official by Emperor Aurelian

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 55, 56.

[p. 55] In 274, Aurelian ... created a new cult of the “Invincible Sun.” Worshipped in a splendid temple, served by pontiffs who were raised to the level of the ancient pontiffs of Rome, celebrated every fourth year by magnificent games, *Sol Invictus* was definitely promoted to the highest rank in the divine hierarchy and became the official protector of the Sovereigns and of the Empire... He [Aurelian] placed in his new sanctuary the

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

images of Bel [god of Babylon; see No. 154] and Helios, which he captured at Palmyra. In establishing this new State cult, Aurelian in reality proclaimed the dethronement of the old Roman idolatry and the accession of Semitic Sun-worship...

[p. 56] This sidereal theology, founded on ancient beliefs of Chaldean astrologers, transformed in the Hellenistic age under the twofold influence of astronomic discoveries and Stoic thought, [was] promoted, after becoming a pantheistic Sun-worship, to the rank of official religion of the Roman Empire.

1345. Rome, Religion of—Emperor Worship—Roman Emperors Become Personification of Sun-god

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 53, 54.

[p. 53] In proportion as Caesarism became more and more transformed into absolute monarchy, it tended more and more to lean for support on the Oriental clergy. These priests, loyal to the traditions of the Achaemenids and the Pharaohs, preached doctrines which tended to elevate sovereigns above mankind, and they supplied the emperors with a dogmatic justification of their despotism. For the old [p. 54] principle of the sovereignty of the people, the original form of Caesarism, was substituted a reasoned belief in supernatural influences. The emperor is the image of the Sun on earth, like him invincible and eternal (*invictus, aeternus*), as his official title declares. Already in the eyes of the Babylonians the Sun was the royal planet, and it is he that in Rome continues to give to his chosen ones the virtues of sovereignty, and destines them for the throne from the time of their appearance on earth.

1346. Rome.—Seat of Empire Moved to Constantinople by Constantine

SOURCE: Henry Edward Manning, *The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ* (2d ed.; London: Burns & Lambert, 1862), pp. 11, 12.

[p. 11] From the hour when Constantine ... translated the seat of empire to Constantinople, from that moment there never reigned [p. 12] in Rome a temporal prince to whom the Bishops of Rome owed a permanent allegiance [see No. 1119].

1347. Rome, So-called “Christianizing” of

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 93.

But the elevation of Christianity as the religion of the state presents also an opposite aspect to our contemplation. It involved great risk of degeneracy to the church. The Roman state, with its laws, institutions, and usages, was still deeply rooted in heathenism, and could not be transformed by a magical stroke. The christianizing of the state amounted therefore in great measure to a paganizing and secularizing of the church. The world overcame the church, as much as the church overcame the world, and the temporal gain of Christianity was in many respects cancelled by spiritual loss. The mass of the Roman empire was baptized only with water, not with the Spirit and fire of the gospel, and it smuggled heathen manners and practices into the sanctuary under a new name. The very combination of the cross with the military ensign by Constantine was a most doubtful omen, portending an unhappy mixture of the temporal and the spiritual powers.

1348. Rome—Theodosius I Makes Christianity the State Religion

SOURCE: Charles Norris Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), pp. 328–332. Used by permission.

[p. 328] By the manifesto of Constantine and Licinius there had been substituted for the classical idea of the commonwealth the notion of two more or less distinct orders, the

one political, the other ecclesiastical. With that of Theodosius [I], the relationship between these orders was finally determined by the complete subordination of the temporal to the spiritual power...

The recognition in Catholicism of a principle of universal validity and application suggested the possibility of its adoption as the basis for a new social order, in which the state should find justification for its existence in 'defending the peace of the Church'. In this idea may be seen the spirit and purpose of Theodosianism, and it found expression in a thoroughgoing effort to realize, within the framework of the Roman system, the forms of a Catholic state...

[p. 329] The formal liquidation of paganism under Theodosius and his successors has been characterized as 'perhaps the only example of the total extirpation of any ancient and popular superstition' and thus deserving of consideration as 'a singular event in the history of the human mind'...

Legislative activity against paganism began with the edict of 381, branding it as sacrilegious to participate in forbidden rites either by day or night with the object of divination, or to use for such purpose any existing shrine or altar. The year following witnessed the nationalization of the temples and of their treasures (including the statues of the gods) which were thrown open to the public as monuments of art, access to the altars alone being prohibited. In 385 the campaign against divination was extended to include the prohibition of *auspicia* even by native rites. These and similar measures were followed in 392 by what has been called a final and comprehensive enactment against paganism:

'No one of whatever rank, position or dignity, high or low, rich or poor, in any place whatsoever in any city, shall sacrifice an innocent victim to senseless images; nor, in the more intimate efforts of propitiation, shall he worship the *lar* with fire, the *genius* with wine, the *penates* with savour, by lighting flames, laying on incense or suspending garlands...

'Individuals presuming to sacrifice victims or to consult their entrails shall be assimilated to the position of those charged with treason, all persons being authorized to lay an accusation against them and, upon conviction, they shall suffer the penalties provided by law, even though they have made no inquiries contrary or relative to the safety of the prince. It is enough to convict them that they should have desired to break the laws of nature itself, by prying into and unfolding forbidden mysteries...

'Any one who worships an image constructed by human hands and thus foolishly reveals his fears of that which he has himself made, who decorates trees with fillets or erects altars of cut turf, shall be punished by the confiscation of the property upon which he is shown to have indulged in such superstition. 'Any one who attempts, either in public temples or shrines or on private properties other than his own, to perform any act of pagan sacrifice ... shall be liable to a fine of twenty pounds, gold.'

The prohibition of pagan worship was followed, in 396, by a final cancellation of privileges and immunities accorded by ancient law to the priests and ministers of pagan cults, whose profession was now officially outlawed...

[p. 331] These measures will serve to illustrate the methods employed by Theodosius in stamping out the vestiges of paganism. They reveal the official Graeco-Roman religion as a victim of weapons which it had itself invoked against Christianity in the days of its ascendancy. In legislating the gods out of existence, the role of the state was purely formal and, formally, the victory appears to have been pathetically easy and swift. Opposition developed chiefly among the nobility of the ancient capital. [p. 332] ... Otherwise the administration encountered serious resistance only among the volatile masses of great Eastern cities such as Alexandria, where the conflict between pagan and Christian was bitter and prolonged.

1349. Rome, to Be Displaced by New Barbarian Nations

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 128.

The uncontrollable progress of avarice, prodigality, voluptuousness, theatre going, intemperance, lewdness, in short, of all the heathen vices, which Christianity had come to eradicate, still carried the Roman empire and people with rapid strides toward dissolution, and gave it at last into the hands of the rude, but simple and morally vigorous barbarians. When the Christians were awakened by the crashings of the falling empire, and anxiously asked why God permitted it, Salvian, the Jeremiah of his time, answered: "Think of your vileness and your crimes, and see whether you are worthy of the divine protection." Nothing but the divine judgment of destruction upon this nominally Christian, but essentially heathen world, could open the way for the moral regeneration of society. There must be new, fresh nations, if the Christian civilization prepared in the old Roman empire was to take firm root and bear ripe fruit.

1350. Rome—Western Empire—Barbarian Invasions as Viewed by a Contemporary

SOURCE: Ammianus Marcellinus *History* xxvi. 4. 5; translated by John C. Rolfe, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 587, 589. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 587] At this time [c. A.D. 365], as if trumpets were sounding the war-note throughout the whole Roman world, the most savage peoples roused themselves and poured across [p. 589] the nearest frontiers. At the same time the Alamanni were devastating Gaul and Raetia, the Sarmatae and Quadi Pannonia, while the Picts, Saxons, Scots, and Attacotti were harassing the Britons with constant disasters. The Austoriani and other Moorish tribes raided Africa more fiercely than ever and predatory bands of Goths were plundering Thrace and Pannonia.

1351. Rome—Western Empire, Breakup of, Gradual

SOURCE: F. J. Foakes-Jackson, "The New West and Gregory the Great," in the composite work *An Outline of Christianity* (New York: Bethlehem Publishers, 1926), Vol. 2, pp. 149–152.

[p. 149] While ecclesiastical dogma was being hardened into a definite creed the Roman world was slowly dissolving. The battle of Hadrianople, where the Emperor Valens and his army were annihilated in 378, was in a sense the beginning of the end. The victorious Goths then reached the suburbs of Constantinople but advanced no further. During the reign of Theodosius the Great, the barbarians, on the whole, respected the frontiers of the empire. The crisis came about 410, when the Visigothic King Alaric captured Rome. The Roman legions were withdrawn from Britain, and the island was left to intestine discord and foreign invasion. The Goths, a Teutonic people, set up kingdoms in Gaul and Spain. Then came the terrible Vandal invasion of Africa and the establishment of the pirate kingdom of Carthage. In 455 Genseric the Vandal took Rome. But before this a more terrible enemy had appeared, in Attila and the Huns, wild Mongolian horsemen, whose vast hordes from a world unknown to the Romans carried ruin and desolation far and wide. Under the feeble rule of Theodosius II Attila's progress was unchecked, but when his sister Pulcheria raised her husband Marcian to the purple manlier counsels prevailed, and the Huns were defeated by the Roman general, Aetius, and the Visigothic king, Theodoric, at the great battle of Châlons in the year 451.

[p. 150] In the West the empire was in the throes of dissolution—Africa, Spain, and Britain were lost. In Italy barbarian generals set up puppet emperors only to dethrone them. At last in 479 [i.e., 476] Odoacer, a barbarian chief, the real master of Italy,

deprived Romulus Augustulus of the imperial dignity, sending the insignia of the empire to the Eastern emperor, Zeno, with a message that one ruler of the Roman world was sufficient. From this time a barbarian king ruled with an authority nominally delegated to him by the emperor at Constantinople. Odoacer was supplanted by Theodoric the Ostrogoth, under whom civilization was for a time fostered and preserved in Italy, but whose glorious reign was succeeded by a period of uninterrupted misery and disaster.

From 476 to 521 the world was almost entirely under the sway of Arians. All the barbarians, Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and Vandals professed Arianism. Not that they could appreciate the intricate subtleties of the Greek language or the technical terms which separated those who held the Creed of Nicaea from the followers of Arius, but because they had received their Christianity from Arian missionaries, and perhaps because they disdained to worship with the despised Roman provincials. In Africa the orthodox were subjected to a cruel persecution by their Vandal overlords. Roman orthodoxy was isolated from the Christianity professed in the East as well as from that of the barbarians, till it received the support of an uncivilized race hitherto almost unknown.

On the northern frontier of Gaul the Franks were ruled by a ferocious and very able king named Clovis, who accepted baptism (496) at the hands of an orthodox bishop, St. Remigius, Bishop of Rheims, and was admitted by him to the Church with the words: "Bow thine head, Sicambrian, adore what thou hast burned, and burn what thou hast adored."

Clovis embraced the faith with ardor. When he heard the story of the Passion and Crucifixion, he exclaimed: "Had I and my Franks been there, it never would have happened" He resolved to become the champion of the true faith...

[p. 151] In recalling the empire's misfortunes in the West, it must not be forgotten that in the East it retained its inherent vitality for centuries, and when all seemed lost it was capable of suddenly asserting its strength. The genius of Diocletian, and after him of Constantine, was displayed in their recognizing that the heart of the empire was no longer in Italy but in Asia Minor, and when Constantine made Byzantium impregnable as Constantinople, he thereby saved civilization for centuries. Under a vigorous administration Constantinople was capable of dominating the Mediterranean seaboard; this was proved by the long reign of Justinian, the builder of the Church of St. Sophia and the man who has left an imperishable memorial in the consolidation of Roman law familiarly known as the Code of Justinian. Under Justinian the Persians were confined to the frontier, Africa was recovered from the Vandals, and Italy from the Ostrogoths, and his reign was made glorious by the exploits of Belisarius, one of the greatest of Roman generals. For though much has been written of the degeneracy of the Roman armies, then and for generations to come, when properly led, they were more than a match for any barbarian force however numerous.

The war between the Romans of Constantinople and the Ostrogoths proved the ruin of Rome and of Italy. Rome was taken and retaken by Belisarius and the barbarian kings; the aqueducts were destroyed, and Rome was at one time left without a single inhabitant. The city remained with its splendid edifices deserted even though not demolished. Italy, except for the cities in the south and on the Adriatic coast, had become almost desolate; nor were matters improved when it was restored to the empire, and what the barbarian had spared became the [p. 152] prey of the imperial tax-gatherer. It was left open to

another barbarian incursion—that of the Lombards, who like the Franks became a powerful influence on the destinies of Europe.

1352. Rome—Western Empire, “Fall” of, Not Sudden

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 92, 93. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 92] For several centuries after the fall of Rome, the political and social structure of Europe was such a mass of confusion that it defies representation in any simple pattern...

[p. 93] When and how did Rome fall? The first term in the title of Gibbon’s famous work was more appropriate than the second. After the division of the empire and the removal of the seat of its western part from the city of Rome, there was a long decline—an evaporation of authority, a sinking of its vitality, the gradual fading and ultimate disappearance of its apparatus of government. Though moribund, it still drew a labored breath after the raid on Rome by Alaric the Goth (410). The invasion of Italy by Attila the Hun (455) left the Western empire virtually unconscious. It died in a coma a few years later, though already it had practically ceased to exist. When the insignificant Romulus Augustulus was deposed (476), there was no longer even a titular emperor. The ghost of the Western empire—feeble even for a ghost—was the shadowy claim of the Eastern emperor at Constantinople to the allegiance of the barbarian chiefs who exercised independent military control in Italy, Gaul, Spain, and North Africa. The only part of that claim that ever had any historical reality was the Eastern emperor’s exarchate at Ravenna.

1353. Rome—Western Empire—Last Emperor Dethroned by Odoacer

SOURCE: Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), pp. 42, 43. Copyright 1950 by Will Durant. Used by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc.

[p. 42] A new conglomeration of barbarians swept down into Italy—Heruli, Sciri, Rugii, and other tribes that had once acknowledged the rule of Attila. At the same time a Pannonian general, Orestes, deposed Nepos, and established his son Romulus (nicknamed Augustulus) on the throne (475). The new invaders demanded from Orestes a third of Italy; when he refused they slew him, and replaced Romulus with their general Odoacer (476). This son of Attila’s minister Edecon was not without ability; he convened the cowed Senate, and through it he offered to Zeno, the new Emperor of the [p. 43] East, sovereignty over all the Empire, provided that Odoacer might as his *patricius* govern Italy. Zeno consented, and the line of Western emperors came to an end...

Actually, however, Odoacer ruled Italy as a king, with small regard for Zeno. In effect the Germans had conquered Italy as Gaiseric had conquered Africa, as the Visigoths had conquered Spain, as the Angles and Saxons were conquering Britain, as the Franks were conquering Gaul. In the West the great Empire was no more.

1354. Rome—Western Empire—Last Emperor Replaced by Odoacer, Who Became Undeclared Ruler in the West

SOURCE: Ernest Barker, “Italy and the West, 410–476,” chap. 14 in *The Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936), pp. 430, 431. Used by permission.

[p. 430] Odovacar [or Odoacer] ... had served under Ricimer in 472 against Anthemius; and by 476 he had evidently distinguished himself sufficiently to be readily chosen as their king by the congeries of Germanic tribes which were cantoned in Italy. His action was prompt and decisive. He became king on 23 August: by the 28th Orestes had been captured and beheaded at Piacenza, and on 4 September Paulus, the brother of Orestes, was killed in attempting to defend Ravenna. The Emperor Romulus Augustulus

became the captive of the new king, who, however, spared the life of the handsome boy, and sent him to live on a pension in a Campanian villa. While Odovacar was annexing Italy, Euric was spreading his conquests in Gaul; and when he occupied Marseilles, Gaul, like Italy, was lost.

[p. 431] The success of Odovacar did not, however, mean the erection of an absolutely independent Teutonic kingdom in Italy, or the total extinction of the Roman Empire in the West; and it does not therefore indicate the beginning of a new era, in anything like the same sense as the coronation of Charlemagne in 800. It is indeed a new and important fact, that after 476 there was no Western Emperor until the year 800, and it must be admitted that the absence of any separate Emperor of the West vitally affected both the history of the Teutonic tribes and the development of the Papacy, during those three centuries.

1355. Rome—Western Empire, Replaced by New European States

SOURCE: Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), p. 43. Copyright 1950 by Will Durant. Used by permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc.

The results of the barbarian conquest were endless. Economically it meant reruralization... Ethnically the migrations brought a new mingling of racial elements—a substantial infusion of Germanic blood into Italy, Gaul, and Spain, and of Asiatic blood into Russia, the Balkans, and Hungary... Politically the conquest replaced a higher with a lower form of monarchy; it augmented the authority of persons, and reduced the power and protection of laws; individualism and violence increased. Historically, the conquest destroyed the outward form of what had already inwardly decayed; it cleared away with regrettable brutality and thoroughness a system of life which, with all its gifts of order, culture, and law, had worn itself into senile debility, and had lost the powers of regeneration and growth. A new beginning was now possible: the Empire in the West faded, but the states of modern Europe were born.

1356. Rome, Witiges' Repulse From, by Belisarius (A.D. 538), a Turning Point

SOURCE: George Finlay, *Greece Under the Romans* (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1844), p. 295.

With the conquest of Rome by Belisarius, the history of the ancient city may be considered as terminating; and with his defence against Witiges commences the history of the middle ages.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The period known as the Middle Ages is, roughly speaking, the age of the Papacy.]

1357. Rome, Church of—Early Growth

SOURCE: Jérôme Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, pp. 136, 137. Copyright 1940 by Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

[p. 136] Although Statius and Martial and Juvenal may perhaps not have suspected the fact; and though Pliny the Younger—who in Bithynia had himself been up against the Christians of his province—lets fall no hint of its existence in his *Letters*; though Tacitus and Suetonius speak of it only from hearsay, the former in abusive language which excludes his having had any first-hand knowledge, the second with confusions which prove both the lacunae in his information and his own lack of insight—it is nevertheless beyond all doubt that “Christianity” in Rome goes back to the reign of Claudius (41–54), and that under Nero it had become so widespread that the emperor was able to throw the blame for the great fire of 64 onto the Christians. Using this as a pretext, he inflicted on them atrocious refinements of torture, the first of the persecutions which assailed without

destroying the Church of Christ. It is evident that its subterranean growth had progressed with astounding rapidity. This was perhaps due less to the importance of the Urbs in the world than to the existence in Rome of the Jewish colony which the goodwill of Julius Caesar had acclimatised there. From the beginning of the empire members of the Jewish colony had proved so troublesome that in 19 A.D. Tiberius thought it necessary to take severe measures against them, and so numerous that he was able to ship off 4,000 Jews at one swoop to Sardinia. It was through the Jewish colony that the first Christians coming from Jerusalem penetrated into Rome, breaking up the unity of the colony and ranging against each other the upholders of the ancient Mosaic law and the adherents of the new faith.

The Jewish religion had cast its spell over a number of Romans, attracted by its monotheism and the beauty of the Decalogue. The religion of the Christians which dispensed the same light but offered in addition a splendid message of redemption and brotherhood, was not behind in substituting its own proselyting. Seen from the outside and from a little distance, the two religions were at first easily confused with each other, and it is possible, for instance, that the invectives which Juvenal hurls at the Jews were really directed at the Christians whom he had not at this date learned to distinguish from them. They also were obedient to the commandments of their God, and might [p. 137] well pass in the eyes of a superficial observer for being simply “attached to Jewish customs.” But after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., and under the early Antonines, “the Church” inevitably began to be distinguished from “the Synagogue”; and the Church’s teaching, which made no distinction of race, soon began to supplant that of the Jews.

We have, naturally, no means of estimating the number of conversions which Christianity effected in those days in Rome, but it would be wrong to suppose that they were confined to the lower strata of the population. The Epistles of Saint Paul, saluting those of the brethren who are of the household of Caesar (*in domo Caesaris*), prove directly that the apostle had recruited some of his followers from among the retainers of the emperor, among those slaves and freedmen who, under a specious appearance of humility, included the most powerful servants of the empire.

1358. Rome, Papal, Continuation of Pagan Roman Empire

SOURCE: Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Rise of the Mediaeval Church* (reprint; New York: Burt Franklin, [1959]), pp. 148, 149. Used by permission.

[p. 148] The mighty Catholic Church was little more than the Roman Empire baptised. Rome was transformed as well as converted. The very capital of the old Empire became the capital of the Christian [p. 149] Empire. The office of Pontifex Maximus was continued in that of Pope... Even the Roman language has remained the official language of the Roman Catholic Church down through the ages. Christianity could not grow up through Roman civilisation and paganism, however, without in turn being coloured and influenced by the rites, festivities, and ceremonies of old polytheism. Christianity not only conquered Rome, but Rome conquered Christianity. It is not a matter of great surprise, therefore, to find that from the first to the fourth century the Church had undergone many changes.

1359. Rome, Papal, Continuation of Roman Empire

SOURCE: Adolf Harnack, *What Is Christianity?* trans. by Thomas Bailey Saunders (2d ed., rev.; New York: Putnam, 1901), pp. 269, 270. [Ernest Benn Ltd., London, has recently published a new edition of this book.]

[p. 269] Whatever Roman elements the barbarians and Arians left ... [came] under the protection of the Bishop of Rome, who was the chief person there after the Emperor's disappearance... [p. 270] *The Roman Church in this way privily pushed itself into the place of the Roman World-Empire, of which it is the actual continuation; the empire has not perished, but has only undergone a transformation...* That is no mere "clever remark," but the recognition of the true state of the matter historically, and the most appropriate and fruitful way of describing the character of this Church. It still governs the nations... It is a political creation, and as imposing as a World-Empire, because the continuation of the Roman Empire. The Pope, who calls himself "King" and "Pontifex Maximus," is Caesar's successor.

1360. Rome, Papal, Successor to Pagan Rome

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 6, 7. Copyright 1946 by University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 6] As Rome's role in pagan history came to an end, she was destined to play another, a sacred one, in Christian history very like that of Jerusalem in Judaism... Rome's part in ecclesiastical history had begun...

Thus a Christian Rome, destined, like its pagan predecessor on the Palatine, to conquer a large part of the earth, gradually arose on Vatican Hill... [p. 7] While today the Palatine [the hill of the Roman emperors' palaces] is in ruins, St. Peter's still draws worshipers from all parts of the world. Of the Christian conversion of Rome in the fourth century the historian Freeman said: "That Christianity should become the religion of the Roman Empire is the miracle of history; but that it did so is the leading fact of all history from that day onwards." But while the Empire became Christian, the Church became in part pagan. For it gradually assumed the Empire's monarchical form, and later the imperial gradations of rank and geographical divisions. By the eighth century the Bishop of Rome had become a temporal prince, so that the philosopher Hobbes could truthfully say of the Papacy that it was "the ghost of the Roman Empire, crowned and seated on the grave thereof." Still later, in our time, the Pope, having lost his temporal power, has gone further and has become, since 1870, virtually an absolute monarch over the spiritual lives of Roman Catholics.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For the pope's status since 1929, see No. 1169.]

1361. Rome, Papal, Survives the Roman Empire

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

No, the Church will not descend into the tomb. It will survive the Empire... At length a second empire will arise, and of this empire the Pope will be the master—more than this, he will be the master of Europe. He will dictate his orders to kings who will obey them.

3

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