

1676. Tabernacle, Parallels to

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 213, 214. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 213] Modern criticism shows a tendency to deny the historicity of the original tabernacle described in the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua and to make it essentially a reflection of the later allegedly more ornate and complex Davidic tent or a concoction of exilic and post-exilic priestly writers. Modern criticism supposes that the elaborate construction and appurtenance of the Mosaic institution were unsuitable to the life of migrants. However, archeology has shown that the description of the construction of the tabernacle offers nothing which would have been difficult for the craftsmen of the Mosaic era to make, and technical terms employed of the tabernacle and its parts have recently been found in records dating from the fourteenth to the eleventh centuries B.C.²⁶ [Note 26 refers to Albright in *Old Testament Commentary*, p. 143.] The tent which David pitched for the ark accordingly may be safely taken as a faithful replica of the Mosaic tent and not as largely a Davidic innovation.

Moreover, from ancient Arabic tradition and modern Bedouin practice it is well known that it was customary for nomadic desert tribes to carry their sacred tent-shrines with them much [p. 214] in the manner of Israel in the wilderness. From fragments of the Phoenician history of Sanchuniathon (c. 650 B.C.) there is a reference to a portable shrine of much earlier date, which was drawn by oxen. Diodorus, the Greek historian of the first century A.D., tells of a sacred tent pitched in the center of a Carthaginian battle camp with an altar nearby.

Of particular significance in the archeology of the tabernacle is the ancient miniature red leather tent with domed top, called the *qubbah*. In the pre-Islamic period some of these tents were suitable for mounting on camel back. Others were larger. The tent frequently contained the local idols (betyls) and was deemed capable of guiding the tribe in its wanderings, and by virtue of its presence on the battlefield, was regarded as efficacious to protect from the enemy and to give victory. Accordingly, it was commonly set up near the chieftain's tent. As an object of peculiar sacredness the *qubbah* was thus a palladium affording general protection. It was also a place of worship, where priests gave forth oracles.

Since black tents were characteristic from most ancient times, the red leather of which they were made is most extraordinary, especially since the color tended to expose the camp and the station of the chieftain. This strange custom implies a deep-rooted conservative religious practice, and is illustrated by a number of representations of the *qubbah* from Syria and a specific reference to the institution in an Aramaic inscription. The temple of Bel in Palmyra, which dates from the third to the first century B.C., interestingly portrays the *qubbah* in a bas-relief, with remnants of paint still clinging to it.

The *qubbah* is mentioned in Numbers 25:8 in connection with Phinehas who "went into the tent" (*qubbah*) and slew the "man of Israel" and the Midianitish woman whom he had married. The passage is usually construed as a reference to the tabernacle or to the sacred enclosure.

1677. Targum, Definition of

SOURCE: "Targum," *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959), cols. 1793, 1794. Copyright 1959 by Encyclopedia Publishing Company, Ltd. Used by permission of I. J. Carmin-Karpman, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

[col. 1793] *Targum* (Aram. from Assyrian *targumanu* "interpreter", cf. "dragoman"):

The Aramaic translation of the Bible. The Talmud (*Megillah 3a*) concludes from Neh. 8:8 that the custom of adding an Aramaic translation to the public reading of the Bible goes back to Ezra; it was certainly well-established in the Second Temple Period. This oral T. was both a translation and an interpretation adding legal and midrashic details to the text and studiously avoiding anthropomorphism. All T.'s are written in a somewhat artificial ARAMAIC, halfway between biblical Aramaic and the spoken language of Palestine.

There are three T.'s to the Pentateuch: *T. Onkelos* (according to some so called after the proselyte AQUILA) showing the most archaic type; *T. Jonathan* (erroneously so called); and *T. Yerushalmi* (or Palestinian T.), known only in a fragmentary form until 1956 when a complete ms was discovered. The T. to the Former and Latter Prophets is called after Jonathan ben Uzziel; it is mainly a paraphrase emphasizing the teachings of the text. The T.'s to the various books of the Hagiographa are midrashic in character, especially those to the Five Scrolls; they are considerably longer than the text they render and often show little connection with the literal sense. An exception is the T. to Proverbs, which is literal and couched in a language close to Syriac. The T. (especially T. Onkelos) has long enjoyed a sanctity second only to the Hebrew text. The Talmud enjoins the reading of the weekly passage "twice in Hebrew, once in T." (*Berakhot 8a*). The T. is cited as an authoritative interpretation by Rashi [col. 1794] and other commentators, and like the Hebrew text, has a Masorah and numerous commentaries. There is also a Samaritan Aramaic T. *Targum* is the word used by the Jews of Kurdistan to denote their spoken Aramaic language.

1678. Temple, at Jerusalem (Herod's)—Date of Building

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* xv. 11. 1, in *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans. by William Whiston (Cincinnati: H. S. & J. Applegate, 1850), p. 321.

And now Herod, in the eighteenth year of his reign, and after the acts already mentioned, undertook a very great work, that is, to build of himself the temple of God.

1679. Temple, at Jerusalem (Herod's), Grandeur of

SOURCE: Josephus *War* v. 5. 6; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 269. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

The exterior of the building wanted nothing that could astound either mind or eye. For, being covered on all sides with massive plates of gold, the sun was no sooner up than it radiated so fiery a flash that persons straining to look at it were compelled to avert their eyes, as from the solar rays. To approaching strangers it appeared from a distance like a snow-clad mountain; for all that was not overlaid with gold was of purest white. From its summit protruded sharp golden spikes to prevent birds from settling upon and polluting the roof. Some of the stones in the building were forty-five cubits in length, five in height and six in breadth.

1680. Temple, at Jerusalem, Site of

SOURCE: F. J. Hollis, *The Archaeology of Herod's Temple*, pp. 1–3. Copyright 1934 by J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., London. Used by permission of the author.

[p. 1] The historian Josephus relates that Herod the Great rebuilt the Temple at Jerusalem...

It would have been impossible for Herod to select another site without arousing a storm of opposition, however he enlarged and enriched the building...

With regard to this work of rebuilding the Temple, there is a saying of Rabbi Eliezer (c. A.D. 120), preserved in the Mishnah, to the following effect:

I have heard that when the Temple (*Hêkhāl*) was being built, they made curtains (*q^elā'îm*) for the Temple, and curtains for the court; and then they built the walls of the Temple outside of the curtains, but those for the court inside of the curtains.

It would seem that in this tradition we have a glimpse of the precautions taken to secure that the new Temple should be situated exactly where the old one was. Rabbi Eliezer was not far removed [p. 2] from the occasion to which he refers; he may even have seen Herod's Temple itself, before its destruction in A.D. 70, and may well have conversed with those who received this tradition at first hand from the builders themselves... Early traditions then point to the well-known fact of the rebuilding of the Temple, and indicate that the site of the new was the same as that occupied by the old.

Further there is evidence that the Temple and altar built by Zerubbabel occupied the same positions, and were erected on the same sites, as the Temple and altar of Solomon. For although Nebuchadrezzar had sacked the city and burnt the Temple, yet all trace of Temple and altar had certainly not quite disappeared, for Jeremiah tells of men bringing offerings to the House of the Lord after its destruction; and after the Exile it is clear that the first step was to reconstruct the broken-down altar. Doubtless this had earlier been erected 'in the middle of the court that was before the House of the Lord', the place which had been hallowed to receive the burnt offerings, instead of the brazen altar of Solomon. Furthermore it is to be noted that the historian was careful to point out that David had erected his altar on the spot occupied by the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite, and there seems no reason to doubt that the altar of Solomon's Temple was on the same spot. It is therefore highly probable that the altar of Herod's [p. 3] Temple was erected on the very site of Araunah's threshing-floor. With regard to the work of Zerubbabel, it is clear that the buildings completed by him were not on such a magnificent scale as those of Solomon, for 'in comparison it was as nothing', yet this Temple at the time of Herod was reputed to be sixty cubits high and sixty cubits wide, and reared on the same spot as Solomon's Temple.

1681. Ten Commandments—Abiding and Universal

SOURCE: Wilbur M. Smith, ed., *Peloubet's Select Notes* for 1946, p. 35. Copyright 1945 by W. A. Wilde Company, Boston. Used by permission.

These laws are what we might call *universal*... These Ten Commandments are only the codification of what man's own moral nature approves as right; and they are right, and true, and abiding in every age for every race.

1682. Ten Commandments, Binding—Christian Obligation to Obey (Methodist View)

SOURCE: *Catechism No. 1 ... of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1884), pp. 18, 21.

[p. 18] 85. *What does God require of man?*

Obedience to his revealed will.

86. *What is the rule of our obedience?*

The moral law.

87. *Where is the moral law given?*

In the ten commandments.—Exod. xx...

[p. 21] 103. *Are all Christians under obligation to keep the law?*

Yes; they are “not without law to God, but under the law to Christ.”—1 Cor. ix, 21.

1683. Ten Commandments, Binding Permanently Upon All Mankind

SOURCE: John Wesley, Sermon 25, “Upon Our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount,” in his *Works* (reprint of 1872 ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, [n.d.]), Vol. 5, pp. 311, 312.

[p. 311] The Ritual or ceremonial law, delivered by Moses to the children of Israel, containing all the injunctions and ordinances which related to the old sacrifices and service of the Temple, our Lord indeed did come to destroy...

The moral law, contained in the Ten Commandments, and enforced by the Prophets, he did not take away... This is a law which never can be broken, which “stands fast as the faithful witness in heaven.” The moral stands on an entirely different foundation from the ceremonial or ritual law, which was only designed for a temporary restraint upon a disobedient and stiff-necked people; whereas this was from the beginning of the world, being “written not on tables of stone,” but on the hearts of all the children of men, when they came out of the hands of the Creator... [p. 312] Every part of this law must remain in force upon all mankind, and in all ages; as not depending either on time or place, or any other circumstances liable to change, but on the nature of God, and the nature of man, and their unchangeable relation to each other.

1684. Ten Commandments, Binding Still, Under Penalty (Moody on)

SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, *Weighed and Wanting* (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 16.

The people must be made to understand that the Ten Commandments are still binding, and that there is a penalty attached to their violation.

1685. Ten Commandments, Binding Today

SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, *Weighed and Wanting* (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 15.

The commandments of God given to Moses in the Mount at Horeb are as binding today as ever they have been since the time when they were proclaimed in the hearing of the people. The Jews said the law was not given in Palestine, (which belonged to Israel), but in the wilderness, because the law was for all nations.

Jesus never condemned the law and the prophets, but He did condemn those who did not obey them. Because He gave new commandments it does not follow that He abolished the old. Christ’s explanation of them made them all the more searching. In His Sermon on the Mount He carried the principles of the commandments beyond the mere letter. He unfolded them and showed that they embraced more, that they are positive as well as prohibitive.

1686. Ten Commandments, Binding Upon Christian People

SOURCE: *The Episcopal Church Sunday School Magazine*, 105 (June–July, 1942), 183, 184.

[p. 183] We must understand that the Ten Commandments are just as binding upon Christian people as they were upon the Children of Israel...

The Moral Law is a part of the natural law of the universe... Just as a natural law broken in the material world brings its inevitable consequences, so the Moral Law broken brings its inevitable consequences in the spiritual and mental worlds.

The Lord Jesus knew this. He knew it much better than anyone else who ever lived. Therefore He built His Gospel upon a firm foundation of Moral Law, knowing that such a foundation [p. 184] can never be upset...

Christ's teaching goes beyond the Ten Commandments, but does not thereby make the Commandments of non-effect. Quite the contrary! Christianity strengthens the authority of the Commandments.

1687. Ten Commandments, Catholic Catechism Abridges

SOURCE: Peter Geiermann, *The Convert's Catechism of Catholic Doctrine* (1957 ed.), pp. 37, 38. Copyright 1930 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

[p. 37] *Q. Which are the Ten Commandments?*

A. The Ten Commandments are:

- (1.) I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt not have strange gods before me.
- (2.) Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
- [p. 38] (3.) Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day.
- (4.) Honor thy father and thy mother.
- (5.) Thou shalt not kill.
- (6.) Thou shalt not commit adultery.
- (7.) Thou shalt not steal.
- (8.) Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.
- (9.) Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.
- (10.) Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods.

1688. Ten Commandments—Catholic Catechism Enlarges on Third

[i.e., Fourth]

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), pp. 41, 42.

[p. 41] *Third Commandment of God.* Thou shalt keep holy the Lord's day.

209. *Which is the Lord's day?*

Sunday, the first day of the week, is the Lord's day.

On Sunday, God the Father began the creation, God the Son arose from the dead, and the Holy Ghost descended from Heaven.—The Jews observed the last day of the week, the Sabbath, and the apostles, commissioned by our Lord Jesus Christ, substituted for it the first day, the Sunday.

210. *Which days must we keep holy like the Sunday?*

We must keep the Holydays of obligation holy like the Sunday.

211. *Which are the Holydays of obligation in the United States?*

The Holydays of obligation in the U. S. are:

- 1) The Immaculate Conception. December 8.
- 2) Christmas. December 25.
- 3) The Circumcision of our Lord. New Year's day.
- 4) The Ascension of our Lord. 40 days after Easter.
- 5) The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. August 15.
- 6) All Saints' Day. November 1.

212. *How must we keep holy the Sundays and Holydays of obligation?*

We must keep holy the Sundays and Holydays of obligation

- 1) by not doing any servile work,
- 2) by hearing Mass.

[p. 42] "*Six days shalt thou labor, and shalt do all thy works. But on the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord, thy God: Thou shalt do no work on it (neither) thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy beast*" (Exod. 20:9, 10).

Servile works = such as are usually done by servants and laborers. Permitted in case of *necessity*. Dispensation.

Application.

If you desire to have God's blessing, observe the Sunday. Do no unnecessary work. If possible, enter no service where you cannot observe the Sunday as you should. Remember: All depends on God's blessing.

1689. Ten Commandments, Divisions and Numbering of

SOURCE: *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, on [Exodus 20](#), p. 218. Copyright 1953 by Thomas Nelson & Sons, New York. Used by permission.

g Two divisions of the commandments into ten are still found among Christians, both derived from different Jewish divisions, one preferred by the Greeks and the other by the Latins. At the Reformation the Lutherans kept the Latin, the Calvinists adopted the Greek division. English Protestants took the Greek division from the Calvinists while Catholics retained the Latin one. The Hellenist Jews, Philo, Josephus, etc., so divided the commandments as to make the prohibition of images a distinct precept and combined the two prohibitions of evil desires into one precept. Origen who introduced this view into the Church attests the previous existence of a different one in which two precepts forbidding evil desires were recognized and one and the same precept forbade the worship of images and of strange gods. The Palestinian Jews, on the other hand, whose view is clearly defined in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, regarded Ex. 20:2 '*I am Yahweh thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt and out of the house of bondage*' as the first precept, the prohibition of the worship of strange gods and images as the second and the two prohibitions of evil desires as the tenth. The Christians therefore rightly rejected their first precept as an introduction to, not a part of the decalogue, retained their second as the first and divided their tenth into two forbidding two kinds of evil desires. St Augustine's exposition of this division secured its universal acceptance in the Latin Church.

h The exegetical determination of the original division is complicated by a problem in textual criticism. In Ex. 20:17 we read: *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house: Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife*; in Deut 5:21: *Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife: Thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's house*. Sam. has the reading of Ex, LXX that of Deut in both passages. But Pap. Nash, though generally agreeing with Ex against Deut, has the reading of Deut in this passage. The intrinsic reasons in favour of Deut and two precepts of desire are still stronger. As two acts of adultery and theft are forbidden in two separate precepts and as adultery precedes theft in all texts, versions and NT allusions, so we expect the two corresponding desires to be mentioned in the same order and to be forbidden in two distinct precepts. The argument is strengthened by the fact that the indulgence of two distinct evil passions, licentiousness and covetousness, is proscribed and that *thou shalt not covet* appears twice in both texts. The passage in Ex moreover contains further evidence of textual corruption in the omission of *his field*, found in Deut and Pap. Nash and required by the parallelism of pairs: house and field, man-servant and maidservant, ox and ass.

i The case of *the first precept* is very different. Only images of strange gods were prohibited as appears not only from the words: *Thou shalt not adore them; thou shalt not serve them* (Ex 20:5a; Deut 5:7) but also from the cherubim (Ex 25:18) and the brazen serpent (Num 21:8) which Yahweh ordered to be made and from the mural decorations of the Jewish synagogues in the early Christian period as excavations abundantly attest.

There is question therefore not of a separate commandment which forbids the worship of all images but of an application of the precept forbidding the worship of strange gods. The prohibition of idols is found in the Book of the Covenant (20:23). It appears here in an amplified form (20:4–6) most probably as a later addition to the decalogue to illustrate and safeguard the first commandment. The Latin division of the commandments is thus the more reasonable one and the more likely to be original.

1690. Ten Commandments—First Four Applicable Today

SOURCE: B. Davie Napier, "Jesus, and the Ten Commandments," *The New Century Leader*, 57 (October, 1956), 15.

The first four Commandments define the *minimum* requirements of a man's relationship with God: Thou shalt have no other gods ... no images ... Like all of the Commandments, these are not—as some in our own generation would have it—applicable only in the time of Moses, or the Biblical period. And Jesus knew this, and understood the subtle ways in all time by which men set up for themselves other gods.

1691. Ten Commandments—Foundation of New Testament Religion

SOURCE: Earl L. Douglass, *The Snowden-Douglass Sunday School Lessons: 1946*, p. 279. Copyright 1945 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission of the author.

The basic laws of morality, and particularly the Ten Commandments, remain until the end of time as the moral and spiritual foundation upon which New Testament religion is built.

1692. Ten Commandments, Importance of, Alexander Campbell on

SOURCE: Alexander Campbell, in *A Debate ... Between Alexander Campbell and John B. Purcell* (Cincinnati: J. A. James & Co., 1837), p. 214.

God's ten WORDS ... not only in the Old Testament, but in all revelation, are the most emphatically regarded as the synopsis of all religion and morality.

1693. Ten Commandments, in New Testament

SOURCE: "Jesus and the Commandments," *The New Century Leader*, 59 (May, 1958), 21.

Because Jesus was so often in conflict with the religious teachers of his time, some have assumed that he disagreed with the Old Testament. He did say, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time... But I say unto you" (Matthew 5:27, 28). When, however, one takes a closer look at the old law and then compares it with the teachings of Jesus, he discovers that Jesus does not contradict the law but shows the deepest meaning and then converts the principle, given first as a prohibition to curb human sin, into a positive program of creative Christian action. Note the following comparisons:

- (1) No other gods
Our Father (Matt. 6:9).
- (2) No images
God is a Spirit (John 4:24).
- (3) No blasphemy
Hallowed be thy name (Matt. 6:9).
- (4) Keep the Sabbath
The Sabbath was made for man (Mark 2:27).
- (5) Honor parents
Treat all godly as parents (Matt. 12:50).
- (6) No killing
Be not angry (Matt. 5:22).
- (7) No adultery

Allow no lustful thoughts (Matt. 5:28).

(8) No stealing

Give to him that asks (Matt. 5:42).

(9) No false swearing

Speak simple truth (Matt. 5:37).

(10) No coveting

Covet righteousness (Matt. 5:6).

1694. Ten Commandments—Infidels and Skeptics Must Admit as Right

SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, *Weighed and Wanting* (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 11.

Now men may cavil as much as they like about other parts of the Bible, but I have never met an honest man that found fault with the Ten Commandments. Infidels may mock the Lawgiver and reject Him who has delivered us from the curse of the law, but they can't help admitting that the commandments are right. Renan said that they are for all nations, and will remain the commandments of God during all the centuries.

If God created this world, He must make some laws to govern it. In order to make life safe we must have good laws; there is not a country the sun shines upon that does not possess laws. Now this is God's law. It has come from on high, and infidels and skeptics have to admit that it is pure.

1695. Ten Commandments, Luther Denies Rejecting

SOURCE: Martin Luther, "Wider die Antinomer ("Against the Antinomians")," secs. 6, 8, in his

Sämmtliche Schriften, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, Vol. 20 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), cols. 1613, 1614. German.

[col. 1613] I wonder exceedingly how it came to be imputed to me that I should reject the law or the ten commandments... [col. 1614] Can anyone think that sin exists where there is no law? Whoever abrogates the law, must of necessity abrogate sin also.

1696. Ten Commandments, Luther on

SOURCE: Martin Luther, "Wider die Sabbather ("Against the Sabbatarians")," in his *Sämmtliche*

Schriften, ed. by Joh[ann] Georg Walch, Vol. 20 (St. Louis: Concordia, 1890), col. 1852. German.

58. Lastly we want to speak also on the Ten Commandments, for the Jews perhaps too will call the Ten Commandments Moses' law because it is given on Mount Sinai, where there were then only Jews or Abraham's children, et cetera. Here you should answer: "If the Ten Commandments are to be called Moses' law, Moses came much too late; besides, he had far too few people before him. For the Ten Commandments were not only before Moses but also before Abraham and all the patriarchs, also they have gone over the whole world. Even if no Moses had ever come, and Abraham had not been born, still in all mankind the Ten Commandments would have had to reign from the beginning, as they have done and still do.

1697. Ten Commandments, Luther's Catechism on

SOURCE: *Luther's Small Catechism* (A.D. 1529), trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 3, p. 77.

God threatens to punish all who transgress these Commandments [the Ten Commandments]: we should, therefore, fear his anger, and do nothing against such Commandments. But he promises grace and every blessing to all who keep them: we should, therefore, love and trust in him, and gladly obey his Commandments.

1698. Ten Commandments—Man's Duty Summarized

SOURCE: Earl L. Douglass, *The Snowden-Douglass Sunday School Lessons*: 1946, p. 17. Copyright 1945 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission of the author.

The Ten Commandments constitute a summary of the duties God requires of men. These commandments are the foundation which lies beneath the ethical life of humanity. They are as binding upon Christians today as they were upon the Hebrews who first received them.

1699. Ten Commandments, a Mirror to Show Our Need of Grace

SOURCE: Billy Graham, in sermons on the Ten Commandments, quoted in George Burnham and Lee Fisher, *Billy Graham and the New York Crusade*, pp. 108, 109. Copyright 1957 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 108] Like Wesley, I find that I must preach the law and judgment before I can preach grace and love...

The Ten Commandments ... are the moral laws of God for the conduct of people. Some think they have been revoked. That is not true. Christ taught the law. They are still in effect today. God has not changed. People have changed...

Every person who ever lived, with the exception of Jesus Christ, has broken the Ten Commandments. Sin is a transgression of the law. The Bible says all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. The Ten Commandments are a mirror to show us how far short we fall in [p. 109] meeting God's standards. And the mirror of our shortcomings drives us to the Cross, where Christ paid the debt for sin. Forgiveness is found at the Cross, and no other place, according to the Bible...

God says, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." You may not have any idols set up in your back yard, but there are idols in your life. Anything that comes before God is your idol. You spend more time reading the newspaper than you spend reading the Bible. You spend more time in front of the television set than you spend in church. Idols have crowded God out of your life. You just don't have time for Him any more.

Another Commandment says, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not which old him guiltless that taketh His name in vain." You may not curse God, but you take His name in vain when you profess to be a Christian and don't live like one. You take His name in vain when you defile your bodies, when you make vows and don't keep them, when you pray and don't believe God.

The Bible says, "Honor thy father and thy mother." Young people today think this is old-fashioned. God doesn't think it is old-fashioned. He commands that such respect be given.

The Scriptures say, "Thou shalt not kill." You may not have broken this Commandment with a gun or a knife, but you have broken it. If you have ever had hate in your heart, you are guilty. You can murder your own soul by denying or neglecting God. You can murder others by setting a bad example.

1700. Ten Commandments—Moral Law of God (Billy Graham on)

SOURCE: Billy Graham, sermon in Times Square, quoted in George Burnham and Lee Fisher, *Billy Graham and the New York Crusade*, p. 191. Copyright 1957 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

This [the Ten Commandments] is God's moral law given through Moses. These Commandments express the requirements of a righteous God. To transgress even one of these Commandments is sin, the result of which is eternal separation from God. The whole human race has broken God's Law. That is why nations war and fight. Individuals who make up the nations are rebellious lawbreakers having no peace in their own lives

and none in the world. Men for generations have fought, bled and died on thousands of battlefields simply because we refuse to keep God's Law.

I warn you tonight, there can be no peace until the Law is kept and there is no power within us to keep the Law. Human nature is bankrupt. That is why Christ came to give us a new nature and to set in motion forces that would bring about a new world order.

1701. Ten Commandments, Moral, Perpetual and Universal

SOURCE: Timothy Dwight, *Theology: Explained and Defended* (Middletown, Conn.: Printed by Clark and Lyman, for Timothy Dwight, 1818), Vol. 4, pp. 2, 3.

[p. 2] The Moral Law is, in the most universal sense, binding on men of every age, and every country...

[p. 3] Is it not clear beyond every rational debate, that God designed to distinguish these precepts [the Ten Commandments] from every other part of the Mosaic law, both as to their superior importance, and their perpetuity? Is it not incredible, ... unless he intended, that all, to whom these precepts should come, that is, all Jews and Christians, or all who should afterwards read the Scriptures, should regard these Commands as possessing that very importance, which he thus significantly gave them; should consider them as being, in a peculiar sense, his law; and hold them as being perpetually, and universally, obligatory?

1702. Ten Commandments, Morality of, Defined

SOURCE: Earl L. Douglass, *Snowden's Sunday School Lessons: 1943*, p. 290. Copyright 1942 by the Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission of the author.

The Ten Commandments constitute the basis of all morality. They did not originate morality; they defined it. They can really be said to constitute ten sides of God's great moral system.

1703. Ten Commandments, the Most Perfect Moral Code

SOURCE: *The Augsburg Sunday School Teacher*, 63 (August, 1937), 483.

God gave the Ten Commandments, first by word of mouth and then on tables of stone. They are not discoveries that men made. They are from heaven, and indicate the nature and purpose of God Himself. "The Decalogue is the most perfect code of laws existing. Its simplicity, comprehensiveness, ethical depths, and universal character stamp it as divine; and in its majestic simplicity, supplying the highest and best demands of the human heart, it may well be placed beside that other divine production, the Lord's Prayer."

1704. Ten Commandments, Not Abolished With Ritual System

SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, *Weighed and Wanting* (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 14.

The commandments did not originate with Moses, nor were they done away with when the Mosaic Law was fulfilled in Christ, and many of its ceremonies and regulations abolished.

1705. Ten Commandments—Obedience to All Ten Required

SOURCE: G. Campbell Morgan, *The Ten Commandments* (New York: Revell, 1901), p. 11.

In the Epistle of James is found a word of deep significance. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all," (ii.10)... Herein lies the explanation of the apparent severity of James's utterance. Men are apt to think that if there be ten commandments, of which they obey nine, such obedience will be put to their credit, even though they break the tenth.

1706. Ten Commandments, One Law

SOURCE: D[wight] L. Moody, *Weighed and Wanting* (Chicago: Revell, 1898), p. 119.

These ten commandments are not ten different laws; they are one law. If I am being held up in the air by a chain with ten links and I break one of them, down I come, just as surely as if I break the whole ten. If I am forbidden to go out of an enclosure, it makes no difference at what point I break through the fence. “Whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.” “The golden chain of obedience is broken if one link is missing.”

1707. Ten Commandments—Why Negative

SOURCE: B. Davie Napier, “Jesus, and the Ten Commandments,” *The New Century Leader*, 57 (October, 1956), 15.

The cold facts are that we cannot—and should not—totally eliminate the negative...

There seems no way on earth by which we can avoid imposing certain absolute prohibitions on our children. There are certain “commandments of the household” which can only be stated negatively and which *are* absolutes—that is, under *no* circumstances are they subject to change or waiver. They apply at all times, in every home. Thou shalt not play with fire ... razor blades ... medicines. Thou shalt not strike a playmate with any object that could inflict injury. Thou shalt not use thy brother’s or thy sister’s or thy father’s or thy mother’s things without permission. And any parent could extend the list, with full agreement from all other parents. To be sure, these commandments may on occasion be broken, always to the parents’ consternation, and sometimes to the injury of persons or property. But they are known as absolutes, as unalterable laws, and the consequences of their violation are seldom regarded as unjust...

Suppose we look for a moment at the Ten Commandments. They are, for the most part, negative statements. But like our commandments of the household, these are all fundamental, all in the nature of absolutes, all universally applicable and unmodifiable in any “household of faith”! This is to say that there is nothing *relative* about them, that is, there are *no* circumstances under which they can be disregarded. And they are God-given.

1708. Thomas Aquinas—Nature of Teaching

SOURCE: *Henry Bettenson*, Introductory note on Aquinas, in *Documents of the Christian Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 199. Used by permission.

Scholasticism reached its height in the writings of the Dominican friar, Thomas of Aquino, ‘The Angelic Doctor.’ His systematic exposition of the Catholic Faith in terms of Aristotelian philosophy produced a revolution in Christian thought, for Augustine and Anselm, the Christian thinkers in general before Aquinas, had regarded Platonism as the specifically Christian philosophy. In the thirteenth century the works of Aristotle became known through the writings of the Arabian philosophers, Avicenna and Averrhoës, and the Jew Maimonides, and the translations and commentaries of such men as Albert of Cologne and Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln. At first the students of Aristotle were suspected of ‘Averrhoist’ heresy (the chief error of which was the reduction of God to a mere First Cause, latent in the uncreated and eternal universe), but the modified Aristotelianism which was the foundation of the monumental *Summa Theologica* of Aquinas soon won acceptance, and the teaching of Aquinas was set up by Leo XIII as the classical exposition of Catholic Doctrine.

1709. Tillich, Views of, Summarized

SOURCE: Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-day Theologians are Thinking* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1959), pp. 67–69. Copyright 1959 by Daniel Day Williams. Used by permission.

[p. 67] If one takes up the first volume of Tillich's *Systematic Theology* and looks at it side by side with Barth or with Brunner's *Dogmatic*, they appear as different as night from day. Where Barth and Brunner depend upon continued reference to Biblical sources and work out theology in closest relation to a systematic Biblical exegesis, Tillich's work seems filled with philosophical terms. He discusses God only after he has clarified the metaphysical meaning of being and nonbeing. He discusses sin in relation to an existential analysis of anxiety. Anxiety is interpreted in relation to the metaphysical structures of space, time, causality and substance. This weaving together of theology and philosophy is the key to Tillich's method. His aim is to produce an apologetic theology [p. 68] which will bring the Christian message into specific relation with the ways in which contemporary man understands his experience.

Tillich's solution of the problem of apologetics is to develop what he calls the method of "correlation." This means that the Gospel is to be shown to give answers to the questions which man asks in his attempt to find the meaning of life. We cannot look to philosophy for the real truth about God or the way of salvation.

"The problem of correlation cannot be solved by another attempt to build a natural theology. Human existence does not involve answers to the question of man's relation to God; it involves the question."

What the theologian has to do is to show how man's existence as a finite creature drives him to the question of ultimate being, that is to the question of God. Man's existence in anxiety raises the question of a courage which can overcome anxiety. Man's ultimate concern to know the infinite reality beyond his finite existence raises the question of a final revelation which judges all preliminary grasp of the divine.

The norm for Christian thought then cannot be found in philosophy or in any other kind of human resource. It is given to the Christian in the final revelation in Jesus Christ. But we see how the method of correlation puts the problem of the norm in a new way. The meaning of Jesus Christ cannot be stated in Biblical terms alone. It must be stated as the answer to the questions raised by human philosophical and religious searching. Both the form of the question and the form of the Christian answer are determined in part by the form in which the question is asked. This is why Tillich's systematic theology is so heavily freighted with a philosophical analysis of the structure of being. As theologian he interprets man's life philosophically in order to show how the Christian message overcomes that separation between man and God which all philosophy reveals. The one literal state- [p. 69] ment man can make about God takes a philosophical form. God is "being itself."

1710. Tithing, Recognition of God's Ownership of All

SOURCE: Charles A. Cook, *Stewardship and Missions* (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1908), p. 118. Copyright 1908 by A. J. Rowland. Used by permission.

Tithing is an expression of our stewardship in giving. We tithe in recognition of God's ownership of the whole, just as a tenant pays rent in recognition of the landlord's ownership of, or rights in, the house or farm. Paying rent entitles the tenant to use the house or farm, but it does not constitute him the owner of it. The tithe is paid not simply because it is the Lord's, but because all one has, or acquires, is his. Paying tithes does not constitute a man the owner of the nine-tenths that are left. God's rights in the remainder are just the same as before the tenth is paid. He owns it. It is written, "The tithe is the Lord's." It is also written, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof," and "the silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts."

1711. Tobacco, and Athletics

SOURCE: Gene Tunney, "Nicotine Knockout, or the Slow Count," *Reader's Digest*, 39 (December, 1941), 21. Copyright 1941 by The Reader's Digest Association, Inc., Pleasantville, New York. Used by permission.

It's over 13 years since I retired from the Heavyweight Championship. But here's a challenge: If Joe Louis will start smoking, and promise to inhale a couple of packages of cigarettes every day for six months, I'll engage to lick him in 15 rounds. Of course, Joe wouldn't be foolish enough to meet my terms. No boxer, no athlete in training smokes. He knows that whenever nerves, muscles, heart and brain are called upon for a supreme effort, the tobacco-user is the first to fold.

1712. Tobacco, and Coronary Thrombosis

SOURCE: *Report of the Study Group on Atherosclerosis and Ischaemic Heart Disease* (World Health Organization Technical Report Series, No. 117. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1957), p. 21. Used by permission.

Two independent large-scale studies on the role of tobacco in cancer of the lung state as an incidental finding that heavy smokers have higher death-rates from coronary thrombosis.

1713. Tobacco, and Lung Cancer

SOURCE: Leroy E. Burney, "Smoking and Lung Cancer," *JAMA*, 171 (Nov. 28, 1959), 1835, 1836. Copyright 1959 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

[p. 1835] 1. The weight of evidence at present implicates smoking as the principal etiological [causative] factor in the increased incidence of lung cancer. 2. Cigarette [p. 1836] smoking particularly is associated with an increased chance of developing lung cancer. 3. Stopping cigarette smoking even after long exposure is beneficial. 4. No method of treating tobacco or filtering the smoke has been demonstrated to be effective in materially reducing or eliminating the hazard of lung cancer. 5. The nonsmoker has a lower incidence of lung cancer than the smoker in all controlled studies, whether analyzed in terms of rural areas, urban regions, industrial occupations, or sex. 6. Persons who have never smoked at all (cigarettes, cigars, or pipe) have the best chance of escaping lung cancer. 7. Unless the use of tobacco can be made safe, the individual person's risk of lung cancer can best be reduced by the elimination of smoking.

1714. Tobacco, and Lung Cancer

SOURCE: "What We Know Now About Smoking and Health," *Consumer Reports*, 63 (December, 1958), 635. Copyright 1958 by Consumer Union of U.S., Inc., Mount Vernon, N.Y. Used by permission.

If no special commercial interests were at stake, there probably would be little disagreement that heavy cigarette smoking is *one of the factors* responsible for lung cancer and that every effort should be made to identify and eliminate from cigarettes all substances carcinogenic to any animal and to persuade cigarette smokers to practice moderation or abstinence.

1715. Tobacco, Causes Disease and Shortens Life

SOURCE: Richard H. Overholt, M.D., "Filters—the 'Inside' Story," *Smoke Signals*, 6 (April–June, 1960), 2.

Smokers (1) find it necessary to consult doctors more often, (2) require hospitalization with greater frequency, and (3) fail to respond to treatment of such diseases as bronchitis, tuberculosis, diabetes, and heart trouble as promptly as nonsmokers. Finally, there is a differential in the life expectancy for smokers and nonsmokers. In men over fifty the latter group lives longer by approximately nine years.

1716. Tobacco—Cigarettes—Effect on Heart Patients

SOURCE: Paul Dudley White and others, *Rehabilitation of the Cardiovascular Patient*, p. 120. Copyright © 1958 by McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

It is well known that smoking may cause peripheral vasoconstriction, increase the pulse rate, and elevate the blood pressure. In the presence of coronary disease, abnormal ballistocardiograms may be observed in over 60 per cent of patients following smoking. Fewer patients, however, have abnormal ballistocardiograms after exercise comparable to the double Master's test. It seems reasonable, therefore, to assume that smoking a package of cigarettes may cause considerable circulatory distress, perhaps as much as that caused by climbing as many as 20 flights of stairs.

1717. Tobacco—Cigarettes Raise Death Rate

SOURCE: E. Cuyler Hammond and Daniel Horn, "The Relationship Between Human Smoking Habits and Death Rates," *JAMA*, 155 (Aug. 7, 1954), 1328. Copyright 1954 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

It was found [in a study of 187,766 men] that men with a history of regular cigarette smoking have a considerably higher death rate than men who have never smoked or men who have smoked only cigars or pipes...

Disease of the coronary arteries was indicated as the primary cause of death...

1718. Tobacco—Coronary Thrombosis and Smoking

SOURCE: Richard Doll and A. Bradford Hill, "Lung Cancer and Other Causes of Death in Relation to Smoking," *British Medical Journal* (Nov. 10, 1956), p. 1081. Used by permission.

If the causes of death as certified are accepted at their face value, mortality from coronary thrombosis reveals a ... significant relationship with smoking.

1719. Tobacco—Death Rate in Cardiovascular Disease

SOURCE: "Smoking and Health" (joint report), *Science*, 125 (June 7, 1957), 1129. Reprinted from *Science* by permission.

At least three statistical investigations show an association of tobacco smoking with a decrease in longevity, probably referable to a higher risk, for male smokers, of dying from cardiovascular disease. The mortality among smokers in certain age groups is reported to be approximately double that of the non-smokers...

Cardiovascular diseases account for well over half of all adult male deaths. Even a relatively small proportionate excess in the cardiovascular death rate could, therefore, contribute a larger number of deaths than a much larger excess in the lung cancer death rate.

1720. Tobacco—Effect on Cardiovascular System

SOURCE: Ellen McDevitt and Irving S. Wright, "The Cardiovascular System," in *The Biologic Effects of Tobacco*, ed. by Ernest L. Wynder, p. 94. Copyright 1955 by Little, Brown and Company, Boston.

Nicotine is the most noxious agent affecting the cardiovascular system in man thus far isolated from tobacco. It is present in varying amounts in all forms of tobacco. Neither protective filters nor denicotinization to the degree now practiced have eliminated the deleterious effect of tobacco on the cardiovascular system.

1721. Tobacco—Filters

SOURCE: Richard H. Overholt, M.D., "Filters—the 'Inside' Story," *Smoke Signals*, 6 (April–June, 1960), 1, 2.

[p. 1] For a filter to be truly protective, all the tar and the nicotine would have to be removed, leaving nothing but clean hot air to inhale. It is obvious, however, that if the smoker is to get some taste and pleasure, the filter must let some smoke through. Much research, money, time, and effort have been spent on reducing the nicotine and tar content without detracting from the pleasure of smoking...

[p. 2] While nature's filter, the lung, is attempting to take out the tars and nicotine which escape the filter in the cigarette, there are disturbances locally and generally. These are effects of wear and tear at the point of entry and at the point of exit. These might be termed local troubles. After years of smoke inhalation, there often is an aggravation of emphysema (loss of absorptive membranes), and certainly there is an acceleration of cancer. With the former, oxygen absorption is impaired. Shortness of breath, wheezing, easy fatigue, and dizziness are common manifestations. Both conditions occur with ten times the frequency in smokers as in non-smokers.

1722. Tobacco—Smoker a Victim of Drug Addiction

SOURCE: Richard H. Overholt, M.D., "Filters—the 'Inside' Story," *Smoke Signals*, 6 (April–June, 1960), 1, 2.

[p. 1] The basis of the physical joy in smoking is a drug effect. There is a specific pharmacologic action. The body of the long-term smoker requires a replenished supply for a feeling of well-being. He is the victim of a drug addiction. The smoker who shifts from regular cigarettes to filters actually, in most cases, increases his daily consumption of cigarettes by [p. 2] the same percentage that the filter has extracted nicotine from each cigarette smoked. The addiction is then kept smoldering, and satisfaction comes only by increasing the number of the cigarettes smoked so that the total daily nicotine requirement will be satisfied. The filter was, therefore, a wise choice as far as the industry is concerned. It has resulted in a higher consumption of cigarettes by those who have continued to smoke. This, together with the intensified advertising campaign among young people, has more than offset losses of sales to those who quit smoking.

1723. Tobacco—Smoking and Death Rate

SOURCE: E. Cuyler Hammond and Daniel Horn, "Smoking and Death Rates—Report on Forty-four Months of Follow-up of 187,783 Men," *JAMA*, 166 (March 8, 1958), 1159. Copyright 1958 by the American Medical Association, Chicago. Used by permission.

This report gives an analysis of death rates in relation to the smoking habits of 187,783 men who have been traced for an average of 44 months. The first results of the study were presented when the subjects had been traced for 20 months. The major findings at that time were that (1) the death rate of cigarette smokers was far higher than the death rate of men who had never smoked cigarettes, and (2) deaths ascribed to cancer accounted for about one-quarter of the excess deaths ascribed to coronary artery disease accounted for over one-half the excess.

1724. Tradition, as Defined by Roman Catholics

SOURCE: Joseph Faà di Bruno, *Catholic Belief*, rev. by Louis A. Lambert (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884), pp. 39, 40.

[p. 39] By TRADITION we do not mean a mere report, a hearsay, wanting sufficient evidence to deserve belief; or a local tradition started by men, and therefore merely human, as were those traditions of the Pharisees condemned by our [p. 40] Lord; but we mean a Tradition first coming from God, continually taught, recorded, and in all desirable ways kept alive by a body of trustworthy men successively chosen in a divine, or divinely appointed manner, well instructed, and who are, as a body, protected by God from

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

teaching what is wrong, or handing down unfaithfully to others the doctrine committed to them.

1725. Tradition, as Held in the Catholic Church

SOURCE: Francis J. Butler, *Holy Family Series of Catholic Catechisms* (Boston: Thomas J. Flynn & Co., 1904), p. 63 [FRS No. 2.]

Some of the truths which God has revealed and which have always been taught by the Catholic Church, are not contained in the Bible. These truths have come down to us by what is called oral tradition; that is, they have been handed down by word of mouth. By Catholic Tradition, therefore, we understand all those truths which the Church received from Jesus Christ and the Apostles, but which are not found in the Bible. These truths we firmly believe, because they were revealed by God and are proposed to us by the Church.

Some of the truths that have been handed down to us by Tradition and are not recorded in the Sacred Scripture, are the following: that there are just seven Sacraments; that there is a Purgatory; that, in the New Law, Sunday should be kept holy instead of the Sabbath; that infants should be baptized, and that there are precisely seventy-two books in the Bible.

The truths of Catholic Tradition have been handed down in the Church by means of the writings of the “Fathers of the Church,” as well as by the decrees of Councils, by approved Creeds and by the prayers and ceremonies of the Church. These ancient writings and institutions show plainly what has been the faith of the Church from the earliest times.

However, it is only the infallible teaching of the Church that secures us against error as to the truths contained in Tradition as well as in Holy Scripture. The voice of the Church is the voice of God.

1726. Tradition, Bible and

SOURCE: John Milton, “Of Prelatical Episcopacy,” in *The Prose Works of John Milton*, Vol. 2 (London: George Bell and Sons, 1888), p. 424.

Thus while we leave the Bible to gad after the traditions of the ancients, we hear the ancients themselves confessing, that what knowledge they had in this point was such as they had gathered from the Bible.

Since therefore antiquity itself hath turned over the controversy to that sovereign book which we had fondly straggled from, we shall do better not to detain this venerable apparition of Leontius [the representative of apostolical tradition] any longer.

1727. Tradition, Bible and, Regarded by Catholics as of Equal Value

SOURCE: John Laux, *A Course in Religion for Catholic High Schools and Academies*, part 1, pp. 50, 51. Copyright 1936 by Benziger Brothers, New York. Used by permission. [FRS No. 43.]

[p. 50] Since the truths contained in Scripture and those handed down by Tradition both come from God, Scripture and Tradition are of equal value as sources of faith. Both deserve the same reverence and respect. Each alone is sufficient to establish a truth of our holy faith...

[p. 51] Scripture and Tradition are called the *remote rule of faith*, because the Catholic does not base his faith *directly* on these sources. The *proximate rule of faith* is for him the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, which alone has received from God the authority to interpret infallibly the doctrines He has revealed, whether these be contained in Scripture or in Tradition.

1728. Tradition, Bible and, Regarded by Catholics as of Same Authority

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session IV (April 8, 1546), Decree Concerning the Canonical Scriptures, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (4th ed., rev.; New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 79, 80.

[p. 79] The sacred and holy, oecumenical, and general Synod of Trent,—lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost,—... [p. 80] seeing clearly that this truth and discipline [of the gospel] are contained in the written books, and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand: [the Synod] following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates with an equal affection of piety and reverence, all the books both of the Old and of the New Testament—seeing that one God is the author of both—as also the said traditions, as well those appertaining to faith as to morals, as having been dictated, either by Christ’s own word of mouth, or by the Holy Ghost, and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession.

1729. Tradition, Catholic Dependence Upon

SOURCE: Joseph Faà di Bruno, *Catholic Belief*, rev. by Louis A. Lambert (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1884), p. 45. [FRS No. 55.]

Like two sacred rivers flowing from Paradise, the Bible and divine Tradition contain the Word of God, the precious gems of revealed truths.

Though these two divine streams are in themselves, on account of their divine origin, of equal sacredness, and are both full of revealed truths, still, of the two, TRADITION is to us more clear and safe.

1730. Tradition, Early Development of, in Christianity

SOURCE: Tertullian, *The Chaplet* (Latin, *De Corona*), chaps. 3, 4, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, pp. 94, 95.

[p. 94] CHAP. III...

Let us inquire, therefore, whether tradition, unless it be written [see No. 1725] should not be admitted. Certainly we shall say that it ought not to be admitted, if no cases of other practices which, without any written instrument, we maintain on the ground of tradition alone, and the countenance thereafter of custom, affords us any precedent. To deal with this matter briefly, I shall begin with baptism. When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the president, we solemnly profess that we disown the devil, and his pomp, and his angels. Hereupon we are thrice immersed, making a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the Gospel. Then, when we are taken up (as newborn children), we taste first of all a mixture of milk and honey, and from that day we refrain from the daily bath for a whole week. We take also, in congregations before daybreak, and from the hand of none but the presidents, the sacrament of the Eucharist, which the Lord both commanded to be eaten at meal-times, and enjoined to be taken by all alike. As often as the anniversary comes round, we make offerings for the dead as birthday honours. We count fasting or kneeling in worship on the Lord’s day to be unlawful. We rejoice in the same privilege also from Easter to Whitsunday. We feel pained should any wine or bread, even though our own, be cast upon the ground. At every forward step and movement, at every going in and out, when we put on our clothes and shoes, when we bathe, when we sit at table, when we light the lamps, on couch, on [p. 95] seat, in all the ordinary actions of daily life, we trace upon the forehead the sign [of the cross].

CHAP. iv.

If, for these and other such rules, you insist upon having positive Scripture injunction, you will find none. Tradition will be held forth to you as the originator of them, custom as their strengthener, and faith as their observer.

1731. Tradition, Protestants Accused of Following

SOURCE: Bertrand L. Conway, *The Question-Box Answers* (New York: The Columbus Press, 1910), pp. 75, 76. Issued earlier by “The Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle in the State of New York.” [FRS No. 6.]

[p. 75] Because the origin of our faith is not the Bible alone, but the Church which gives us both the written and the unwritten word...

So in the New Law, Catholics believe some things not in the Scriptures, although wholly in accord with them, because of the infallible witness of the Church as to their divine or apostolic origin. Why do Protestants accept the Scriptures as inspired? Why do they honor the first day of the week instead of the seventh? Why do they baptize children? Contrary to their principles, they must look outside the Bible to the voice of tradition, [p. 76] which is not human, but divine, because guaranteed by the divine, infallible witness of the Catholic Church.

1732. Transubstantiation, as Defined by Council of Trent

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIII (Oct. 11, 1551), Decree Concerning the Eucharist, chap. 4, trans. in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 74. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

And because that Christ our Redeemer declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own Body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy synod doth now declare it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and of the wine a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His Blood; which conversion is by the holy Catholic Church suitably and properly called transubstantiation.

1733. Transubstantiation, as Defined by Medieval Monk

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 146, 147. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 146] The doctrine of transubstantiation was first rather clearly stated by the monk Radbertus in the ninth century, and the word was coined in the twelfth. It meant that the real *substance* of the bread and wine was changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ while their *qualities* (or “accidents”) as known to the senses, remained unchanged. Ever since Plato and Aristotle there has been philosophical argument about the nature of the “substance” or “essence” of existing reality in general and of particular things. It is, indeed, one of the fundamental problems of philosophy. One way of looking at it was to say that every material object as known consists of an inner “substance,” which constitutes its reality or essence, and certain “qualities” which alone can be known by the senses. The “substance,” as that which “stands under” the qualities and holds them together so that they form a knowable object, cannot itself be observed by the senses. It was therefore conceivable that, by pure miracle, one “substance” could be substituted for another while the sensible qualities remained as they had been. Belief that such a “transubstantiation” has actually occurred is an act of pure faith, for it can be neither proved nor disproved by observation, since, by defini- [p. 147] tion, it is only the unchanged “qualities” of the bread and wine that can be observed.

With this sharper definition of the doctrine and with greater emphasis on the concept of the Mass as a continuation of the sacrifice on Calvary—that is, the continued offering of the flesh of the victim that had been slain once for all—came the more extensive use of the Mass as a means of conferring spiritual benefits upon any to whom they were directed by the officiating priest, and as a meritorious offering to God having a definite value whether or not any communicants received the elements. Three results of this view were: infrequent communion; the giving of only the bread to the laity, since the entire substance of the body and blood was declared to be present in the smallest particle of either the bread or wine when duly consecrated, and the reservation of the consecrated bread and wine for worship in the “adoration of the Host.”

1734. Transubstantiation, as It Is Explained by Catholic Catechism

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis: B. Herder, 1913), p. 72.

343. *What power did Jesus give His Apostles when He said: “Do this for a commemoration of Me?”*

By the words: “Do this for a commemoration of Me,” Jesus gave His Apostles the power to do what He had done, namely: to change bread and wine into His Body and Blood.

344. *Who received from the Apostles the power of changing bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ?*

The bishops and priests received from the Apostles the power of changing bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ.

345. *When do the bishops and priests change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ?*

The bishops and priests change bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ in the holy sacrifice of Mass.

346. *After the consecration, what is on the altar in the place of bread and wine?*

After the consecration there is on the altar in the place of bread and wine the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.

347. *What remains of the bread and wine after consecration?*

Only the appearance of the bread and wine remain after consecration. . .

At all times and in all places there have been sacrifices. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel, of Noah, of Abraham. The pagans also have sacrifices. In the old law, God prescribed in detail the sacrifices of clean animals. These were *figures* of the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross; therefore *imperfect sacrifices*.

358. *Which is the perfect sacrifice?*

The perfect sacrifice is the sacrifice on the Cross, in which Jesus Christ offered Himself to His heavenly Father.

The visible gift was Jesus Himself. He was also the priest. The Cross was the altar.

359. *Is the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross still offered?*

The sacrifice of Christ on the Cross is still offered in every Mass.

1735. Transubstantiation, Catechism of Trent on

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), pp. 228, 229. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 228] Pastors, aware of the warning of the Apostle that those who discern not the body of the Lord are guilty of a most grave crime, should first of all impress on the minds of the faithful the necessity of detaching, as much as possible, their mind and understanding from the dominion of the senses; for if they believe that this Sacrament

contains only what the senses disclose, they will of necessity fall into enormous impiety. Consulting the sight, the touch, the smell, the taste and finding nothing but the appearances of bread and wine, they will naturally judge that this Sacrament contains nothing more than bread and wine. Their minds, therefore, are as much as possible to be withdrawn from subjection to the senses and excited to the contemplation of the stupendous might and power of God.

The Catholic Church firmly believes and professes that in this Sacrament the words of consecration accomplish three wondrous and admirable effects.

The first is that the true body of Christ the Lord, the same that was born of the Virgin, and is now seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is contained in this Sacrament.

The second, however repugnant it may appear to the senses, is that none of the substance of the elements remains in the Sacrament.

The third, which may be deduced from the two preceding, although the words of consecration themselves clearly express [p. 229] it, is that the accidents which present themselves to the eyes or other senses exist in a wonderful and ineffable manner without a subject. All the accidents of bread and wine we can see, but they inhere in no substance, and exist independently of any; for the substance of the bread and wine is so changed into the body and blood of our Lord that they altogether cease to be the substance of bread and wine.

1736. Transubstantiation, Council of Trent of Meaning of

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIII (Oct. 11, 1551), On the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, canons 1–4, *trans.* in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 136, 137.

[p. 136] CANON I.—If any one denieth, that, in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, are contained truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ; but saith that he is only therein as in a sign, or in figure, or virtue: let him be anathema.

CANON II.—If any one saith, that, in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains conjointly with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and denieth that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood—the species only of the bread and wine remaining—which conversion indeed the Catholic [p. 137] Church most aptly calls Transubstantiation: let him be anathema.

CANON III.—If any one denieth, that, in the venerable sacrament of the Eucharist, the whole Christ is contained under each species, and under every part of each species, when separated: let him be anathema.

CANON IV.—If any one saith, that, after the consecration is completed, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not in the admirable sacrament of the Eucharist, but [are there] only during the use, whilst it is being taken, and not either before or after; and that, in the hosts, or consecrated particles, which are reserved or which remain after communion, the true body of the Lord remaineth not: let him be anathema. [Brackets in the translation.]

1737. Transubstantiation — Development of Theory

SOURCE: G. G. Coulton, *Five Centuries of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1929), Vol. I, pp. 102–104. Used by permission.

[p. 102] The earliest records are too vague to enable us to affirm clearly how far *This is my body, This is my blood*, were at first taken figuratively, and how far they were taken literally. Justin Martyr and Ignatius use language which is claimed by one party as implying the literal, by another the figurative, sense of the words. St. Augustine, often as he recurs to the subject, leaves us in still worse doubt—or, rather, inclines distinctly in favour of the figurative interpretation².

[Note 2: Harnack maintains that his doctrine was essentially that of the Swiss reformer Zwingli, and therefore more Protestant than Luther's. *The Catholic Encyclopedia* can only plead that this is a "rather hasty conclusion"; and the long and disjointed argument which it opposes to Harnack will hardly carry conviction to unbiassed readers. Moreover, the writer has not verified his references, which are very confused; and one, which he quotes as conclusive in favour of his own view, is followed a few lines later by words which flatly contradict it:

Definition of *Cath. Encyc.* (v, 575 a). "The Body given to the Apostles [at the Last Supper] was the self-same Body that was crucified on Good Friday; and the Chalice drunk by them, the self-same Blood that was shed on the Cross for our sins."

Augustine, *Enarr. in Psalmum* xcvi, § 9 (following the words appealed to in *Cath. Encyc.* p. 577). Christ at the Last Supper instructed His Apostles, saying, "Understand spiritually that which I have spoken; ye are not about to eat this Body which ye see, nor are ye about to drink this Blood which those men shall shed who will crucify Me."...

[p. 103] That doctrine crystallized very slowly. Not until 787 did the Eastern Church commit itself to a clear conciliar decision, [p. 104] at Nicaea, in favour of the Real Presence; and the West was tardier still. Western bishops had attended this Ecumenical Council of Nicaea; yet, about 855 A.D., it was possible for one of the most distinguished western theologians, the Benedictine Ratramnus, to deny the bodily presence of Christ in the Eucharist, resting mainly upon St Augustine; and a series of Benedictine theologians, during the next 80 years, agreed more or less definitely with Ratramnus. As late as 1050, the well-known Berengar of Tours combated the theory of Transubstantiation; but it was definitely consecrated by the scholastic theology of the twelfth century; and at last it was dogmatically proclaimed by Innocent III at the great Lateran Council of 1215. The first decree of that Council asserts that "Christ's body and blood is truly contained in the Sacrament of the Altar under the appearance of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into His body, and the wine into His blood by God's power." The Council of Trent defined further, that not only the bread became Christ's body and the wine His blood, but that every particle of the consecrated wafer, when broken, contained the whole God-man, body, blood and soul: "really and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ"; from which it necessarily follows (as the Middle Ages had decided from the thirteenth century onwards), that the Consecrated Host must be adored with exactly the same adoration which would be given to the God-Christ if He appeared visibly before His worshippers.

1738. Transubstantiation—Worship of Christ in the Host, as God

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIII (Oct. 11, 1551), On the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, can. 6, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 137, 138.

[p. 137] If any one saith, that, in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, is not to be adored with the worship, even external of latria [worship due to God alone]; and is, consequently, neither to be venerated with a special festive solemnity, nor to be solemnly borne about in procession, accord- [p. 138] ing to the laudable and universal rite and custom of holy Church; or, is not to be proposed

publicly to the people to be adored, and that the adorers thereof are idolaters: let him be anathema.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This doctrine of transubstantiation is presented to the people in its most literal sense. The Catholic believes as firmly as the Protestant that worshipping a piece of bread is idolatry, but he believes that the host is not bread but has been changed to the actual body of Christ. Hence he speaks of worshipping "Christ in the tabernacle" (that is, in the container in which the sacramental wafer is kept on the altar), and he genuflects toward the altar and bows as the host is carried past in processions, because he believes that he is thus paying homage to Christ Himself.]

1739. Trent, Council of, Catechism of—Original and Authority

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), Introduction, pp. xxxiii, xxxv, xxxvi. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. xxxiii] The Roman Catechism is unlike any other summary of Christian doctrine, not only because it is intended for the use of priests in their preaching, but also because it enjoys a unique authority among manuals. In the first place, as already explained, it was issued by the express command of the Ecumenical Council of Trent, which also ordered that it be translated into the vernacular of different nations to be used as a standard source for preaching. Moreover it subsequently received the unqualified approval of many Sovereign Pontiffs...

[p. xxxv] Salmanticenses, the great Carmelite commentators on St. Thomas, paid the following high tribute to the Catechism: "The authority of this Catechism has always been of the greatest in the Church, because it was composed by the command of the Council of Trent, because its authors were men of highest learning, and because it was approved only after the severest scrutiny by Popes Pius V and Gregory XIII, and has been recommended in nearly all the Councils that have been held since the Council of Trent."

...

[p. xxxvi] Doctor John Hagan, the present Rector of the Irish College in Rome, writes thus: "The Roman Catechism is a work of exceptional authority. At the very least it has the same authority as a dogmatic Encyclical,—it is an authoritative exposition of Catholic doctrine given forth, and guaranteed to be orthodox by the Catholic Church and her supreme head on earth..."

Its teaching is not infallible; but it holds a place between approved catechisms and what is *de fide*."

1740. Tribulation, of Last Days

SOURCE: George L. Murray, *Millennial Studies*, p. 130. Copyright 1948 by Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

For the sake of better understanding, it might be plainly stated that we do not deny that there shall be great tribulation toward the end of the Gospel age. Those who have spiritual discernment can already hear the rumblings which betoken the loosening of an avalanche of apostasy. As it gains momentum, life will become increasingly difficult for those who remain steadfast in the faith, and loyal to Jesus Christ. Some of them are already paying a price for their devotion to Him.

The professing church is gradually, but surely, concentrating its endeavors on carnal organization which shall presumably embrace all of Christendom. The indications of ecclesiastical regimentation are everywhere in evidence. The question of questions is whether the world organization shall be under the direction of Christ, or of Antichrist. The history of ecclesiastical mergers does not justify the hope of world revival under a world church. The alternative is worldwide apostasy.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The view that there will be a time of tribulation preceding the Second Advent has been generally held, though not necessarily the specific form of the view that sees the great tribulation of 3 1/2 times caused by the Antichrist as applying to this time. This latter theory is held today by premillennialists of the futurist school, who are divided, however, as to whether the church is to be bodily removed from this tribulation by the "pretribulation rapture" or is to remain on earth through it (the post-tribulationist view). See Nos. 1524, 1526n.]

1741. Tyre, Ancient and Modern

SOURCE: Wallace B. Fleming, *The History of Tyre* (Vol. 10 of Columbia University Oriental Studies), p. x. Copyright © 1915 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

Allusions to Tyre are to be found in the writings of the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Persians, the Hebrews, the Greeks, and the Romans of the ancient times, and in a few meager fragments of their own writing. In the medieval period to the close of the Crusades, the sources of information are the Latin, the Greek, the Arabic, the French and the Hebrew. The Crusaders left their principal records in Latin and French. From the close of the Crusades there is scarcely any story to tell, for Tyre lay in utter ruins. For this period we have the notes of pilgrims and travelers. The present petty town of Sur has arisen since the Mutowalis occupied the district in 1766 A.D. Its humble story presents little difficulty, but it is connected with the Tyre of history in location and name only.

[EDITORS' NOTE: A footnote on the same page quotes Renan, *Mission de Phénicie* (IV, 1). He says (translated): "I do not think that any great city that played, through the centuries, a role of the first order has left fewer traces than Tyre."]

2

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