

### 353. Calendar—Date Line, Adjustment of Date at, by Travelers

SOURCE: Lucia Carolyn Harrison, *Sun, Earth, Time and Man*, p. 201. Copyright © 1960 by Rand McNally & Company, New York. Used by permission.

When the route of a plane or ship takes it across the International Date Line, the change in the calendar date is made whenever it seems most convenient. It is customary not to omit or to repeat a Sunday or a holiday and to make the adjustment during the night, as if the actual crossing had occurred at midnight. Of course no one adds a day to his life by a west to east crossing or loses a day of his life by an east to west crossing. He merely adjusts his record of day and date to accord with that of the region into which he is going. Somewhere it is necessary that he either repeat or omit a day in order to bring his calendar record into alignment with the calendar of his longitude.

### 354. Calendar.—Date Line — Day “Lost” in (Westbound) Round-the-World Voyage

SOURCE: Douglas C. Ridgley, “College Cruise Around the World”, in *The Journal of Geography*, 26 (March, 1927), 110–112. Used by permission.

[p. 110] Our ship crossed the 180th meridian [the “Date Line”] on Monday night. We therefore went to bed on Monday night, October 25, and awoke the [p. 111] next morning on Wednesday, October 27. We experienced no Tuesday, and we did not live during the date known as October 26, 1926... From Sunday, October 24, to Sunday, October 31, there were only five intervening days, not six, as usual between two consecutive Sundays...

[p. 112] Our days have been lengthened, bit by bit, so that we have lengthened the days by a total of 24 hours. We will see the sun rise, run its course thru the sky, and set one time less than our friends at home. The number of meals served on our cruise around the world will be three meals fewer than served at our homes. We have lost one day, having had one day less than our friends at home. But we have not lost a single hour, for we have lived as many hours as our friends at home; 24 hours have been distributed, bit by bit, among our 226 days of daylight, which have been 227 days at home. We provided for the “lost day” in the mid-Pacific so that our days of the week and dates of the month will be the same as at the seaports and the home port at which we are to go ashore.

### 355. Calendar—Date Line, No Time Really Lost in Crossing

SOURCE: Lucia Carolyn Harrison, *Daylight, Twilight, Darkness, and Time*, pp. 180, 181. Copyright 1935 by Silver, Burdett and Company, New York. Used by permission of Rand McNally & Company.

[p. 180] One can always make a given calendar day last longer by traveling westward, for he has the benefit of an earlier appearance of the sun at the place from which he starts in the morning and of a later disappearance at the place at which he arrives in the evening... [p. 181] He will seem [at the end of a trip around the world] to have gained an entire day [by the calendar; see editors’ note below].

In reality he has already lived that day. He has been lengthening his day an hour for every 15° of longitude he flew westward... He is, therefore, a day behind in his counting of the passage of time. He must move his calendar reckoning ahead a day to compensate for the minutes he has been adding to each day.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The terminology in cases like this can be confusing. Upon returning to his starting point, if he has made no correction in crossing the date line, the traveler discovers that the calendar at that point registers one day later than his own observations en route would indicate should be the case. The calendar will seem to him to have gained a day. That is, he arrives home on what, for example, he thinks is Monday the 15th, to find that it is actually Tuesday the 16th. He wonders where the extra day has gone, the day that, from one point of view, he seems to have “lost” because he did not know he had it. The second

paragraph of the extract explains that he *has* had it, by piecemeal, an hour of it every time he has crossed a 15° longitude line (or a standard time zone, which is approximately equivalent).]

### **356. Calendar—Date-Line Problem—“Lost” Day Puzzles Magellan’s Sailors**

SOURCE: Pietro Martire d’ Anghiera, *De Orbe Novo*, trans. by Francis Augustus MacNutt, Vol. 2 (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1912), pp. 170, 171.

[p. 170] When the *Victoria* [the last surviving ship of Magellan’s globe-girdling expedition] reached the Cape Verde islands, the sailors believed the day to be Wednesday, whereas it was Thursday. They had consequently lost one day on their voyage, and during their three years’ absence. I said: “Your priests must have deceived you, since they have forgotten this day in their ceremonies and the recitation of their office.” They answered: “Of what are you thinking? Do you suppose that all of us, including wise and experienced men, could have made such a mistake? . . .”

Some gave one reason and some another, but all agreed upon one point, they had lost a day. I added: “My friends, remember that the year following your departure, that is to say, the year 1520, was a bissextile year, and this fact may have led you into error.” They affirmed that they had taken account of the twenty-nine days in the month of February in that year, which is usually shorter, and that they did not forget the bissextile of the calends of March of the same year. The eighteen men who returned from the expedition are mostly ignorant, but when questioned, one after another, they did not vary in their replies.

Much surprised by this agreement, I sought Gaspar Contarino,<sup>1</sup> [Note 1: A learned Venetian, afterwards created Cardinal by Paul II. He died in 1552.] ambassador of the illustrious republic of Venice at the court of the Emperor. He is a great sage [p. 171] in many subjects. We discussed in many ways this hitherto unobserved fact, and we decided that perhaps the cause was as follows. The Spanish fleet, leaving the Gorgades Islands, proceeded straight to the west, that is to say, it followed the sun, and each day was a little longer than the preceding, according to the distance covered. Consequently, when the tour of the world was finished,—which the sun makes in twenty-four hours from its rising to its setting,—the ship had gained an entire day; that is to say, one less than those who remain all that time in the same place. Had a Portuguese fleet, sailing towards the east, continued in the same direction, following the same route first discovered, it is positive that when it got back to the Gorgades it would have lost a little time each day, in making the circuit of the world; it would consequently have to count one day more. If on the same day a Spanish fleet and a Portuguese fleet left the Gorgades, each in the opposite direction, that is to say one towards the west and the other towards the east, and at the end of the same period and by different routes they arrived at the Gorgades, let us suppose on a Thursday, the Spaniards who would have gained an entire day would call it Wednesday, and the Portuguese, who would have lost a day would declare it to be Friday. Philosophers may discuss the matter with more profound arguments, but for the moment I give my opinion and nothing more.

### **357. Calendar—Date Line, Where the New Day Begins**

SOURCE: Lucia Carolyn Harrison, *Sun, Earth, Time and Man*, pp. 194–169. Copyright © 1960 by Rand McNally & Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 194] It [the International Date Line] is the calendar [p. 195] boundary between today and tomorrow or yesterday when crossing the Pacific.

The general trend of the Date Line is along the meridian of  $180^\circ$ , but there are several deflections from this longitude line. It is customary to place all members of an island group on the same side of the Date Line. Small islands in the South Pacific, whose commercial or political ties are with Australia or New Zealand, use the Asiatic calendar even though they may lie east of the meridian of  $180^\circ$ . A swerve of the Date Line to the east brings the eastern tip of Siberia, about  $169^\circ 30'W.$ , under the Asiatic calendar reckoning. A swerve to the west draws the western end of the Aleutian Island chain, about  $172^\circ 30'E.$ , under the American calendar...

[p. 196] Were there no zigzags in the Date Line, one date, February 14, would exist all over the world for one instant; the beginning of the first second of it east of the Line would occur simultaneously with the ending of the last second of it west of the Line. Immediately February 15 would come into being west of the Line and begin progressing westward; but February 14 that was just born east of the Line would survive at all places along that meridian for twenty-four hours...

When it is noon of July 1 in New York City,  $75^\circ W.$ , it is midnight of that date  $180^\circ$  to the east, or along the meridian of  $105^\circ E.$  July 1 is the calendar date from  $105^\circ E.$  westward to  $180^\circ W.$ , or for  $285^\circ$  of longitude. New York is  $105^\circ$  from  $180^\circ W.$ , so its time is 7 hours later than the time at  $180^\circ W.$ , where it is only 5:00 A.M. July 2 has spread from  $180^\circ W.$  westward over  $75^\circ$  ( $180^\circ - 105^\circ$ ) and so that date is 5 hours old. At Osaka, Japan,  $135^\circ E.$ , the time is 2:00 A.M. of July 2. This date is just coming into being at Singapore,  $105^\circ E.$

### **358. Calendar—Day and Night in the Arctic**

SOURCE: Lucia Carolyn Harrison, *Sun, Earth, Time and Man*, pp. 107, 108. Copyright © 1960 by Rand McNally & Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 107] Longyearbyen [near Spitzbergen] is in latitude about  $78^\circ N.$ , more than 5,000 miles north of the Equator. On March 21 the Sun rises due east about six o'clock, at noon is about  $12^\circ$  above the southern horizon, and sets about six o'clock due west. A long, bright twilight slowly deepens, but at midnight the Sun is still only about  $12^\circ$  below the northern horizon; the twilight is then so dim that the stars are visible, although, if the day is clear, there may be a faint glow in the northern sky.

Each morning thereafter, the Sun rises slightly earlier and farther to the north of east, at noon is a little higher in the southern sky, sets slightly later and farther to the north of west, at midnight is a little closer to the horizon, and the midnight twilight grows steadily brighter. When the Sun is vertical to the Earth at latitude  $12^\circ N.$ , April 22, the circle of illumination lies  $12^\circ$  beyond the North Pole, and were it not for atmospheric refraction, that date would mark the beginning of the period of continuous daylight. The noon altitude that day is  $24^\circ$  above the southern horizon. Daily thereafter the Sun circles the sky, a little higher each day above the southern horizon at noon and above the northern horizon at midnight. On June 21 the Sun is  $35 \frac{1}{2}^\circ$  above the southern horizon at noon and  $11 \frac{1}{2}^\circ$  above the northern horizon at midnight. For two months the Sun has seemed to be circling the sky, each day following a higher path than on the preceding day, and daylight has been continuous; for two months more the Sun is visible the entire twenty-four hours, although its daily circuit of the sky steadily lowers. By August 22 Longyearbyen is  $90^\circ$  at midnight from the latitude where the Sun is vertical, but because of refraction, the Sun can still be seen in the northern sky at midnight until [p. 108] about August 25. Each day thereafter, the Sun sets a little earlier, a little nearer to due west, the midnight twilight becomes less bright, the Sun rises a little later and nearer to due east,

and at noon is a little lower in the sky. Conditions on September 23 duplicate those of March 21.

After September 23 the Sun does not rise until after six o'clock, each day somewhat later and farther to the south of east than on the previous day; each noon it is a little lower in the southern sky and it sets a little earlier and farther to the south of west. Darkness at midnight gradually replaces the dim twilight of September 23. By October 25 the Sun merely appears on the southern horizon for a few moments at noon. For nearly four months thereafter, it cannot be seen. At first it is so close to the southern horizon at midday that the twilight is as bright as daylight, and the southern sky is suffered with a rosy glow, if the day is fair—tantalizing for it foretells no coming sunrise. Gradually the midday twilight dims. On December 22 the Sun is  $11\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$  below the southern horizon at noon. A very dim twilight at that time, light from the Moon, and reflection from the snow and ice afford some relief during the many weeks of no daylight. By late January the Sun is close enough to the southern horizon at midday to produce civil twilight. Daylight will not return until the vertical ray has migrated back to  $12^{\circ}$ S. and again brought Longyearbyen within  $90^{\circ}$  of the center of the lighted half at noon. This happens in mid-February and the Sun then rolls along the southern horizon for a few moments at midday. The long night has ended. Thereafter, the Sun rises earlier and nearer to the east each day, mounts a little higher in the sky at noon, and sets later and a little nearer to due west. By March 21 the Sun is again rising in the east at six o'clock and the year's pattern of Sun-behavior begins to repeat itself. At Longyearbyen there are about 128 days of continuous daylight and only about 110 days with no daylight. Refraction of light-rays accounts for this lengthening of the daylight period in part. An important contributing factor is the slower rate of the Earth's revolution when in aphelion ... [northern summer]. [For sunset in the arctic, see Nos. 1392, 1393.]

### **359. Calendar—Day and Night in the Arctic, Ancient Knowledge of**

SOURCE: Procopius, *History of the Wars* vi. 15. 6, 7, 9–12; translation by H. B. Dewing, Vol. 3 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 417. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

For [on the island of Thule (identification uncertain)] the sun at the time of the summer solstice never sets for forty days, but appears constantly during this whole time above the earth. But not less than six months later, at about the time of the winter solstice, the sun is never seen on this island for forty days, but never-ending night envelops it... I made enquiry from those who come to us from the island as to how in the world they are able to reckon the length of the days, since the sun never rises nor sets there at the appointed times. And they gave me an account which is true and trustworthy. For they said that the sun during those forty days does not indeed set just as has been stated, but is visible to the people there at one time toward the east, and again toward the west. Whenever, therefore, on its return, it reaches the same place on the horizon where they had previously been accustomed to see it rise, they reckon in this way that one day and night have passed. When, however, the time of the nights arrives, they always take note of the courses of the moon and stars and thus reckon the measure of the days.

### **360. Calendar, Gregorian, Adopted in British Countries in 1752**

SOURCE: *The Ladies Diary: or Woman's Almanack For the Year of our Lord, 1752* ([n.p.]: A. Wilde, 1752), calendar for September (unpaged).

1752 SEPTEMBER HATH ONLY XIX DAYS IN THIS YEAR ...

---

1	T	Giles, <i>Abbat &amp; Conf. Sun faster than Year 3'55"</i>	8A 12
2	W	London Burnt, 1666. Sun rises 5,37, sets 6,22.	8 49

---

By 365 Days, 6 Hours, the mean Julian Year, being long reckon'd for 365d. 5h. 48m. 54s. 41th. 27 fourths, the Year by the Sun, according to Dr. Halley, (See Palladium 1750, p. 53.) *The Account of Time has each Year run a head of Time by the Sun 11m. 5s. 18th. 33 fourths, or 44m. 21s. 14th. 12 fourths, every 4 Years, and consequently 3d. 1h. 55m. 23s. 40 thirds in 400 Years: And so from the Council of Nice, when the Kalendar was settled, in the Year 325, to this present Year 1752, being 1427 Years, the Time by Account is forward of that by the Sun 10d. 23h. 43m. and therefore 11 Days is left out of Account, in this Month, as the most convenient, for reducing the Kalendar or Year to its first establish'd Order. And for keeping the shortest and longest Days (or the Solstices) and also the Days of 12 h. long (or the Equinoxes) on the same nominal Days of the Month for the future, it is ordain'd by Act of Parliament, that every fourth hundred Year is to consist of 366 Days as usual, but all other whole hundred Years of 365 Days only: The Years between which whole hundreds to be common and Bissextile as formerly, and the Date of the Year henceforward to begin on the first of January.*

---

14	T	Holy Cross Day, Holy-Rood, or Exalt. of the Cross	9 33
15	F	Day 12 hours 20 minutes long ...	10 24

---

The third of *September* the fourteenth is nam'd,  
 For which *British Annals* will ever be fam'd;  
 For by *Wisdom* and *Art* to the House made appear,  
 The *Sun* was reduc'd to attend on the *Year*.

[EDITORS' NOTE: By 1752 the error in the calendar was 11 days, one day more than in 1583. See Nos. 362, 363.]

### 361. Calendar, Gregorian, Adopted in Various Countries

SOURCE: *The [British] Nautical Almanac for the Year 1932* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1930), p. 740. Crown Copyright. Used by permission of the Controller of Her Britannic Majesty's Stationery Office.

The Gregorian calendar was adopted in Italy, France, Spain, Portugal and Poland in 1582, by most of the German Roman Catholic states and by Holland and Flanders in 1583, and by Hungary in 1587. The adoption in Switzerland was gradual; it began in 1584 and was completed in 1812. The German and Dutch Protestant states generally, along with Denmark, adopted it in 1700, the British dominions in 1752, Sweden in 1753, Japan in 1873, China in 1912, Bulgaria in 1915, Turkey and Soviet Russia in 1917, Yugoslavia and Romania in 1919, and Greece in 1923. The rules for Easter have not, however, been adopted by those oriental churches which are not subject to the papacy.

### 362. Calendar, Gregorian—Revision Did Not Change the Week

SOURCE: Gerald M. Clemence, "Calendar," *McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology*, Vol. 2, p. 416. Copyright © 1960 by the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission from the McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology.

The calendar used for civil purposes throughout the world, known in western countries as the Gregorian calendar, was established by Pope Gregory XIII, who decreed that the day following Thursday, October 4, 1582, should be Friday, October 15, 1582, and that thereafter centennial years (1600, 1700, and so on) should be leap years only when divisible by 400 (1600, 2000, and so on), other years being leap years when divisible by four, as previously.

### **363. Calendar, Gregorian—Why Ten Days “Dropped”**

SOURCE: William T. Skilling and Robert S. Richardson, *Astronomy*, pp. 211, 212. Copyright 1939, 1947, by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 211] The reason for dropping ten days out of the year was to [p. 212] bring the celebration of Easter back to the time that had been fixed for it by the famous Council of Nice [Nicaea] which had met in 325 A.D. The Council had decreed that Easter should be observed on the first Sunday after the first full moon occurring after the vernal equinox. When the date of Easter was thus fixed the vernal equinox was occurring on the 21st of March. During the more than 1200 years that had elapsed since 325 A.D. the date of the vernal equinox had slipped back from March 21 to March 11. Ten too many leap years had been observed.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Such expressions as "too many leap years," "the spring equinox slipping," or "ten lost days" may require some explanation. In the first place, it was the calendar, not the equinox, that slipped out of line. The equinoxes and solstices recur regularly each solar year, which is the time required for one circuit of the earth around the sun, amounting to 365 days plus slightly less than 1/4 day. Caesar's calendar (beginning 45 B.C.) accounted for the fraction of the day above 365 days by the addition of one day to February every four years, it being then believed that this fraction of a day was exactly 1/4 day. Since it was slightly less, a correction over a period of time would require slightly fewer leap years than one in four. The regular succession of leap years between 325 and 1583 had inserted into the calendar ten February 29ths more than were needed to keep the year in step with the equinoxes. This accumulated error of ten days in the calendar count could be remedied only by correcting the count, which was done in 1582. The day that was numbered as October 4 in that particular year would have been numbered the 14th if the calendar had been running in step with the equinoxes. Therefore, by calling the following day the 15th the revisers brought the calendar back into the same relation to the equinoxes that it had held in A.D. 325, and March 21 once more became the day of the spring equinox. The ten days were not "lost"; the error in the count was simply corrected. Nor were the days of the week affected. Thursday October 4 was followed by Friday October 15. See No. 362.]

### **364. Calendar, Jewish—Day From Sunset**

SOURCE: Josephus *The Jewish War* iv. 9. 12.; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Vol. 9 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), pp. 171, 173. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 171] Above the roof of the priests' chambers, ... it was the custom for [p. 173] one of the priests to stand and to give notice, by sound of trumpet, in the afternoon of the approach, and on the following evening of the close, of every seventh day, announcing to the people the respective hours for ceasing work and for resuming their labours.

### **365. Calendar, Jewish—Festivals Kept on Two Days in the Diaspora**

SOURCE: *Talmud Rosh Hashanah* 21a, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), p. 87. Used by permission.

R. Johanan issued a proclamation: 'In all those places which can be reached by the messengers sent out in Nisan but not by those sent out in Nisan but not by those sent out

in Tishri, two days should be kept [on Passover], Nisan being included so that there should be no mistake as to Tishri'.

### **366. Calendar, Jewish — Intercalary Month, Need for, Determined by Calculation**

SOURCE: *Talmud Rosh Hashanah 7a*, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), pp. 24, 25. Used by permission.

[p. 24] Has it not been taught: 'A leap year is not decreed'<sup>11</sup> [Note 11: In the time of the Second Temple the calendar was not fixed, but the Beth din declared any year a leap year (i.e., inserted an intercalary month) according as they judged necessary, subject to certain rules.] before New Year, and if such a decree is issued it is not effective. In cases of emergency, however, the decree may be issued immediately after New Year, and even so the intercalary month must be [the second] Adar! ...

[p. 25] People know that a leap year depends on calculation, and they say to themselves that the Rabbis have only now got the calculation right.

### **367. Calendar, Jewish — Month Delayed Because of Late Arrival of Witnesses**

SOURCE: Mishnah *Rosh Hashanah* 4.4, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), *Rosh Hashanah* 30b, pp. 143, 144. Used by permission.

[p. 143] Originally they used to accept testimony with regard to the new moon during the whole of the day. On one occasion the witnesses were late in arriving, and the Levites went wrong in the daily hymn. It was therefore ordained that testimony should be accepted [on New Year] only until [p. 144] the afternoon sacrifice, and that if witnesses came after the afternoon sacrifice that day should be kept as holy and also the next day. After the destruction of the Temple Rabban Johanan b. Zaccai ordained that testimony with regard to the new moon should be received during the whole of the day. [Brackets in the original.]

### **368. Calendar, Jewish — New Moon Announced to Diaspora by Fire Signals**

SOURCE: Mishnah *Rosh Hashanah* 2.2, 3, 4, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), *Rosh Hashanah* 22b, 23a, pp. 96, 97. Used by permission.

[p. 96] Originally they used to light beacons. When the Cutheans [Samaritans] adopted evil courses, they made a rule that messengers should go forth. How did they light the beacons? They used to bring long poles of cedar and reeds and olive wood and flax fluff which they tied to the poles with a string, and someone used to go up to the top of a mountain and set fire to them and wave them to and fro and up and down until he saw the next one doing the same thing on the top of the second mountain; and so on the top of the third mountain. Whence did they carry the [chain of] beacons? From [p. 97] the Mount of Olives [in Jerusalem] to Sartaba, and from Sartaba to Grofina, and from Grofina to Hauran, and from Hauran to Beth Baltin. The one on Beth Baltin did not budge from there but went on waving to and fro and up and down until he saw the whole of the Diaspora before him like one bonfire. [Brackets in the original.]

### **369. Calendar, Jewish — Postponements to Avoid a Festival Falling on Friday or Sunday**

SOURCE: *Talmud Rosh Hashanah* 20a, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), pp. 82, 83. Used by permission.

[p. 82] When ‘Ulla came [from Palestine to Babylon], he said: They have prolonged Elul. Said ‘Ulla thereupon: Do our Babylonian colleagues recognize what a boon we are conferring on them? What was the boon?—‘Ulla said: On account of the vegetables; [p. 83] R. Aha b. Hanina said: On account of the [unburied] dead. What difference does it make [in practice which view we adopt here]?—There is a difference, in the case of a Day of Atonement coming just after Sabbath... We must therefore say that the practical difference is in the case of a festival which comes just before or just after Sabbath...

Rabbah b. Samuel has learnt: I might think that just as the year is prolonged in case of emergency, so the month may be prolonged to meet an emergency.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Brackets are in the original. To “prolong” the month Elul meant giving it 30 days instead of an expected 29; to prolong the year meant inserting a thirteenth month.]

### **370. Calendar, Jewish**—Witnesses of New Moon, to Establish the First of the Month

SOURCE: *Mishnah Rosh Hashanah* 2.6, trans. in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. by Isidore Epstein (35 vols.; London: The Soncino Press Ltd., 1935–1952), *Rosh Hashanah* 23b, pp. 101, 102. Used by permission.

[p. 101] How do they test the witnesses? The pair who arrive first are tested first. The senior of [p. 102] them is brought in and they say to him, Tell us how you saw the moon—in front of the sun or behind the sun? To the north of it or the south? How big was it, and in which direction was it inclined? And how broad was it? If he says [he saw it] in front of the sun, his evidence is rejected. After that they would bring in the second and test him. If their accounts tallied, their evidence was accepted, and the other pairs were only questioned briefly, not because they were required at all, but so that they should not be disappointed, [and] so that they should not be dissuaded from coming. [Brackets in the original.]

### **371. Calendar, Jewish** — Year, Described

SOURCE: “Calendar,” *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959), col. 388. Copyright 1959 by Encyclopedia Publishing Company, Ltd. Used by permission of I. J. Carmin-Karpman, Tel-Aviv, Israel.

The Jewish calendar is a “bound lunar” type: it consists of twelve months calculated according to the moon, but in order to celebrate the agricultural festivals in their proper season, the difference between the lunar year (354 days) and the solar year (365 1/4 days) is made up by adding (intercalating) a full month after *Adar* in the 3rd, 6th, 8th, 11th, 14th, 17th, and 19th year of each 19-year cycle (5711 [A.D. 1950–51] began such a cycle). The month so added is called *Adar Sheni* (“Second *Adar*”) and the year, a leap year. The year commences at the New Moon of *Tishri* (Sept.–Oct.) but its beginning may be shifted by a day for various reasons, among them the rule that the Day of Atonement must not fall on Friday or Sunday, or the 7th day of Tabernacles on a Sabbath. Thus non-leap years can have 353, 354, or 355 days, leap years 383–385 days. The months are counted (following the biblical custom) from *Nisan*. Only a few biblical month-names

are known (*Abib* and *Ziv* in the spring; *Bul* and *Ethanim* in the fall); the present ones are of Babylonian origin:

HEBREW NAME	BABYLONIAN NAME	LENGTH
1. <i>Nisan</i>	<i>Nisannu</i>	30 days
2. <i>Iyyar</i>	<i>Ayaru</i> (“Bud”)	29 "
3. <i>Sivan</i>	<i>Simânu</i>	30 "
4. <i>Tammuz</i>	<i>Du’ûzu</i> (Name of a god)	29 "
5. <i>Av</i>	<i>Abu</i>	30 "
6. <i>Elul</i>	<i>Ulûlu</i> (“Purification”)	29 "
7. <i>Tishri</i>	<i>Tashrêtu</i> (“Beginning”)	30 "
8.	<i>Arakhshamna</i>	29 or 30 "
<i>Marḥeshvan</i> ( <i>Ḥeshvan</i> )		
9. <i>Kislev</i>	<i>Kislîmu</i>	29 or 30 "
10. <i>Tevet</i>	<i>Tabêtu</i> (“Flooding?”)	29 "
11. <i>Shevat</i>	<i>Shabâtu</i> (“Beating”)	30 "
12. <i>Adar</i>	<i>Addaru</i>	29 "
(in leap year 30)		

This constant c. was probably officially introduced by the patriarch Hillel II (330–65). Before that time, witnesses had to report each month the appearance of the new moon to the Sanhedrin which announced the date by fire-signals, and later by messengers (because of the uncertainty involved, it became customary for countries in the Diaspora to celebrate certain holidays for 2 days); the Sanhedrin also determined each year whether intercalation was to take place. Some sectarians, whose views are preserved in the Book of Jubilees, etc., advocated a purely solar calendar (probably 12 months of 30 days and 4 extra days).

[EDITORS’ NOTE: It is not known when the “postponements,” to avoid having festivals fall on certain days of the week, or the fixed sequence of 29- and 30-day months, came into use; probably not until some time after Bible times; some think even later than Hillel’s day. For the variability in the lengths of the months in NT times, see No. 372n.; see *SDADic*, “Year.”]

### 372. Calendar, Lunar (Babylonian), Difficulties in Computation of

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (2d ed.; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1957), pp. 102, 106–109, 119, 120.

[p. 102] Up to about 480 B.C., the intercalations of the lunar calendar show no regularity whatsoever. One century later, however, the rule of 7 intercalations in 19 years at fixed intervals seems to be in use, and remains from now on the basis of all the lunar calendar which were derived from the Babylonian scheme, including the lunar calendar of the Middle Ages...

In the preceding period a “year” was an interval of sometimes 12 or sometimes 13 months, where probably the state of the harvest decided the need for a 13th month. The

existence of a cycle, however, proves that a more precise astronomical definition of “year” was adopted. We cannot give accurate data about the mean length of such a year or how it was determined. There are good reasons, however, which point to an observation of the summer solstice as the point of comparison. At any rate, it is the summer solstices which are systematically computed, whereas the equinoxes and the winter solstices are simply placed at equal intervals. Because much more accurate methods were known in the Seleucid period [beginning 311 B.C.], it is plausible to assume that the scheme of the 19-year cycle represents a slightly earlier phase of development...

Mathematical astronomy is fully developed at about 300 B.C. at the latest. The 19-year intercalation cycle is certainly one of the most important steps preceding the later astronomical methods, that is to say, later than about 450 B.C. Roughly to the same period, probably the fourth century, belongs also the invention of the zodiac... The constellations which lent their names to the zodiacal signs are, of course, much older. But it was only for mathematical reasons that a definite great circle which measured the progress of the sun and the planets with respect to exactly 30°-long sections was introduced...

[p. 106] So far as we know, the Babylonian calendar was at all periods truly lunar, that is to say, the “month” began with the evening when the new crescent was for the first time again visible ... shortly after sunset. Consequently the Babylonian “day” also begins in the evening and the “first” of a month is the day of the first visibility. In this way the beginning of a month is made dependent upon a natural phenomenon which is amenable to direct observation...

No two consecutive reappearances of the new crescent after a short period of invisibility of the moon are ... separated by more than 30 days or by less than 29 days. Thus immediately the main problem arises: when is a month 30 days long, when 29? To answer this problem we must obtain an estimate not only of the lunar motion, but also of the motion of the sun... The time from one new crescent to the next is obviously about equal to the time from invisibility to invisibility. But the moon is invisible because it is close to the sun. Thus a month is measured by the time from one “conjunction” of the moon with the sun to the next...

[p. 107] Now the real difficulties begin. In order to make the first crescent visible the sun must be sufficiently deep below the horizon to make the moon visible shortly before it is setting... The evening before, the moon was still too close to the sun to be seen. Hence it is necessary to determine the distance from the sun to the moon which is required to obtain visibility. This distance obviously depends on the relative velocity of the two bodies...

But even if we had insight into the variable velocity of both bodies the visibility problem would not be solved. For a given place, all stars set and rise at fixed angles which are determined by the inclination of the equator and the horizon. The relative motion which we were discussing before is a motion in the ecliptic, which makes an angle of about 24° with the equator. Consequently we must know the variations of the angles between ecliptic and horizon. For Babylon we find a variation from almost 30° to almost 80°...

[p. 108] Then we must still remember that only the sun travels in the ecliptic whereas the moon deviates periodically from it between the limits of about  $+5^\circ$  and  $-5^\circ$  in “latitude”...

All these effects act independently of each other and cause quite irregular patterns in the variation of the length of lunar months. It is one of the most brilliant achievements in the exact sciences of antiquity to have recognized the independence of [p. 109] these influences and to develop a theory which permits the prediction of their combined effects. Epping, Kugler, and Schaumberger have indeed demonstrated that the lunar ephemerides of the Seleucid period follow in all essential steps the above outlined analysis...

We can observe that the solution of the problem of first visibility readily permits the solution of some other problems which were also of great interest. First of all, the day by day positions of sun and moon can easily be established as soon as the laws which determine the variation of solar and lunar velocity are known. Thus it is not surprising to find tables which give the daily motion of sun or moon. Secondly, one can solve the problem of last visibility of the moon by applying essentially the same argument to the eastern horizon and the rising of sun and moon. Finally, both the first and last visibility require as a preliminary step the knowledge of the moments of conjunction which fall in the middle of the interval of invisibility. Exactly the same considerations lead to the computation of the moments of opposition. If we combine this knowledge with the rules which determine the latitude of the moon, we can answer the question when the moon will be close to the ecliptic at oppositions or conjunctions. In the first case we can expect a lunar eclipse, in the second a solar eclipse. Thus it is only a logical step which leads from the computation of the new moons to eclipse tables which we find derived from the ephemerides...

[p. 119] Tables for solar eclipses are computed exactly like the tables for lunar eclipses... The Babylonian texts do not suffice to say anything more than that a solar eclipse is excluded or that a solar eclipse is possible. But they cannot answer even approximately the question whether a possible solar eclipse will actually be visible or not. One has to remember that this is the state of affairs during the last period of Mesopotamian astronomy, from about 300 B.C. to 0. Before 300 B.C. the chances for the correct prediction of a solar eclipse are still smaller. At all periods, exclusion of an eclipse of the sun is the only safe prediction that was possible...

The remaining part of the [Babylonian] ephemerides concerns the fundamental problem of the lunar calendar: to determine the evening of first visibility after conjunction when the new crescent again becomes visible... [p. 120] For this particular evening [on which the first crescent might be expected] one computes how long the new crescent will be above the horizon after sunset. If the resulting time difference between sunset and the setting of the moon is long enough to secure visibility, then ... the evening which starts the new month is known. If the resulting value seems too high, the computation has to be repeated for one day earlier. If the first result seems too low, a new value must be found for 24 hours later. In some cases alternative results are recorded in the final column *P*, corresponding to either a 29-day month or a 30-day month.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This last sentence shows that even at the peak of their astronomical knowledge the ancients often had to allow an uncertainty of a day in predicting the first day of the (lunar) month. The fact that this was necessary for them, because of variable factors affecting the visibility of the new crescent, demonstrates the futility of modern attempts to find the exact day of an ancient event, such as the

crucifixion. See letter from the same author in *SDACom* 5, p. 264, in which he points out this element of uncertainty in modern attempts to compute an exact day in a lunar month two thousand years ago.]

### 373. Calendar. Lunar (Babylonian)—19-Year Cycle

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *Astronomical Cuneiform Texts*, Vol. 1 (12 Bedford Sq., London, W.C.1: Lund Humphries, [1955]), p. 33.

The months of the Babylonian calendar are here simply denoted by I, II, ... XII, and VI<sub>2</sub> or XII<sub>2</sub> for the intercalary month in leap years.

During the whole Seleucid period a fixed intercalation cycle was followed. One cycle contains 19 years with 7 intercalations, 6 of which are a XII<sub>2</sub>, one a VI<sub>2</sub>. We shall use the following notation:

(4)            n\*                                    leap year with XII<sub>2</sub>  
                  n\*\*                                leap year with VI<sub>2</sub>

The arrangement of these leap years within the cycle is illustrated by the following cycle:

S[eleucid]	E[ra]	1*	2	3	4*	5	6	7*
(5) 8	9*	10	11		12*			13
14	15*	16	17		18**			19

It seems as if the \*\*-year was considered as the “first” year of a 19-year cycle.<sup>2</sup> [Note 2: Cf. No. 821b, column VIII ([vol. 2,] p. 442).]

### 374. Canaanite Religion, Depravity of, Demoralizing in the Extreme

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, “The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization,” in *Studies in the History of Culture* (Menasha, Wisconsin: Published for the Conference of Secretaries of the American Council of Learned Societies by the George Banta Publishing Company, 1942), pp. 28, 29. Used by permission of the American Council of Learned Societies and the author.

[p. 28] Canaanite religion ... inherited a relatively very primitive mythology and had adopted some of the most demoralizing cultic practices then existing in the Near East. Among these practices were human sacrifice, long [p. 29] given up by the Egyptians and Babylonians, sacred prostitution of both sexes, apparently not known in native Egyptian religion though widely disseminated through Mesopotamia and Asia Minor, the vogue of eunuch priests, ... who were much less popular in Mesopotamia and were not found in Egypt, serpent worship to an extent unknown in other lands of antiquity. The brutality of Canaanite mythology, both in the tablets of Ugarit and in the later epitome of Philo Byblius, passes belief; to find even partial parallels in Egypt and Mesopotamia one must go back to the third millennium B.C.

### 375. Canaanite Religion, Depravity of, Justifies Destruction

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 175, 176. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich, Used by permission.

[p. 175] The Ugaritic epic literature has helped to reveal the depth of depravity which characterized Canaanite religion. Being a polytheism of an extremely debased type, Canaanite cultic practice was barbarous and thoroughly licentious...

The brutality, lust and abandon of Canaanite mythology is far worse than elsewhere in the Near East at the time. And the astounding characteristic of Canaanite deities, that they had no moral character whatever, must have brought out the worst traits in their devotees and entailed many of the most demoralizing practices of the time, such as sacred prostitution, child sacrifice and snake worship...

So vile had the practices of the Canaanites become that the land was said to “vomit out its inhabitants” (Lev. 18:25) and the Israelites were warned by Yahweh to keep all His statutes and ordinances “that the land,” into which He was about to bring them to

dwelt, “vomit” them not out (Lev. 20:22). The character of Canaanite religion as portrayed in the Ugaritic literature furnishes ample background to illustrate the accuracy of these Biblical statements in their characterization of the utter moral and religious degeneracy of the [p. 176] inhabitants of Canaan, who were accordingly to be decimated and dispossessed.

3. *The Character of Canaanite Cults Completely Justifies the Divine Command to Destroy Their Devotees*. It is without sound theological basis to question God’s justice in ordering the extermination of such a depraved people or to deny Israel’s integrity as God’s people in carrying out the divine order...

The principle of divine forbearance, however, operates in every era of God’s dealings with men. God awaits till the measure of iniquity is full, whether in the case of the Amorite (Gen. 15:16), or the wicked antediluvian race, which He destroyed by the flood (Gen. 6), or the degenerate dwellers of Sodom and Gomorrah, whom He consumed by fire (Gen. 19). In the case of the Canaanites, instead of using the forces of nature to effect His punitive ends, He employed the Israelites as the ministers of His justice. The Israelites were apprized of the truth that they were the instruments of the divine justice (Josh. 5:13, 14). In the light of the total picture the extermination of the Canaanites by the Israelites was just and the employment of the Israelites for the purpose was right. It was a question of destroying or being destroyed, of keeping separated or of being contaminated and consumed.

4. *Canaanite Cults Dangerously Contaminating*. Implicit in the righteous judgment was the divine intention to protect and benefit the world.

### **376. Canaanite Religion — Fertility Cults**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, [1955]), pp. 82, 83. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 82] Study of our source materials shows that Canaanite cult practice was oriented toward sex and its manifestations. In no country has so relatively great a number of figurines of the naked goddess of fertility, some distinctly obscene, been found. Nowhere does the cult of serpents appear so strongly. The two goddesses Astarte (Ashtarothe) and Anath are called “the great goddesses which conceive but do not bear.” Sacred courtesans and eunuch priests were excessively common. Human sacrifice was well known, though it does not seem to have been practiced quite so frequently as used to be thought. [p. 83] The aversion felt by followers of YHWH-God when confronted by Canaanite idolatry is, accordingly, very easy to understand.

### **377. Canaanite Religion — Fertility Cults, Influence on Israelites**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 71, 72. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co. Ltd., London.

[p. 71] For evidences of fertility rites in Palestine we are not dependent on the Ras Shamra texts alone. The frequent polemic against practices connected with such rites standing in the Old Testament, and the allusions to the Adonis myth found there, would sufficiently demonstrate that these things had entered into the texture of the life of the people. The Queen of Heaven, who figures in the book of Jeremiah as an object of popular worship, is probably to be identified either with the Ashtarte or with the Anat of the Ras Shamra texts, and in either case is to be connected with this cycle of myths, and the rites that belonged to them. The goddess Anat has left her name in some place-names, including Anathoth, Jeremiah’s birthplace, and a Beth Anath in Judah and another in

Galilee. She appears in Bethshean, where she is connected with Resheph, the Syrian god of the Underworld, who figures not only in Ras Shamra texts, but also in Aramaic inscriptions from North Syria. More surprising still, we find this goddess mentioned in the Elephantine papyri, as having a place beside Yahweh in the Temple there.

Archaeology has frequently reinforced this evidence of the hold of the fertility cults on the people by turning up large numbers of figurines of a nude goddess, with exaggerated emphasis on sex. It is not difficult to see why grave moral evils and impurities were associated with this wor- [p. 72] ship, or why the Israelite prophets should so vigorously oppose it.

### **378. Canaanite Religion, Immorality in, Israelite Reaction to**

SOURCE: James B. Pritchard, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 91, 92, 122, 124, 125. Copyright 1958 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

[p. 91] While the picture of the religion of Canaan preserved in the Old Testament is vague, there are many references to it. "To go a whoring after" other god, is a phrase as fran in its original Hebrew as it is in this older translation into Elizabeth English; it is the usual way of referring to participation in the rites for the Canaanite god Baal. Along with Baal, other deities are occasionally mentioned: the goddess Ashtoreth, to whom there was a temple at Beth-shan, where the armor of Saul was placed after his death; Chemosh, the god of the Transjordan Moabite, for whom Solomon erected a high place; Molech, the god to whom child August was made; and Dagon, the Philistine god of Ashdod. More frequently the pantheon of Canaan is referred to merely by the anonymous "other gods."

Vague also is the picture of how the Canaanites worshipped. From scattered references in the Bible we can piece together a picture of worship at high places, equipped with altars, standing pillars, and images of Asherah. [p. 92] Idols were used, described as being of two kinds, molten images and graven images. The officians at Canaanite shrines are named by two Hebrew words, the meanings of which translators have found difficult to convey in English. The word for the male functionary has been variously rendered by "sodomite," "temple prostitute," and "cult prostitute" in the Revised Standard Version. The female attendant is known by a term which has been translated as "cult prostitute," or "whore." Such was the language used to describe the personnel of the shrines of Israel's rivals.

These tantalizing references label, rather than describe, the objects and the personnel of the cult of Canaan. Yet the frequency with which these labels occur on the pages of the Old Testament makes it clear that the contest between Yahweh, the God of Israel, and Baal was a real and a long struggle.

The story of how this vague picture given in the Bible has, in the course of the last century, become clearer is largely the account of the work of French archaeologists in that area of ancient Canaan called Phoenicia...

[p. 122] The prohibition by Hebrew prophet and lawmaker against the making of idols suggest the prevalence of idolatry in Canaan. From this clue one would naturally look for the remains of Canaanite images in the debris of the dozens of ancient sites which have been excavated in Palestine-Syria.

The most frequently recurring "likeness of anything that is the heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath," is the clay plague of a nude female figure no larger than a man's hand... These terrocattas are far from being works of art. They are generally crude, but always emphasize, sometimes through exaggeration, the distinctively feminine aspects of the human figure...

[p. 124] At one point at least the picture of Canaanite religion in the Old Testament and the discoveries of the past century converge: the cult Canaan was concerned with fertility in field, flock, and family.

Ugaritic mythology pictures the gods as engaging in most human activities: they sacrifice, eat, make war, kill, build houses, relax and “twiddle their fingers,” ride on beautiful jackasses. One text, of which only a fragment is preserved, has a graphic account of sexual union between Baal and Anath and seems to be followed by a description of the resulting fertility of the herds: “Calves the cows drop: an ox for the Maiden Anath and a heifer for Yahamat Liimmim.”

By a kind of sympathetic magic the union of gods, resulting, as it was believed, in the fertility of flocks and family, was effected, or at least stimulated, by similar actions among humans in the temples of the gods. Evidence for this ritual comes from a late, and possibly somewhat exaggerated, source in the writing of the Greek Lucian of Samosata, who lived in the second century A.D. Under the thin veneer of the deities Aphrodite and Adonis may be recognized the older Canaanite personages of Ashtoreth and Baal. Wrote Lucian:

But I also saw in Byblos a great temple of Aphrodite of Byblos, in which also the rites of Adonis are performed. I also made inquiry concerning the rites; for they tell the deed which is done to Adonis by a boar in their own country, and in memory of his suffering they beat their breasts each year, and wail, and celebrate these rites, and institute great lamentation throughout the country. But when they have bewailed and lamented, first they perform funeral rites to Adonis as if he were dead, but afterward upon another day they say he lives, and they [p. 125] cast dust into the air and shave their heads as the Egyptians do when Apis dies. But women such as do not wish to be shaven pay the following penalty: On a certain day the stand for prostitution at the proper time; and the market is open to strangers only, and the pay goes as a sacrifice to Aphrodite.<sup>31</sup> [Note 31: *De Dea Syria*, 6.]

The practice of sacred prostitution is probably the occasion for the invective of the prophet Hosea of the eighth century, who cried out: “They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and offer upon the hills, under oaks and poplars and terebinths, because the shadow thereof is good; therefore your daughter-in-law commit adultery . . . and they sacrifice with harlots.”

### **379. Canaanites, Curse on**

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 74, 75. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 74] Noah in an unguarded moment dishonors himself. In turn his son Ham, revealing the licentious bent of his character, shamefully dishonors his father. The patriarch, by the Spirit of prophecy, foretells the inevitable outworking of this lascivious tendency in the curse that lights upon Ham’s “son” (rather, “descendant”) Canaan, who represents the progenitor of that branch of the Hamitic peoples which later occupied Palestine before Israel’s conquest (Gen. 10:15–20).

The curse does not involve the infliction of a grievous disability upon a large portion of the human race either by God or Noah. It is rather an expression used prophetically to describe the natural outworking of the sensuality characteristic of Ham which, although it would doubtless be manifested throughout the various Hamitic peoples, would be fully developed with its disastrous results in the posterity of Canaan. That this is the case is shown by the fact that neither Ham, the son actually guilty of shameful license, nor his sons Cush, Mizraim and Put come either directly or indirectly under the prophesied malediction, but only Ham’s fourth son, Canaan (Gen. 10:6).

The purpose of this prophecy is clearly to show the origin of the Canaanites and to set forth the source of their moral pollution, which centuries later was to lead to their destruction by Joshua and their enslavement by Israel. As H. C. Leupold notes [*Exposition of Genesis* (1950), Vol. 1, pp. 350, 351],

... The descendants of Canaan, according to 10:15–20, are the peoples that afterward dwelt in Phoenicia and in the so-called land of Canaan, Palestine. That they became races accursed in their moral impurity is apparent from passages such 15:16; 19:5; Lev. 18 and 20; Deut. 12:31. In Abraham's day the measure of their iniquity was already almost full. By the time of the entrance of Israel into [p. 75] Canaan under Joshua the Canaanites, collectively also called Amorites, were ripe for divine judgment through Israel, His scourge. Sodom left its name for the unnatural vice its inhabitants practiced. The Phoenicians and the colony of Carthage surprised the Romans by the depth of their depravity. Verily cursed was Canaan!

In their religion the Canaanites were enslaved by one of the most terrible and degrading forms of idolatry, which abetted rather restrained their immorality. That Canaan's curse was basically religious has been amply demonstrated by archeology, particularly by the discovery of the Canaanite religious texts from ancient Ugarit in North Syria, 1929–1937. These texts fully corroborate the estimate of such older scholars as Lenormand, who said of Canaanite religion, "No other people ever rivalled them in the mixture of bloodshed and debauchery with which they thought to honor the Deity."<sup>3</sup> [Note 3: *Manual of the Ancient History of the Near East*, Vol. II, p. 219.]

### **380. Canaanites, Depravity of**

SOURCE: James Baikie, *The Life of the Ancient East*, pp. 434–439. Copyright 1923 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 434] Already, before you reach the gate [in an imaginary visit to ancient Gezer], your nostrils have been saluted by the aroma... Such a thing as sanitation is undreamt of, and ... all the garbage and filth of the tightly packed population is cast out into the narrow streets or upon the nearest open space, there to rot and fester, and breed disease... The inhabitants are quite careless of the horror which they breathe every day and all day, though it has left its marks, plainly enough to be seen, on their unhealthy complexions, and their disease-marked frames. Over the sea, in Crete, the Minoan of this time is rearing stately palaces, whose drainage-systems make us open our eyes with wonder at the present day, so modern are they; but the Semite of Gezer in those days was ... indifferent [to sanitation]... If you were to examine the cisterns from which they draw the water-supply for their cooking, or for their infrequent ablutions, you would very likely find at the bottom of several of them all that remains of one of the family, or of the family next door, who unfortunately overbalanced himself or herself in stooping to draw up the waterpot, and found a watery grave. Literally so; for again it was nobody's business to clean out the cistern, and the [p. 435] mourners were at least saved the trouble of providing a funeral. Whether they went on drinking essence of ancestor or not, one cannot [*sic*] say positively. "We can but hope," says Dr. Macalister, "that the water was never used again: certainly the bodies were never taken out." On the one side you have a hope; on the other a certainty...

[p. 436] The inhabitants have their own High-Place on an open piece of ground near the centre of the town. it is an irregularly shaped area, about 150 feet by 120, and in the middle of it stands a row of ten great unhewn stones set upright... [p. 437] As to the rites which go on under the shadow of the standing-stones of Gezer, perhaps the less said the better. To the Amorite mind of that day there may have been something very sacred about them; to the Western mind of to-day they can be summed up in two words,—beastliness and blood. As to the first part of this description, the evidence of the type of votive

offering found on the high place is too clear to be misunderstood; as to the second, it is enough to say that “the whole area of the High Place was found on excavation to be a cemetery of new-born infants.” ... Manifestly the Gezerites regularly sacrificed their first-born to whatever god or demon they adored, and the little skeletons, crushed into large two-handed jars, and buried under the shadow of the sacred stones, are the witnesses to their devotion to a faith surely the most horrible and degrading which has ever possessed the human mind. Indications were not wanting that adults, as well as infants, [p. 438] were sometimes offered on this place of abominations; and indeed the whole city gave evidence of what Dr. Macalister calls “an Aztec-like disregard of the value of human life.”

As you go through the streets you are stopped by the crowd gathered to watch the ceremony at the foundation of a new house. No house can be lucky unless it is reared upon a sacrifice's life, and so the builder of this one is going to ensure good fortune by the offering of one of his dependants. Being a thrifty man, he chooses one who is crippled with disease and comparatively useless; and so a poor old woman, bent double with spinal curvature, is dragged along, bound, and thrown into a hole in the ground, with a jar of food and a bowl of water beside her to nourish her spirit in the shades; and the stones of the new house are piled above the poor tortured body. A little further along they sacrificed a man recently; but he had lost his left hand in a fight anyway, and so was not of much use. If you could dig down in another spot, not far away, you would come upon a half, disposed in a way that suggests an even ghastlier horror. Two skeletons are lying side by side, and above them lies the upper half of the body of a youth about 18 years of age, who has been sawn asunder at the waist. Around the bones lie vessels for food and drink; and the grimmest horror of all is that the skeleton fingers of the left hand of one of the figures are dipping into one of the bowls. You picture the poor wretch groping in the stifling darkness of his living grave for a last morsel of food; and when you have seen the “weird charnel-house,” as the excavator justly calls the ghastly [p. 439] cistern where fourteen men and a young girl of sixteen, this last sawn asunder at the waist also, had been cast, and wondered what horrible tragedy could account for their presence in such a place, you have probably had about enough of “the iniquity of the Amorite,” and wonder, not at the command of extermination which went forth against the race, but rather that it was allowed to curse the earth for so long.

### **381. Catechisms, Catholic, Important, Listed**

SOURCE: *A Catholic Dictionary*, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.), p. 79. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

The best known catechism in England is the so-called “Penny Catechism,” approved by the archbishops of England and Wales and directed to be used in all their dioceses... In the United States the official Baltimore Catechism of 1885 is only one among many in use: a revision of this, in two parts according to age, was published in 1941. The first synod of Maynooth (1875) produced the “Maynooth Catechism” for use in Ireland. The “Catechism of the Council of Trent” or “Roman Catechism,” published in 1566, is not really a catechism at all but a manual of Christian instruction for the use of the clergy. It is a document of high authority, being written by command of a general council and approved by many popes. Three quasi-official catechisms, for little children, for children and for grown-ups, were compiled by Cardinal Peter Gasparri and published in Rome in 1931. These have been translated into English and other languages.

### **382. Catholic Church, Roman, Age and Vigor of**

SOURCE: [Thomas B.] Macaulay, "Ranke's History of the Popes" (first published 1840), in his *Critical and Historical Essays* (London: Longmans, 1865), Vol. 2, p. 128.

There is not, and there never was on this earth, a work of human policy so well deserving of examination as the Roman Catholic Church. The history of that Church joins together the two great ages of human civilisation. No other institution is left standing which carries the mind back to the times when the smoke of sacrifice rose from the Pantheon, and when camelopards and tigers bounded in the Flavian amphitheatre. The proudest royal house are but of yesterday, when compared with the line of the Supreme Pontiffs. That line we trace back in an unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond the time of Pepin the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable.

The republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the republic of Venice was modern when compared with the Papacy; and the republic of Venice is gone, and the Papacy remains. The papacy remains, not in decay, not a mere antique, but full of life and youthful vigour. The Catholic Church is still sending forth to the farthest ends of the world missionaries as zealous as those who landed in Kent with Augustin, and still confronting hostile kings with the same spirit with which she confronted Attila. The number of her children is greater than in any former age. Her acquisitions in the New World have more than compensated for what she has lost in the Old. Her spiritual ascendancy extends over the vast countries which lie between the plains of the Missouri and Cape Horn, countries, which, a century hence, may not improbably contain a population as large as that which now inhabits Europe...

Nor do we see any sign which indicates that the term of her long dominion is approaching. She saw the commencement of all the governments and of all the ecclesiastical establishments that now exist in the world; and we feel no assurance that she is not destined to see the end of them all. She was great and respected before the Saxon had set foot on Britain, before the Frank had passed the Rhine, when Grecian eloquence still flourished at Antioch, when idols were still worshipped in the temple of Mecca. And she may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.

### **383. Catholic Church, Roman—Commandments of the Church**

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th ed.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1913), p. 49.

243. *Which are the chief commandments of the Church??*

The chief commandments of the church are

- 1) To hear Mass on Sundays and Holydays to obligation.
- 2) To fast and to abstain on the days appointed.
- 3) To confess at least once year and to receive Holy Communion at Easter or within the time appointed.
- 4) Not to join forbidden societies.
- 5) To contribute to the support of the Church and our pastors.
- 6) Not to marry contrary to the laws of the Church.

**384. Catholic Church, Roman—Creed Subscribed To by Converts**  
(Creed of Pope Pius IV, or Profession of the Tridentine Faith)

SOURCE: Double bull of Pope Pius IV, Nov. 13 and Dec. 9, 1564, trans. in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 1, pp. 98, 99.

[p. 98] I. THE NICENE CREED OF 381, with the Western Changes.

1. I,—, with a firm faith, believe and profess all and every one of the things contained in the symbol of faith, which the holy Roman Church makes use of, viz.:

I believe in ONE GOD THE FATHER Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord JESUS CHRIST, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds; *God of God*, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made;

Who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man;

He was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate; suffered and was buried;

And the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures;

And ascended into heaven; sitteth on the right hand of the Father;

And he shall come again, with glory, to judge the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

And in the HOLY GHOST, the Lord, and Giver of life; who proceedeth from the Father *and the Son*; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets.

And one holy catholic and apostolic Church;

I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins;

And I look for the resurrection of the dead;

And the life of the world to come. Amen.

[p. 99] II. Summary of the TRIDENTINE CREED (1563).

2. I most steadfastly admit and embrace the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.
3. I also admit the holy Scriptures according to that sense which our holy Mother Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers (*juxta unanimum consensum Patrum*).
4. I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one, to wit: baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, penance, and extreme unction, holy orders, and matrimony; and that they confer grace; and that of these, baptism, confirmation, and ordination can not be reiterated without sacrilege. I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church used in the solemn administration of the aforesaid sacrament.
5. I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.
6. I profess likewise that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead (*verum, proprium, et propitiatorium sacrificium pro vivis et defunctis*); and that is the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially (*vere, realiter, et substantialiter*) the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made

a change of the whole essence (*conversionem totius substantiae*) of the bread into the body, and of the whole essence of the wine into the blood; which change the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation.

7. I also confess that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.
8. I firmly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

Likewise, that the saints reigning with Christ are to be honored and invoked (*venerandos atque invocandos esse*), and that they offer up prayers to God for us; and that their relics are to be held in veneration (*esse venerandas*).

9. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ and of the perpetual Virgin, the Mother of God, and also of other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given them.

I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

### III. ADDITIONAL ARTICLES AND SOLEMN PLEDGES (1564).

10. I acknowledge the holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church as the mother and mistress of all churches, and I promise and swear (*spondeo ac juro*) true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, as the successor of St. Peter, prince of the Apostles, and as the vicar of Jesus Christ.
11. I likewise undoubtingly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and oecumenical Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized.
12. I do at this present freely profess and truly hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved (*extra quam nemo salvus esse potest*); and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. And I will take care, as far as in me lies, that it shall be held, taught, and preached by my subjects, or by those the care of whom shall appertain to me in my office. This I promise, vow, and swear—so help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This Profession of Pius IV (or of Tridentine Faith) is, says Schaff (p. 98), "the most concise and, practically, the most important summary of the doctrinal system of Rome." He remarks that "to bring the Tridentine formula up to the present standard of Roman orthodoxy, it would require the two additional dogmas of the immaculate conception, and papal infallibility." To that would now be added the dogma of the assumption of the Virgin.]

### **385. Catholic Church, Roman—Development After Constantine**

SOURCE: T. Valentine Parker, *American Protestantism: An Appraisal*, pp. 4-7. Copyright 1956 by Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 4] [Constantine] granted toleration to the Christian church and then professing Christianity himself lifted it to a privileged position. The effects were obvious. The church gained tremendous prestige. Its growth and prosperity were assured. But inevitably the church became a worldly institution mixed inextricably with the politics of Rome and Christianity was soon the religion of the state.

Constantine, emperor, took upon himself authority to summon councils of the church. It was thus that the Nicene creed was adopted. The same council recognized the claims to

primacy of the bishop of Rome in the west. The decisions of the council of Nicaea were promulgated as imperial law. Thus not only were state and church united but the state was seen as superior in power...

The Roman empire had been divided into an eastern dominion with its capital Byzantium, afterwards re-named Constantinople, and a western where Rome continued its domination, challenged by barbarians who eventually took over and became the rulers. In these changeful times the Church was the stabilizing force. It was natural that with the advance of episcopacy the prestige of the "Eternal City," Rome, should enhance the Rome, the position of the Bishop of Rome. It was Leo, called the Great, bishop of Rome, 440–461, who envisaging an ecclesiastical monarchy, made the first claims for the supremacy of the Roman see and became the first real Pope...

[p. 5] In the year 590 Gregory the Great came to the papal chair. His vigorous reforms and energetic politics put the church into first place in Italy and the West. His credulity in respect of miracles and his veneration of relics are signs of the way the church had taken. The period in general is notable for three things: The order the church was able to impose upon the barbarians, whose incursions were destined to change Europe drastically; the extension of Roman Christianity through missionary effort; and the schism that separated the eastern church from the west...

In order to understand the course of the church in these almost fantastic developments from the simplicity of Apostolic times, it should be noted that in exchange for papal favors in the recognition of his dynasty, Pepin the Frank granted the pope political and territorial authority in Ravenna. It was thus that the pope first acquired temporal dominion.

[p. 6] ... The story of the church and what it came to mean is made clear by conditions and claims that evolved from this somewhat undefined relation between church and empire. There was admitted corruption in the monasteries and among the clergy, but even a pope inclined to reforms found his intentions impeded by the intermixture of spiritual and political authority...

[p. 7] Hildebrand, who became Pope Gregory VII was a reformer. It was logical from the papal point of view to claim for the spiritual potentate supremacy over the political monarch. Was not the pope the representative of God as no emperor or king could be? Did he not possess the rights guaranteed to him as the successor of Peter, to whom were given the keys of the kingdom of God? When such assumptions were made, it was inevitable that they should come into conflict with imperial claims and ambitions. In the struggle, the advantage was with the pope. The zenith of papal power was attained when an emperor stood as a penitent, asking the forgiveness of the pope and accepting the claim of the pope to be the judge of kings.

1

### **386. Catholic Church, Roman—Enters Void Left by Collapsing Empire**

SOURCE: Douglas Auchincloss, "City of God & Man," *Time*, 76 (Dec. 12, 1960), 64. Copyright 1960 by Time, Inc., New York; courtesy *Time*.

The all-conquering barbarians were storming the gates of Augustine's city when the saint died in 430. The North African town Hippo was one of the last imperial outposts to

---

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

be attacked. Rome had already gone under. Only four years before, St. Augustine's *City of God* had laid the theological groundwork for the church to step into the void left by the collapsing Roman Empire. Ever since, Western civilization and the Christian enterprise have been joined together for better or worse; the church has moved and countermoved, advanced, backtracked, tottered and triumphed before the contingencies of history. And the barbarian is seldom far from the city gates.

### **387. Catholic Church, Roman—History, Doctrines, Organization, Worship**

SOURCE: *CRB* 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1542–1550.

[p. 1542] *History*. The Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church, commonly known as the “Catholic Church,” recognizes the Bishop of Rome as Pope, the Vicar of Christ on earth, and the Visible Head of the Church on earth, and the Visible Head of the Church. It dates its origin from the selection by Jesus Christ of the Apostle Peter as “chief of the Apostles,” and it traces its history through his successors in the Bishopric of Rome.

Until the tenth century practically the entire Christian Church was recognized as one. Divergent views on various matters culminated in the eleventh century in the separation of a considerable portion of the Near East countries. It was then that the use of the word “Roman” became more frequent, though even in the earliest centuries it had been one of the tests of truly Catholic doctrine. The discoveries of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries contributed new life to the church and resulted in wider extension. Africa, India, China, and Japan were visited by the missionary fathers, numerous Catholic converts were made, and many Catholic communities were established. The discovery of America opened still another field. Missionaries accompanied the various Spanish expeditions of discovery and settlement in the first half century after Columbus made the first voyage to America, and they always raised the cross and conducted divine worship.

The first Catholic congregation in the territory now constituting the United States was founded at St. Augustine, Fla., in 1565, although Catholic services had been held on the soil of Florida long before that date, and from that point many companies of missionaries went along the coast, particularly toward the north, and labored among the Indians. That date also marks the evangelization of practically all of the present Latin America... Many tribes of Indians accepted the Catholic faith...

The history of the Catholic Church among the English colonists began with the immigration of English and Irish Catholics to Maryland in 1634 and the founding of the town of St. Marys in that year. Religious toleration was from the beginning the law of the colony; but in later years the Catholics were restricted and even disfranchised, and the restrictions were not entirely removed until after the War of the Revolution. In Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and New England, severe laws against Catholics were enforced for many years. In New York there were, it is said, no more than seven Catholic families in 1696, and the few Catholics living on Manhattan Island 80 years later had to go to Philadelphia to receive the sacraments. In a report to the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in 1763, Bishop Challoner gave the number of missionaries in Maryland as 12, of Catholics, including children, 16,000; in Pennsylvania, missionaries 5, Catholics 6,000 or 7,000. The Roman Catholic missionaries in Maryland and the other English colonies were under the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical superiors in England...

[p. 1543] Catholics, almost to a man, took sides with the colonists in the War of the Revolution. Among the signers either of the Articles of Confederation, the Declaration of

Independence, or the Constitution, were three Catholics—Thomas Fitzsimmons, Daniel Carroll, and Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who saw in the Declaration “the basis for a future charity and liberty for his church”; while Thomas Sim Lee was war governor of Maryland. Volunteers joined the Army and Navy, and a regiment of Catholic Indians from Maine was enlisted for the colonial forces, while the accession of the French Government to the American cause brought to the service of the Republic many Catholics, both officers and men, from Europe.

Following the war ... some of the colonies promptly removed the existing restrictions on the Catholics, admitting members of that church to all rights of citizenship. Religious equality, however, became universal and complete only after the Philadelphia Convention of 1787, in which the present Constitution [o]f the United States was adopted. During the discussion of the Constitution a memorial was presented by Rev. John Carroll, recently appointed (1784) superior of the missions in the United States, which undoubtedly contributed to the adoption of the provision of the sixth article which abolishes religious tests as a qualification for any office or public trust, and of that portion of the first amendment which says: “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

The Revolutionary War left the Catholic Church in America without any immediate hierarchical superior. The vicar apostolic of London held no intercourse with the church in America and refused to exercise jurisdiction in the United States. The Maryland clergy took steps to secure their property and maintain some kind of discipline, and application was made to Rome for the appointment of a superior with power to administer confirmation and with other privileges not strictly of the episcopal order... French influence was brought to bear to secure a Frenchman as ecclesiastical superior in the colonies, with a view of making the church a dependency of the Church of France... After considerable investigation and delay the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith proposed the name of John Carroll as the superior, or prefect apostolic, of the church in the Thirteen Original States, with the power to administer confirmation. This nomination was confirmed and was followed by a decree making the church in the United States a distinct body from that in England.

Already the question of foreign jurisdiction had arisen, and the new superior in 1785 urged that as Catholics were not admitted to any office in the State unless they renounced all foreign jurisdiction, civil or ecclesiastical, some plan should be adopted by which an ecclesiastical superior might be appointed “in such a way as to retain absolutely the spiritual jurisdiction of the Holy See and at the same time remove all ground of objecting to us [Catholics] as though we [they] held anything hostile to the national independence.” Accompanying this letter was a statement of the number of Catholics in the United States, according to which there were 15,800 in Maryland; in Pennsylvania, 700; in Virginia, 200; and in New York, 1,500. In the territory bordering on the Mississippi there were said to be many Catholics, for whom there were no priests.

In the early history of the church various perplexing situations appeared. One of the first was occasioned by what was known as “trusteeship.” In 1785 the board of “Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the city of New York” was incorporated and purchased a site for a church. These trustees were not content with holding the property, but held that the congregation represented by them had the right not only to choose its pastor but to dismiss him at pleasure, and that no ecclesiastical superior, bishop, or prefect, had any

right to interfere. Such a situation, as Dr. Carroll wrote to the New York trustees, “would result in the formation of distinct and independent societies in nearly the same manner as the Congregational Presbyterians,” and several churches for a time firmly resisted the authority of the bishops. Subsequently the present system was adopted.

[p. 1544] Another problem was that of providing a body of native clergy in place of the older missionaries, who were mostly members of the Society of Jesus, and were fast passing away. The immediate difficulty was solved in a measure by the coming of a number of priests of the Congregation of St. Sulpice in Paris, during the French Revolution (1791). They founded an ecclesiastical seminary in Baltimore, and made their special work the preparation for the priesthood of those who were native to America and thoroughly identified with the new national life.

The general policy of the earlier episcopate was to avoid the antagonisms often occasioned by different nationalities, languages, and training. To accomplish this an effort was made to incorporate the non-English speaking Catholics in the same churches with those whose habitual language was English, and whose spirit was thoroughly American. As immigration increased, however, great pressure was brought to bear for the appointment of clergy native to the various countries and familiar with the languages and customs—as Irish, German, French, and Slavic. The Church of the Holy Trinity, opened for Germans in Philadelphia in 1789, was the first effort to meet this demand, and since then the immediate needs of these foreign communities have been met, in the main, by the appointment of priests of their own nationality, although the general policy of the church has been to extend the use of the English language as much as possible. Restriction of immigration in recent years has greatly diminished the problem.

In this connection mention should be made of what are known as the “Uniat Churches,” some of which were formerly connected with the Eastern or Oriental Churches, particularly in southeastern Europe and the Levant. They recognize the authority of the Pope but have divergences from the Latin Church, in some matters of discipline, and they use their own languages, as Greek, Syriac, Slavonic, Armenian, etc., in the liturgy. Among them are the Maronite, the Greek Catholic or United Greek, and the Slavonic.

A difficulty which the church faced during the second quarter of the nineteenth century was the “Know-nothing” movement. Some raised the cry that Catholics were not merely un-American, but anti-American and absolutely disloyal. As a result, riots occurred in various cities and considerable property of Catholics was destroyed, but the storm soon spent its force.

During the same period the school question arose. As the elementary school system developed it was under the control of Protestants, who introduced Protestant forms of religious observance. The Catholics objected to conditions which constrained their children to attend, or take part in, non-Catholic services or instruction. The result was the absolute separation of public education from the control of any religious body. The Catholics initiated and developed the parochial school system in order to meet the demands of conscience and the right of the parent to secure the religious education which he wished for his child.

Of a somewhat similar nature to this was a question which arose in regard to Government assistance in missionary education, especially in the West. The church had organized extensive schools among the Indians and Protestant bodies had done the same.

The question arose as to the relation of the Government to such religious teaching, and the result was that Government aid was withdrawn from all alike.

In these questions two men stand out preeminently as leaders: Archbishop Carroll, of Baltimore, and Archbishop Hughes, of New York. Their influence, however, was not confined to distinctively church matters; the former was one of a committee sent to Canada in 1776 by the Continental Congress, in order to induce the Canadian Catholics to join the Revolutionary forces; while the latter was sent by President Lincoln as an envoy to France and Spain during the Civil War and succeeded in materially checking the movement in Europe in favor of the Confederacy.

The growth of the church is indicated by the increase in its membership, the development of its dioceses, and its councils.

In 1807 about 80 churches and a Catholic population of 150,000 were reported. Since that date a number of estimates have been made by different historians, some of them differing very widely. Thus, Prof. A. J. Schemm gives the total Roman Catholic population in 1860 as 4,500,000, while John Gilmary Shea estimates it as 3,000,000. According to the census report of 1890 the number of communicants or members, not including those under 9 years of age, was 6,231,417.

The first diocese was that of Baltimore, erected in 1789, becoming likewise the first archdiocese in 1808...

[p. 1545] Three plenary or national councils have been held in Baltimore—in 1852, in 1866, and in 1884. Other items of interest are the promotion to the Cardinalate of Archbishop McCloskey, of New York, in 1875, of Archbishop Gibbons, of Baltimore, in 1886; of Archbishop Farley, of New York, in 1875, of Archbishop Gibbons, of Baltimore, in 1886; of Archbishop Farley, of New York, and Archbishop O'Connell, of Boston, in 1911; of Archbishop Dougherty, of Philadelphia, in 1921; and of Archbishop Mendelien, of Chicago, and Archbishop Hayes, of New York, in 1924. The Catholic University of America was founded at Washington, D. C., by the decree of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884). The Apostolic Delegation was established at Washington in 1893...

In 1917 ... the National Catholic War Council was called into existence, and rendered much service in caring for the spiritual and moral welfare of American service men in the war...

The War Council was succeeded in peace times by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, with departments dealing with education, social action, laws and legislation, press, lay organizations, immigration, and other fields...

*Doctrine.* The doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are found in that deposit of faith given to it by Christ and through His apostles. That deposit of faith is sustained by Holy Scripture and by tradition. These doctrines are both safeguarded and defined by the Pope when he speaks "ex cathedra," or as Head of the Church, and specifically declares he speaks as such and on a matter of Christian faith and morals. Such definitions by the Holy Father neither constitute nor establish new doctrines, but are official statements that the particular doctrine was revealed [p. 1546] by God and is contained in the "Depositum Fidei," or Sacred Depository of Faith.

The Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the Athanasian Creed are regarded as containing essential truths accepted by the church. A general formula of doctrine is presented in the "profession of faith," to which assent must be given by those who join

the church. It includes the rejection of all such doctrines as have been declared by the church to be wrong, a promise of obedience to the authority of the church in matters of faith, and acceptance of the following statement of belief:

One only God, in three divine Persons, distinct from, and equal to, each other—that is to say, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

The Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ; and the personal union of the two Natures, the divine and the human; the divine maternity of the Most Holy Mary, together with her most spotless virginity.

The true, real, and substantial presence of the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

The seven sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ for the salvation of mankind; that is to say: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, Matrimony.

Purgatory, the resurrection of the dead, everlasting life.

The primacy, not only of honor, but also of jurisdiction, of the Roman Pontiff, successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, Vicar of Jesus Christ; the veneration of the saints and of their images; the authority of the apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and of the Holy Scriptures, which we must interpret, and understand, only in the sense which our holy mother the Catholic Church has held, and does hold; and everything else that has been defined, and declared by the sacred Canons, and by the General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent, and delivered, defined, and declared by the General Council of the Vatican, especially concerning the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and his infallible teaching authority.

The sacrament of baptism is administered to infants or adults by the pouring of water and the pronouncement of the proper words and “cleanses from original sin.” Baptism is the condition for membership in the Roman Catholic Church, whether that sacrament is received in infancy or in adult years. At the time of baptism the name of the person is officially registered as a Catholic and is so retained unless by formal act he renounces such membership. Confirmation is the sacrament through which “the Holy Spirit is received” by the laying on of hands of the bishop, and the anointing with the holy chrism in the form of a cross. The Eucharist is “the sacrament which contains the Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity, of the Lord Jesus Christ, under the appearance of bread and wine.” It is usually to be received fasting and is given to the laity only in the form of bread. Penance is a sacrament in which the sins committed after baptism are forgiven. Extreme Unction is a sacrament in which the sick who are in danger of death receive spiritual succor by the anointing with holy oil and the prayers of the priest. The sacrament of Orders, or Holy Orders, is that by which bishops, priests, and other ministers of the church are ordained and receive power and grace to perform their sacred duties. The sacrament of Matrimony is the sacrament which unites a Christian man and woman in lawful marriage, and such marriage “cannot be dissolved by any human power.”

The chief commandments of the church are: To hear mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation; to fast and abstain on the days appointed; to confess at least once a year; to receive the Holy Eucharist during Easter time; to contribute toward the support of pastors; and to observe the regulations in regard to marriage.

*Organization.* The organization of the Roman Catholic Church centers in the Bishop of Rome as Pope, and his authority is supreme in matters of faith and in the conduct of the affairs of the church. Next to the Pope is the College of Cardinals, whose members act as his advisers and as heads or members of various commissions called congregations, which are charged with the general administration of the church. These never exceed 70 in number, and are of 3 orders—cardinal deacons, cardinal priests, and cardinal bishops. These terms do not indicate their jurisdictional standing, but only their position in the cardinalate. With few exceptions the cardinal priests are archbishops or bishops, and the

cardinal deacons are [p. 1547] generally priests. In case of the death of the Pope the cardinals elect his successor, authority meanwhile being vested in the body of cardinals. Most of the cardinals reside in Rome, and their active duties are chiefly in connection with the various congregations which have the care of the different departments of church activity.

The Roman Curia is constituted of these congregations and other departments, together with the tribunals and offices...

[p. 1548] The organization of the church in the United States includes an Apostolic Delegate, ... archbishops, ... bishops, and ... priests. The special province of the Apostolic Delegate is the settling of difficulties that may arise in the conduct of the dioceses. An archbishop has the care of his archdiocese, and has precedence and a certain limited competence in his province... Within each diocese authority is vested in the bishop, although appeal may be made to the Apostolic Delegate, and in the last resort to one of the congregations in Rome. In addition to the bishop the organization of a diocese includes a vicar-general, who, under certain conditions, acts as the bishop's representative; a chancellor, or secretary; a council of consultors, usually six in number, three of whom are nominated by the bishop and three by the clergy of the diocese; and different boards of examination and superintendence. Special appointments are also made of persons to conduct specific departments of the diocesan work.

In the parish the pastor is in charge, subject to the bishop; he alone has authority to administer the sacraments, though he has the assistance of other priests as may be needed. Appointment to a parish rests with the bishop or archbishop.

Appointment to a bishopric rests with the Holy See at Rome, but names are recommended by the hierarchy in this country...

An important element in the polity of the Roman Catholic Church is furnished by the religious orders. These are of two kinds—the monastic orders, the members of which take solemn vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity, and the religious congregations of priests and the various brotherhoods and sisterhoods. Most of the members of these religious congregations take simple, not perpetual, vows. They are governed ultimately by a general or president, or superior, who is represented in the different countries by subordinates and by councils of various [p. 1549] forms, though some form independent communities. The clerical members are ordained, and constitute what is known as the “regular” clergy, in distinction from the parish priests, known as the diocesan or “secular” clergy. The term “regular” is from the Latin *regula*, a rule, and is applied to these priests because they live under a special rule in a community...

A prominent feature in the organization of the Roman Catholic Church, and an important factor in its history, is the system of ecclesiastical councils. These are general or ecumenical, plenary or national, and provincial. A general council is convoked by the Pope, or with his consent, is presided over by him or his legates, and includes all the Catholic bishops of the world. A plenary or national council is an assembly of all the bishops of a country, as the United States. A provincial council includes the bishops within the territory of a metropolitan or archbishop. There is, in addition, the diocesan synod, which is a gathering of the priests of a diocese.

The acts of a general council, to be binding, must be confirmed by the Pope; those of a plenary or provincial council must be submitted to the Holy See before promulgation, for confirmation, and for any needed correction. The scope of the general council

includes doctrine and matters of discipline concerning the church in the whole world. Plenary and provincial councils do not define, but repeat the doctrine defined by the general councils, and apply universal discipline, determined by those councils and the Holy See, by explicit statutes to each country or province, or they initiate such discipline as the peculiar circumstances may demand.

The procedure and working of these councils are similar to those of an ordinary legislative body... At the close the minutes of the debates, called “*acta*,” and the bills passed, called “*decreta*,” are sent to Rome, where they are examined by commissions who may make amendments, usually in the wording rather than in the matter. Their report is submitted to the Pope, whose approval is not, however, meant to be such an act as entails papal infallibility. As confirmed by the Holy See, these decrees are sent back to the president of the council, are promulgated and communicated to the bishops by him, and then become laws.

Diocesan synods make further promulgation and application of these decrees, applying thus the legislation to the priests and laymen of each diocese.

The laity have no voice in the conduct of the church, nor in the choice of the local priest, but they are consulted in the management of parish affairs...

[p. 1550] It is the custom to hold the Sunday morning services, or Masses, at different hours. The more important service, or high Mass, in which some parts of the liturgy are sung by the officiating clergyman and other parts by the choir, and at which a regular sermon is delivered by one of the priests, is celebrated between 10 a. m. and noon. At the other services, called low Masses, from 5 a. m. to noon, the Mass is read and a short instruction is given. At these services, varying from two to seven in number, the congregations attending are always quite different. Vespers are also sung on Sunday afternoon or evening, Mass is said daily by each priest, and special services are held on all holy days. The churches are kept open through the day for individual worship and confession. The liturgy is the same for all Roman Catholic churches and is in Latin, except in such Uniat churches as have the privilege of using their own language. The sermons and instructions, however, are always in the language spoken by the congregation, and the Scriptures are read in the same language.

[EDITOR’S NOTE: Membership (1959), 40,871,302 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 257).]

### **388. Catholic Church, Roman—Membership Gains Exceed Rate of Population Rise in U.S.**

SOURCE: News item, *The Washington Post*, Oct. 17, 1960, p. A2. Copyright 1960 by The Washington Post Co., Wash., D.C. Used by permission.

Roman Catholic Church membership increased faster than the population last year, while Protestant growth lagged slightly behind the population’s upward trend, the latest statistics showed today.

Roman Catholic membership rose to 40,871,302, a gain of 1,361,794 or 3.4 per cent, while Protestant membership reached 62,543,502, a gain of 1.7 per cent. During the same period, population gained an estimated 1.8 per cent.

The figures, compiled by the bureau of research and survey of the National Council of Churches, showed total religious affiliations climbed to 112,226,905.

This was an over-all increase of 2,669,164, or 2.4 per cent, a proportionately faster rise than the population. Of all Americans, 63.4 per cent belonged to a church or synagogue in 1959, compared to 63 per cent in 1958.

Gathered for use in the “Yearbook of American Churches for 1961,” the figures showed that 33.8 per cent of the population are Protestants, and 23.1 per cent are Roman Catholics.

### **389. Catholic Church, Roman—Penalties Revoked in New Code of Canon Law**

SOURCE: Charles Augustine [Bachofen], *A Commentary on the New Code of Canon Law*, Vol. I (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1918), pp. 60, 77, 78. Copyright 1918 by Joseph Gummersbach. Used by permission.

[p. 60] Our gloriously reigning Holy Father Benedict XV, in his Bull of promulgation, refers to the *Motu proprio* “*Arduum sane*,” which was issued by Pius X, March 17, 1904, and gave rise to the present Code. In that memorable pronouncement the late Pontiff stated the reasons which prompted him as the supreme Pastor of souls, who has the care of all the churches, to provide for a new codification of ecclesiastic laws, with a view “to put together with order and clearness all the laws of the Church thus far issued, removing all those that would be recognized as abrogated or obsolete, adapting others to the necessities of the times, and enacting new ones in conformity with the present needs.” ...

[p. 77] CAN. 6...

The Code for the most part retains the discipline hitherto in force, but makes some opportune changes. Thus:

- 1.° All laws, whether universal or particular, that are opposed to the prescriptions of this Code, are abrogated, unless some special provision is made in favor of particular laws;
- [p. 78] 2.° Those canons which restate the ancient law without change, must be interpreted upon the authority of the ancient law, and therefore in the light of the teaching of approved authors;
- 3.° Those canons which agree with the ancient law only in part, must be interpreted in the light of the ancient law in so far as they agree with it, and in the light of their own wording in so far as they differ from the ancient law;
- 4.° When it is doubtful whether a canon contained in this Code differs from the ancient law, the ancient law must be upheld;
- 5.° As regards penalties not mentioned in the Code, whether spiritual or temporal, medicinal or (as they say) vindictive, whether incurred by the act itself or imposed by judicial sentence, they are to be considered as abrogated;
- 6.° If there be one among the other disciplinary laws hitherto in force, which is neither explicitly nor implicitly contained in this Code, it must be held to have lost all force unless it is found in approved liturgical books or unless it is of divine right, positive or natural.

[EDITORS' NOTE: As Coulton remarks (see No. 840), any physical or temporal penalties inflicted on Protestants for the sake of religion are a violation of present canon law.]

### **390. Catholic Church, Roman, Power of, Decline in 18th Century**

SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N. Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 21, 22. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 21] That eighteenth-century trade war between the British and French in North America (which the Americans call the “French and Indian War” and the British “Seven Years’ War”) ... brought about a reverse to Catholic fortunes in the New World as grave as the revolution of 1688 had caused in England...

[p. 22] The French lost the war, and the Church lost North America, surviving only at Quebec, in the North, and in Maryland, Florida, Louisiana, and Mexico in the South.

And again, because the British Navy was more efficient than the French Navy, the trade of the French West Indian Islands was ruined in the war, and the Jesuits, heavily involved in that trade, were also ruined, and were compelled to return to Paris to defend themselves. In Paris their archenemies, the lawyers of the French *parlement*, saw to it that their ruin was consummated, and the Society of Jesus was expelled from France. And this expulsion, in its turn, led on to the general suppression of the society by Pope Clement XIV in 1773... The balance of world power in the eighteenth century was tilted against the Church by the victories of Anglo-Saxon arms.

### **391. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood, Functions of—Priest Held to Be Representative of Christ**

SOURCE: A. Nampon, *Catholic Doctrine as Defined by the Council of Trent* (Philadelphia: Peter F. Cunningham, 1869), pp. 543, 544. Ellipses in source.

[p. 543] The priest is the man *of God*, the minister *of God*, the portion *of God*, the man *called of God*, *consecrated to God*, wholly occupied with *the interests of God*; “he that despiseth him, despiseth *God*; he that hears him hears *God*: he remits sins as *God*, and that which he calls his body at the altar is adored *as God* by himself and by the congregation. This shows Jesus Christ as God-Man ... The priest is not vested with the functions and powers of the priesthood except by a *holy anointing*, whence comes the name of *Christ* (anointed) given Him in the Scriptures. This shows that the Incarnation was for the Saviour an anointing altogether divine, celebrated by the prophets, which causes the name of *Christ* to be added to his name Jesus... The priest daily offers a great sacrifice; and the victim which he immolates is the Lamb of God, bearing the sins of the world; and by continence, by Apostolic self-devotion, he ought daily to associate himself with this great immolation. This shows Jesus Christ content to offer Himself as a holocaust upon the altar of the caenacle and on that of the cross, for the salvation of the whole world... From the [p. 544] virtue of this sacrifice, which he offers daily, the priest derives the power and the right to teach the faith, to administer the sacraments, to govern souls. It is because Jesus Christ, becoming our Redeemer, by the sovereign efficacy of His sacrifice, is thereby also teacher, pattern, pastor, legislator, supreme judge of all men, the eternal glory of the saints. In one word, the priest, such as he is in the christian system, that is to say, the Catholic priest, presupposes, represents, shows forth Jesus Christ, the God-Man.

### **392. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood, Origin of, Claimed From Christ**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXIII (July 15, 1563), Sacrament of Order, chap. 1, On the Institution of the Priesthood of the New Law, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 150, 151. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 150] Sacrifice and priesthood are, by the ordinance of God, in such wise conjoined, as that both have existed in every law. Whereas, therefore, in the New Testament, the Catholic Church has received, from the institution of Christ, the holy visible Sacrifice of the Eucharist [the mass]; it must needs also be confessed that there is, in that Church, a new, visible and [p. 151] external priesthood (can. i), into which the old has been translated. And the Sacred Scriptures show, and the tradition of the Catholic Church has always taught, that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord our Saviour (can. iii), and that to the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood was the power delivered of consecrating, offering and administering His Body and Blood, as also of forgiving and retaining sins.

### **393. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood, Position of**

SOURCE: *Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests*, trans. by John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan (1958), p. 318. Copyright 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

Bishops and priests being, as they are, God's interpreters and ambassadors, empowered in His name to teach mankind the divine law and the rules of conduct, and holding, as they do, His place on earth, it is evident that no nobler function than theirs can be imagined. Justly, therefore, are they called not only Angels, but even gods, because of the fact that they exercise in our midst the power and prerogatives of the immortal God.

In all ages, priests have been held in the highest honor; yet the priests of the New Testament far exceed all others. For the power of consecrating and offering the body and blood of our Lord and of forgiving sins, which has been conferred on them, not only has nothing equal or like to it on earth, but even surpasses human reason and understanding.

### **394. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood, Power of Absolution by**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIV (Nov. 25, 1551), On the Most Holy Sacrament of Penance, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 118, 119. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 118] Canon IX. If anyone saith that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who con- [p. 119] fesses; provided only he believe himself to be absolved, or (even though) the priest absolve not in earnest, but in joke; or saith that the confession of the penitent is not required in order that the priest may be able to absolve him; let him be anathema.

Canon X. If anyone saith that priests who are in mortal sin have not the power of binding and of loosing; or that not priests alone are the ministers of absolution, but that to all and each of the faithful of Christ is it said: "Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall be loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven;" and, "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained"; by virtue of which words every one is able to absolve from sins, to wit, from public sins by reproof only, provided he who is reprov'd yield thereto, and from secret sins by a voluntary confession; let him be anathema.

### **395. Catholic Church, Roman—Priesthood—Priest Held to Be Creator of the Creator**

SOURCE: Alphonsus de Liguori, *Dignity and Duties of the Priest; or, Selva* (Brooklyn: Redemptorist Fathers, 1927), pp. 26, 27, 31–35.

[p. 26] With regard to the power of priests over the real body of Jesus Christ, it is of faith that when they pronounce the words of consecration the Incarnate Word has obliged himself to obey and to come into their hands under the sacramental species... We find that in obedience to the words of his priests—HOC EST CORPUS MEUM [This is my body]—God himself descends on the altar, that he comes wherever they call him, and as often as they call him, and places [p. 27] himself in their hands, even though they should be his enemies. And after having come, he remains, entirely at their disposal; they move him as they please, from one place to another; they may, if they wish, shut him up in the tabernacle, or expose him on the altar, or carry him outside the church; they may, if they choose, eat his flesh, and give him for the food of others...

- [p. 31] Besides, the power of the priest surpasses that of the Blessed Virgin Mary; for, although this divine Mother can pray for us, and by her prayers obtain whatever she wishes, yet she cannot absolve a Christian from even the smallest sin...
- [p. 32] Thus the priest may, in a certain manner, be called the creator of his Creator, since by saying the words of consecration, he creates, as it were, Jesus in the sacrament, by giving him a sacramental existence, and produces him as a victim to be offered to the eternal Father...
- [p. 33] “The power of the priest,” says St. Bernardine of Sienna, “is the power of the divine person; for the transubstantiation of the bread requires as much power as the creation of the world.” ...
- [p. 34] “Let the priest,” says St. Laurence Justinian, “approach the altar as another Christ.” According to St. Cyprian, a priest at the altar performs the office of Christ...

The priest holds the place of the Saviour himself, when, by saying “Ego te absolvo,” he absolves from sin. This great power, which Jesus Christ has received from his eternal Father, he has communicated to his priests... [p. 35] The Jews justly said: *Who can forgive sins but God alone?* But what only God can do by his omnipotence, the priest can also do by saying “Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis” [“I absolve you from your sins”]...

Cardinal Hugo represents the Lord addressing the following words to a priest who absolves a sinner: “I have created heaven and earth, but I leave to you a better and nobler creation; make out of this soul that is in sin a new soul, that is, make out of a slave of Satan, that the soul is, a child of God.”

### **396. Catholic-Protestant Relations—Coercion of Press**

SOURCE: James Hastings Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951), pp. 260, 261. Copyright 1951 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 260] As Heywood Broun had said: “There is not a single New York editor who does not live in mortal terror of the power of this group [the Catholic Church]. It is not a case of numbers but of organization.”<sup>13</sup> [Note 13 refers to George Seldes, *The Catholic Crisis*, p.. 186.]...

In every parish of the United States and Canada, agencies were established to watch the press and to coerce it. Coercion was preferred to any attempt to persuade. Instead of arguing, the Church hits through the business office. Cardinal Dougherty, for example, turned the Philadelphia archdiocese on the *Record* for identifying the cause of the Spanish Republic with democracy. Boycott of the newspaper was urged in Catholic pulpits throughout the city as well as by the diocesan paper. Pamphlets were distributed at Masses, with the suggestion that recipients show them to the advertising managers of department and other stores that advertised in the *Record*. The New York and Baltimore prelates similarly bullied great newspapers into warping their news by threats of advertising boycotts. The Legion of Decency achieved similar results in the movies. The same technique was applied in the case of the magazines. A systematic campaign of letters and post cards to advertisers in magazines was used to suppress free expression. These are the devices by which a small minority of a minority sect was able to control the news of a great war in a neutral press and simultaneously to poison the [p. 261] springs of democratic discussion in America and contribute to the establishment of a totalitarian state in Spain. They have been employed elsewhere in the English-speaking world, as in Australia and Britain, with similar if less sweeping success.

Occasionally one would hear of a publisher, movie producer, or department store owner who challenged the insolence of the bishop, and in such cases he often won a

complete victory. There was the case of the famous department store owner who refused to take the local bishop's order to withdraw his advertising from an offending newspaper. When the bishop then announced that he would impose a boycott on the store also, the owner merely asked to be notified in advance of the time of the boycott. The bishop's agent asked why. The businessman replied that at that time all Roman Catholic employees of the store would receive their final checks, with a letter explaining the reasons for their dismissal. At this the episode ended.

### **397. Catholic-Protestant Relations, Fortrightness and Charity in (a Catholic's View)**

SOURCE: Donald Attwater, "The Other Sheep," *Worship*, 28 (January, 1954), 88.

A false "eirenicism," toning down or disregarding real disagreement between Christians and minimizing the significance of what the Church teaches as revealed truth—that would be both a betrayal of our faith and a grave disservice to our separated brethren. But equally does that faith call for a true "eirenicism" towards those who know it not or share it only in part: a spirit of understanding of patience, of humility, of loving-kindness, of tolerance, in a word, of real love in Christ.

That she is the Body of Christ is, I suppose, the one truth about His Church about which all Christians are in some manner agreed. When all of us, of all "denominations," realize, that is, make real to ourselves, that the vast majority of us are by charity united one to another invisibly by means of that Mystical Body; when we realize the significance of valid baptism and of a sincere desire to follow Christ in His way (huge numbers of non-Catholics have the first [see editors' note below]; and the second is inseparable from everyone in good faith); when we all think of and act towards one another in the light of these things then—and not till then—shall we have begun to do our part in preparing the way to the *complete and visible* Christian unity that our Lord wills.

[EDITORS' NOTE: For the Catholic view that Protestant baptism can be valid, that is, that it places the recipient in the "true" church, see Nos. 837, 838.]

### **398. Catholic-Protestant Relations, Fortrightness and Charity in (a Protestant View)**

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown. "The Issues Which Divide Us," in *American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View*, edited by Philip Scharper, p. 60. © Sheed and Ward, Inc., New York, 1959. Used by permission.

The attitude which this chapter will attempt to exemplify is an attitude of forthrightness in the context of charity. St. Paul puts it less formidably when he talks about "speaking the truth in love"; speaking the truth, however sharp and cutting a two-edged sword that truth may be, but speaking also in love, remembering that the edge of truth's sword is dulled if it is flourished in malice, jealousy, spite or hatred. This means sifting out true charges from false, replacing caricature by accurate description, but also, in less exalted terms, calling the shots as one sees them. It does *not* mean assuming sentimentally that underneath "we really all believe the same thing," and that a little give and take will uncover this least common denominator. We do *not* all believe the same thing, even though we may believe a lot of the same things. The areas where we agree may actually outnumber the areas where we disagree, but the latter are so fundamental as to outweigh much of the former.

### **399. Celibacy, Catholic Advocacy of**

SOURCE: E. Friedberg, "Celibacy," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 2, pp. 465, 466. Copyright 1908 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of the present publisher, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich.

[p. 465] Celibacy, in the Roman Catholic Church, means the permanently unmarried state to which men and women bind themselves either by a vow or by the reception of the major orders which implies personal purity in thought and deed... Very early in the history of the Church the idea grew up that the unmarried state was preferable (Hermas, I, ii. 3; Ignatius to Polycarp, v.), and grew into a positive contempt of marriage (Origen, *Hom. vi. in Num.*; Jerome, *Ad Jovinianum*, i. 4). As early as the second century examples of voluntary vows of virginity are found, and the requirement of continence before the performance of sacred functions. By the fourth century canons began to be passed in that sense (Synod of Neocaesarea, 314 A.D., canon i; Synod of Ancyra, 314 A.D. canon x.). Unmarried men were preferred for ecclesiastical offices, though marriage was still not forbidden; in [f]act, the clergy were expressly prohibited from deserting a lawfully married wife on religious grounds (Apostolic Canons, v.)... Within its own boundaries the Latin Church has held more and more strictly to the requirement of celibacy, though not without continual opposition on the part of the clergy. The large number of canons on this subject enacted from the eighth century on, shows that their enforcement was not easy. After the middle of the eleventh century the new ascetic tendency whose champion was Gregory VII had a strong influence in this matter. Even before Hildebrand's accession to the Papacy, the legislation of Leo IX. (1054), Stephen IX. (1058), Nicholas II. (1059), and Alexander II. (1063), had laid down the principles which as Pope he was to carry out. In the synod of 1074 he renewed the definite enactment of 1059 and 1063, according to which both the married priest who said mass and the layman who received communion at his hands were excommunicate... After the Reformation had done its work, Charles V. endeavored by the Interim of 1548 to bring about the abolition of these rules, and with several other [p. 466] princes requested the discussion of the question at the Council of Trent. The council, however, maintained the system as a whole, and the following rules are now in force: (1) through the reception of major orders or the taking of monastic or other solemn vows, celibacy becomes so binding a duty that any subsequent marriage is null and void. (2) Any one in minor orders who marries loses his office and the right to go on to major orders, but the marriage is valid. (3) Persons already married may receive the minor orders if they have the intention of proceeding to the major, and show this by taking a vow of perpetual abstinence; but the promotion to the higher orders can only take place when the wife expresses her willingness to go into a convent and take the veil. The Council of Trent further lays down that the functions of the minor orders may be performed by married men in default of unmarried—though not by those who are living with a second wife. In the nineteenth century attempts were not lacking, even within the Roman Catholic Church, to bring about the abolition of celibacy. They were rather hindered than helped by temporal governments, and always firmly rejected by Rome. Celibacy has been abolished among the Old Catholics; and modern legislation in Germany, France, Belgium, Italy, and Switzerland authorizes the marriage both of priests and of those who have taken a solemn vow of chastity. Austria, Spain, and Portugal still forbid it. The evangelical churches at the very outset released their clergy from the obligation of celibacy, professing to find no validity in the arguments adduced in its favor on the Roman side.

#### **400. Celibacy, Council of Trent's Pronouncement on**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XXIV (Nov. 11, 1563), Canons on the Sacrament of Matrimony, can. 10, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 164. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

If anyone saith that the marriage state is to be placed above the state of virginity or of celibacy, and that it is not better and more blessed to remain in virginity or in celibacy than to be united in matrimony; let him be anathema.

#### **401. Celibacy, of Clergy**

SOURCE: *A Catholic Dictionary*, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.), pp. 83, 84. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

- [p. 83] i. In the Western church marriage is prohibited to all clergy of the rank of subdeacon and upwards... This is a matter of discipline which rests on a positive enactment of ecclesiastical law, which is rarely dispensed... It is grounded in the doctrine of the superior excellence of virginity and has been reinforced by the spiritual and temporal experience of many centuries: by it the clergy are left free for the things of God (*cf.*, 1 Cor. vii, 32–3), and on countless occasions have been enabled to carry on under circumstances wherein wife and children would have made it impossible...  
[p. 84] ii. Amongst Catholics of most Eastern rites the discipline of clerical marriage is that common to the East: married men may be ordained to the priesthood and retain their wives; if his wife dies the deacon or priest cannot remarry, nor can men ordained while bachelors afterwards marry; bishops must be single or widowers...  
iii. Amongst the non-Catholic Easterns the discipline is as just stated and has been maintained, with periods of local relaxation.

#### **402. Celibacy, of Clergy, Decreed in 1074**

SOURCE: Oliver J. Thatcher and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Mediaeval History*, pp. 134, 135. Copyright 1905 Charles Scribner's Sons; renewal copyright 1933 Oliver J. Thatcher. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

[p. 134; translator's note:] Although the opinion had long prevailed in the church that the celibate life, or chastity, was more holy than the married life, and therefore more becoming in the clergy, yet it was not uncommon for clergymen to marry. The Cluniac party regarded this state of affairs as especially blameworthy, and demanded that all the clergy be required to take the vow of perpetual chastity. In this, as in other respects, Gregory VII endeavored to carry out the Cluniac programme and so exerted himself to suppress clerical marriage, or, as the Cluniac party called it, clerical concubinage...

*THE ROMAN COUNCIL, 1074.*

Mansi, XX, p. 404...

[p. 135] Nor shall clergymen who are married say mass or serve the altar in any way. We decree also that if they refuse to obey our orders, or rather those of the holy fathers, the people shall refuse to receive their ministrations, in order that those who disregard the love of God and the dignity of their office may be brought to their senses through feeling the shame of the world and the reproof of the people...

*GREGORY VII, 1074.*

Mansi, XX, p. 433; Corpus Juris Can., Dist. LXXXI, c. xv.

If there are any priests, deacons, or subdeacons who are married, by the power of omnipotent God and the authority of St. Peter we forbid them to enter a church until they repent and mend their ways. But if any remain with their wives, no one shall dare hear them their wives, no one shall dare hear them [when they officiate in the church], because

their benediction is turned into a curse, and their prayer into a sin. For the Lord says through the prophet, “I will curse your blessings” [Mal. 2:2]. Whoever shall refuse to obey this most salutary command shall be guilty of the sin of idolatry. For Samuel says: “For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry” [1 Sam. 15:23]. Whoever therefore asserts that he is a Christian but refuses to obey the apostolic see, is guilty of paganism.

#### **403. Census, Edict for, Similar to That at Christ’s Birth**

SOURCE: Adolf Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East* (London: Hodder and Stoughton Publishers, [1927]), pp. 270, 271. Used by permission of the publisher and Harper & Brothers, New York.

[p. 270] On the occasion of the enrolment for taxation made by Cyrenius, “all went to enrol themselves, every one to his own city.” That this was no mere figment of St. Luke or his authority, but that similar things took place in that age, is proved by an edict<sup>7</sup> [Note 7: *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, Vol. III., ed. F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell, London, 1907 p. 125, No. 904<sup>18ff.</sup>, with facsimille (Plate 30)...] of G. Vibius Maximus, [p. 271] governor of Egypt, 104 A.D.: ...

Gaius Vibius Maximus, Praefect of Egypt, saith: The enrolment by household being at hand, it is necessary to notify all who for any cause soever are outside their nomes to return to their domestic hearths, that they may also accomplish the customary dispensation of enrolment and continue steadfastly in the husbandry that belongeth to them.

#### **404. Chaldean, as Variouslly Defined**

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint, New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), p. 16.

The word *καλδαῖος*, *Chaldaeus*, bore amongst the ancients very different meanings from time to time. These terms designated first of all the inhabitants of Chaldea, that is, lower Mesopotamia, and next the members of the Babylonian priesthood... Later the epithet *καλδαῖος* was applied as a title of honour to the Greeks who had studied in the Babylonian schools and proclaimed themselves disciples of the Babylonians; finally it served to denote all those charlatans who professed to foretell the future according to the stars.

#### **405. Chaldeans (Babylonia Priests), in Babylon and Elsewhere Under Alexander (c. 330 B.C.) and After**

SOURCE: Frederick H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*, pp. 9–11, 13. Copyright 1954 by the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 9] In the days of Eudoxus [4th cent. B.C.] the word “Chaldaean” did not—as in Cicero’s day—connote *astrologer* only, but also the priestly class of Babylon, or even the population of the area in general...

The invasion and destruction of the Persian empire by Alexander the Great (336–323 B.C.) intensified but did not inaugurate the cultural exchange between east and west...

[p. 10] With the successful conquest of the Persian empire the relations between the Chaldaeans and their new ruler, Alexander, were soon established on a friendly basis. True to his cosmopolitan ideals, Alexander went out of his way to woo and cajole the influential priestly groups throughout his realm. In turn, the Chaldaeans, at least according to Hellenistic tradition, were willing to put their divinatory prowess at Alexander’s disposal...

[p. 11] Seleucus, moreover, was reported to have consulted Babylonian astrologers (called *magi* by our late source of information in the second century A.D.) when founding his new city Seleucia not far from Babylon. The Chaldaeans may have feared—and rightly—that Seleucia would eventually eclipse Babylon—a development which led to the complete abandonment of the ancient metropolis in the first century.<sup>67</sup> [Note 67: Strabo, 16, 1, 6 (f. 739): Cassius Dio. *ep.*, 68, 30, 1.]...

[p. 13] The lesser Hellenistic princes followed the example of the great rulers... The Seleucids, Lagids, Attalids surrounded themselves with court astrologers...

The rise of Stoicism in the Greek world greatly facilitated the growth of Hellenistic faith in the science of fatalist astrology. The first oriental apostle according to Graeco-Roman tradition was a Babylonian priest, who left Mesopotamia to settle on the Greek island of Cos, long famous for its school of medicine. His name was Berossus.

He was credited with revealing to the Greek world the hitherto secret priestly astrology of Babylonia.<sup>84</sup> [Note 84: Josephus, *contra Apionem*, 1, 129.]

#### **406. Chaldeans (Babylonian Priests), in Babylon Still After Depopulation**

SOURCE: Pliny *Natural History* vi. 30. 121–123; translated by H. Rackham, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 431. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

The temple of Jupiter Belus [i.e. Bel Marduk] in Babylon is still standing—Belus was the discoverer of the science of astronomy; but in all other respects the place has gone back to a desert, having been drained of its population by the proximity of Seleucia, founded for that purpose by [Seleucus] Nicator not quite 90 miles away, at the point where the canalised Euphrates joins the Tigris... Hippareni—this also a school of Chaldaean learning like Babylon— [is] situated on a tributary of the river Narraga, from which the city-state takes its name (the walls of Hippareni were demolished by the Persians); also Orcheni, a third seat of Chaldaean learning, is situated in the same neighbourhood towards the south.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Hippareni and Orcheni are apparently Sippar and Uruk (see O. Neugebauer, *Astronomical Cuneiform Texts*, Vol. 1, p. 5).]

#### **407. Chaldeans (Babylonian Priests)—Relations With Greeks in Hellenistic Period**

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

The Chaldaeans, whom the policy of the [Seleucid] kings of Antioch strove to conciliate, entered into close relations with the learned men who came to Asia in the train of their conquerors, and they even proceeded to carry their precepts throughout the land of Greece. A priest of Bel, Berossus, established himself about the year 280 in the island of Cos, and there revealed to his sceptical hearers the contents of the cuneiform writings accumulated in the archives of his country, annals of the ancient kings and astrological treatises. Another Chaldaean, Soudines, invited to the court of Attalus I., king of Pergamus, practised there, about the year 238, the methods of divination in vogue in his native land, such as inspection of the liver... At the same time [3d cent. B.C.] centres of Greek science were established in the heart of Mesopotamia, and in the ancient observatories of Bel learners were initiated into the methods and discoveries of the astronomers of Alexandria or Athens. Under the Seleucids and the early Arsacids Babylon was a hellenised city.

#### 408. Chaldeans (Babylonians Priests), Subdivisions of, in First Century

B.C.

SOURCE: *Strabo The Geography of Strabo* 16. 1. 6, translated by Horace Leonard Jones, Vol. 7 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1954), pp. 201, 203. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 201] In Babylonia [Note 2: Βαβυλωνι, Groskurd and Meineke emend to Βαβυλωνια.] a settlement is set apart for the [p. 203] local philosophers, the Chaldaeans, as they are called, who are concerned mostly with astronomy; but some of these, who are not approved of by the others, profess to be genethliologists [casters of horoscopes]. There is also a tribe of the Chaldaeans, and a territory inhabited by them, in the neighbourhood of the Arabians and of the Persian Sea, as it is called. There are also several tribes of the Chaldaean astronomers. For example, some are called Orcheni, others Borsippeni, and several others by different names, as though divided into different sects which hold to various different dogmas about the same subjects. And the mathematicians make mention of some of these men; as, for example, Cidenas and Naburianus and Sudinus. Seleucus of Seleuceia is also a Chaldaean, as are also several other noteworthy men.

#### 409. Character, Power of Habit in Formation of

SOURCE: William James, *The Principles of Psychology* (Vol. 53 of Great Books of the Western World), p. 83. Copyright 1952 by Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago. Used by permission of Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York.

The physiological study of mental conditions is thus the most powerful ally of hortatory ethics. The hell to be endured hereafter, of which theology tells, is no worse than the hell we make for ourselves in this world by habitually fashioning our characters in the wrong way. Could the young but realize how soon they will become mere walking bundles of habits, they would give more heed to their conduct while in the plastic state. We are spinning our own fates, good or evil, and never to be undone. Every smallest stroke or virtue or of vice leaves its never so little scar. The drunken Rip Van Winkle, in Jefferson's play, excuses himself for every fresh dereliction by saying, "I won't count this time!" Well! he may not count it, and kind Heaven may not count it; but it is being counted none the less. Down among his nerve-cells and fibres the molecules are counting it, registering and storing it up to be used against him when the next temptation comes. Nothing we ever do is, in strict scientific literalness, wiped out. Of course, this has its good side as well as its bad one. As we become permanent drunkards by so many separate drinks, so we become saints in the moral, and authorities and experts in the practical and scientific spheres, by so many separate acts and hours of work. Let no youth have any anxiety about the upshot of his education, whatever the line of it may be. If he keep faithfully busy each hour of the working-day, he may safely leave the final result to itself. He can with perfect certainty count on waking up some fine morning, to find himself one of the competent ones of his generation, in whatever pursuit he may have singled out. Silently, between all the details of his business, the *power of judging* in all that class of matter will have built itself up within him as a possession that will never pass away. Young people should know this truth in advance. The ignorance of it has probably engendered more discouragement and faint-heartedness in youths embarking on arduous careers than all other causes put together.

#### 410. Chastity, Catholic Position on

SOURCE: John L. Thomas, *The Catholic Viewpoint on Marriage and the Family* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House), pp. 106, 107. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission of the publisher.

[p. 106] Catholic philosophers and theologians have developed a balanced, carefully defined set of principles related to sex. In their teaching, chastity is the virtue that moderates the use of the sexual functions in accordance with right reason, and as such it is a form of the cardinal virtue of temperance, which controls the human appetites having to do with the pleasures of eating, drinking, and sex. The chaste person is one who realizes the order of reason in the province of sexuality, while sins against chastity are transgressions and violations of the rational order in this area of human activity. As the term is used here, the “order of reason” is the order that corresponds to the reality made evident to man through faith human knowledge. Now, considering the nature of man and his purpose in life, together with what we know about the generative faculties and their reproductive purpose, we must conclude that right reason requires that all voluntary expression of the [p. 107] sensitive appetite for venereal pleasure be excluded among the unmarried and be regulated in conformity with the purposes of marriage and the inherent purpose of the generative act in marriage. One who has acquired the habitual disposition to act in this manner possesses the virtue of chastity.

#### **411. Christian and Missionary Alliance**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 364, 365.

[p. 364] *History*. The Christian and Missionary Alliance originated in a somewhat informal movement started by Rev. A. B. Simpson, D. D., in the year 1881. At that time Dr. Simpson was pastor of a Presbyterian church in New York City, but left the pastorate, and also withdrew from the presbytery of New York, for the purpose of conducting a wider evangelistic movement among the unchurched masses. For several years he held services in public halls, theaters, and in the summer in gospel tents. Shortly after the movement was started an independent church was organized in New York with an independent charter, still known as the Gospel Tabernacle Church. The work became more widely known and affiliated throughout the country through many calls for evangelistic services and religious conventions in popular centers, such as Old Orchard Beach, Maine, and various other resorts, and a number of local organizations were formed. From the beginning a strong missionary tone characterized the conferences, and in 1887 two societies were organized, respectively, for home and foreign missionary work—one known as the Christian Alliance (incorporated in 1890), for [p. 365] home work, especially among the neglected classes in towns and cities of the United States; the other, the International Missionary Alliance (incorporated in 1889), was for the purpose of planting missions among neglected communities in non-Christian lands. In 1897 the two societies were united in The Christian and Missionary Alliance and since then have labored in the double function of home and foreign evangelism.

*Doctrine*. The Christian and Missionary Alliance is strictly evangelical in its doctrine. It stands firmly for the inspiration of the Scriptures, the atonement of Christ, the supernaturalism of religious experience, and a life of separation and practical holiness. It has no strict creed, but expresses the great essential features of its testimony in a simple formula known as the fourfold Gospel of Christ, as Saviour, Sanctifier, Healer, and Coming Lord. It is not a sectarian body, but allows liberty in the matter of church government, and is in fraternal union with evangelical Christians of all denominations,

accepting missionaries from the various churches, provided they are in full sympathy with the evangelical standards of the Alliance.

*Organization.* There is no close ecclesiastical organization, though the society has in the United States and Canada about a dozen organized districts with about 500 regular branches. Only a small proportion of these are organized churches, as the society seeks always to avoid a sectarian aspect and therefore is somewhat averse to the establishment of independent churches. Each local branch is entirely self-directing and in most cases is primarily evangelistic in character and a center of missionary conference. An annual council meets in the spring, to which reports are submitted from all branches and fields, and which passes such legislation as may be needed concerning the government and administration of the work. It is to be noted that many of the most liberal and active supporters of this work are still in active membership in various Protestant churches, giving their support to the Alliance in its evangelistic work.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 59, 644 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

#### **412. Christian Churches (Disciples of Christ), International Convention**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 540–542.

[p. 540] *History.* The Disciples of Christ trace their origin to a movement in the early part of the nineteenth century, when a number of leaders arose who pleaded for the Bible alone, without human addition in the form of creeds and formulas. At first they emphasized Christian fellowship and the independence of the local church, without adherence to any ecclesiastical system. Somewhat later an element was added which sought to restore the union of the churches through a “return, in doctrine, ordinance, and life, to the religion definitely outlined” in the New Testament.

In 1807 Rev. Thomas Campbell, a minister of the Secession branch of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, came to the United States, was received cordially, and found employment in western Pennsylvania. Finding that, in the generally destitute condition of that region, a number of families belonging to other presbyteries had not for a long time enjoyed the communion service, he invited them to attend his service. For this he was censured by his presbytery, but upon his appeal to the Associate Synod of North America, on account of informalities in the proceedings of the presbytery, he was released from censure. In the presentation of his case, however, he emphasized very strongly the evils of sectarianism, and as it became increasingly evident that his views differed from those of the presbytery, he formally withdrew from the synod. In 1809 his son, Alexander Campbell, with the rest of the family, joined him, and an organization called the Christian Association of Washington, Pa., was formed. From this association was issued a “declaration and address,” which became historic.

Its main purpose was to set forth the essential unity of the Church of Christ, which, while necessarily existing in particular and distinct societies, ought to have “no schisms, or uncharitable divisions among them.” To this end, it claimed that nothing should be inculcated “as articles of faith or terms of communion but what is expressly taught and enjoined \*\*\* in the Word of God,” which is “the perfect constitution for the worship, discipline, and government of the New Testament Church,” nor has “any human authority power to impose new commands and ordinances upon the church.” While “inferences and deductions from Scripture promises \*\*\* may be truly called the doctrine of God’s Holy Word, yet they are not formally binding upon the consciences of Christians,” and while “doctrinal expositions of divine truths are advantageous, yet they ought not to be

made terms of Christian communion,” all the “precious saints of God” being under obligation “to love each other as brethren.”

Division among Christians is characterized as “a horrid evil, fraught with many evils,” anti-Christian, anti-Scriptural, antinatural, and “productive of confusion and every evil work.” Membership in the church should be confined to such as “profess their faith in Christ and obedience to Him in all things according to the Scriptures,” and “continued to manifest the reality of their profession by their temper and conduct.” Ministers are “to inculcate none other things than those articles of faith and holiness expressly revealed and enjoined in the Word of God,” and in administration are to observe the “example of the Primitive Church without any additions whatsoever of human opinions or inventions of men.” Should there be any “circumstantials indispensably necessary to the observance of divine ordinances not found upon the page of express revelation,” these may be adopted only under the title of “human expedients without any pretense to a more sacred origin.”

The publication of this address did not meet with much response, and the two Campbells appear to have been somewhat uncertain as to just what to do. The development of their Christian Association into a distinct denomination was the very thing they did not wish, and accordingly overtures were made to the Presbyterians Synod of Pittsburg. The address, however, stood in the way of acceptance, and in 1810 they and their associates organized “The First Church of the Christian Association of Washington, meeting at Cross Roads and Brush Run, Washington County, Pennsylvania.”

[p. 541] Subsequently, an invitation was given to the members of this association to join the Redstone Baptist Association, but difficulties arose on both sides. The Campbells had accepted the general principle of believers’ baptism, but some elements in their position were not pleasing to the Baptists. On the other hand, the Baptist Association, in accepting the Philadelphia Confession of Faith, had done the very thing to which the Campbells objected. Still it seemed advantageous for them to enter into fellowship with the churches nearest to their own in belief and practice, and, accordingly, the invitation was accepted. This alliance, however, did not continue for any length of time, as difference of views became more evident, and later the Campbell association withdrew and joined the Mahoning Baptist Association, in which their teachings had gained general acceptance. In 1829, however, since a majority of the members believed that there was no warrant in Scripture for an organization such as theirs, the association was disbanded as an ecclesiastical body. Alexander Campbell was opposed to this action, as he thought that such an organization was needed and that there was no reason why a specific “Thus saith the Lord” should be required in a case of this character.

Meanwhile, Barton W. Stone, another Presbyterian minister, and a number of his associates had accepted the principle of baptism by immersion, although comparatively few made it a test of fellowship; and as they came into relations with Alexander Campbell a partial union was effected in Lexington, Ky., in the early part of 1832. In this there seems to have been no effort at entire agreement, but only a readiness to cooperate heartily. When the question arose as to the name to be adopted, Mr. Stone favored “Christians,” as the name given in the beginning by divine authority. Mr. Campbell and his friends preferred the name “Disciples” as less offensive to good people and quite as scriptural. The result was that no definite action was taken and both names were used, the

local organization being known, generally, as a "Christian Church," or a "Church of Christ," and, rarely, as a "Church of Disciples," or a "Disciples' Church."

During the first few years of the movement, Alexander Campbell and other leaders were often engaged in more or less heated controversies with representatives of other denominations. Gradually, however, these discussions became less frequent and at the same time more conciliatory in tone.

The growth of the new organization was very rapid, especially in the Middle West. Throughout Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Tennessee, and Missouri it gathered numerous congregations, though there was evident a strong objection to any such association, even for fellowship, as would appear to involve ecclesiastical organization. This manifested itself in various ways, especially in opposition to the use of societies for carrying on missionary work. The use of instrumental music in the churches also occasioned dissatisfaction.

During the Civil War the movement suffered from the general disorganization of the sections in which it had gained its strength, and the death of Alexander Campbell in 1866 was no doubt a severe blow. From the effect of these discouragements, however, it soon recovered, and the period since that war has been one of rapid expansion. With this expansion there developed, out of the objections referred to above, and especially to any semblance of ecclesiastical organization and to the use of instrumental music in the churches, two parties, generally termed "Progressives" and "Conservatives." The former were anxious to include all under one general head as was done in the census report for 1890, leaving each church free to conduct its affairs in its own way, but the Conservatives objected, and insisted on separate classification. Accordingly, in the report for 1906 and in subsequent reports the "Conservative" churches have been listed as Churches of Christ. The line of demarcation between the two bodies, however, is by no means clear.

*Doctrine.* The doctrinal position of the Disciples has been summarized as follows: They accept the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; the all-sufficiency of the Bible as a revelation of God's will and a rule of faith and life; the revelation of God in threefold personality of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as set forth by the Apostles; the divine glory of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, His incarnation, doctrine, miracles, death as a sin offering, resurrection, ascension, and coronation; the personality of the Holy Spirit and His divine mission to convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment to come, and to comfort and sanctify the people of God; the alienation of man from his Maker, and the necessity of faith, repentance, and obedience in order to salvation; the obligation of the divine ordinances of baptism and the [p. 542] Lord's Supper; the duty of observing the Lord's day in memory of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus; the necessity of holiness on the part of believers; the divine appointment of the Church of Christ, composed of all who by faith and obedience confess His name, with its ministries and services for the edification of the body of Christ and the conversion of the world; the obligation of all disciples to carry the gospel into all the world, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you"; the fullness and freeness of the salvation that is in Christ to all who will accept it on the New Testament conditions; the final judgment, with the reward of the righteous and punishment of the wicked.

In addition to these beliefs, in which they are in general accord with other Protestant churches, the Disciples hold certain positions which they regard as distinctive:

1. Feeling that “to believe and to do none other things than those enjoined by our Lord and His Apostles must be infallibly safe,” they aim “to restore in faith and spirit and practice the Christianity of Christ and His Apostles as found on the pages of the New Testament.”
2. Affirming that “the sacred Scriptures as given of God answer all purposes of a rule of faith and practice, and a law for the government of the church, and that human creeds and confessions of faith spring out of controversy and, instead of being bonds of union, tend to division and strife,” they reject all such creeds and confessions.
3. They place especial emphasis upon “the Divine Sonship of Jesus, as the fundamental fact of Holy Scripture, the essential creed of Christianity, and the one article of faith in order to baptism and church membership.”
4. Believing that in the Scriptures “a clear distinction is made between the law and the gospel,” they “do not regard the Old and New Testaments as of equally binding authority upon Christians,” but that “the New Testament is as perfect a constitution for the worship, government, and discipline of the New Testament church as the Old was for the Old Testament church.”
5. While claiming for themselves the New Testament names of “Christians,” or “Disciples,” “they do not deny that others are Christians or that other churches are Churches of Christ.”
6. Accepting the divine personality of the Holy Spirit, through whose agency regeneration is begun, they hold that men “must hear, believe, repent, and obey the gospel to be saved.”
7. Repudiating any doctrine of “baptismal regeneration,” and insisting that there is no other prerequisite to regeneration than confession of faith with the whole heart in the personal living Christ, they regard baptism by immersion “as one of the items of the original divine system,” and as “commanded in order to the remission of sins.”
8. Following the apostolic model, the Disciples celebrate the Lord’s Supper on each Lord’s day, “not as a sacrament, but as a memorial feast,” from which no sincere follower of Christ of whatever creed or church connection is excluded.
9. The Lord’s day with the Disciples is not a Sabbath, but a New Testament institution, commemorating our Lord’s resurrection, and consecrated by apostolic example.
10. The Church of Christ is a divine institution; sects are unscriptural and unapostolic. The sect name, spirit, and life should give place to the union and cooperation that distinguished the church of the New Testament.

*Organization.* In polity the Disciples churches are congregational.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Membership (1959), 1,801,414 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

2

### **413. Christian Connection**

SOURCE: Joshua V. Himes, “Christian Connexion,” *Fessenden & Co.’s Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Brattleboro, Vt.: Brattleboro Typographic Company, 1838), pp. 362, 363.

[p. 362] CHRISTIAN CONNEXION, or Christians, sometimes erroneously pronounced *Christ-ians*. This is a religious denomination of recent origin in the United States of America, and among the last that has arisen, which, from its numbers and character, has

---

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

attained much consideration and influence. Its beginning may be dated about the year 1800... The denomination seems to have sprung up almost simultaneously in different and remote parts of the country, without any preliminary interchange of sentiments or concerted plan of action...

In New England, where the Christian denomination seems first to have attracted attention by any public demonstration or organization as a distinct sect, it was composed, principally, of individuals who separated from the Calvinistic Baptists. Soon after the formation of their first churches, several large churches of the Calvinistic Baptists declared themselves independent of the Baptist [p. 363] association and united with them... In the southern states, the first associations of this sect consisted, mostly, of seceders from the Methodists, and, in the western states, from the Presbyterians... At first, they were generally Trinitarians; subsequently they have, almost unanimously, rejected the Trinitarian doctrine as unscriptural.

But though toleration is still their predominant principle, and it would be wide of the truth to say that any doctrine is universally held by the connexion, or is considered indispensable to membership, still it may be asserted, with confidence, that discussion in their periodicals and personal intercourse and conference, have produced a manifest approximation to unanimity of sentiment, and that the following are very generally regarded as Scripture doctrines:—That there is one living and true God, the Father almighty, who is unoriginated, independent, and eternal, the Creator and Supporter of all worlds; and this God is one spiritual intelligence, one infinite mind, ever the same, never varying: That this God is the moral Governor of the world, the absolute source of all the blessings of nature, providence and grace, in whose infinite wisdom, goodness, mercy, benevolence and love have originated all his moral dispensations to man: That all men sin and come short of the glory of God, consequently fall under the curse of the law: That Christ is the Son of God, the promised Messiah and Savior of the world, the Mediator between God and man, by whom God has revealed his will to mankind; by whose sufferings, death and resurrection a way has been provided by which sinners may obtain salvation, may lay hold on eternal life; that he is appointed of God to raise the dead and judge the world at the last day: That the Holy Spirit is the power and energy of God, that holy influence of God by whose agency, in the use of means, the wicked are regenerated, converted and recovered to a virtuous and holy life, sanctified and made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light; and that, by the same Spirit, the saints, in the use of means, are comforted, strengthened and led in the path of duty: The free forgiveness of sins, flowing from the rich mercy of God, through the labors, sufferings and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ: The necessity of repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ: The absolute necessity of holiness of heart and rectitude of life to enjoy the favor and approbation of God: The doctrine of a future state of immortality: The doctrine of a righteous retribution, in which God will render to every man according to the deeds done in the body: The baptism of believers by immersion: And the open communion at the Lord's table of Christians of every denomination having a good standing in their respective churches.

The principles upon which their churches were at first constituted, and upon which they still stand, are the following: The Scriptures are taken to be the only rule of faith and practice, each individual being at liberty to determine, for himself, in relation to these matters, what they enjoin: No member is subject to the loss of church fellowship on

account of his sincere and conscientious belief, so long as he manifestly lives a pious and devout life: No member is subject to discipline and church censure but for disorderly and immoral conduct: The name Christian to be adopted, to the exclusion of all sectarian names. . . . Each church is considered an independent body, possessing exclusive authority to regulate and govern its own affairs.

For the purpose of promoting the general interest and prosperity of the connexion by mutual efforts and joint counsels, associations were formed, denominated Conferences. . . . In twenty of the United States, there are now, (1833,) thirty-two conferences. The number of their . . . communicants, from 75,000 to 100,000, and from 250 to 300,000 who entertain their views and attend upon their ministry.

Several periodicals have been published under the patronage of the connexion; the principal of which are, the *Christian Herald* at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, the *Gospel Luminary* at New York, the *Christian Messenger* at Georgetown, Kentucky, and the *Christian Palladium* at Rochester, New York.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The writer of this article, Joshua V. Himes, was for a time the general secretary of the Christian Connection, and later became a leader in the Millerite movement. From this Christian denomination came many Millerites and at least two of the early SDA leaders, Joseph Bates and James White, who had been in the Miller movement. For the recent history of this denomination see *United Church of Christ*.]

#### **414. Christian Life—Christ Living Within**

SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *The Case for Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 53, 54. Used by permission of the publisher and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 53] Your natural life is derived from your parents; that doesn't mean it will stay there if you do nothing about it. You can lose it by neglect, or you can drive it away by committing suicide. You've got to feed it and look after it: but remember, all the time you're not making it you're only keeping up a life you got from someone else. In the same what a Christian can lose the Christ-life which has been put into him, and he has to make efforts to keep it. But even the best Christian that ever lived is not acting on his own steam—he is only nourishing or protecting a life he could never have acquired by his own efforts. And that has practical consequences. As long as the natural life is in [p. 54] your body, it will do a lot towards repairing that body. Cut it, and up to a point it will heal, as a dead body wouldn't. A live body isn't one that never gets hurt, but one that can to some extent repair itself. In the same way a Christian isn't a man who never goes wrong, but a man who is enabled to repent and pick himself up and begin over again after each stumble—because the Christ-life is inside him, repairing him all the time, enabling him to repeat (in some degree) the kind of voluntary death which Christ Himself carried out.

That is why the Christian is in a different position from other people who are trying to be good. They hope, by being good, to please God if there is one; or—if they think there isn't—at least they hope to deserve approval from good men. But the Christian thinks any good he does comes from the Christ-life inside him. He doesn't think God will love us because we're good, but that God will make us good because He loves us; just as the roof of a greenhouse doesn't attract the sun because it's bright, but becomes bright because the sun shines on it.

And let me make it quite clear that when Christians say the Christ-life is in them, they don't mean simply something mental or moral. This isn't simply a way of saying that we

are thinking about Christ or copying Him. They mean that Christ is actually operating through them.

#### **415. Christian Life.—Spiritual and Social Aspects**

SOURCE: Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial*, pp. 246–248. Copyright 1948 by Oxford University Press, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 246] If man has been created in the likeness of God, and if the true end of man is to make this likeness ever more and more like, then Aristotle's saying that 'man is a social animal' applies to man's highest potentiality and aim—that of trying to get into ever closer communion with God. Seeking God is itself a social act. And if God's love has gone into action in this world in the Redemption of mankind by Christ, then man's efforts to make himself liker to God must include efforts to follow Christ's example in sacrificing himself for the redemption of his fellow men. Seeking and following God in this way, that is God's way, is the only true way for a human soul on Earth to seek salvation. The antithesis between trying to save one's own soul by seeking and following God and trying to do one's duty to one's neighbour is therefore wholly false. The two activities are indissoluble. The human soul that is truly seeking to save itself is as fully social a being as the ant-like Spartan or the bee-like Communist. Only, the Christian soul on Earth is a member of a very different society from Sparta or Leviathan. He is a citizen of the Kingdom of God, and therefore his paramount and all-embracing aim [p. 247] is to attain the highest degree of communion with, and likeness to, God Himself; his relations with his fellow men are consequences of, and corollaries to, his relations with God; and his way of loving his neighbour as himself will be to try to help his neighbour to win what he is seeking for himself—that is, to come into closer communion with God and to become more godlike.

If this is a soul's recognized aim for itself and for its fellow souls in the Christian Church Militant on Earth, then it is obvious that under a Christian dispensation God's will *will* be done in Earth as it is Heaven to an immeasurably greater degree than in a secular mundane society...

Therefore, while the replacement of the mundane civilizations by the worldwide and enduring reign of the Church Militant on Earth would certainly produce what to-day would seem a miraculous improvement in those mundane social conditions which the civilizations have been seeking to improve during the last six thousand years, the aim, and test, of progress under a truly Christian dis- [p. 248] pensation on Earth would not would be the spiritual life of individual souls in their passages through this earthly life from birth into this world to death out of it.

#### **416. Christianity—Background in Pagan Roman Empire**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 17–19. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 17] To a considerable degree, as many writers have pointed out, the way had been opened for the swift permeation of the Graeco-Roman world by the waning vigor of its old faiths. The temples of the Roman and Greek gods were still open; the prescribed sacrifices were still offered in them. But there was a general feeling that what virtue the ancient forms of worship had once possessed [p. 18] was rapidly seeping out of them. Both Roman and Greek literature from the time of Cicero on is filled with mourning for the passing of the "good old days," and with exhortations to return to the virtues of the fathers, now largely vanished. This pervasive sense of unfulfilled spiritual desires

encouraged the important from Egypt and the East of a number of so-called “mystery religions.”

By the time Peter and Paul started on their missionary labors, Rome was filled with these new fads in religion, existing alongside the official cult of the state gods and goddesses, commanding devotion from their initiates and exerting an alluring fascination on thousands. Such a great emperor, for example, as Hadrian (117–138), who spent little of his reign in Rome, eagerly sought initiation into whatever cults he encountered as he moved about his vast domain. This sense of the weakening hold of the old gods and of the need to find satisfaction in strange new rites was as deeply felt in the other cities of the empire as in Rome.

Indeed, the time had come when a moral decline in all the lands clustered around the Mediterranean showed the need for a new spiritual lift to higher levels of conduct. Not that the Graeco-Roman world was bereft of moral ideals. Far from it. Socrates, Plato, and the other great Greek philosophers had taught principles of conduct which remain an imperishable legacy. The Stoics held up standards that were loftier than the mine-run of human beings have ever lived up to anywhere or at any time. Nevertheless, the corruption which, as Lord Acton says, goes with power was working havoc in Roman society, while the outlying cities of the empire sometimes seemed to be vying with one another to win notoriety as centers of vice. As one reads today the history of the Caesars, or the comments of contemporary satirists on the society they observed about them, the smell of putrefaction rises from page after page. Read Juvenal and Martial and Suetonius’s *Lives of the Twelve Caesars*.

Into this morally sick world Christianity came like a breath of fresh air. It had a theology of a God-man who opened a way of salvation that was more arresting than any of the myths of the older faiths. It had baptismal and eucharistic rites as conducive to the curiosity of outsiders as any rites of the mystery religions. [p. 19] (Some of the wild rumors that gained general credence concerning these rites were to make bitter trouble for the Christians.) But primarily, it had an object lesson to show that pagan world in the form of communities in which people of all kinds—a few aristocrats, numbers of artisans and tradesmen and housewives, even numerous slaves—were living the sort of daily lives which their neighbors instinctively wished they were living.

#### **417. Christianity, Early—Adherents Described**

SOURCE: *The Epistle to Diognetus* (anonymous) v. 1–17, in *The Apostolic Fathers*, trans. Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1950), pp. 359, 361. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and the Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 359] For the distinction between Christians and other men, is neither in country nor language nor customs. For they do not dwell in cities in some place of their own, nor do they use any strange variety of dialect, nor practise an extraordinary kind of life. This teaching of theirs has not been discovered by the intellect or thought of busy men, nor are they the advocates of any human doctrine as some men are. Yet while living in Greek and barbarian cities, according as each obtained his lot, and following the local customs, both in clothing and food and in the rest of life, they show forth the wonderful and confessedly strange character of the constitution of their own citizenship. They dwell in their own fatherlands, but as if sojourners in them; they share all things as citizens, and suffer [p. 361] all things as strangers. Every foreign country is their fatherland, and every fatherland is a foreign country. They marry as all men, they bear children, but they do not expose their offspring [see editors’ note]. They offer free hospitality, but guard their

purity. Their lot is cast “in the flesh,” but they do not live “after the flesh.” They pass their time upon the earth, but they have their citizenship in heaven. They obey the appointed laws, and they surpass the laws in their own lives. They love all men and are persecuted by all men. They are unknown and they are condemned. They are put to death and they gain life. “They are poor and make many rich”; they lack all things and have all things in abundance. They are dishonoured, and are glorified in their dishonour, they are spoken evil of and are justified. “They are abused and give blessing,” they are insulted and render honour. When they do good they are buffeted as evil-doers, when they are buffeted they rejoice as men who receive life. They are warred upon by the Jews as foreigners and are persecuted by the Greeks, and those who hate them cannot state the cause of their enmity.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Among the pagans it was customary to dispose of an unwanted newborn infant by abandoning it in some public place where it might either die or be picked up and reared in slavery.]

#### **418. Christianity, Early, Brotherhood Manifest in**

SOURCE: Jérôme Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, p. 139. Copyright 1940 by Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

The Christians were brothers and called each other so. Their meetings were often called *agape*, which in Greek means “love.” They constantly assisted each other “without parage or patronage.” An unceasing interchange “of counsel, of information, and of practical help” took place between one Christian and the other and, as Duchesne has said, “all this was alive and active in a fashion wholly different from that of the pagan brotherhoods.” Many observers in those days were constrained to say of the Christians: “How simple and pure is their religion! What confidence they have in their God and His promise! How they love one another and how happy they are together!”

#### **419. Christianity, Early, Conditions Favorable to Spread of**

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, 1st ed., pp. 21, 22. Copyright 1953 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 21] At the time when Christianity came into being, much in the basin of the Mediterranean favoured the spread of religions, either new or old. Jesus was . . . born in the reign of Augustus. After a long period of wars which had racked the Mediterranean and its shores, political unity had been achieved and the Roman Empire had become roughly conterminous with the Mediterranean Basin. Here and there it was soon to spread beyond it. Augustus was the first Emperor. Building on the foundations laid by his uncle, Julius Caesar, he brought peace and under the guise of the chief citizen of a restored republic ruled the realm which for several generations Rome had been building. The internal peace and order which Augustus achieved endured, with occasional interruptions, for about two centuries. Never before had all the shores of the Mediterranean been under one rule and never had they enjoyed such prosperity. The *pax Romana* made for the spread of ideas and religions over the area where it prevailed.

With the *pax Romana* went the building of roads and the growth of commerce. Highways of solid construction traversed the Empire and made possible more extensive travel and trade than the region had ever known. The pirates had been curbed who had imperilled shipping in the Mediterranean. Roads, travel, and commerce facilitated cultural and religious as well as political unity.

Travel and trade were accompanied by the spread of two languages, Greek and Latin. Greek was spoken among one or more groups in most of the cities of the Empire where

commerce was to be found. The Greek-speaking and Greek-reading groups were most numerous in the eastern part of the Mediterranean. Alexandria in Egypt was a particularly prominent focus of Greek culture. Yet those for whom Greek was a primary tongue were also present in Rome, in Sicily and the south of Italy, in some of the cities of the south of Gaul, and in several other centres in the western portions of the Mediterranean. The Greek was the *koine* in one or more of its varieties. Latin was more [p. 22] prevalent in the West. In the first centuries of the Christian era, while Christianity was expanding in the Empire, it was increasingly the speech of much of the population on the western borders of the Mediterranean. A religion which employed Greek and Latin, and especially Greek, had advantages over rivals which did not and might gain an Empire-wide hearing.

#### **420. Christianity, Early, Contrasted With Paganism**

SOURCE: Jérôme Carcopino, *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, p. 139. Copyright 1940 by Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

To the polytheism of the Graeco-Roman gods, reduced to mere symbols as they were, to the vague and diffuse monotheism of the oriental religions, the Christian opposed his doctrine of the One God, the Father Omnipotent. In contrast to the various idolatries, spiritualized though they might be by the divine ether and the eternal stars, he offered a worship solely of the spirit, purified of astrological aberration, of bleeding sacrifice, of mystery-ridden initiation; for all these he substituted a baptism of pure water, prayer, and a frugal common meal. Like the pagan religionists he gave answer in the name of his sacred books to every question about the origin of things and the destiny of man; but the Redeemer whose “good tidings” he brought, instead of being an elusive and ambiguous figure lost in a mythological labyrinth, was revealed in miraculous reality in the earthly life of Jesus, the Son of God. Like the pagan religionists, the Christian guaranteed salvation after death, but instead of engulfing the believer in the silence of a starry eternity, he restored him to life in a personal resurrection foreshadowed by the resurrection of Christ himself. Like the pagan, the Christian laid down a rule of life for all believers, but while not excluding contemplation or asceticism or ecstasy, he did not abuse them and condensed his moral teaching into man’s love of his neighbour which the gospels inculcated.

Herein lay beyond question the strongest attraction of the new religion.

#### **421. Christianity, Early, Corruption of**

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 28, Vol. 3 (London: Methuen & Co., 1897), pp. 214, 215.

[p. 214] The sublime and simple theology of the primitive Christians was gradually corrupted; and the MONARCHY of heaven, already clouded by metaphysical subtleties, was degraded by the introduction of a popular mythology, which tended to restore the reign of polytheism...

The Christians frequented the tombs of the martyrs, in the hope of obtaining, from their powerful intercession, every sort of spiritual, but more especially [p. 215] of temporal, blessings... Edifying pictures, which could not long escape the abuse of indiscreet or idolatrous devotion, represented the image, the attributes, and the miracles of the tutelar saint... The most respectable bishops had persuaded themselves that the ignorant rustics would more cheerfully renounce the superstitions of Paganism, if they found some resemblance, some compensation, in the bosom of Christianity. The religion

of Constantine achieved, in less than a century, the final conquest of the Roman empire: but the victors themselves were insensibly subdued by the arts of their vanquished rivals.

#### **422. Christianity, Early, in Western Europe**

SOURCE: Ferdinand Lot, *The End of the Ancient World*, trans. by Philip Leon and Mariette Leon (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1931), p. 392. Used by permission of Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., London.

The form of Christianity which triumphed in the West was of neither a high nor a pure quality. Even the best bishops were superstitious, believing in omens and haunted by fear of the Devil. Their notion of the deity was too often that of a jealous vindictive god who favoured his devotees without troubling about their morality. What are we to say of the bulk of believers? Certain practices contributed to the degradation of Christian feeling, such as the use of “penitentials,” coming apparently from Ireland; these were tariffs of prices for the redemption of sins.

From this period, the worship of God gave way to the worship of the Saints... Gradually differentiations between the saints were set up which specialized the effects of their intervention, so that the healing saints replaced the gods and heroes of Antiquity... Left to itself the human mind fell back wholly into paganism.

#### **423. Christianity, Essence of, in Redemption**

SOURCE: James Orr, “Christianity: II. Historical and Doctrinal,” *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Vol. 1, p. 625. Copyright 1939 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

Though, therefore, Christ, in His relations of love and trust to the Father, and perfection of holy character, necessarily ever remains the Great Exemplar to whose image His people are to be conformed (Rom 8 29), in whose steps they are to follow (1 Pet 2 21), it is not correct to describe Christianity simply as the religion which Christ practised. Christianity takes into account also the work which Christ came to do, the redemption He achieved, the blessings which, through Him, are bestowed on those who accept Him as their Saviour, and acknowledge Him as their Lord. Essentially Christianity is a religion of redemption; not, therefore, a religion practised by Jesus for Himself, but one based on a work He has accomplished for others. Experimentally, it may be described as consisting, above all, in the joyful consciousness of redemption from sin and reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ, and in the possession of a new life of sonship and holiness through Christ’s Spirit. Everything in the way of holy obedience is included here. This, at least, reduced to its simplest terms, is undeniably what Christianity meant for its first preachers and teachers, and what historically it has meant for the church ever since.

#### **424. Christianity, Modern—Practice Without Belief**

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

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, to our dismay, in this generation.

#### **425. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Accepted From Popular Custom**

SOURCE: Will Durant, *The Age of Faith* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1950), pp. 745, 746. Copyright 1950 by Will Durant. By permission of Simon and Schuster, Inc.

[p. 745] In general the Church did not so much encourage superstitions as inherit them from the imagination of the people or the traditions of the Mediterranean world. The belief in miracle-working objects, talismans, amulets, and formulas was as dear to Islam as to Christianity, and both religions had received these beliefs from pagan antiquity. Ancient forms of phallic worship lingered far into the Middle Ages, but were gradually abolished by the Church. The worship of God as Lord of Hosts and King of Kings inherited Semitic and Roman ways of approach, veneration, and address; the incense burnt before altar or clergy recalled the old burnt offerings; aspersion with holy water was an ancient form of exorcism; processions and lustrations continued immemorial rites; the vestments of the clergy and the papal title of *pontifex maximus* were legacies from pagan Rome. The Church found that rural converts still revered certain springs, wells, trees, and stones; she thought it wiser to bless these to Christian use than to break too sharply the customs of sentiment. So a dolmen at Plouaret was consecrated as the chapel of the Seven Saints, and the worship of the oak was sterilized by hanging images of Christian saints upon the trees. Pagan festivals dear to the people, or necessary as cathartic moratoriums on morality, reappeared as Christian feasts, and pagan vegetation rites were transformed into Christian liturgy. The people continued to light midsummer fires on St. John's Eve, and the celebration of Christ's resurrection took the pagan name of Eostre, the old Teutonic goddess of the spring. The Christian calendar of the saints replaced the Roman *fasti*; ancient divinities dear to the people were allowed to revive under the names of Christian saints; the Dea Victoria of the Basses-Alpes became St. Victoire, and Castor and Pollux were reborn as Sts. Cosmas and Damian.

The finest triumph of this tolerant spirit of adaptation was the sublimation [p. 746] of the pagan mother-goddess cults in the worship of Mary. Here too the people took the initiative. In 431 Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria, in a famous sermon at Ephesus, applied to Mary many of the terms fondly ascribed by the pagans of Ephesus to their "great goddess" Artemis-Diana; and the Council of Ephesus in that year, over the protests of Nestorius, sanctioned for Mary the title "Mother of God." Gradually the tenderest features of Astarte, Cybele, Artemis, Diana, and Isis were gathered together in the worship of Mary. In the sixth century the Church established the Feast of the Assumption of the Virgin into heaven, and assigned it to August 13, the date of ancient festivals of Isis and Artemis. Mary became the patron saint of Constantinople and the imperial family; her picture was carried at the head of every great procession, and was (and is) hung in every church and home in Greek Christendom. Probably it was the Crusades that brought from the East to the West a more intimate and colorful worship of the Virgin.

#### **426. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Adaptation of Pagan Customs**

SOURCE: André Rétif, *The Catholic Spirit*, trans. by Dom Aldhelm Dean (Vol. 88 of *The Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Catholicism*), p. 85. Copyright 1959 by Hawthorn Books, New York. Used by permission.

The missionary history of the Church clearly shows her adaptability to all races, all continents, all nations. In her liturgy and her art, in her traditions and the forming of her doctrine, naturally enough she includes Jewish elements, but also elements that are of pagan origin. In a certain respect, she has copied her organization from that of the Roman Empire, has preserved and made fruitful the philosophical intuitions of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, borrowed from both Barbarians and the Byzantine Roman Empire, but always remains herself, thoroughly digesting all elements drawn from external sources.

In her laws, her ceremonies, her festivals and her devotions, she makes use of local customs after purifying them and “baptizing” them. “This adaptation of pagan customs,” says Fr Sertillanges in *Le Miracle de l’Église*, p. 183, “prudently regulated, allows for the utilization of instincts and sentiments that preserve local traditions, and so lends powerful aid to the furthering of the Gospel... The Church’s cultus of saints and martyrs is a helpful substitute and replaces popular divinities in the minds of the populace.”

#### **427. Christianity—Non-Christian Elements in, Admonition of Gregory I Concerning**

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 129, 130.

[p. 129] “Remember,” said [p. 130] Gregory the Great, when issuing his instructions to a missionary to the Saxon heathens, “that you must not interfere with any traditional belief or religious observance that can be harmonized with Christianity.”

#### **428. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Adopted From Paganism**

SOURCE: Grant Showerman, Introduction, in Franz Cumont, *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), p. xi.

Nor did Christianity stop there. It took from its opponents their own weapons, and used them; the better elements of paganism were transferred to the new religion.

#### **429. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Bowing to the Sun**

SOURCE: Leo the Great, Sermon 27, “On the Feast of the Nativity, VII,” chap. 4, *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 12, p. 140.

From such a system of teaching [astrology, demon worship, etc.] proceeds also the ungodly practice of certain foolish folk who worship the sun as it rises at the beginning of daylight from elevated positions: even some Christians think it is so proper to do this that, before entering the blessed Apostle Peter’s basilica, which is dedicated to the one living and true God, when they have mounted the steps which lead to the raised platform, they turn round and bow themselves towards the rising sun and with bent neck do homage to its brilliant orb. We are full of grief and vexation that this should happen, which is partly due to the fault of ignorance and partly to the spirit of heathenism.

#### **430. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Brought by Pagan Converts**

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

The long association between pagans and Christians and the rapid incorporation of new converts into the ranks of the Church [after Constantine’s conversion], exercised a profound influence upon Christian beliefs and practices. Pagan belief in magic contributed largely to the spread of Christian belief in miracles; and the development of the cult of the saints was stimulated by pagan concepts of inferior divinities, demigods and daemons. Many pagan festivals were transformed into festivals of the Church.

#### **431. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Brought Into the Church**

SOURCE: Adolph Harnack, *History of Dogma*, trans. by Neil Buchanan, Vol. 4 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1898), pp. 304, 305.

[p. 304] There existed in Christendom, ever since there was a *doctrina publica* [public teaching], *i.e.*, from the end of the second century, a kind of subsidiary religion, one of the second rank, as it were subterranean, different among different peoples, but everywhere alike in its crass superstition, naïve doketism, dualism, and polytheism.

“when religions change, it is as if the mountains open. Among the great magic snakes,

golden dragons and crystal spirits of the human soul, which ascend to the light, there come forth all sorts of hideous reptiles and a host of rats and mice.” Every new religion invigorates the products of the ancient one which it supersedes. In one aspect of it we know very little of the “Christianity” of the second rank, for it had no literary existence; in another we are thoroughly familiar with it; for we only need to set before us, and to provide with a few Christian reminiscences, the popular conditions and rites with which Christianity came in contact in different provinces, as also the tendencies, everywhere the same, of the superstitious mob, tendencies inert in the moral sphere, exuberant in the realm of fancy. Then we have this second-class Christianity. It consisted in worship of angels—demigods and demons, reverence for pictures, relics, and amulets, a more or less impotent enthusiasm for the sternest asceticism—therefore not infrequently strictly dualistic conceptions—and a scrupulous observance of certain things held to be sacred, words, signs, rites, ceremonies, places, and times. There probably never was an age in which Christendom was free from this “Christianity,” just as there never will be one in which it shall have been overcome. But in the fully formed Catholic Church as it passes over into the Middle Ages, this Christianity was not only dragged along with it as a tolerated, because irremovable, burden, but it was to a very large extent legitimised, though under safeguards, and fused with the *doctrina publica*. Catholicism as it meets us in Gregory the Great and in the final decisions of the seventh [p. 305] Council, presents itself as the most intimate union of Christianity of the first order with that subterranean, thoroughly superstitious, and polytheistic “Christianity”; and the centuries from the third to the eighth mark the stages in the process of fusion, which seems to have reached an advanced point even in the third and was yet reinforced from century to century to a most extraordinary extent.

It is the business of the historian of the Church and of civilisation to describe these developments in detail, and to show how in separate provinces the ancient gods were transformed into Christian saints, angels, and heroes, and the ancient mythology and cultus into Christian mythology and local worship. This task is as aesthetically attractive as that other which is closely allied to it, the indication of the remains of heathen temples in Christian Churches. The temple of Mithras which became St. George’s Church, proves that St. George was Mithras; in St. Michael the ancient Wotan had been brought to life again, just as Poseidon in St. Nicholas; the different “mothers of God,” who were honoured with all sorts of sacred offerings—one preferred fruits, another animals—only show that Demeter, Venus, Juno, and countless other great mothers and holy or unholy virgins, had merged in the one mother.—The provincial calendars and various “Church Years” conceal significant reminiscences from the old heathen times.

### **432. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Egyptian Influence**

SOURCE: Jaroslav Cerny, *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (London, W. I.: Hutchinson, 1952), pp. 147–149. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 147] Attempts have sometimes been made to show that among early Christian beliefs there are traces of the influence of the Egyptian religion. A direct influence can hardly be proved; it is, however, extremely likely that the Egyptian religion had its share in the formation of a common cultural background and the fertile soil from which Christianity rose and spread. In fact, neither the beliefs nor the requirements which Christianity imposed upon its devotees lacked analogies in contemporary religions and philosophical thought...

On the other hand Christianity added much that was new...

[p. 148] It cannot, however, be denied that when greater numbers were gained for the Christian faith, various pagan elements found their way into Christian beliefs and religious practices. The worship of the Virgin Mary and the picture of her with the child Jesus in her arms almost certainly owe a great deal to the influence of the goddess Isis with the young Horus on her lap. The creation of various local saints, the erection of their shrines, pilgrimages to these holy places and festivals around them were substitutes—almost the continuation—of the worship of former local deities. The resemblance between St. George killing the dragon with his spear to Horus killing his enemy, the evil god Setekh, in the form of a crocodile, must be very striking to anyone... [p. 149] The practice of astrology and magic which had long been forbidden was now tolerated and countless magical texts have come down to us from Christian Egypt. They resemble the pagan ones except that the names of the old Egyptian gods are replaced by those of Jesus and the saints, who are even threatened if they should not comply with the magician's orders.

### **433. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Holydays From Roman Pagan Festivals**

SOURCE: Tertullian, *On Idolatry*, chap. 14, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 3, p. 70.

Let us live with all; let us be glad with them, out of community of nature, not of superstition. We are peers in soul, not in discipline; fellow-possessors of the world, not of error. But if we have no right of communion in matters of this kind with strangers, how far more wicked to celebrate them among brethren! Who can maintain or defend this? The Holy Spirit upbraids the Jews with their holy-days. "Your Sabbaths, and new moons, and ceremonies," says He, "My soul hateth." By us, to whom Sabbaths are strange, and the new moons and festivals formerly beloved by God, the Saturnalia and New-year's and Mid-winter's festivals and Matronalia are frequented—presents come and go—New year's gifts—games join their noise—banquets join their din! Oh better fidelity of the nations to their own sect, which claims no solemnity of the Christians for itself! Not the Lord's day, not Pentecost, even if they had known them, would they have shared with us; for they would fear lest they should seem to be Christians. *We* are not apprehensive lest we seem to be *heathens!* If any indulgence is to be granted to the flesh, you have it. I will not say your own days, but more too; for to the *heathens* each festive day occurs but once annually: *you* have a festive day every eighth day. Call out the individual solemnities of the nations, and set them out into a row, they will not be able to make up a Pentecost.

### **434. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Image Worship Forced on the Clergy**

SOURCE: John William Draper, *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1876), Vol. 1, p. 368.

The inhabitants of Italy and Greece were never really alienated from the idolatries of the old times. At the best, they were only Christianized on the surface. With many other mythological practices, they forced image-worship on the clergy.

### **435. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Listed and Justified by Newman**

SOURCE: John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1906), pp. 371–373, [See [FRS](#) No. 73.]

[p. 371] Confiding then in the power of Christianity to resist the infection of evil, and to transmute the very instruments [p. 372] and appendages of demon-worship to an evangelical use, and feeling also that these usages had originally come from primitive revelations and from the instinct of nature, though they had been corrupted; and that they must invent what they needed, if they did not use what they found; and that they were moreover possessed of the very archetypes, of which paganism attempted the shadows; the rulers of the Church from early times were prepared, should the occasion arise, to adopt, or imitate, or sanction the existing rites and customs of the populace, as well as the philosophy of the educated class...

[p. 373] In the course of the fourth century two movements or developments spread over the face of Christendom, with a rapidity characteristic of the Church; the one ascetic, the other ritual or ceremonial. We are told in various ways by Eusebius,<sup>7</sup> [Note 7: V. Const. iii. 1, iv. 23, &c.] that Constantine, in order to recommend the new religion to the heathen, transferred into it the outward ornaments to which they had been accustomed in their own. It is not necessary to go into a subject which the diligence of Protestant writers has made familiar to most of us. The use of temples, and these dedicated to particular saints, and ornamented on occasions with branches of trees; incense, lamps, and candles; votive offerings on recovery from illness; holy water; asylums; holydays and seasons, use of calendars, processions, blessings on the fields; sacerdotal vestments, the tonsure, the ring in marriage, turning to the East, images at a later date, perhaps the ecclesiastical chant, and the Kyrie Eleison,<sup>8</sup> [Note 8: According to Dr. E. D. Clarke, *Travels*, vol. i. p. 352.] are all of pagan origin, and sanctified by their adoption into the Church.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This essay was written shortly before Newman left the Anglican Church to become a Roman Catholic.]

### **436. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Manichaeian Accusation (5th Century)**

SOURCE: Faustus' accusation, quoted in Augustine, *Reply to Faustus the Manichaeian* xx. 4, trans. in *NPNF*, 1st series, Vol. 4, p. 253. [FRS No. 86.]

The sacrifices you [the Christians] change into love-feasts, the idols into martyrs, to whom you pray as they do to their idols. You appease the shades of the departed with wine and food. You keep the same holidays as the Gentiles; for example, the calends and the solstices. In your way of living you have made no change. Plainly you are a mere schism; for the only difference from the original is that you meet separately.

### **437. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Moslem Denunciation of Eastern Church**

SOURCE: Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial*, p. 76. Copyright 1948 by Oxford University Press, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

As the Muslims saw it, the Prophets of Israel were all right, and Jesus was God's last and greatest prophet before His final messenger Muhammad. The Muslims' quarrel was not with the Prophet Jesus but with the Christian Church, which had captivated Rum [the Byzantine, or Eastern "Roman" Empire] by capitulating to pagan Greek polytheism and idolatry. From this shameful betrayal of the revelation of the One True God, Islam had retrieved the pure religion of Abraham. Between the Christian polytheists on the one side and the Hindu polytheists on the other there again shone the light of monotheism; and in Islam's survival lay the hope of the world. [See No. 483.]

### **438. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in—Sacred Cakes**

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 165, 172, 173.

[p. 165] Of especial interest are the cakes (*liba farinacea*) offered at the festival of Summanus, which were made in wheel-shaped moulds. And in this connection we should consider the moulds for sacred cakes described by Sir Arthur Evans in his article on "Recent Discoveries of Tarentine Terra-cottas." That the objects he mentions are cake-moulds seems clear from the evidence he adduces, and we find on them, besides symbols of several gods, wheel and cross impressions. Moreover, some of the moulds are divided into segments and Evans plausibly suggests that the cakes were made in this way in order to facilitate distribution. In the British Museum also there are representations of round cakes, apparently used as offerings, which are divided into four parts, like the loaves found at Pompeii...

[p. 172] It seems probable that some of the Roman customs connected with sacred cakes have survived. For example, the hot cross buns that we eat on Good Friday have an obvious affiliation with the sacred cakes made in such moulds as those found at Tarentum. Again, the Simnel cakes eaten on Midlent Sunday are stamped with the figure of Christ or the Virgin Mary, replacing in all probability representations or symbols of pagan divinities. The marking of segments on some of the cakes used on festivals of the Christian year, as for example on Twelfth Day, certainly suggests the idea of distribution which has been mentioned as the probable reason for the dividing lines on the sacred cakes of the ancients. In the case of Twelfth cakes there seems to have been a part for every person in the house and for Christ, the Virgin, and the wise men from the East as well. And it is not too far a call to trace back to the sacred cake of the *confarreate* marriage [p. 173] in Rome the importance of the wedding-cake in modern marriage.

Nor did the custom of offering cake or bread as sacrifice pass away with paganism. We are told that in Franconia persons entering a forest make an offering to the spirit of the woods; and that in Bohemia bread is thrown into a stream in which a man has been drowned. In Devonshire offerings of pieces of cake, accompanied by libations of cider, used to be made to the trees in the orchards.

#### **439. Christianity, Non-Christian Elements in, Survive in Greek and Roman Church Practices Today**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 70.

The spirit of Graeco-Roman paganism is not extinct. It still lives in the natural heart of man, which at this day as much as ever needs regeneration by the spirit of God. It lives also in many idolatrous and superstitious usages of the Greek and Roman churches, against which the pure spirit of Christianity has instinctively protested from the beginning.

#### **440. Christmas, and the Roman Saturnalia, a Comparison of the Two Festivals**

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 58, 62–65.

[p. 58] The festival of Saturn fell on December 17, but its popular celebration lasted for seven days. It began as a country festival in the time when agriculture was one of the chief activities of the Romans, but it soon came to be celebrated in urban centers also. It was a period of indulgence in eating, drinking, and gambling, and during these seven days city officials condoned conduct that they would not have tolerated at any other season. One feature of the occasion was the license allowed to slaves, who were permitted to treat their masters as if they were their social equals. Frequently indeed masters and slaves changed places and the latter were waited on by the former. Another

feature of the celebration was the exchange of gifts, such as candles (*cerei*) which are supposed to have symbolized the increasing power of the sunlight after the winter solstice, and little puppets of paste or earthenware (*sigillaria*), the exact significance of which is obscure. It was a season of hilarity and good-will...

[p. 62] The extremists who have said that Christmas was intended to replace the Saturnalia have vastly overstated the case. Nor is it of any importance that Epiphanius, the bishop of Salamis in Cyprus in the fourth century, places the Saturnalia on the twenty-fifth of December. This is not the only error in the list of dates in which it occurs. Without doubt, however, many of the customs of the Saturnalia were transferred to Christmas. Although the dates did not exactly coincide, for the Saturnalia proper fell on the seventeenth of December, the time of year was practically the same, and it has already been pointed out how frequently festivals of the merry-making type occur among various peoples at this season. Fowler, mentioning the good-will that so generally characterizes these celebrations, raises the question whether this was one of the reasons why Christmas was put at the winter solstice. Possibly, as has also been suggested, the postponement of the festivities from the date of the [p. 63] Saturnalia to Christmas week was in part at least caused by the institution of the Advent fast covering the period of the four Sundays before Christmas.

Certainly many of the customs of the Christmas season go back to the Roman festival. In it lies the origin of the excessive eating and drinking, the plethora of sweets, the playing of games, and the exchange of gifts. Nor can we fail to connect our custom of burning candles with the candles (*cerei*) that were so conspicuous a part of the Saturnalia. Moreover, our Christmas holidays, like the Roman festival, are approximately a week...

In mediaeval times there were still other sur- [p. 64] vivals, and the king of the Saturnalia is obviously the prototype not only of the Abbot of Unreason who at one time presided over the Christmas revels in Scotland, but also of the Lord of Misrule in England and the Abbé de Liesse in Lille. This mock dignitary had other titles...

[p. 65] We hear also of the Boy-Bishop (*Episcopus Puerorum*), whose authority lasted from St. Nicholas' day (December 6) till Childermas (December 28) and whose tradition (as well as that of the Bishop of Unreason) still survives to a certain extent in Santa Claus. Apparently the compromise made by the early Church in adapting the customs of the Saturnalia to Christian practice had little or no effect in checking the license of the festival. This continued through the whole Christmas festival and sometimes lasted till the day of Epiphany (January 6). We find many criticisms by churchmen or councils. In England Henry VIII issued a proclamation in 1542, abolishing the revels, but Mary restored them in 1554.

#### **441. Christmas, Date and Origin of**

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 60–62. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 60] The early Christians, who attributed to Christ not only the title (*Kyrios*) but also many other honors that the pagans paid to their "divine" emperors, naturally felt inclined to honor the birth of the Saviour. In most places the commemoration of Christ's birth was included in the Feast of the Epiphany (Manifestations) on January 6, one of the oldest annual feasts.

Soon after the end of the last great persecution, about the year 330, the Church in Rome definitely assigned December 25 for the celebration of the birth of Christ. For a while, many Eastern Churches continued to keep other dates, but toward the end of the fourth century the Roman custom became universal.

No official reason has been handed down in ecclesiastical documents for the choice of this date. Consequently, various explanations have been given to justify the celebration of the Lord's nativity on this particular day. Some early Fathers and writers claimed that December 25 was the actual date of Christ's birth...

[p. 61] It was expressly stated in Rome that the actual date of the Saviour's birth was unknown and that different traditions prevailed in different parts of the world.

A second explanation was of theological-symbolic character. Since the Bible calls the Messiah the "Sun of Justice" (Malachi 4, 2), it was argued that His birth had to coincide with the beginning of a new solar cycle, that is, He had to be born at the time of the winter solstice... This explanation, though attractive in itself, depends on too many assumptions that cannot be proved and lacks any basis of historical certitude.

There remains then this explanation, which is the most probable one, and held by most scholars in our time: the choice of December 25 was influenced by the fact that the Romans, from the time of Emperor Aurelian (275), had celebrated the feast of the sun god (*Sol Invictus*: the Unconquered Sun) on that day. December 25 was called the "Birthday of the Sun," and great pagan religious celebrations of the Mithras cult were held all through the empire. What was more natural than that the Christians celebrate the birth of Him Who was the "Light of the World" and the true "Sun of Justice" on this very day? The popes seem to have chosen December 25 precisely for the purpose of inspiring the people to turn from the worship of a material sun to the adoration of Christ the Lord. This thought is indicated in various writings of contemporary authors.

It has sometimes been said that the Nativity is only a "Christianized pagan festival." However, the Christians of those early centuries were keenly aware of the difference between the two festivals—one pagan and one Christian—on the same day. The coincidence in the date, even if intended, does not make the two [p. 62] celebrations identical. Some newly converted Christians who thoughtlessly retained external symbols of the sun worship on Christmas Day were immediately and sternly reprov'd.

#### **442. Christmas, Date of**

SOURCE: A. H. Newman, "Christmas," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 3, p. 47. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

**Christmas:** The supposed anniversary of the birth of Jesus Christ, occurring on Dec. 25. No sufficient data ... exist, for the determination of the month or the day of the event... There is no historical evidence that our Lord's birthday was celebrated during the apostolic or early postapostolic times. The uncertainty that existed at the beginning of the third century in the minds of Hippolytus and others—Hippolytus earlier favored Jan. 2, Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, i. 21) "the 25th day of Pachon" (= May 20), while others, according to Clement, fixed upon Apr. 18 or 19 and Mar. 28—proves that no Christmas festival had been established much before the middle of the century. Jan. 6 was earlier fixed upon as the date of the baptism or spiritual birth of Christ, and the feast of Epiphany ... was celebrated by the Basilidian Gnostics in the second century ... and by catholic Christians by about the beginning of the fourth century.

The earliest record of the recognition of Dec. 25 as a church festival is in the Philocalian Calendar (copied 354 but representing Roman practise in 336).

### **443. Christmas, Development of**

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York; Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 62–67. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 62] MIDDLE AGES. The great religious pioneers and missionaries who brought Christianity to the pagan tribes of Europe also introduced the celebration of Christmas...

[p. 63] The period from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries was the peak of a general Christian celebration of the Nativity... It was at this period, too, that most of the delightful Christmas customs of each country were introduced. Some have since died out; others have changed slightly through the ages; many have survived to our day. A few practices had to be suppressed as being improper and scandalous, such as the customs of dancing and mumming in church, the "Boy Bishop's Feast," the "Feast of the Ass," New Year's fires, superstitious (pagan) meals, impersonations of the Devil, and irreverent carols.

DECLINE. With the Reformation in the sixteenth century there naturally came a sharp change in the Christmas celebration for many countries in Europe. The Sacrifice of the Mass—the very soul of the feast—was suppressed. The Holy Eucharist, the liturgy of the Divine Office, the sacramentals and ceremonies all disappeared. So did the colorful and inspiring processions, the veneration of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the saints. In many countries all that remained of the once rich and glorious religious festival [p. 64] was a sermon and a prayer service on Christmas Day. Although the people kept many of their customs alive, the deep religious inspiration was missing, and consequently the "new" Christmas turned more and more into a feast of good-natured reveling.

On the other hand, some groups, including the German Lutherans, preserved a tender devotion to the Christ Child and celebrated Christmas in a deeply spiritual way within their churches, hearts, and homes.

In England the Puritans condemned even the reduced religious celebration that was held in the Anglican Church after the separation from Rome...

When the Puritans finally came to political power in England, they immediately proceeded to outlaw Christmas...

[p. 65] REVIVAL IN ENGLAND. When the old Christmas eventually returned with the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, it was actually a "new" Christmas. The spiritual aspect of the feast was now left mostly to the care of the ministers in the church service on Christmas Day. What was observed in the home consisted of a more shallow celebration in the form of various non-religious amusements and of general reveling... However, a spirit of good [p. 66] will to all and of generosity to the poor ennobled these more worldly celebrations of the great religious feast. Two famous descriptions of this kind of popular celebration are found in Charles Dickens's *A Christmas Carol* and in Washington Irving's *Sketch Book*...

CHRISTMAS IN AMERICA... The feast was celebrated with all the splendor of liturgical solemnity and with the traditional customs of the respective nationalities in Florida, on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, in Canada, and in the territory of the present State of Michigan.

In the colonies of New England, however, the unfortunate and misdirected zeal of the Puritans against Christmas persisted far into the nineteenth century...

[p. 67] It was not until immigrants from Ireland and from continental Europe arrived in large numbers toward the middle of the last century that Christmas in America began to flourish. The Germans brought the Christmas tree. They were soon joined by the Irish, who contributed the ancient Gaelic custom of putting lights in the windows...

Very soon their neighbors, charmed by these unusual but attractive innovations, followed their example and made many of these customs their own.

#### **444. Christmas, on the Sun's Birthday**

SOURCE: Gordon J. Laing, *Survivals of Roman Religion* (New York: Longmans, 1931), pp. 150–153.

[p. 150] One of the dominant religious ideas of the second and third centuries was the belief in the divinity of the Sun...

This divinity is of especial interest for our inquiry, for his annual festival fell on the twenty-fifth of December and its relation to Christmas [p. 151] has been a matter of protracted discussion. Obviously the season of the winter solstice, when the strength of the sun begins to increase, is appropriate for the celebration of the festival of a sun-god. The day in a sense marks the birth of a new sun. But the reason for its being chosen as the day for the commemoration of Christ's nativity is not so evident... [p. 152] The identity of date is more than a coincidence. To be sure the Church did not merely appropriate the festival of the popular sun-god. It was through a parallelism between Christ and the sun that the twenty-fifth of December came to be the date of the nativity... [p. 153] Even Epiphanius, the fourth century metropolitan of Cyprus, though giving the sixth of January as the date of birth, connects the event with the solstice. Moreover, the diversion of the significance of a popular pagan holiday was wholly in accord with the policy of the Church. Of the actual celebration of a festival of the nativity, it should be added, there is no satisfactory evidence earlier than the fourth century. Its first observance in Rome on December the twenty-fifth took place in 353 or 354 (Usener) or in 336 (Duchesne). In Constantinople it seems to have been introduced in 377 or 378.

#### **445. Christmas, on Winter Solstice, Sun's Birthday**

SOURCE: Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans* (reprint; New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960), pp. 89, 90.

[p. 89] A very general observance required that on the 25th of December the birth of the "new Sun" should be celebrated, when after the winter solstice the days began to lengthen and the "invincible" star triumphed again over darkness. It is certain that the date of this *Natalis Invicti* was selected by the Church as the commemoration of the *Nativity* of Jesus, which was previously confused with the Epiphany. In appointing this day, universally marked by pious rejoicing, which were as far as possible retained,—for instance the old chariot-races were preserved,—the ecclesiastical authorities purified in some degree the customs which they could not abolish. This substitution, which took place at Rome probably between 354 and 360, was adopted throughout the Empire, and that is why we still celebrate Christmas on the 25th of December.

The pre-eminence assigned to the *dies Solis* also certainly [p. 90] contributed to the general recognition of Sunday as a holiday. This is connected with a more important fact, namely, the adoption of the week by all European nations.

#### **446. Christmas, Pagan Parallels to (Dusares' Birthday)**

SOURCE: Stephen H. Langdon, *Semitic [Mythology]* (Vol. 5 of *The Mythology of All Races*. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America, Marshall Jones Company, 1931), pp. 15–19. Copyright 1931 by Marshall Jones Company, Inc. Used by permission of The Macmillan Company, New York.

[p. 15] Babylonian influence becomes particularly prominent in the great Nabataean kingdom whose principal capitals were Petra [p. 16] and Damascus, and whose history can be traced from their first mention by Ashurbanipal in the middle of the seventh century B.C., to their absorption into the Roman Empire in 106 A.D. They were a North Arabic race who used the Aramaic script, and their principal male deity is Dusura, rendered into Greek as Dousares, and identified by the Greeks with Dionysus. The name means “he of Shara” (*dhu Šar*), “he of the mountain range *esh-sharā*,” at Petra, and he is a Sun-god according to Strabo Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, writing in the fourth century, preserves the only illuminating information about the mythology of this great cult of the Nabataeans. As he was born and educated in Palestine, and served in a monastic order there, his statement must be taken authoritatively. He says that the Nabataeans praised the virgin whose Arabic name is *Χααβοῦ*. In Nabataeans the Arabic nominative ending in *u* is regularly preserved in proper names, and Epiphanius undoubtedly heard the word *ka’bu*, “square stone,” symbol in Nabataean religion for both Dusares and the great Mother-goddess Allat of the Nabataeans. An Arabic writer says that a four-sided stone was worshipped as Allat, who in a Nabataean inscription was called “Mother of the gods.” ... Epiphanius states that Dusares was the offspring of the virgin Chaabou and only son of the “lord” (*δεσπότης*). The panegyarchs of Nabataean cities came to Petra to assist in the festival of his birth, which was celebrated on the twenty-fifth of December.

[p. 17] Worship of a dying god, son of the Earth-mother, was the principal cult of this North Arabian people during the period immediately before and after the life of Jesus of Nazareth in Palestine. The title of the Mother-goddess Allat is “Mother of the gods” here, and a translation of the title of the great Mother-goddess of Babylonia, *bēlet ilāni*, “queen of the gods,” whose title in Sumerian is also “goddess Mother.” Dusares and Allat of the Nabataeans are an Arabian reflex of the great Babylonian myth of Tammuz and Ishtar, and if the god is identified with Dionysus, the original character common to both is that of a Sun-god and patron of fertility. Strabo describes the Nabataeans as a particularly abstemious people; the Greeks and Romans called Dusares the Arabian Dionysus or Bacchus; and a statue of him found in the Hauran (see Fig. 5) portrays him as a deity of the vine. The cornucopia and patera are also characteristic of Dusares on coins of Nabataean cities. As an Arabian [p. 18] Bacchus, Dusares is a Greek and Roman deity; as a god of Fertility, represented by a baetyl, he is a local Arabic Earth and Sun deity; and, as son of the virgin Earth-goddess, he is a Babylonian deity. The celebration of his birth in December at Petra and the northern cities of Bostra and Adraa in the Hauran with games and festivities is a replica of the spring festivities at Babylon, when the death, burial, and resurrection of Marduk were celebrated with weeping, which was exchanged for rejoicing. The meaning of the *actia dusaria* at Petra may be inferred from the similar festival at Alexandria in Egypt, there called after an unexplained Egyptian word *Kikēllia*, or in Greek the *Cronia*, which also occurred by night on the twenty-fifth of December. In this festival an image of a babe was taken from the temple sanctuary and greeted with loud acclamation by the worshippers, saying, “the Virgin has begotten.” On the night of the fifth of December occurred a festival before the image of *Corē*; it ended with bringing forth from beneath the earth the image of *Aiōn*, which was carried seven times around the inner sanctuary of *Corē*’s temple. The image was then returned to its place below the

surface of the earth. Epiphanius, in whose writings this Egyptian cult is described, identifies the virgin mother of this myth with the Greek Under-world goddess Corē, as he does the virgin mother of Dusares, Chaabu of the Nabataeans. There is a wide [p. 19] syncretism here in this Arabic religion, composed of Babylonian, Greek, and Egyptian elements; and beyond all doubt the Nabataeans possessed an elaborate cult of Tammuz and Ishtar, of Osiris and Isis, of Dionysus and Basilinna, the equivalent of Proserpine-Corē, in which this deity was represented as a youth, son of the Mother-goddess, who was reborn yearly in midwinter and who died in the summer.

The Mother-goddess of the Nabataeans, Allat, identified with Corē by the Greeks, is essentially the North Semitic Ashtart, and the Babylonian Ishtar.

#### **447. Christmas, Symbols of—Mistletoe, a Sacred Plant in the Pagan Religion of the Druids**

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 103, 104. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 103] The mistletoe was a sacred plant in the pagan religion of the Druids in Britain. It was believed to have all sorts of miraculous qualities: the power of healing diseases, making poisons harmless, giving fertility to humans and animals, protecting from witchcraft, banning evil spirits, bringing good luck and great blessings. In fact, it was considered so sacred that even enemies who happened to meet beneath a mistletoe in the forest would lay down their arms, exchange a friendly greeting, and keep a truce until the following day. From this old custom grew [p. 104] the practice of suspending mistletoe over a doorway or in a room as a token of good will and peace to all comers...

After Britain was converted from paganism to Christianity, the bishops did not allow the mistletoe to be used in churches because it had been the main symbol of a pagan religion. Even to this day mistletoe is rarely used as a decoration for altars. There was, however, one exception. At the Cathedral of York at one period before the Reformation a large bundle of mistletoe was brought into the sanctuary each year at Christmas and solemnly placed on the altar by a priest. In this rite the plant that the Druids had called "All-heal" was used as a symbol of Christ, the Divine Healer of nations.

The people of England then adopted the mistletoe as a decoration for their homes at Christmas. Its old, pagan religious meaning was soon forgotten, but some of the other meanings and customs have survived: the kiss under the mistletoe; the token of good will and friendship; the omen of happiness and good luck and the new religious significance.

#### **448. Christmas, Symbols of—Santa Claus**

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958), pp. 113, 114. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 113] When the Dutch came to America and established the colony of New Amsterdam, their children enjoyed the traditional "visit of Saint Nicholas" on December 5, for the Dutch had kept this ancient Catholic custom even after the Reformation. Later, when England took over the colony and it became New York, the kindly figure of Sinter Klaas (pronounced like Santa Claus) soon aroused among the English children the desire of having such a heavenly visitor come to their homes, too.

The English settlers were glad and willing to comply with the anxious wish of their children. However, the figure of a Catholic saint and bishop was not acceptable in their eyes, especially since many of them were Presbyterians, to whom a bishop was

repugnant. In addition, they did not celebrate the feasts of saints according to the ancient Catholic calendar.

The dilemma was solved by transferring the visit of the mysterious man whom the Dutch called Santa Claus from December 5 to Christmas, and by introducing a radical change in the figure itself. It was not merely a “disguise,” but the ancient saint was completely replaced by an entirely different character. Behind the name Santa Claus actually stands the figure of the pagan Germanic god Thor (after whom Thursday is named). Some details about Thor from ancient German mythology will show the origin of the modern Santa Claus tale:

Thor was the god of the peasants and the common people. He was represented as an elderly man, jovial and friendly, of heavy build, with a long white beard. His element was the fire, his color red. The rumble and roar of thunder were said to be caused by the rolling of his chariot, for he alone among the gods never rode on horseback but drove in a chariot drawn by two white goats (called Cracker and Gnasher). He was fighting the giants of ice and snow, and thus became the Yule-god. He was said to live in the “Northland” where he had his palace among icebergs. By our pagan forefathers he was considered as the cheerful and friendly god, never harming the humans but rather helping and protecting them. The fireplace in every home was especially sacred to him, and he was said to come down through the chimney into his element, the fire.<sup>70</sup> [Note 70: H. A. Grueber, *Myths of Northern Lands*, Vol. I, New York, 1895, 61 ff.]

[p. 114] Here, then, is the true origin of our “Santa Claus.” It certainly was a stroke of genius that produced such a charming and attractive figure for our children from the withered pages of pagan mythology. With the Christian saint whose name he still bears, however, this Santa Claus has really nothing to do.

#### **449. Christmas—Uncertainty About Date of Christ’s Birth**

SOURCE: Walter Woodburn Hyde, *Paganism to Christianity in the Roman Empire*, pp. 249, 250. Copyright 1946 by the University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 249] Uncertainty about Jesus’ birthday in the early third century is reflected in a disputed passage of the presbyter Hippolytus, who was banished to Sardinia by Maximin in 235, and in an authentic statement of Clement of Alexandria. While the former favored January second, the learned Clem- [p. 250] ent of Alexandria enumerates several dates given by the Alexandrian chronographers, notably the twenty-fifth of the Egyptian month *Pachon* (May twentieth) in the twenty-eighth year of Augustus and the twenty-fourth or twenty-fifth of *Pharmuthi* (April eighteenth or nineteenth) of the year A.D. 1, although he favored May twentieth. This shows that no Church festival in honor of the day was established before the middle of the third century. Origen at that time in a sermon denounced the idea of keeping Jesus’ birthday like that of Pharaoh and said that only sinners such as Herod were so honored. Arnobius later similarly ridiculed giving birthdays to “gods.” A Latin treatise, *De pascha computus* (of ca. 243), placed Jesus’ birth on March twenty-first since that was the supposed day on which God created the Sun (Gen. 1:14–19), thus typifying the “Sun of righteousness” as Malachi (4:2) called the expected Messiah. A century before Polycarp, martyred in Smyrna in 155, gave the same date for the birth and baptism placing it on a Wednesday because of the creation of the Sun on that day.

#### **450. Christmas—Worshippers of Mithras Won by Making December 25 Birthday of Christ**

SOURCE: H. Lamer, “Mithras,” *Wörterbuch der Antike* (2d ed.; Leipzig: A. Kröner, 1933). Used by permission. German.

While Christianity won a comparatively easy victory over the Graeco-Roman religion, it had a hard struggle with the Mithras religion. The worshippers of Mithras were won by taking over the birthday of Mithras, December 25, as the birthday of Christ.

#### **451. Chronology** — Astronomically Fixed Dates—Assyrian (Eclipse of 763 B.C.)

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Vol. 1 (6th ed., rev.; New York: Abingdon, 1915), p. 503.

The fragments of this [eponym] list which have come down to us begin during the reign of Shalmaneser III (859–824 B.C.), and brief though they are, have proved of immense importance. On one of these fragments, by the side of the Eponym Pur (ilu) Sa-gal-e, there is mentioned an eclipse of the sun under these words, “In the month of Sivan there was an eclipse of the sun.” Astronomical investigations have shown that a total eclipse of the sun occurred at Nineveh June 15, 763 B.C. lasting two hours and forty-three minutes, with the middle of the eclipse at 10:05 A. M. This astronomical calculation gave a fixed date for the year of that eponym and thereby fixed every year in the entire canon.

#### **452. Chronology** — Astronomically Fixed Dates—Babylonian (37th Year of Nebuchadnezzar)

SOURCE: Paul V. Neugebauer und Ernst F. Weidner, “Ein astronomischer Beobachtungstext aus dem 37. Jahre Nebukadnexas II (–567/66)” (An Astronomical Observation Text From the 37th Year of Nebuchadnezzar [–567/66]), *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig* (“Reports Concerning the Proceedings of the Royal Saxon Society of Science at Leipzig”), Philologisch Historische Klasse, Vol. 67 (1915), Part 2, pp. 29, 34, 35, 38. German.

[p. 29] Among the historical cuneiform texts in the near Eastern Department of the Berlin Museums, tablet VAT 4956 occupies first place in significance. It is the earliest known historical observation text which is composed in the detailed form of the late Babylonian times. Up to now this honor had been ceded to the text 78,11–7,4 of the British Museum, which originated in the 7th year of Cambyses, hence of the year – 522/21 [i.e. 523/22 B.C.]. This was therefore composed already in the time of the Persian Kings. Our new text, however, comes from the year –567/66 [i.e. 568/67 B.C.], and is therefore the first extensive and purely historical document from the time which preceded the destruction of the Neo-Babylonian empire. As far as its contents are concerned, it contains, just as all later similar documents, detailed observations of the moon, the sun and the planets, also data concerning meteorological and geological phenomena, information on the height of the water, prices of food, and at the end also some paragraphs dealing with some interesting curiosities.

#### *Translation*

[p. 34] 1. 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon. On Nisan 1 (the intercalary Adar had twenty-nine days) the moon became visible behind the Hyades; the duration of visibility was sixty-four minutes [ ].

---

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

2. Saturn is opposite of the southern fish of the zodiac. On the morning of the 2d a rainbow was stretched out in the west. In the night of the 3d the moon was two cubits before [ ] ...

[p. 35] 17. [ ]. On the 15th the god was seen together with the god. There was an interval of thirty minutes between sunrise and the disappearance of the moon the next morning. The eclipse of the moon which was skipped [ ] ...

[p. 38] 22. 38th year of Nebuchadnezzar. On Nisan 1 (the month Adar had 29 days) it was cloudy the whole [ ] ...

[Note to line 17:]

[p. 50] The lunar eclipse of Sivan 15 (= -567, July 4) was not visible in Babylon. The Babylon astronomer had ascertained it only on the basis of an eclipse period (probably of the Saros) known to him, and had therefore written: *atalû Sin* ‘computed lunar eclipse.’ Accordingly it probably has to be read: *ša etetik (LU)* ‘which is skipped’ (i.e. is invisible in Babylon; see Kugler, *Sternkunde* I, p. 268a). Traces of *ša LU* are still recognizable with some certainty.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The expression “the god was seen together with the god” is explained elsewhere, on p. 42:

“*ilu itti ili ittanmar* ‘the god (moon) was seen together with the god (sun).’ Both luminaries stand in the evening, the moon in the eastern horizon, the sun on the western horizon, on opposition, i.e. it is full moon. This idiomatic expression has been known for a long time.”

In this translation, places where portions of the original text are now missing on the clay tablet, in breaks of varying sizes, are indicated by brackets thus [...]. The brackets in the first paragraph are editorial insertions, indicating the B.C. dates (see No. 454 for the alternate date forms).

In reply to an inquiry Dr. Otto Neugebauer writes (3/26/63) that a text of this kind fixes the date uniquely within historical possibility, since similar positions of the sun, moon, and planets would not recur within hundreds, perhaps thousands, of years.

### **453. Chronology—Astronomically Fixed Dates — Persian (7th Year of Cambyses)**

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, “Babylonian Astronomy—Historical Sketch,” *AJSL*, 55 (April, 1938), 122. Reprinted by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

“Year VII [of Cambyses], Du’uzu (July), night of the 12th, 1 2/3 double hours (3 hours 20 minutes) after night came, Sin [the moon] was eclipsed, the whole was established, the going out of the disk went north”; this very tablet may have been the ultimate source from which Hipparchus drew his knowledge of this lunar eclipse.<sup>29</sup>

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Olmstead’s Note 29 cites sources for: the ancient tablet (Strassmaier, *Kambyses*, No. 400); the modern astronomical dating of the eclipse to July 16, 523 B.C. (Kugler, *Sternkunde*, I, 61 ff.); and Ptolemy’s data on the same eclipse (Ptolemy, *Almagest* v. 14. 3). See also *SDACom* 3:88.]

### **454. Chronology—Christian Era, Modes of Reckoning**

SOURCE: *The [British] Nautical Almanac* for the Year 1932 (London: His Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1930), p. 741. Crown Copyright. Used by permission of the Controller of Her Britannic Majesty’s Stationery Office.

The Christian era invented by Dionysius Exiguus and popularised by Bede has been adopted at different times and in different countries with different initial days for the year. The most common initial dates have been December 25, January 1, March 1 and March 25... In England the Nativity style beginning on December 25 was superseded in the fourteenth century by the Annunciation style (commonly called old style) beginning

on March 25, but the Circumcision style (or new style) beginning on January 1 [the old Roman New Year] was substituted in 1753 by the Act which introduced the Gregorian calendar...

The Christian era begins with the beginning of the year 1 or of the first year. The year immediately preceding is the year 1 B.C. or the first year before Christ. The year before [A.D.] 1 is styled 0 by astronomers, and the preceding year is -1, corresponding to 2 B.C. in the usage of historians. Therefore in converting years B.C. into astronomical dates it is necessary to subtract 1 and to prefix the minus sign. In converting negative astronomical dates into years B.C. it is necessary to remove the minus sign and to add 1 to the number of the year.

#### **455. Chronology—Christian Era, Origin**

SOURCE: Reginald L. Poole, *Studies in Chronology and History*, ed. by Austin Lane Poole (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1934), pp. 28, 33, 34. Used by permission.

[p. 28] The Easter cycle of Dionysius Exiguus ... was a continuation of that attributed to Cyril of Alexandria, and was drawn up in A.D. 525, for a period of five lunar cycles or ninety-five years. But whereas Cyril accompanied his Easter tables with a consecutive series of years beginning with the Emperor Diocletian, Dionysius, as he says, preferred to date his years not from the rule of a persecutor of the Christians but with the Incarnation of our Lord. There is no hint that he intended to establish an era for ordinary historical purposes; he only gave the years for reference, in order to identify the dates assigned to Easter...

[p. 33] So soon as the cycle of Dionysius gained currency, it was not unnatural that the series of years, reckoned from the era of the Incarnation which accompanied it, should be made use of for the indication of historical dates. There is indeed evidence that this era was known in Spain as early as 672; but it is not until [p. 34] the production of the Church History of Bede that we find an historical work in which it is inserted.

#### **456. Chronology—Inclusive Reckoning in Biblical Usage**

SOURCE: A. J. Maclean, "Chronology of the New Testament," in James Hastings, ed., *Dictionary of the Bible* (1-vol. ed.; 1924), p. 133. Copyright 1909 by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and that of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

It must also be noted that reckoning in old times was inclusive. Thus 'three years after' (Gal 1<sup>18</sup>) means 'in the third year after' (cf. Ac 19<sup>8,10</sup> with 20<sup>31</sup>); 'three days and three nights' (Mt 12<sup>40</sup>) means 'from to-day to the day after tomorrow' (Mt 17<sup>23</sup>). Cf. also Gn 42<sup>17f</sup>.

[EDITORS' NOTE: See *SDACom* 2:136; 5:249, 250.]

#### **457. Chronology—Inclusive Reckoning in Greek Usage**

SOURCE: Censorinus, *De Die Natali*, chap. xviii. secs. 3, 4, 12 (Hultsch ed.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1867), pp. 37, 39. Latin.

[p. 37] They [the Greeks] used *tetraeterida* (four-year cycles), but this, because it returned every fifth year, they named *pentaeterida* (five-year cycles)... For this reason the games [dedicated] to Jupiter Olympius in Elis [that is, the Olympic Games] and to Jupiter Capitolinus at Rome are celebrated when every fifth year returns. This period also ... was doubled and made an *octaeteris* (eight-year cycle), which was then called *enneaeteris* (a nine-year cycle) because its first year returned also in the ninth year...

[p. 39] Of all these the Greeks observed mostly ... the *pentaeterida* (five-year cycles), that is, the cycle of four years, which they call the Olympiads. And now among them this is numbered as the second year of the 254th Olympiad.

#### **458. Chronology—King’s Reigns, Two Methods of Dating by**

SOURCE: Richard A. Parker, “Persian and Egyptian Chronology,” *AJSL*, 58 (July, 1941), 298. Reprinted by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

Under the Twenty-sixth Dynasty [of Egypt] the regnal year coincided with the civil year, which began with ... Thoth 1. That portion of the civil year which remained after the death of a king was counted as *year 1* of his successor. According to the Persian method of dating adopted from the Babylonians, the regnal and civil years also coincided, beginning with Nisanu 1, but the unexpired part of the civil year after a king’s death was called the *accession year* of his successor.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Of these two methods of numbering the years of a king’s reign, the first (the “non-accession-year” method, or “antedating”) was used at certain times in Egypt and apparently in the northern Hebrew kingdom (Israel), and by the Macedonians in Alexander’s empire and in its succeeding Hellenistic kingdoms in the East. The second (the “accession-year method” or “postdating”) was employed by the kings of Babylon, Assyria, and Persia (until Alexander), and most probably by the kings of Judah throughout the history of Judah. Note that in both reckonings the regnal year coincided with the calendar year. See *SDACom* 2:138, 139; *SDADic*, “Chronology.”]

#### **459. Chronology — Month, Theroretical, of 30 Days**

SOURCE: O. Neugebauer, *Astronomical Cuneiform Texts*, Vol. 1 (12 Bedford Sq., London, W.C.1: Lund Humphries, [1955]), p. 40.

In planetary ephemerides there occurs a peculiar counting of time which is especially fitted to the situation arising in the [advance] computation of planetary phenomena... Let us assume, *e.g.*, that we know ... the calendaric date *D* of the first phenomenon. In order to find the date of the second phenomenon [200 days later], we should know for all months between *D* and *D* + 200 whether they are 29 or 30 days long... But there would always remain doubtful cases where the lunar ephemerides offer alternative solutions. Consequently, the planetary ephemerides adopted a method of time reckoning which is independent of the civil calendar by introducing thirtieths of the mean length of a synodic month. The name for these units is unknown; we call them here “lunar days” or “*tithis*”...

On a lower level the introduction of *tithis* has its analogy in the practice of counting “months” as always 30 days.

#### **460. Chronology—Problems of B.C. Dating of Biblical Events**

SOURCE: Ira Maurice Price and others, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, pp. 64, 65. Copyright 1958 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 64] One of the most tangled questions connected with the Old Testament has to do with the chronology. The reader doubtless is aware that the dates given in the margins of many English Bibles (King James Version) were worked out by Archbishop U[s]sher of Armagh (A.D. 1580–1656), and were not inserted in the margins of the Bible until A.D. 1701. It is conceded by all scholars that his scheme of dates, though carefully wrought out, and as good as could be constructed at that time, is now, in view of the many discoveries which have been made in Babylonia-Assyria, largely untenable.

The available data for constructing a reasonable chronology of the Old Testament may be found in the following: (1) Ptolemy, an Egyptian astronomer of the second century A.D., left us a list of the kings of Egypt, Persia, and Babylonia down to the accession of Nabonassar, 747 B.C. It is arranged by the use of astronomical calculations,

and these have some real value. (2) Cuneiform literature contains lists of years and chief events kept by the Assyrian kings. These are called Eponym Lists; that is, each year is named after some person, king, or officer. These lists are practically unbroken from 893 to 666 B.C. For a part of that stretch of time, they parallel the list by [p. 65] Ptolemy. Where comparison is possible, the two lists are in substantial agreement. An eclipse of the sun which occurred at Nineveh in the month Sivan (May–June) 763 B.C., has been verified by the calculations of modern astronomers. This then gives us a fixed basis for the chronology of the Old Testament within the years of these lists. (3) Assyrian and Babylonian rulers occasionally made calculations of their own regarding the dates of previous events or rulers, and incorporated these calculations in their records or in the cornerstones of notable buildings. While some of these have a semblance of accuracy, they must be used with caution, as must so many other figures that have reached us from those early days...

Dates earlier than 893 B.C. in Babylonia-Assyria, must be accepted with reservations. Those of the Old Testament may be calculated on the basis of Babylonian-Assyrian lists with credible accuracy back to the beginnings of the Hebrew monarchy (c. 1025 B.C.).

[EDITORS' NOTE: A fourth source of chronological data may be found in numerous dated clay tablets and papyri from ancient sites. Their date lines, given in terms of the numbered regnal years of various kings, in combination with other information, can be of great value in dating the reigns.

In a few cases exact dates can be established from astronomical or calendrical data in such documents as the eclipse record of 763 B.C., dating the Assyrian chronology, and the astronomical texts fixing exactly the 37th year of Nebuchadnezzar and the 7th year of Cambyses. Besides, there are certain of the Elephantine papyri that have double date lines, giving the lunar month and day along with the corresponding known Egyptian solar-calendar date, and thus fix the regnal years of several Persian kings. See *SDACom* 3:88, 89, and note.]

#### **461. Chronology, Radioactive Decay an Inconclusive Basis for Time Measurements**

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 354, 355. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 354] We conclude, therefore, that a time measurement based on the principle of radioactive decay is in itself quite inconclusive. It is, in the first place, quite reasonable to believe that both parent and daughter elements in each radioactive chain were created at the beginning, probably in "equilibrium" amounts. The amount of originally created radiogenic end-product in each chain is uncertain; it is likely, however, that homologous amounts were created in all such minerals so that all such elements would, when created, give an "appearance" of the same degree of maturity or of age. Furthermore, the intense environmental radiation present in the upper atmosphere could well have resulted in much higher decay rates for the radioactive elements at one or more times in the past.

Thus, by the end of the Creation period, each radioactive mineral would very likely contain a sizeable amount of its radiogenic daughter, though actually but a few days old! Again, at the time of the Deluge, it seems reasonable that the increased radioactivity in the environment would have speeded up all decay processes by some unknown amount. Therefore, even in the relatively rare cases where the radioactive mineral was not disturbed excessively during the in [p. 355] tense geologic upheavals of the Creation and Deluge periods, the relative amounts of parent and daughter elements would still be entirely incapable of yielding a valid record of *true* age, since neither the original amount of radiogenic material nor the changes in past decay rates can now be determined. The only thing reasonably certain is that the present decay rate and present amount of

daughter element, if applied in a uniformitarian computation, must result in an age-estimate immensely too great!

#### **462. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating Depends on Assumptions of Uniformity**

SOURCE: J. Laurence Kulp, "The Carbon 14 Method of Age Determination," *The Scientific Monthly*, 75 (November, 1952), 261. Reprinted by permission of *The Scientific Monthly*.

There are two basic assumptions in the carbon 14 method. One is that the carbon 14 concentration in the carbon dioxide cycle is constant. The other is that the cosmic ray flux has been essentially constant—at least on a scale of centuries.

#### **463. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating Disputed in Tests in English Excavation**

SOURCE: Stuart Piggott, "The Radio-Carbon Date from Durrington Walls" (under Notes and News), *Antiquity*, 33 (December, 1959), 289, 290. Used by permission of *Antiquity* and the author.

[p. 289] During the 1952 excavations on the settlement site adjacent to the south bank of the Durrington Walls Henge Monument, a well-preserved mass of wood charcoal was found on the old land surface beneath the chalk rubble mound of the Henge. The position is shown in *Ant. Journ.*, XXXIV (1954), 163, fig. 4, marked 'charcoal' in Cutting III. The charcoal was fresh and crisp, and must have been covered by the bank immediately after its deposition. Two radio-carbon tests on a sample from this charcoal were made by Professor de Vries of Groningen in 1955–6, and the results were:  $4575 \pm 40$  and  $45685 \pm 70$  before present, thus indicating a date of *c.* 2620–2630 B.C. for the charcoal, and so for the construction of the Henge of Durrington Walls.

This date is archaeologically unacceptable for the following reasons. The evidence observed during the excavation makes it virtually impossible to regard the charcoal and the bank of the Henge as anything but contemporary. The 1950–2 excavations on the site [p. 290] showed that in archaeological terms the Henge must be contemporary with the occupation material of Secondary Neolithic (Woodhenge) type which underlies the North Bank of the Henge, and overlaps the tail of the South Bank (*loc. cit.*, 168). Two small scraps of Beaker ware were found with the occupation material at Durrington...

Certain absolute dates in the Dutch Beaker sequence have been provided by radio-carbon tests in the Groningen Laboratory, and a date of  $1980 \pm 70$  is given to a Bell Beaker of the type which stands in an ancestral position to much of our British Beaker pottery;  $1685 \pm 50$  for a 'zigzag' ornamented Beaker; the Veluwe phase is placed between 1700 and 1500 B.C. If one accepts these dates (and they are in accordance with chronologies constructed by archaeological means), we cannot accept the Durrington Walls radio-carbon date, which is roughly a millennium too high!

#### **464. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating, Doubts Concerning**

SOURCE: Glyn Daniel, Editorial, *Antiquity*, 33 (December, 1959), 239. Used by permission of the author.

It is very important to realize that doubts about the archaeological acceptability of radiocarbon dates is not obscurantism nor another chapter in the battle of Science versus the Arts. It is an attempt to evaluate all the available evidence, physical and non-physical...

We are at a moment when some of us at least are uncertain how to answer this question: when is a Carbon 14 reading an archaeological fact? We certainly need reassurance beyond all reasonable doubt at the present moment that scientists know all about the variables involved, that Elsasser, Ney and Winckler are wrong in supposing

that there was variation in the intensity of cosmic-ray formation and that others are wrong in supposing that there were fluctuations in the original C 14 content.

#### **465. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating, Question of Reliability**

SOURCE: Kathleen M. Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land* (New York: Praeger, 1960), pp. 34, 35.

Copyright 1960 by Kathleen M. Kenyon. Used by permission.

[p. 34] A chronology based on an ancient calendar, however, can take us no farther back than *c.* 3000 B.C. Until very recently, that was all that we had. Anything earlier was a sequence only and dates in [p. 35] years assigned to any phase were also only guesswork. Since 1944, however, a new method, first developed by Dr. Libby in Chicago, has been introduced. This is usually known as the Carbon-14, or radio-active carbon, method. It is based on the fact that all living organisms, human beings and other animals, trees and plants, absorb radio-activity while they are alive, and after they are dead give it up at a rate which can be established. The surviving amount can be measured in organic materials recovered on archaeological sites. For various technical reasons charcoal, and to a lesser extent shell, is the most satisfactory material. By comparison of the surviving amount of radioactivity and the established annual rate of loss, the date at which the organism died, for instance the date at which the tree was cut down, can be established. The method is not yet absolutely reliable, but a series of consistent results, including ones which can be checked against evidence from other sources, makes it probable that it can be of much use to archaeologists. There is, however, always a standard margin of deviation, usually of about a hundred and fifty to two hundred years on either side of a central date. Therefore for the periods after *c.* 3000 B.C., the Carbon-14 method is unlikely to give as exact a result as evidence based on other archaeological grounds. But for the earlier periods it is our only source. As will be seen, we already have dates going back to *c.* 8000 B.C., and as evidence accumulates from additional observations we shall both gain assurance whether or not these comparatively isolated results are reliable, and be able to fit other phases and cultures into the general scheme.

#### **466. Chronology—Radiocarbon Dating Wrong if Atmospheric Carbon Has Varied**

SOURCE: Gilbert N. Plass, "Carbon Dioxide and the Climate," *American Scientist*, 44 (July, 1956), 314.

Copyright 1956 by The Society of the Sigma Xi, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

All calculations of radiocarbon dates have been made on the assumption that the amount of atmospheric carbon dioxide has remained constant. If the theory presented here of carbon dioxide variations in the atmosphere is correct, then the reduced carbon dioxide amount at the time of the last glaciation means that all radiocarbon dates for events before the recession of the glaciers are in question.

#### **467. Church, as Defined by Certain Reformers**

SOURCE: J. Kostlin, "Church, The Christian," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 3, pp. 81–83. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

[p. 81] In the West, on the other hand, the definite or- [p. 82] ganization of the church at large took shape in the papal monarchy; the further history of Catholicism and its idea of the church is really a history of the Roman primacy. . .

The first medieval Christian body which, while holding fast to the general Christian faith, abandoned that doctrine of the church sketched above [the Roman Catholic view] was the Waldenses. They considered themselves members of the church of Christ and partakers of his salvation, in spite of their exclusion from organized Christendom,

recognizing at the same time a “church of Christ” within the organization whose heads were hostile to them. There is not, however, in their teaching any clear definition of the nature of the church or any new principle in reference to it.

The first theologian to bring forward a conception of the church radically opposed to that which had been developing was Wyclif; and Huss followed him in it. According to him the church is the “totality of the predestinated”; there, as in his doctrine of grace, he followed Augustine, but took a standpoint contrary as well to Augustine’s as to that of later Catholicism in his account of the institutions and means of grace by which God communicates the blessings of salvation to the predestined, excluding from them the polity of priest, bishop, and pope. He denied the divine institution both of papal primacy and of the episcopate as distinct from the presbyterate, and attributed infallible authority to the Scriptures alone. [p. 83] The idea of both Wyclif and Huss was thus not of an actually existing body of united associates, but merely the total of predestined Christians who at any time are living holy lives, scattered among those who are not predestined, together with those who are predestined but not yet converted, and the faithful who have passed away.

Luther defended Wyclif’s definition at the Leipsic Disputation of 1519, in spite of its condemnation by the Council of Constance. But his own idea was that the real nature of the church was defined by the words following its mention in the creed—“the communion of saints,” taking the word “saints” in its Pauline sense. These (although sin may still cling to them) are sanctified by God through his word and sacraments—sacraments not depending upon an organized episcopally ordained clergy, but committed to the church as a whole; it is their faith, called forth by the word of God, which makes them righteous and accepted members of Christ and heirs of eternal life. Thus the Lutheran and, in general, the Calvinist conception of the church depended from the first upon the doctrine of justification by faith. In harmony with Luther’s teaching, the Augsburg Confession defines the church as “the congregation of saints in which the gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered.” In one sense the church is invisible, since the earthly eye can not tell who has true faith and in this sense is a “saint,” but in another it is visible, since it has its being here in outward and visible vital forms, ordained by God, in which those who are only “saints” in appearance have an external share.

#### **468. Church, as Defined by Pope Boniface VIII in the Bull *Unam***

##### *Sanctam*

SOURCE: *The Papal Encyclicals*, ed. by Anne Fremantle, pp. 72, 73. Copyright © 1956 by Anne Fremantle. Used by permission of G. P. Putnam’s Sons, publishers, New York.

[p. 72] We are compelled, our faith urging us, to believe and to hold—and we do firmly believe and simply confess—that there is one holy Catholic and apostolic Church, outside of which there is neither salvation nor remission of sins... Therefore of this one and only church [p. 73] there is one body and one head—not two heads as if it were a monster:—Christ, namely, and the vicar of Christ, St. Peter, and the successor of Peter.

#### **469. Church, as Fulfilling Ancient Israel’s Role**

SOURCE: Oscar Cullmann, *Knigsherrschaft Christi und Kirche im Neuen Testament* (Royal Reign of Christ and the Church in the New Testament) (Theologische Studien Eine Schriftenreihe, ed. Karl Barth, No. 10. Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1941), pp. 35, 36. German. Used by permission.

[p. 35] Man was appointed to rule over the rest of creation. He fell, and his fall into sin involved the entire creation in the divine curse “by reason of him” (Gen. 3:17; Rom. 8:20). Out of sinful mankind God selected a community, the people of Israel, for the salvation of the world. However, within this people a further reduction takes place, first of all to a small human community upon whom the role indicated by God fell—the “remnant of Israel,” the *qahal Yahweh*. This “remnant” is further compressed and reduced to *one* man who alone could undertake Israel’s role—in Deutero-Isaiah the “servant of Yahweh,” and in Daniel the “Son of man,” who represents the “people of the saints” (Dan. 7:13ff.). This One must enter history in God’s Son, Christ, who through His vicarious death only now accomplishes that for which God elected the people of Israel. Thus until Christ there was in redemptive history a progressive reduction: mankind—the people of Israel—the remnant of Israel—the One, Christ. Thus redemptive history reached its central [p. 36] point, but it did not end there. Now it is necessary, so to say, from this center to proceed in reverse: from the One to the many, but so as to have *the many represent the One*. Now we go from Christ to those who believe on Him, who know they are redeemed by His vicarious death. The road thus leads to the church, which is the body of the One and which now for mankind must fulfill the task of the “remnant” of “the people of the saints,” and therewith assumes the designation of that “remnant” *qahal Yahweh*, the Hebrew equivalent for *ekklēsia*, “church.”

Thus this redemptive history proceeds in two movements: the one going from the many to the One—this is the old covenant; the other from the One to the many—this is the new covenant. Precisely in the center is the decisive *factum* of the death of Christ.

#### **470. Church, Early, Changes in, before Constantine’s Accession**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 2 (8th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1903), pp. 8, 11.

[p. 8] The second period, from the death of the apostle John to the end of the persecutions, or to the accession of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, is the classic age ... of heathen persecution, and of Christian martyrdom and heroism... It furnishes a continuous commentary on the Saviour’s words: “Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves.” ... [p. 11] The ante-Nicene age ... is ... the common root out of which both have sprung, Catholicism (Greek and Roman) first, and Protestantism afterwards. It is the natural transition from the apostolic age to the Nicene age, yet leaving behind many important truths of the former (especially the Pauline doctrines) which were to be derived and explored in future ages. We can trace in it the elementary forms of the Catholic creed, organization and worship, and also the germs of nearly all the corruptions of Greek and Roman Christianity.

#### **471. Church, Early, Changes in, Before Constantine’s Conversion**

SOURCE: W. D. Killen, *The Ancient Church* (New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 1883), pp. xv, xvi.

[p. xv] In the interval between the days of the apostles and the conversion of Constantine, the Christian commonwealth changed it[s] aspect. The Bishop of Rome—a personage un- [p. xvi] known to the writers of the New Testament—meanwhile rose into prominence, and at length took precedence of all other churchmen. Rites and ceremonies, of which neither Paul nor Peter ever heard, crept silently into use, and then claimed the rank of Divine institutions. Officers for whom the primitive disciples could have found

no place, and titles, which to them would have been altogether unintelligible, began to challenge attention, and to be named apostolic.

#### **472. Church, Early, Changes in, Before Eusebius**

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* viii. 1; translated by J. E. L. Oulton, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 253, 255. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 253] But when, as the result of great freedom [immediately preceding the persecution by Diocletian], a change to pride and sloth came over our affairs, we fell to envy and fierce railing against one another, warring upon ourselves, so to speak, as occasion offered, with weapons and spears formed of words; and rulers attacked rulers and laity formed factions against laity, while unspeakable hypocrisy and pretence pursued their evil course to the furthest end... [p. 255] We took not the least care to secure the goodwill and propitious favour of the Deity, but, like some kind of atheists, imagined that our affairs escaped all heed and oversight, we went on adding one wickedness to another other; and those accounted our pastors, casting aside the sanctions of the fear of God, were enflamed with mutual contentions, and did nothing else but add to the strifes and threats, the jealousy, enmity and hatred that they used one to another, claiming with all vehemence the objects of their ambition as if they were a despot's spoils.

#### **473. Church, Early, Changes in—Decline of Standards, 3d Century**

SOURCE: Cyprian, *The Treatises of Cyprian*, Treatise 3, "On the Lapsed," sec. 6, trans. in *ANF*, Vol. 5, p. 438.

Each one was desirous of increasing his estate... Among the priests there was no devotedness of religion; among the ministers there was no sound faith: in their works there was no mercy; in their manners there was no discipline... Not a few bishops ..., despising their divine charge, became agents in secular business, forsook their throne, deserted their people, wandered about over foreign provinces, hunted the markets for gainful merchandise, while brethren were starving in the Church. They sought to possess money in hoards, they seized estates by crafty deceits, they increased their gains by multiplying usuries.

#### **474. Church, Early, Changes in, Under Constantine and Later**

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

[Constantine] appears in the imperial purple at the council of Nice [Nicaea] as protector of the church, and takes his golden throne at the nod of bishops, who still bear the scars of persecution. The despised sect, which, like its Founder in the days of His humiliation, had not where to lay its head, is raised [under Constantine and his successors] to sovereign authority in the state, enters into the prerogatives of the pagan priesthood, grows rich and powerful, builds countless churches out of the stones of idol temples to the honor of Christ and his martyrs, employs the wisdom of Greece and Rome to vindicate the foolishness of the cross, exerts a molding power upon civil legislation, rules the national life, and leads off the history of the world. But at the same time the church, embracing the mass of the population of the empire, from the Caesar to the meanest slave, and living amidst all its institutions, received into her bosom vast deposits of foreign material from the world and from heathenism, exposing herself to new dangers and imposing upon herself new and heavy labors.

The union of church and state extends its influence, now healthful, now baneful, into every department of our history.

The Christian life of the Nicene and post-Nicene age reveals a mass of worldliness within the church; an entire abatement of chiliasm with its longing after the return of Christ and his glorious reign, and in its stead an easy repose in the present order of things; with a sublime enthusiasm, on the other hand, for the renunciation of self and the world, particularly in the hermitage and the cloister, and with some of the noblest heroes of Christian holiness.

#### **475. Church, Early, Changes in, Under Constantine and Later**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), p. 51. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

For Christianity, the reign of Constantine marked the transition from the days in which it lived perilously and amid derision to the days of its freedom from fear and the beginnings of its social prestige. To be sure, the legal process by which Christianity became the religion of the state and paganism a proscribed faith was not completed for nearly half a century after Constantine's death. But Constantine took the decisive steps that were to culminate in the edicts of Theodosius. It is with Constantine on the throne that the process summed up in a famous sentence by Gibbon reached its climax: "While that great body [the Roman Empire] was invaded by open violence, or undermined by slow decay, a pure and humble religion gently insinuated itself into the minds of men, grew up in silence and obscurity, derived new vigor from opposition, and finally erected the triumphant banner of the Cross on the ruins of the Capitol."

Great as was the change in the fortunes of the church with Constantine's tolerance and favor, a greater change was yet to come. During Constantine's reign many professed Christianity to gain worldly advantage, but no one was compelled to do so. Christianity was still, as it had been in the beginning, a voluntary religion. Constantine frowned upon those who would divide the church, because he wanted it to be a unifying force in his empire, but he did not make Christianity compulsory. The great divide in Christian history came near the end of the fourth century when the acceptance of Christianity became mandatory [under Theodosius I, 379–395] and when the church, having so lately escaped from its persecutors, became a persecuting church.

#### **476. Church, Early, Changes in, Under Theodosius I and II**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 72, 73. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 72] Not until Theodosius I did it become politically practicable to attempt serious enforcement of decrees banning pagan worship [see No. 1208] and making orthodox Christianity the sole and compulsory religion within the empire.

A series of edicts beginning in 380 and continuing for more than half a century, through the reign of Theodosius II, achieved this result. With the increasingly rigorous enforcement of these [p. 73] decrees, the revolution in the character of the church became complete. It had ceased to be the voluntary association of believers; it had become the sole legal religion of the empire; its membership had become everybody. To reject this religion was thereafter equivalent to treason against the state and, naturally, was punishable by death. Church and state alike adopted the presupposition that religious homogeneity was essential to the cohesion of the social order and the stability of the civil government. This principle dominated the Middle Ages and was part of the heritage that the great Protestant state churches of the Reformation period accepted from the medieval Catholic Church.

#### **477. Church, Early—Degeneracy With Elevation**

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

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 christianizing of the state amounted therefore in great measure to a paganizing and secularizing of the church... 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.

#### **478. Church, Early—Development of Dogma and Sacrament**

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), p. 127. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

In a living and vitalizing religion like Christianity, developments were inevitable and evolution from germinal to riper forms. But that all the developments which have taken place within institutional Christianity were either inevitable or for the best it would be precarious to affirm. No one conversant with Jesus and with the religion of Jesus and forecasting the fortunes of Christianity when cast upon the stream of history could have anticipated the eagerness with which the new religion at an early stage stepped forth on the bypaths of dogmatism and sacramentarianism, or how the rich and suggestive sacramentalism which was of Jesus' own religion should hold dalliance with the ubiquitous contemporary magic and degenerate into a rigid sacramentarianism—dogmatic, exclusive, miraculous. Jesus, in the interests of ethical and personal religion, protested against the monopolies and pretensions of sacerdotalism, but sacerdotalism survived and secured greater prestige in His religion despite His protests and despite His conception of a God whose love needs no mediatorial offices.

#### **479. Church, Early-Development of Organization**

SOURCE: T. Valentine Parker, *American Protestantism: An Appraisal*, pp. 1–4. Copyright 1956 by Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 1] Any careful reader of the New Testament will perceive that the apostolic church was more of a gelatinous substance than a skeletal structure. Organization was inchoate. The church sprang from a kind of spontaneous necessity. The group of believers held something in common that virtually compelled them to meet together. A new religious direction derived from association with Jesus supplied the primary impulse. Their firm belief that Jesus had conquered death supplied the spark to set them in motion. They were Jews and originally had no thought of breaking away completely from temple and synagogue. Indeed they carried over something of the ideas of the temple and the usages of the synagogue into the Christian churches. But this was later. In the beginning they were not at all sure that mundane affairs would not come to a speedy end with some sort of a triumphant reappearance of Jesus. Meantime they met in simple [p. 2] fashion reading the Scriptures as they had been accustomed to do for the Old Testament then as now was considered a book of divine inspiration. They sang. They prayed. They talked. One custom established relatively early was unique. They partook of bread and wine in commemoration of the Last Supper. Apparently this observance was connected with a common meal. That itself would indicate informality. What leadership existed seemed to be supplied by the apostles—the chosen men who had been close to Jesus... The far flung churches consisted first principally of Jews. More and more Gentiles were received. The Apostle Paul was not the pioneer in establishing Gentile churches but his efforts extended the number of such churches and his interpretation of Christianity loosed the cords that bound Christianity to the Jewish faith and it expanded into a universal religion.

Naturally organization was required. It is not surprising that there was not uniformity in development. Canon Streeter maintains that Episcopal, Presbyterian and Independent usages have equal claim to whatever authority attaches to primitiveness. Presbyters and bishops are mentioned in the later books of the New Testament. Obviously no distinctive priestly powers inhered in the offices, but there was the seed from which clericalism eventually sprang. Similarly the simple eucharist developed into formalism...

[p. 3] Not only was spiritual food transformed in the teaching of the church into a literal partaking of the body and blood of Christ, but liturgy grew and simple leaders became clothed with priestly power that separated them from the laity. Bishops were at first local. Gradually there came to exist the three orders of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Probably the germ of what has subsequently become the doctrine of apostolic succession came into being through practical reasons. When an heretical sect like the Gnostics laid claim to doctrines going back to the Apostle Peter, the church could counter with apostolic sanction for the appointment of bishops. It should be observed that such officers made no pretension to powers claimed by later bishops and also that primacy lay not in a particular bishop—of Rome for example—for bishops were local and theoretically equal. But the bishops did eventually become priests, with distinctive authority, and the simple breaking of bread was changed into a sacrament. As the church organization was solidified its boasted catholicity was attained by the process of excluding all who deviated from the official norm. Emerging from the long period of persecution, the church in time became intolerant of dissent.

At the beginning of the fourth century Constantine was [p. 4] enthroned emperor of Rome and granted toleration to the Christian church and then professing Christianity himself lifted it to a privileged position. The effects were obvious. The church gained tremendous prestige. Its growth and prosperity were assured. But inevitably the church became a worldly institution mixed inextricably with the politics of Rome and Christianity was soon the religion of the state.

#### **480. Church, Early, Discord in**

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 21, Vol. 2 (London: Methuen & Co., 1896), p. 390.

The simple narrative of the intestine divisions, which distracted the peace, and dishonoured the triumph, of the church, will confirm the remark of a pagan historian, and justify the complaint of a venerable bishop. The experience of Ammianus had convinced him that the enmity of the Christians towards each other, surpassed the fury of savage beasts against man; and Gregory Nazianzen [late 4th cent.] most pathetically laments that the kingdom of heaven was converted, by discord, into the image of chaos, of a nocturnal tempest, and of hell itself.

#### **481. Church, Early — Influence of Gnosticism**

SOURCE: S. Angus, *The Religious Quests of the Greco-Roman World* (New York: Scribner, 1929), pp. 400, 401. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons and John Murray, Ltd., London.

[p. 400] The Catholic Church was largely the product of the Gnostic controversy. The Church won the victory, but at what a cost! It was a Pyrrhic victory. The Church took the *via media* and entered upon her long career of compromise; the hierarchic organization standardized faith, and forbade the former spontaneity. The Spirit was no longer free for individuals and individual communities—it spoke in classical writings and through ecclesiastical organization. Apostolic tradition was enthroned oftentimes at a considerable violence to history... [p. 401] The Church would no longer allow the wheat

and tares to grow together until harvest; while attempting to remain a missionary Church it turned persecutor and prepared the way for later defections. As the Catholic Church later, in the throes of the Donatist controversy, formulated a mystic-magical view of baptism which recognized the validity of heretical (Donatist) baptism and so facilitated for numerous Donatist the path of return to the Church, so the earlier Catholic Church was quite willing to accept the sacramentarianism and vicarious value of ecclesiastical rites as held by the Gnostics. Gnostic magic became easily acclimatized in Christianity.

#### **482. Church, Early—Persecuted Becomes Persecutor**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 57, 58. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 57] From Constantine on, the Christian record undergoes a fundamental change. Many will contend that it was not a change for the better. “After Constantine,” said the late Dean William R. Inge, of St. Paul’s Cathedral, London (often called “the Gloomy Dean”), “there is not much that is not humiliating.” This is, of course, too sweeping. But certainly life in a church that had vanquished its rivals, that enjoyed so many special privileges and was constantly being given evidences of the imperial favor, a church in which membership was soon by imperial decree to include all loyal subjects, was bound to differ from that in a church where membership was by individual choice and might involve martyrdom. At one swoop Christian congregations throughout the empire were swamped with hordes of candidates clamoring for baptism whose only motive in becoming Christians was to get on board the imperial bandwagon.

Such a church historian as Bevan laments that, after the church “won” its acceptance by Constantine, no perceptible change or improvement followed in Roman customs or courts. (Constantine [p. 58] did, to be sure, put a final end to gladiatorial contests, but these had been losing their attraction for a long time before his rescript was issued.) How could any improvement have been expected? The new Christians were, so far as thinking and habits went, the same old pagans; their desire for baptism was strictly prudential. Their surge into the churches did not mean that Christianity had wiped out paganism. On the contrary, hordes of baptized pagans meant that paganism had diluted the moral energies of organized Christianity to the point of social impotence. St. Jerome and St. Augustine both deplored the corruption of the Christian community by the sudden influx of the unconverted.

Even more distressing, as one looks back, was the alacrity with which the Christian clergy who had suffered under pagan persecution turned to persecuting their opponents. “In the hour of victory,” writes Arnold Toynbee, “the intransigence of the Christian martyrs degenerated into the intolerance of Christian persecutors who had picked up from the martyrs’ defeated pagan opponents the fatal practice of resorting to physical force as a short cut to victory in religious controversy.” \* [Note\*: *A Study of History*, Oxford University Press, 1954, vol. VII, p. 439.] [Used by permission.] By the time a century had passed, St. Augustine had found in the text from Luke 14:23, “Compel them to come in,” a command from Christ himself for the persecution of heretics!

#### **483. Church, Eastern, Apostasy in, and Islamic Conquest (A Moslem’s View)**

SOURCE: Abdullah Yusuf Ali, Appendix 5, in his translation of the Koran (New York: Hafner, 1946), Vol. 1, pp. 412, 413. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

[p. 412] The Christian creed became narrower and narrower, less and less rational, more and more inclined to use earthly weapons to suppress the eternal truth of God. In 415 the Jews were expelled from Alexandria. . . . Meanwhile the native Christian community—the Coptic Church,—which had all along clung to the Monophysite doctrine, a corrupt form of Unitarianism, was out of the pale, and its members were held down as a depressed class by their Orthodox brethren. The latter also, basking in official sunshine, collected [p. 413] power and property into their own hands. As Kingsley remarks in *Hypatia*, the Egyptian Church “ended as a mere chaos of idolatrous sects, persecuting each other for metaphysical propositions, which, true or false, were equally heretical in their mouths because they used them as watchwords for division.” The social conditions produced an amount of discontent, for which the redress came only with the advent of Islam.

It was for this reason that the Copts and the inhabitants of Egypt generally welcomed the forces of Islam under ‘Amr as delivers in 639 A.D. . . . Except a negligible remnant of conservatives the Egyptians as a nation accepted the religion, the language, and the institutions of the Arabs. . . .

It should be remarked, however, that what happened in Egypt happened generally in western Asia. The jarring sectarian irrational religions gave place before the triumphant religion of Unity and Brotherhood, and the Byzantine Empire receded and receded until it was swept out of existence. The feeble efforts made by the Emperor Leo the Isaurian in 726–731 to restrict the use of images were a reflection of the puritanical zeal of Islam. But they did not succeed in the area of his authority, and they completely alienated the Papacy from the Eastern Orthodox Church. . . . When Islam was making its triumphant march in the 8th century after Christ, the original (Greek) Church began to take some steps to put its own house in order. But it had lost its mission, and the new Islamic people took its place.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: This extract represents simply the views of the translator.]

#### **484. Church, Eastern—Byzantine Emperors and Doctrinal Controversies**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 63–65. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 63] From the time of Julian on, especially in the East, the church was to become little more than an appendage of the state, a tool and plaything of emperors. After Theodosius the Roman realm permanently split into two parts, though a theory of sovereignty over the western half held by the emperor in Constantinople was kept alive down to the time, at the very end of the eighth century, when Charlemagne put an end to that fantasy. In the Byzantine, or Eastern, Empire, where the imperial court remained, the inner rot permeated almost everywhere.

Perhaps the Byzantine emperors were not to blame. A few of them seem to have had at least a glimmering of what the Christian gospel was all about, and would have been happy had the churches in their domains, with their clergy, exemplified the spirit as well as the teaching of that gospel. But most of the emperors regarded the [p. 64] ambitious schemes of patriarchs and bishops with the same cynical complacency they showed toward all the other maneuverings for power that swirled around their thrones. They acquiesced in it when they did not encourage it. As a consequence, ecclesiastics grew more and more servile in their attendance on the throne, clerical preferment became increasingly a pawn of palace intrigue. . . .

While the Eastern church was thus suffering internally through the corruption of its clergy by their ceaseless competition for imperial favor, it was likewise passing through a series of convulsions over doctrine. The less its spiritual vigor, the greater its attention to meticulous definitions of spiritual mysteries. Fighting over the precise Greek words to use to define the indefinable became more and more part of the struggle over ecclesiastical preferment. When one patriarch or bishop wanted to get rid of [p. 65] another patriarch or bishop, either to exalt the comparative importance of his own see or to build up his own personal power, the most effective way of going about it was to accuse his rival of heresy in an appeal to the throne.

Although the great Justinian, who reigned in the middle of the sixth century, was a better theologian than most of his clerical subjects, most of the emperors knew little theology but they knew the value of having what might be called a “palace party” in control of the key bishoprics. So they seldom hesitated to intervene by passing on doctrinal issues and banishing recalcitrant bishops.

#### **485. Church, Medieval, Submerged Anti-Catholic Movements in**

SOURCE: C. A. Scott, “Paulicians,” in James Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York: Scribner, 1928), Vol. 9, p. 697. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner’s Sons and that of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

That continuous stream of anti-Catholic and anti-hierarchical thought and life ... runs parallel with the stream of “orthodox” doctrine and organization practically throughout the history of the Church. Often dwindling and almost disappearing in the obscurity of movements which had no significance for history, it swelled from time to time to a volume and importance which compelled the attention even of unsympathetic historians. The initial impulse of such reaction and of successive renewals of its force was probably practical rather than intellectual—an effort after a “purer,” simpler, and more democratic form of Christianity, one which appealed from tradition and the ecclesiastics to Scripture and the Spirit... The notes common to nearly all the forms of this reaction [were] the appeal to Scripture, the criticism of Catholic clergy in their lives, and of Catholic sacraments in the Catholic interpretation of them, and the emphasis on the pneumatic [spiritual] character and functions of all believers.

#### **486. Church and State—America and Its Status at Present**

SOURCE: Paul Blanshard, *God and Man in Washington* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960), pp. 211–213. Copyright 1960 by Paul Blanshard. Used by permission.

[p. 211] On the whole, Congress and the executive have supported the Supreme Court in its championship of religious liberty and religious equality. In spite of Congressional shortcomings, no major law has come out of Washington in this century abridging religious freedom in any way or granting to any single faith any discriminatory advantage. No impediments have been erected by Congress to the free flow of religious influence into political institutions. We can safely assert that the maintenance of religious liberty in the [p. 212] United States is not at the present time a serious problem. It will become a serious problem only if some single church gains enough political and religious power to threaten our beneficent pluralism.

It is quite a different matter with the partial establishment of religion and the resultant violations of the principle of the separation of church and state. This is still a very critical issue, and it is becoming more critical with the growth of church power. The pressure on the government by churches for sectarian privilege is far stronger than any pressure on the churches by government for conformity. It can be truly said that the state is in need of

protection from the church, not the church from the state... [For the politicians,] church support is a constant political temptation... It is profitable to appear to be on God's side—which often means, in practice, on the side of some religious group that is asking for special favors. For powerful religious organizations, the temptation is even more compelling. The public treasury is there: why not partake of it? The public school is there: why not adapt it to promote religion? The majority of the people are professing Christians: why not use state machinery to maintain the Christian brand of Godliness?

The encroachments upon the neutral state during the last fifty years have not been massive or sensational. Each encroachment has been in the nature of a tiny erosion of the wall of separation between church and state, relatively insignificant in itself but meaningful as an indication of a trend. A "Pray for Peace" cancellation stamp on American mail is followed by an "under God" phrase in the pledge of allegiance to the flag and the adoption of "In God We Trust" as the national motto. No one wishes to protest against such sentimental gestures, but each gesture is used as a precedent for a more substantial favor. Hundreds of Protestant communities [p. 213] ... are defying the Supreme Court's ruling that religion must not be taught in public classrooms, and several scores of Catholic communities ... are defying the same Court's ruling against the use of public money for sectarian schools by ironing their nun-directed "captive schools" into the public treasury. Even a Senate committee directed by an outstanding liberal does not dare to expose these violations of the First Amendment for fear of the counter-charge of bigotry or hostility to religion.

The chief danger in the situation is not conscious, creeping secularism or conscious, creeping clericalism, but unconscious, creeping sentimentalism. The underpinning of America's policy of church-state separation is being eroded by goodhearted people with exalted moral motives who are willing to make step-by-step concessions in order to maintain religious peace and good will. Too often, the good will between established faiths is considered more important than the national policy of state neutrality which has made it possible for all sects to live together with comparative good will.

#### **487. Church and State—American Catholic Bishops on First Amendment to the Constitution**

SOURCE: "The Christian in Action," A Statement of the Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States, released Nov. 21, 1948 (Washington: National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1948), [p. 3]. (The text in full was printed in the *New York Times*, Nov. 21, 1948, p. 63.)

To one who knows something of history and law, the meaning of the First Amendment is clear enough from its own words: "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion or forbidding the free exercise thereof." The meaning is even clearer in the records of the Congress that enacted it. Then, and throughout English and Colonial history, an "establishment of religion" meant the setting up by law of an official Church which would receive from the government favors not equally accorded to others in the cooperation between government and religion—which was simply taken for granted in our country at that time and has, in many ways, continued to this day. Under the First Amendment, the Federal Government could not extend this type of preferential treatment to one religion as against another, nor could it compel or forbid any state to do so. If this practical policy be described by the loose metaphor "a wall of separation between Church and State," that term must be understood in a definite and typically American sense. It would be an utter distortion of American history and law to make that practical policy involve the indifference to religion and the

exclusion of cooperation between religion and government implied in the term “separation of Church and State” as it has become the shibboleth of doctrinaire secularism.

Within the past two years secularism has scored unprecedented victories in its opposition to governmental encouragement of religious and moral training, even where no preferential treatment of one religion over another is involved. In two recent cases, the Supreme Court of the United States has adopted an entirely novel and ominously extensive interpretation of the “establishment of religion” clause of the First Amendment [see No. 506; on the founders’ view, see No. 502]. This interpretation would bar any cooperation between government and organized religion which would aid religion, even where no discrimination between religious bodies is in question. This reading of the First Amendment, as a group of non-Catholic religious leaders recently noted, will endanger “forms of cooperation between Church and State which have been taken for granted by the American people,” and “greatly accelerate the trend toward the secularization of our culture.”

#### **488. Church and State, American Catholic View on**

SOURCE: Theodore Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism*, p. 152. Copyright 1941 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

If these provisions [against a Federal establishment of religion (6th article of the Constitution)] have been a charter of freedom for the Catholic Church—as for every other religious body in the country—one thing should be frankly said. The basis decided upon has never been considered by the Catholic Church as being, absolutely considered, the best basis, though American Catholics will not wish any change so long as our society is constituted as it is. According to Catholic doctrine, however, the union of Church and State is still affirmed to be the most perfect solution, in itself. As the statement is likely to be misunderstood, it should be added that this union is thought of only in a society so predominantly Catholic as to be able to be described as Catholic *sans phrase*, one in which government and people are in full accord in the matter of religion. For only where such unity exists is it possible for ecclesiastical and secular authority to act freely, each in its own field, and to coöperate. Elsewhere there is no chance of putting the principle into operation at all. Under prevailing conditions, therefore, the Church is quite content with the guarantee of sufficient freedom to exercise its functions unhampered. Things being as they are, the Church does not contemplate putting her preferred principle into execution. Before that were done a homogeneity, which would seem to have been permanently destroyed, would first have to be regained.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Here is the contrast between the Catholic’s ideal of church-state union and the practical necessity of separation under present conditions, that is, in a “pluralistic” society of many religions. This contrast has been expressed by other Catholic writers under the terms “thesis” and “hypothesis.” By “thesis” they mean their ideal; they use “hypothesis” (less-than-thesis) to refer to the possibility or necessity under existing conditions. For the original “thesis-hypothesis” explanation see Nos. 508–511; for a modern liberal Catholic’s reversed use of the terms, see No. 512.]

#### **489. Church and State, American Catholic Views on**

SOURCE: “Church and State,” *Time*, 76 (Oct. 10, 1960), 27. Copyright 1960 by Time Inc. Used by permission.

The Reverend Gustave Weigel, professor of ecclesiology at Maryland’s Woodstock College, stepped forward not as an official spokesman but as a distinguished Jesuit theologian to express his views...

Father Weigel begins with the premise of two orders, sacral and secular, governed by divine and human law. Each is autonomous in its own sphere. Divine law concerns man's relationship to God, human law his relationship to his fellow beings. The secular order is inferior to but not subject to the sacral. Man lives in both orders simultaneously, and when they conflict, it is commonly agreed that the individual abides by the dictates of his conscience whether he be Protestant, Jew or Catholic. With this basis stated, Father Weigel turns to some implied questions by "the thinking Protestant," bluntly posed and candidly answered: ...

*Would a Catholic statesman be unduly influenced by his confessor?* "The confessor's service would be exclusively private, moral and religious. He has no competence in political matters, which belong not to the order of morality and piety but to the order of law."

*Would the Pope interfere with a Catholic President?* "The Pope does not meddle with the political activity of Adenauer or De Gaulle, nor would either man permit it. The Catholic President's comportment with the clergy of his church would be exactly like the comportment of a Protestant President with the clergy of his church."

*What about lands where the church is established by law?* "It may be that such laws are good for those communities, maybe not. The American Catholic is not concerned. He only knows that the American law of religious freedom for all citizens is excellent law for his land."

*Would a Catholic majority seek to restrict the religious rights of others?* "Officially and really American Catholics do not want now or in the future a law which would make Catholicism the favored religion of this land. They do not want the religious freedom of American non-Catholics to be curtailed in any way. They sincerely want the present First Amendment to be retained and become ever more effective. With a note of desperation, I ask, what more can we say?"

#### **490. Church and State — Cardinal Manning's View of Church-State Cooperation**

SOURCE: Henry Edward [Manning], *Petri Privilegium: Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1871), first pastoral letter, pp. 82, 83.

[p. 82] Since the Council of Trent, the revolutions in France, Austria, and Italy have separated the civil powers from the unity of the Church. The nations remain Catholic as before, but many public laws are at variance with the laws of the Church. The old forms of usage and of arrangement need revision, in order to bring into peaceful co-operation the two supreme authorities on which the welfare of society reposes. If the governments of the world know their own highest interests, they will recognise the necessity of entering into loyal and honourable relations of confidence and co-operation with a power [p. 83] which pervades, sometimes a large proportion, sometimes the whole population, subject to their civil rule. The Church pervades at least one-fourth, if not a third, of the population of Great Britain and its colonies; about a fifth of the United States; nearly a half of the Prussian monarchy; and almost the entire population of other great kingdoms; and the influence of religion is that which most deeply affects the loyalty and fidelity of nations. It is of the highest moment to the civil powers of the world to readjust their relations with the Catholic Church; for so long as the public laws are at variance with its divine rights and liberties, internal peace and fidelity are hardly to be secured.

## **491. Church and State—Catholic Citizen's Duty, Modern Roman**

### **Synod on**

SOURCE: "The Rules for Rome," *Time* (Feb. 8, 1960), pp. 76, 79. Copyright 1960 by Time Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 76] The Roman Catholic diocese of Rome had its first synod in almost 500 years last week, and Pope John XXIII explained the occasion as "a meeting of a bishop with his priests to study the problems of the spiritual life of the faithful, to give or restore vigor to ecclesiastical laws so as to eliminate abuses, to promote Christian life, foster divine worship and religious practices." ...

[p. 79] For the most part the new constitutions [of this synod; applicable to the local diocese of Rome] restate and re-emphasize existing provisions of canon law, apply old disciplines to new situations. Items: ...

The church must maintain its right and duty to advise laymen on how to vote in elections, and those who profess or defend Communistic, materialistic or anti-Christian principles may not be married in a religious ceremony (which means not being married at all in the eyes of the church) or serve as godparents in baptisms and confirmations. Laymen may not attend non-Catholic church services or argue religion in public with non-Catholics.

## **492. Church and State—Catholic Citizen's Duty, Vatican City Editorial**

### **on**

SOURCE: Excerpts from editorial, "*Punti Fermi* ["Firm Points"]," in *L'Osservatore Romano* (Vatican City), May 18, 1960, p. 1.

There is a tendency to separate Catholics from the Church's hierarchy, restricting the relationship between them to the sphere of a simple sacred ministry and proclaiming the full autonomy of the faithful in the civic sphere.

Thus, an absurd distinction is made between a man's conscience as a Catholic and his conscience as a citizen, as though the Catholic religion were a special and occasional phase of the life of the spirit and not the driving idea that binds and guides the whole of man's existence...

The Church, constituted with its hierarchy by Jesus Christ as a perfect society, has full powers of real jurisdiction over all the faithful and thus has the right and the duty to guide, direct and correct them on the plane of ideas and of action in conformity with the dictates of the Gospel in what is necessary to attain the supreme end of man, which is eternal life...

A Catholic can never depart from the teachings and directives of the Church. In every sector of his activity, his conduct, both private and public, must be motivated by the laws, orientation and instructions of the hierarchy.

The political-social problem cannot be separated from religion because it is a highly human problem and as such has as its basis an urgent ethical-religious need that cannot be abolished. And, by the same token, conscience and the sense of duty, which have a large role in such a problem, likewise cannot be abolished.

Consequently, the Church cannot remain indifferent, particularly when politics touch the altar, as Pope Pius XI said. The Church has the right and the duty to enter also this field to enlighten and aid consciences to make the best choice according to moral principles and those of Christian sociology.

Outside of these principles and of the dutiful discipline of the laity toward the hierarchy, anyone can see what a vast field of special responsibilities, courageous initiatives and fruitful activity is open to the civic activity of Catholic lay people so that they may offer their contribution of opinions and discussions, experiences and accomplishments, to promote the progress of their country.

The problem of collaboration with those who do not recognize religious principles might arise in the political field. It is then up to the ecclesiastical authorities, and not to the arbitrary decisions of individual Catholics, to judge the moral licitness of such collaboration...

It is highly deplorable ... that some persons, though professing to be Catholics, not only dare to conduct their political and social activities in a way which is at variance with the teachings of the Church, but also take upon themselves the right to submit its norms and precepts to their own judgment, interpretation and evaluation with obvious superficiality and temerity.

#### **493. Church and State—Catholic Citizens in America**

SOURCE: James Hastings Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951), p. 99. Copyright 1951 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

Catholics in free societies [as in America] have frequently tried to reserve for their independent judgment the area of “politics” as distinct from “morals.” But only the Roman court can decide where the line falls, so that in practice the Roman court has the right to demand obedience of any Catholic on any political issue. As Cardinal Manning said, “Politics is a branch of morals,” meanings, “Morals is a branch of Church politics.” A democratic society on the most fundamental level is a society where policy is determined by free discussion of moral and political issues. It is incompatible with a society where such issues are determined by decree.

#### **494. Church and State, Catholic Principle of**

SOURCE: James Hastings Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951), p. 266. Copyright 1951 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

The textbook on public ecclesiastical law used at the Pontifical University in Rome, where the elite of the American clergy are trained, makes the duty of Catholics in the United States very clear: “Catholics must make all possible efforts to bring about the rejection of this religious indifference of the State and the instauration, as soon as possible, of the wished-for union and concord of State and Church... Whether tolerance of non-Catholic religions is promised under oath by a statutory law or not, it can never be admitted.”<sup>23</sup> [Note 23: Cited, La Piana, *Shane Quarterly*, April, 1949, pp. 92f.]

#### **495. Church and State, Modern Catholic Views on, in Conflict**

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, “The Issues Which Divide Us,” in *American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View*, ed. by Philip Scharper, pp. 82–86. © Sheed and Ward, Inc., New York, 1959. Used by permission.

[p. 82] *Who really speaks for Catholicism* on such crucial issues as toleration, minority rights, and the relationship of church and state?

To get the issues quite clearly before us, here is a statement from the official publication of the Society of Jesus in Rome, *La Civilita [sic] Cattolica*. It presents a Catholic interpretation of the meaning of religious freedom. The statement was published ten years ago. I have since seen it reproduced in at least half a dozen Protestant books and twice as many Protestant articles, all of which subjoin appropriately Protestant comments:

The Roman Catholic Church, convinced, through its divine prerogatives, of being the only true church, must demand the right to freedom for herself alone, because such a right can only be possessed by truth, never by error. As to other religions, the church will certainly never draw the sword, but she will require that by legitimate means they shall not be allowed to propagate false doctrine. Consequently, in a state where the majority of the people are Catholic, the church will require that legal existence be denied to error, and that if religious minorities actually exist, they shall have only a *de facto* existence, without opportunity to spread their beliefs. If, however, actual circumstances, either due to government hostility or the strength of the dissenting groups, makes the complete application of this principle impossible, then the [Catholic] church will require for herself all possible concessions, limiting herself to accept, as a minor evil, the *de jure* toleration of other forms of worship. In some countries, Catholics will be obliged to ask full religious freedom for all, resigned at being forced to cohabit where they alone should rightfully be allowed to live. But in doing this the [p. 83] church does not renounce her thesis, which remains the most imperative of her laws, but merely adapts herself to *de facto* conditions, which must be taken into account in practical affairs. Hence arises the great scandal among Protestants, who tax the Catholics with refusing to others freedom and even *de jure* toleration, in all places where they are in the majority, while they lay claim to it as a right when they are in a minority. We ask Protestants to understand that the Catholic Church would betray her trust if she were to proclaim, theoretically and practically, that error can have the same rights as truth, especially where the supreme duties and interest of man are at stake. The church cannot blush for her own want of tolerance, as she asserts it in principle and applies it in practice.

Five years later the same kind of position was upheld by Cardinal Ottaviani, and the Vatican found nothing in his comments to which to take exception. To the average Protestant, this all means in effect that the Catholic Church advocates religious freedom when it is in the minority, but practices religious discrimination when it is in the overwhelming majority.

If it should be urged that these statements are simply Italian ones, and that (a) American Catholics do not think this way, and (b) that the American Constitution guarantees freedom of religion, the Protestant is ready with the famous American “Ryan and Boland” quotation, which is a kind of tired staple for discussion of this sort, but none the less relevant to Protestant concerns. It goes in part:

Suppose that the constitutional obstacle to proscription of non-Catholics has been legitimately removed and they themselves have become numerically insignificant: what then would be the proper course of action for a Catholic State? Apparently, the latter State could logically tolerate only such religious activities as were confined to the members of the [p. 84] dissenting group. It could not permit them to carry on general propaganda nor accord their organization certain privileges that had formerly been extended to all religious corporations, for example, exemption from taxation. While all this is very true in logic and in theory, the event of its practical realization in any State or country is so remote in time and in probability that no practical man will let it disturb his equanimity or affect his attitude towards those who differ from him in religious faith.<sup>28</sup> [Note 28: John A. Ryan and Francis J. Boland, *Catholic Principles of Politics* (Macmillan), p. 320.] [Used by permission.]

This, I must insist, is the image of Catholicism which the average non-Catholic has. And it is far from a comfortable image to behold.

However, the whole point of the present discussion is that this is not the only thing that Catholicism says on the matter. There is another point of view, which not only expresses dissatisfaction with the “traditional” position outlined above, but tries in scholarly fashion to voice an alternative position which is not simply heterodox or “expedient.” Its leading exponent in this country is Fr. John Courtney Murray, S.J., and it has received popular articulation in such Catholic journals as *The Commonweal*. It takes into consideration that what was proper for a feudal agrarian state, totally Catholic, may not be proper position for a modern democratic state. The presupposition from which this new position would flow is expressed in the words of Leo XIII:

It is the special property of human institutions and laws, that there is nothing in them so holy and salutary but that custom may alter it, or time overthrow it, or social habits bring it to naught. So in the Church of God, in which changeableness of discipline is joined with absolute immutability of doctrine, it happens not rarely that things which were once [p. 85] apposite and suitable become in the course of time out of date, or useless, or even harmful.<sup>29</sup> [Note 29: Cited in *The Commonweal*, August 7, 1953.]

Thus Fr. Murray could say of the “traditional” view, that “It is still entirely possible and legitimate for Catholics to doubt or dispute whether Cardinal Ottaviani’s discourse represents the full, adequate and balanced doctrine of the church.”<sup>30</sup> [Note 30: Cited in *Time*, August 3, 1953, p. 41.]

It is not within the scope of this chapter to outline Fr. Murray’s alternative position on the relationship of church and state. It would be most instructive, however, not only to Protestants, but also to many Catholics, one suspects, to have a full statement of the position readily available. In order, however, to give readers a basis for comparison, a brief summary of the position, as stated by Professor John C. Bennett, is here appended:

The idea of a Confessional Catholic state belongs to an earlier period in European history and it has become an irrelevancy under contemporary conditions.

Anglo-Saxon democracy is fundamentally different from the democracy of the French Revolution which was totalitarian in tendency.

The state in this country is by its very nature limited and in principle the Church does not need to defend itself against such a state as was necessary in the case of Nineteenth Century European revolutionary states which formed the immediate background of Leo XIII’s political thinking.

There is no anti-clerical or anti-religious motivation behind the American constitutional provision for Church-State relations, and the Church need not defend itself against this doctrine as such.

The Church in America has as a matter of fact enjoyed greater freedom and scope for its witness and activities than it has in the Catholic states of the traditional type.

[p. 86] It is important to emphasize the rights of the state in its own sphere, the freedom of the Church from state control, and the influence of Catholic citizens on the state.

It is impossible to separate religious freedom from civil freedom and there can be no democracy if the freedom of the citizen is curtailed in religious matters, for such curtailment can often take place as a means of silencing political dissent.

Error does not have the same rights as truth, but persons in error, consciences in error, do have rights which should be respected by the Church and the State.

The Church should not demand that the state as the secular arm enforce the Church’s own decisions in regard to heresy.

It does more harm than good to the Church for the state to use its power against non-Catholics.<sup>31</sup> [Note 31: John C. Bennett, *Christians and the State* (New York: Scribner, 1959), pp. 265, 266. This book is the sanest treatment of the issue now available.] [Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner’s Sons. © 1958 John C. Bennett.]

In similar vein, *The Commonweal*, commenting on a concordat between the Holy See and the government of Spain, says:

If coöperation between Church and State in the U.S. is to be effective, it must be along American lines and unquestionably in terms other than those acceptable in Spain... The Spanish pattern may suit Spain; it would be hopelessly discordant in our American climate and destructive of political liberty as we understand it. We have our own tradition; we are proud of that tradition; and in its favor we point to the health of the Church in the U.S., which speaks eloquently for its claims.<sup>32</sup> [Note 32: *The Commonweal*, September 18, 1953. Cf. also *ibid.*, January 14, 1955: “For our part we do not like the identification of canon and civil law in Spain any better than most other Americans. We would not want to see such a system in force in America.” And again, concerning the confiscation of Protestant Bibles in Spain, “We regret this and similar actions of the Franco regime which have been directed against the Protestant minority in Spain...” (*ibid.*, June 14, 1956).]

Now all this, as even the Catholic reader will see, is something else again.

## **496. Church and State, Pope Leo XIII on, Various Statements Concerning Different Aspects of**

SOURCE: *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (3d ed.; New York: Benziger, 1903), pages as indicated.

*a. On Government by Consent of the People*

From *The Christian Constitution of States*:

[p. 120] Sad it is to call to mind how the harmful and lamentable rage for innovation which rose to a climax in the sixteenth century ... spread amongst all classes of society. From this source, as from a fountainhead, burst forth all those later tenets of unbridled license which, in the midst of the terrible upheavals of the last century, were wildly conceived and boldly proclaimed as the principles and foundation of that *new jurisprudence* which was not merely previously unknown, but was at variance on many points with not only the Christian, but even with the natural law.

Amongst these principles the main one lays down that as all men are alike by race and nature, so in like manner all are equal in the control of their life; that each one is so far his own master as to be in no sense under the rule of any other individual; that each is free to think on every subject just as he may choose, and to do whatever he may like to do; that no man has any right to rule over other men. In a society grounded upon such maxims, all government is nothing more nor less than the will of the people, and the people, being under the power of itself alone, is alone its own ruler. It does choose nevertheless some to whose charge it may commit itself, but in such wise that it makes over to them not the right so much as the business of governing, to be exercised, however, in its name...

Thus, as is evident, a State becomes nothing but a multitude, which is its own master and ruler... [p. 121] Moreover, it believes that it is not obliged to make public profession of any religion; or to inquire which of the very many religions is the only one true; or to prefer one religion to all the rest; or to show to any form of religion special favor; but, on the contrary, is bound to grant equal rights to every creed, so that public order may not be disturbed by any particular form of religious belief.

And it is a part of this theory that all questions that concern religion are to be referred to private judgment; that every one is to be free to follow whatever religion he prefers, or none at all if he disapprove of all. From this the following consequences logically flow: that the judgment of each one's conscience is independent of all law; that the most unrestrained opinions may be openly expressed as to the practice or omission of divine worship; and that every one has unbounded license to think whatever he chooses and to publish abroad whatever he thinks.

Now when the State rests on foundations like those just named ... it readily appears into what and how unrightful a position the Church is driven. For when the management of public business is in harmony with doctrines of such a kind, the Catholic religion is allowed a standing in civil society equal only, or inferior, to societies alien from it.

*b. On Separation of Church and State*

From *Human Liberty*:

[p. 150] Since, then, the profession of one religion is necessary in the State, that religion must be professed which alone is true, and which can be recognized without difficulty, especially in Catholic [p. 151] States, because the marks of truth are, as it were, engraven upon it. This religion, therefore, the rulers of the State must preserve and protect, if they would provide—as they should do—with prudence and usefulness for the good of the community.

From *On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens*:

[p. 198] The Church cannot give countenance or favor to those ... who make it their aim and purpose to tear asunder the alliance that should, by the very nature of things, connect the interests of religion with those of the State. On the contrary, she is ... the upholder of those who are themselves imbued with the right way of thinking as to the relations between Church and State... These precepts contain the abiding principle by which every Catholic should shape his conduct in regard to public life.

From *The Christian Constitution of States*, quoting Pope Gregory XVI:

[p. 125] “Nor can We hope for happier results either for religion or for the civil government from the wishes of those who desire that the Church be separated from the State, and the concord between the secular and ecclesiastical authority be dissolved. It is clear that these men, who yearn for a shameless liberty, live in dread of an agreement which has always been fraught with good, and advantageous alike to sacred and civil interests.”

From *Human Liberty*:

[p. 148] Hence follows the fatal theory of the need of separation between Church and State. But the absurdity of such a position is manifest.

[p. 159] From this teaching, as from its source and principle, flows that fatal principle of the separation of Church and State.

#### *c. On Freedom of Religion*

From *Human Liberty*:

[p. 149] Let us examine that liberty in individuals which is so opposed to the virtue of religion, namely the *liberty of worship*, as it is called. This is based on the principle that every man is free to profess as he may choose any religion or none ....

[p. 150] A liberty such as We have described ... is no liberty, but its degradation, and the abject submission of the soul to sin...

Justice therefore forbids, and reason itself forbids, the State to be godless; or to adopt a line of action which would end in godlessness—namely, to treat the various religions (as they call them) alike, and to bestow on them promiscuously equal rights and privileges.

From *The Christian Constitution of States*:

[p. 110] Since, then, no one is allowed to be remiss in the service due to God, and since the chief duty of all men is to cling to religion in both its teaching [p. 111] and practice—not such religion as they may have a preference for, but the religion which God enjoins, and which certain and most clear marks show to be the only one true religion—it is a public crime to act as though there were no God. So, too, is it a sin in the State not to have care for religion, as a something beyond its scope, or as of no practical benefit; or out of many forms of religion to adopt that one which chimes in with the fancy; for we are bound absolutely to worship God in that way which He has shown to be His will...

[p. 112] It is evident that the only true religion is the one established by Jesus Christ Himself, and which He committed to His Church to protect and to propagate [in other words, the Roman Catholic religion].

[p. 126] From these pronouncements of the Popes it is evident that the origin of public power is to be sought for in God Himself and not in the multitude... It is not lawful for the State, any more than for the individual, either to disregard all religious duties or to hold in equal favor different kinds of religion.

[p. 125] Gregory XVI ... inveighed with weighty words against the sophisms, ... namely, that no preference should be shown for any particular form of worship; that it is right for individuals to form their own personal judgments about religion; that each man's conscience is his sole and all-sufficing guide.

From *Human Liberty*:

[p. 155] Another liberty is widely advocated, namely *liberty of conscience*. If by this is meant that every one may, as he chooses, worship God or not, it is sufficiently refuted by the arguments already adduced.

*d. On Freedom of Speech*

From *Human Liberty*:

[p. 151] We must now consider briefly *liberty of speech*, and liberty of the Press. It is hardly necessary to say that there can be no such right as this, if it be not used in moderation... Right is a moral power which ... it [p. 152] is absurd to suppose that nature has accorded indifferently to truth and falsehood, to justice and injustice.

[p. 161] And where such liberties are in use, men ... should estimate them as the Church does.

From *The Christian Constitution of States*:

[p. 126] The unrestrained freedom of thinking and of openly making known one's thoughts is not inherent in the rights of citizens, and is by no means to be reckoned worthy of favor and support.

*e. On Freedom of the Press*

From *Human Liberty*:

[p. 161] From what has been said, it follows that it is quite unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of worship, as if these were so many rights given by nature to man.

From *On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens*:

[p. 183] We are bound, then, to love dearly the country whence we have received the means of enjoyment this mortal life affords, but we have a much more urgent obligation to love, with ardent love, the Church to which we owe the life of the soul, a life that will endure for ever.

*f. On the Duties of Citizens*

From *On the Chief Duties of Christians as Citizens*:

[p. 193] But the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff. Union of minds, therefore, requires ... complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself...

[Quoting St. Thomas Aquinas:] "Now it is evident that he who clings to the doctrines of the Church as to an infallible rule yields his assent to everything the Church teaches..."

[p. 194] In defining the limits of the obedience owed ... to the authority of the Roman Pontiff, it must not be supposed that it is only to be yielded in relation to dogmas... Nay, further, it is not enough ... to assent to doctrines... But this likewise must be reckoned amongst the duties of Christians, that they allow themselves to be ruled and directed by the authority and leadership of bishops, and above all of the Apostolic See.

[p. 197] In the public order itself of States ... it is always urgent, and indeed the main preoccupation, to take thought how best to consult the interests of Catholicism.

From *The Christian Constitution of States*:

[p. 132] It is the duty of all Catholics ... to endeavor to bring back all civil society to the pattern and form of Christianity which We have described... [p. 133] The defence of Catholicism, indeed, necessarily demands that in the profession of doctrines taught by the Church all shall be of one mind and all steadfast in believing...

Further, it is unlawful to follow one line of conduct in private and another in public, respecting privately the authority of the Church, but publicly rejecting it.

*g. On the Duties of American Catholics*

From *True and False Americanism in Religion*:

[p. 442] The principles on which the new opinions We have mentioned are based may be reduced to this: that ... the Church ought to adapt herself somewhat to our advanced civilization, and relaxing her ancient rigor, show some indulgence to modern popular theories and methods...

[p. 444] In the matter of which we are now speaking, Beloved Son, the project involves a greater danger and is more hostile to Catholic doctrine and discipline, inasmuch as the followers of these novelties judge that a certain liberty ought to be introduced into the Church, so that, limiting the exercise vigilance of its powers, each one of the faithful may act more freely in pursuance of his own natural bent and capacity. They affirm, namely, that this is called for in order to imitate that liberty which, though quite recently introduced, is now the law and the foundation of almost every civil community... [p. 445] For they say, in speaking of the infallible teaching of the Roman Pontiff, that after the solemn decision formulated in the Vatican Council, there is no more need of solicitude in that regard, and, because of its being now out of dispute, a wider field of thought and action is thrown open to individuals. A preposterous method of arguing, surely. For if anything is suggested by the infallible teaching of the Church, it is certainly that no one should wish to withdraw from it; nay, that all should strive to be thoroughly imbued with and be guided by its spirit, so as to be the more easily preserved from any private error whatsoever.

From *Human Liberty*:

[p. 162] It is not of itself wrong to prefer a democratic form of government, if only the Catholic doctrine be maintained as to the origin and exercise of power.

From *Catholicity in the United States*:

[p. 323] For the Church amongst you, unopposed by the Constitution and government of your nation, ... is free to live and act without hindrance. Yet, though all this is true, it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church... [p. 324] She would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.

From *Human Liberty*:

[p. 158] And although in the extraordinary condition of these times the Church usually acquiesces in certain modern liberties, not because she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient to permit them, she would in happier times exercise her own liberty.

#### **497. Church and State—Pope's Authority Asserted**

SOURCE: William E. Gladstone, *The Vatican Decrees in Their Bearing on Civil Allegiance* (bound with two of his other tracts as *Rome and the Newest Fashions in Religion*. New York: Harper, 1875), pp. 30, 31.

[p. 30] Absolute obedience, it is boldly declared, is due to the Pope, at the peril of salvation, not alone in faith, in morals, but in all things which concern the discipline and

government of the Church. Thus are swept into the Papal net whole multitudes of facts, whole systems of government, prevailing, though in different degrees, in every country of the world. Even in the United States, where the severance between Church and State is supposed to be complete, a long catalogue might be drawn of subjects belonging to the domain and competency of the State, but also undeniably affecting the government of the Church; such as, by way of example, marriage, burial, education, prison discipline, blasphemy, poor-relief, incorporation, mortmain, religious endowments, vows of celibacy, and obedience. In Europe the circle is far wider, the points of contact and of interlacing [being] almost innumerable. But on all matters respecting which any Pope may think proper to declare that they concern either faith or morals, or the government or discipline of the Church, he claims, with the approval of a Council un- [p. 31] doubtedly Oecumenical in the Roman sense, the absolute obedience, at the peril of salvation, of every member of his communion.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Gladstone refers to chap. 3 of the same decree of the Vatican Council that declared the pope infallible (see No. 865).]

#### **498. Church and State.—Prediction of Great Issues Ahead**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson, *The New Leviathan* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Company, 1946), p. 19. Copyright 1946 by Paul Hutchinson. Used by permission of Harper & Brothers, New York.

There is reason to believe, accordingly, that the old issue of church and state, or of church against state, will soon be upon us in a fury unknown for a thousand years. Are we ready to face that storm? Do we comprehend from how many quarters it is likely to blow?

#### **499. Church and State, Separation of, as Seen by an Englishman**

SOURCE: James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (3d ed., rev.; New York: Macmillan, 1895), Vol. 2, p. 695.

In examining the National government and the State governments we have never once had occasion to advert to any ecclesiastical body or question, because with such matters government has in the United States absolutely nothing to do. Of all the differences between the Old World and the New this is perhaps the most salient. Half the wars of Europe, half the internal troubles that have vexed European states, ... have arisen from theological differences or from the rival claims of church and state. This whole vast chapter of debate and strife has remained virtually unopened in the United States. There is no Established Church. All religious bodies are absolutely equal before the law, and unrecognized by the law, except as voluntary associations of private citizens.

4

#### **500. Church and State, Separation of, Dangers Threatening**

SOURCE: J. J. Taylor, *The Sabbatic Question*, pp. 62, 63. Copyright 1914 by Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 62] Through agony and blood this country at least has learned the doctrine of separation between church and state. In the fundamental law of the land it has disclaimed all right to regulate religion, and has distinctly forbidden legislation designed to establish or maintain any form of worship.

---

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

Feeling the restraint of these constitutional provisions certain citizens have assumed for themselves an extra amount of piety and patriotism, and have banded themselves together in such organizations as the National Reform Association, or the American Sabbath Union, for the [p. 63] avowed purpose of securing “such an amendment to the constitution of the United States as shall suitably express our national acknowledgment of Almighty God as the source of all authority in civil government, of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Ruler of nations, and of his revealed will as of supreme authority.”

Plainly stated the purpose of these intolerant people is to remove the constitutional provisions that guarantee religious liberty, re-instate the cast-off principles that wrought the inquisition, and turn the country over to fanatics and fakirs.

### **501. Church and State, Separation of, in America Benefits Christianity**

SOURCE: James Bryce, *The American Commonwealth* (3d ed., rev.; New York: Macmillan, 1895), Vol. 2, pp. 702, 710, 711.

[p. 702] The legal position of a Christian church is in the United States simply that of a voluntary association or group of associations corporate or unincorporate, under the ordinary law...

[p. 710] The influence of Christianity seems to be, if we [p. 711] look not merely to the numbers but also to the intelligence of the persons influenced, greater and more widespread in the United States than in any part of western Continental Europe, and I think greater than in England.

### **502. Church and State, Separation of—Intention of Founding Fathers**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison. *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 231, 232. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 231] The concept of civil and political liberty, which was also an import from England, had so far developed in the American climate that the separation of church and state was inevitable and imminent.

Virginia led the way. Its Declaration of Rights—adopted two weeks before the signing of the Declaration of Independence—asserted that “all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience.” Ten years later—and just a year before the writing of the Federal Constitution—the Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, drafted by Jefferson, declared that the state has no right to tax a citizen for the support of any religion, even his own, and that civil rights and eligibility to public office “have no dependence on religious opinions.” This meant absolute disestablishment. The act was all the more emphatic because before enacting it the Virginia lawmakers had defeated a compromise proposal to set up a sort of establishment of Christianity in general and levy church taxes that would be prorated among all the churches. The widely publicized [p. 232] debate on this latter proposition should dispose of the argument—sometimes heard in our own times—that the framers and supporters of the First Amendment could not have thought of prohibiting tax support for the churches if only it were fairly distributed among them.

The Articles of Confederation (1777), which created “The United States of America,” had declared that the thirteen states enter into a firm league “for their common defense ... against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretence whatever.” The inclusion of religion, and at the head of the list of the possible grounds of attacks that are to be resisted, is not without significance. In view of the religious diversity of the Americans and the steps already taken and about to be taken to guarantee complete religious liberty, it is obvious

that what they were banding together to defend was not some one preferred church but the vital principle of freedom in religion.

### **503. Church and State, Separation of—Religion Outside the Province of Government**

SOURCE: Justice John Welch in *Board of Education of Cincinnati v. Minor et al* (1872–73), 23 Ohio State Reports 253.

Government is an organization for particular purposes. It is not almighty, and we are not to look to it for everything. The great bulk of human affairs and human interests is left by any free government to individual enterprise and individual action. Religion is eminently one of those interests, lying outside the true and legitimate province of government.

### **504. Church and State, Separation of—U.S. Constitution, First Amendment**

SOURCE: First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, in *United States Code*, 1958 ed., p. XLVI.

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

### **505. Church and State, Separation of—U.S. First Amendment Dictated by Regard for Religion**

SOURCE: Joseph Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States*, bk. 3, chap. 44 (Boston: Hilliard, Gray, and Company, 1833), p. 702, sec. 992.

It was under a solemn consciousness of the dangers from ecclesiastical ambition, the bigotry of spiritual pride, and the intolerance of sects, thus exemplified in our domestic, as well as in foreign annals, that it was deemed advisable to exclude from the national government all power to act upon the subject.

### **506. Church and State, Separation of—U.S. Supreme Court’s View of First Amendment**

SOURCE: U.S. Supreme Court Opinions in *U.S. Reports*, as indicated.

From *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (Feb. 10, 1947)

[p. 15] The “establishment of religion” clause of the First Amendment means at least this: Neither a state nor 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 entertain- [p. 16] ing 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 organizations 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.”

From Concurring opinion of Justice Felix Frankfurter in *McCullum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203 (March, 1948).

[p. 231] Separation means separation, not something less. Jefferson's metaphor in describing the relation between Church and State speaks of a "wall of separation," not of a fine line easily overstepped... "The great American principle of eternal separation"—Elihu Root's phrase bears repetition—is one of the vital reliances of our Constitutional system for assuring unities among our people stronger than our diversities. It is the Court's duty to enforce this principle in its full integrity.

**507. Church and State—Syllabus of Errors (Some of the Propositions Pronounced Erroneous by Pope Pius IX)**

SOURCE: Pope Pius IX, Syllabus of Errors, *trans.* in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, pp. 191, 193–199, 202, 208, 209. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 191] 15. Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, guided by the light of reason, he shall consider true...

17. Good hope at least is to be entertained of the eternal salvation of all those who are not at all in the true Church of Christ...

18. Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion, in which form it is given to please God equally as in the Catholic Church...

[p. 193] 21. The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion...

23. Roman pontiffs and oecumenical councils have wandered outside the limits of their powers, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even erred in defining matters of faith and morals...

[p. 194] 24. The Church has not the power of using force, nor has she any temporal power, direct or indirect...

27. The sacred ministers of the Church and the Roman pontiff are to be absolutely excluded from every charge and dominion over temporal affairs...

[p. 195] 30. The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons derived its origin from civil law...

31. The ecclesiastical forum or tribunal for the temporal causes, whether civil or criminal, of clerics, ought by all means to be abolished, even without consulting and against the protest of the Holy See...

[p. 196] 37. National churches, withdrawn from the authority of the Roman pontiff and altogether separated, can be established...

38. The Roman pontiffs have, by their too arbitrary conduct, contributed to the division of the Church into Eastern and Western...

[p. 197] 39. The State, as being the origin and source of all rights, is endowed with a certain right not circumscribed by any limits...

40. The teaching of the Catholic Church is hostile to the well-being and interests of society...

[p. 198] 45. The entire government of public schools in which the youth of a Christian state is educated, except (to a certain extent) in the case of episcopal seminaries, may and ought to appertain to the civil power, and belong to it so far that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognized as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the schools, the arrangement of the studies, the conferring of degrees, in the choice or approval of the teachers...

47. The best theory of civil society requires that popular schools open to children of every class of the people, and, generally, all public institutes intended for instruction in

letters and philosophical sciences and for carrying on the education of youth, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, control and interference, and should be fully subjected to the civil and political power at the pleasure of the rulers, and according to the standard of the prevalent opinions of the age...

[p. 202] 55. The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church...

[p. 208] 77. In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship...

78. Hence it has been wisely decided by law, in some Catholic countries, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own peculiar worship...

79. Moreover, it is false that the civil liberty of every form of worship, and the full power, given to all, of overtly and publicly manifesting any opinions whatsoever and [p. 209] thoughts, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to propagate the pest of indifferentism...

80. The Roman Pontiff can, and ought to, reconcile himself, and come to terms with progress, liberalism and modern civilization.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The encyclical *Quanta Cura*, published by Pope Pius IX, Dec. 8, 1864, was accompanied by a syllabus containing a summary in eighty propositions of various doctrines condemned by that pontiff. In reading this document it should be remembered that every proposition is from the Catholic viewpoint an error. Some hold that it is therefore legitimate to conclude in a general way that the Roman Catholic Church teaches the exact opposite of the errors condemned in these propositions. However, other writers point out that a reversed statement may imply more than what accords with facts. The "thesis and hypothesis" explanation [No. 508] has had more than one interpretation. Different Roman Catholic writers of considerable standing take varying views upon the authority of this Syllabus of Errors, as to whether it is an *ex cathedra* statement and therefore infallible. It is generally acknowledged to be of great authority, and ultramontane partisans doubtless regard it as infallible.]

### **508. Church and State—“Thesis” and “Hypothesis” as Explanation of Pope Pius IX’s Syllabus of Errors**

SOURCE: E. E. Y. Hales, *The Catholic Church in the Modern World* (Garden City, N.Y.: Hanover House, 1958), pp. 124–126, 130, 131. Copyright © 1958 by Doubleday & Company, Inc., New York. Reprinted by permission.

[p. 124] Though the issues involved are still a matter for argument, upon which Catholic historians are not entirely agreed, it would seem that, tactically speaking, the issue of the Syllabus was a move whose wisdom may well be doubted...

[p. 125] The cumulative effect of reading the whole Syllabus is naturally very harsh, and to the layman often provoking. The most recent and scholarly historian of the pontificate of Pius IX, Roger Aubert of Louvain, has described its effect by saying that “the majority of Catholics were stupefied.” Even many of the bishops, especially in France and in Germany, were somewhat at a loss to know how to interpret it... [p. 126] It was the great Bishop of Orleans, Dupanloup, who saved the situation by promptly publishing a pamphlet in which he explained the denunciations of the Syllabus in terms of what was called the “thesis” and the “hypothesis.” What was denounced, he explained, was the thesis, the general proposition, the notion, for instance, that the *ultimate and universal ideal* was a society with rival religious beliefs, and in which many children were brought up in ignorance of the Faith or in hostility to it. It was impossible that the

Church should hold such a state of things to be an *ideal* for society. But to assert, as a consequence of this thesis, the hypothesis that in the present state of society it was necessarily wrong to have a very wide measure of freedom of speech or of the press, or even (it might be) to disestablish the Catholic Church, was quite incorrect. There was no intention of trying to interfere with such liberties, for example, as Napoleon III chose to permit in France, or to criticise those much fuller liberties which pertained in England or in America. Conversely, however, because America had no Established Church, and a secular education only, and enjoyed the “benefits” of divorce laws, it was not correct to say that such things should be introduced universally—for example in the Papal States.

Such was Dupanloup’s reasoning on the Syllabus and, though it was accepted a little grudgingly at Rome, it earned for the Bishop of Orleans more than six hundred letters of congratulation from bishops all over the world, who now knew where they stood. Some there were who regarded the distinction between thesis and hypothesis as specious (it was an invention of the *Civiltà Cattolica*). But if the wits of Paris enjoyed saying: “The thesis is when the Church condemns the Jews; the hypothesis is when the papal nuncio dines with the Baron de Rothschild,” the argument was none the less perfectly valid, and it remains applicable to a wide range of matters where the Church is concerned with order and discipline, rather than with faith...

[p. 130] The Syllabus of Errors was not an infallible papal pronouncement; since it was a summarised classified index to previous pronouncements it [p. 131] could not be. If the infallibility lay anywhere it lay with the documents to which the Syllabus made reference; but since these, for the most part, were concerned with particular people, books, and occasions, it was not likely that they either, would fulfil the conditions of an infallible pronouncement, namely that it must be made by the Pope “when exercising the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians.”

### **509. Church and State—“Thesis” and “Hypothesis” in Catholic Political Doctrine**

SOURCE: J. B. Bury, *History of the Papacy in the 19th Century (1864–1878)*, ed. by R. H. Murray (London: Macmillan, 1930), pp. 42, 43. Used by permission.

[p. 42] How is it that two such different interpretations [of Pope Pius IX’s *Syllabus of Errors*] as that of the Liberal Catholic Dupanloup and the ultramontane Schrader could be alike accepted by the Vatican? How is it that ultramontanes themselves, when they choose, can explain away what seems the plain and obvious meaning of the *Syllabus*, and accept principles to which it seems to be opposed? The answer lies in the distinction between *thesis* and *hypothesis*. The *Syllabus* is concerned with *thesis*, the laying down of principles, which are of absolute validity, and would prevail in an ideal society when the Church possessed the power of enforcing its authority, as it did to such a vast extent in the Middle Ages. But in modern times the Church in [p. 43] practice has to deal with *hypothesis*, *i.e.* it has to determine its actions to meet certain given conditions which it cannot control; it has to compromise and conciliate its theoretical principles, up to a certain point, with actual circumstances. This it has had to do in the interests of self-preservation; the Concordat of 1801 [with Napoleon] began the policy. But notwithstanding this unwilling and necessary condescension, the Papacy never abandoned the theoretical principles which are the logical consequence of its claim to independent sovran authority, superior to the civil authority; they remain in the background as the ideal, like a utopia, which the Church would realize if it could. On the

other hand, the Pope had no illusions that there was any chance of realizing them at present. Thus the ultramontane interpretation of the *Syllabus* as thesis was perfectly correct; on the other hand, the softer interpretation of the French Liberal Catholic was, though not literally sound, yet in spirit at least *just*, in so far as it went to show that there was no practical danger that the Papacy would not continue to compromise and find, however reluctantly, a *modus vivendi* with modern political institutions.

### **510. Church and State—“Thesis” and “Hypothesis,” Pope Leo XIII on**

SOURCE: James Hastings Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951), pp. 141, 142. Copyright 1951 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 141] On these issues Leo [XIII] set forth thesis and hypothesis especially in *Immortale Dei* and *Libertas humana*. In them he made it clear that his most fundamental objection to the modern democratic state was that it refused on principle to respect the Roman claim to have a monopoly of truth, and to have a directive and veto power on political actions. The great fault of liberal democracy was “the rejection of the holy and august authority of the Church, which presides in the name of God over the human race.” “States have been constituted without any count at all of God or of the order established by him.”<sup>21</sup> On the contrary, the State must “act up to the manifold and weighty duties linking it to God, by the public profession of religion,” as is evident to natural reason. “It is a sin in the State not to have any care for religion, as if this [p. 142] were something beyond its scope, or of no practical benefit; or else out of many forms of religion to adopt that one which chimes in with its fancy.”<sup>22</sup> It is one of the first obligations of all States consequently to give official privileged status to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, since, as “is evident,” this religion alone is established of God, the others being human inventions. First principles thus laid down, Leo proceeds to the hypothesis: “The Church indeed deems it unlawful to place various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion, but does not, on that account, condemn those rulers who for the sake of securing some great good, or of hindering some great evil, tolerate in practice that these various forms of religion have a place in the State.”<sup>23</sup> Even this concession seems to fall far short of the liberal democratic principle of separation, and, rather, to sanction, under extenuating circumstances, the system of toleration and conjoint establishments as found in Germany or France under the Napoleonic Concordat. Separation as embodied in American fundamental law would not even come under Leo’s hypothesis, once Roman Catholics were in a position to abrogate it.

“Corollary to the separation of Church and State are the civil and religious liberties of various democratic constitutions and bills of rights. With reference to such liberties Leo reaffirmed specifically the condemnations of *Mirari vos* and the *Syllabus*. Liberty of worship, of conscience, of thought, of the press, are all contrary to the Catholic doctrine of society.”<sup>24</sup> [Notes 21–24 refer to Husslein, *Social Wellsprings*, Vol. I, pp. 16, 68, 84, and 81f., respectively.]

### **511. Church and State—“Thesis” and “Hypothesis” Seen in Leo XIII’s Encyclical *Immortale Dei***

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 72. Used by permission.

Although Leo XIII did not invent the famous distinction between “thesis” and “hypothesis”<sup>2</sup> [Note 2: This distinction was first explicitly formulated by the Jesuits in

*La Civiltà cattolica*, in 1863, in a desperate attempt to find a rational explanation of the condemnations of Pius IX.] he seems nevertheless to have accepted it. Here is his clearest text on the matter, taken from the Encyclical “Immortale Dei”:

“No one has any legitimate ground for accusing the Church of being an enemy of either just tolerance or healthy and justifiable liberty. While the Church considers *that it is not right to put the various forms of worship on the same footing* as the true religion, it does not follow that she condemns heads of states who, *with a view to achieving good or preventing evil, in practice* allow these various creeds each to have their own place in the state. It is indeed the custom of the Church to take the greatest care to ensure that no one shall be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will, for, as Saint Augustine wisely observes, a man can believe only of his own free will.”

### **512. Church and State—“Thesis” Theory Reinterpreted**

SOURCE: Albert Hartmann, *Toleranz und Christlicher Glaube* (“Tolerance and Christian Faith”) (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht Carolusdruckerei, 1955), p. 211, **trans.** in A. F. Carrillo de Albornoz, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 21. Used by permission of both publishers.

The ideal (“thesis”), which has obviously not been reached, [...] *is not the Catholic state, which refuses to allow non-Catholic public worship*, but that condition of human society in which tolerance is not necessary because everyone is united in confessing the truth. This is a great difference. The imperfection of the actual situation (“hypothesis”) is due *not to the practice of tolerance but to the existence of invincible human errors*.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The omission is not indicated in translation.]

### **513. Church Councils, Ecumenical, Beginning of**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), pp. 334, 335.

[p. 334] The ecumenical councils have not only an ecclesiastical significance, but bear also a *political* or state-church character. The very name refers to ... the empire... The Christian Graeco-Roman *emperor* is indispensable to an ecumenical council in the ancient sense of the term; its temporal head and its legislative strength...

[p. 335] Upon this Byzantine precedent, and upon the example of the kings of Israel, the Russian Czars and the Protestant princes of Germany, Scandinavia, and England—be it justly or unjustly—build their claim to a similar and still more extended supervision of the church in their dominions.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The first ecumenical, or general, council at Nicaea, in 325, was called and presided over by Constantine.]

### **514. Church Councils, Ecumenical, List of**

SOURCE: *A Catholic Dictionary*, ed. by Donald Attwater (3d ed.), p. 126. Copyright 1958 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Cassell and Company Ltd., London.

The following councils are regarded as ecumenical by the Catholic Church, only the first seven by the Orthodox Eastern Church, the first two by the Nestorians and the first three by the separated Armenians, Syrians and Copts. 1. Nicaea I, 325; 2. Constantinople I, 381; 3. Ephesus, 431; 4. Chalcedon, 451; 5. Constantinople II, 553; 6. Constantinople III, 680–1; 7. Nicaea II, 787; 8. Constantinople IV, 869; 9. Lateran I, 1123; 10. Lateran II, 1139; 11. Lateran III, 1179; 12. Lateran IV, 1215; 13. Lyons I, 1245; 14. Lyons II, 1274; 15. Vienne, 1311–13; 16. Constance, 1414–18 (in part only); 17. Basle-Ferrara-Florence, 1431–43; 18. Lateran V, 1512–17; 19. Trent, 1545–1563; 20. Vatican, 1869, adjourned 1870 and still unfinished. The first six are commemorated on a single feast in the Byzantine rite and some of them separately in several Eastern churches.

### **515. Church of Christ, Scientist**

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 397–399.*

[p. 397] *History.* Christian Science is the religion founded by Mary Baker Eddy and represented by the Church of Christ, Scientist. The Christian Science denomination was founded by Mrs. Eddy at Boston in 1879, following her discovery of this religion at Lynn, Mass., in 1866, and her issuing of its textbook, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, in 1875.

For many years prior to 1866 Mrs. Eddy observed and studied mental causes and effects. Profoundly religious, she was disposed to attribute causation to God and to regard Him as divine Mind. In that year, she recovered almost instantly from a severe injury after reading an account of healing in the Gospel according to Matthew. The discovery of what she named Christian Science ensued from this incident. As she has said, “I knew the Principle of all harmonious Mind-action to be God, and that cures were produced in primitive Christian healing by holy, uplifting faith; but I must know the Science of this healing, and I won my way to absolute conclusions through divine revelation, reason, and demonstration.” (*Science and Health*, p. 109.)

As her discovery developed in her thought, Mrs. Eddy demonstrated its importance to mankind by many cases of healing and by teaching which equipped students for successful practice. In due course, a distinct church became necessary to facilitate cooperation and unity between Christian Scientists, to present Christian Science to all people, and to maintain the purity of its teachings and practice. Accordingly, she and her followers organized the Church of Christ, Scientist, “to commemorate the words and works of our Master” and to “reinstate primitive Christianity and its lost element of healing.” (*Church Manual*, p. 17.)

Mrs. Eddy passed away in 1910. Until then, she had initiated every step in the progress of Christian Science. Although the organic law of the Christian Science movement, its *Church Manual*, confers adequate powers upon an administrative board, The Christian Science Board of Directors, yet this board always had functioned under her supervision. Mrs. Eddy’s demise, therefore, tested the *Church Manual* as an organic law in the absence of its author, but it has fulfilled the most confident expectations. The period since 1910 has been the most fruitful and prosperous in the history of Christian Science.

The primary source of information about Christian Science is Mrs. Eddy’s book, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, first published in 1875 and occasionally revised “only to give a clearer and fuller expression of its original meaning.” This book received from the author its final revision in 1907. Mrs. Eddy is the author of other books on Christian Science, published from 1886 to 1913, which are collected in her *Prose Works Other Than Science and Health* and her *Poetical Works*. Her writings can be found in many public libraries and in all Christian Science reading rooms.

*Doctrine.* Christian Science is a religious teaching and practice based on the words and works of Christ Jesus, which is applicable to health for the same reasons that the Christian religion originally was. As defined by Mrs. Eddy, the religion she founded is “divine metaphysics”; it is “the scientific system of divine healing”; it is “the law of God, the law of good, interpreting and demonstrating the divine Principle and rule of universal harmony.” (*Science and Health*, pp. 111, 123; *Rudimental Divine Science*, p. 1.)

The theology of Christian Science begins with the propositions that God is “All-in-all”; He is the “Divine Principle of all that really is.” To define God further, it employs frequently the word “good,” besides such terms as Life, Truth, Love, and Mind, Soul,

Spirit. Next to God, the name of Jesus and references to him occur most frequently in the authorized literature of Christian Science. Concerning Jesus Christ and His relation to God and man, Christian Science distinguishes between what is in the New Testament and what is in the creeds, doctrines, and dogmas of later times. Accordingly, Christian Scientists [p. 398] speak of Him oftenest as the Master or the “Way-shower,” and they regard the atonement, His chief work, as “the exemplification of man’s unity with God’[,] whereby man reflects divine Truth, Life, and Love.” (Science and Health, p. 18.)

The most distinctive feature of Christian Science teaching is its absolute distinction between what is real and what is apparent or seeming, but unreal. This distinction Mrs. Eddy explains, for instance, as follows: “All reality is in God and His creation, harmonious and eternal. That which He creates is good, and He makes all that is made. Therefore the only reality of sin, sickness, or death is the awful fact that unrealities seem real to human, erring belief, until God strips off their disguise. They are not true, because they are not of God.” (Science and Health, p. 472.)

Contrary to common misapprehension, Christian Science does not ignore what it regards as unreal. This religion teaches its adherents to forsake and overcome every form of error or evil on the basis of its unreality; that is, by demonstrating the true idea of reality. This it teaches them to do by means of spiritual law and spiritual power.

In this connection, Christian Science maintains that the truth of being—the truth concerning God and man—includes a rule for its practice and a law by which its practice produces effects. To a certain extent Jesus declared this rule and law when he said, “Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free” (John viii, 32). Accordingly, for an individual to gain his freedom from any form of error or evil, he should know the truth, the absolute truth of being, applicable to his case; and Christian Science further teaches that this practice is effective when employed by one individual for another, because such is the unity of real being and such is the law of God. For these reasons, evidently Jesus could and did declare the possibility of Christian healing in unlimited terms. (See Matthew x, 5–10 and xxviii, 16–20; Mark xvi, 14–18; John xiv, 12.)

The practice of Christian Science is not merely mental; it must be also spiritual. Indeed, it is truly mental only as it is absolutely spiritual. The nonspiritual elements in the so-called human mind do not contribute to harmony or to health. The practitioner must know or realize spiritually, and his ability to do this is derived from the divine Mind. Therefore, he must agree with the Teacher and Way-shower, who said, “I can of mine own self do nothing” (John v, 30), and he must prepare for the healing ministry and keep himself in condition for it by living the life of a genuine Christian. The practice of Christian Science is not limited, as is commonly supposed, to the healing of the sick. On the contrary, Christian Scientists regard their religion as applicable to practically every human need...

*Organization.* Since its reorganization in 1892, the denomination has consisted of the Christian Science Mother Church, the proper name of which is The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Mass., and branch churches or branch societies at all places where there are enough adherents for a local organization. A branch church is called First Church of Christ, Scientist, of its city or town, or is called Second Church of Christ, Scientist, of that place, and so on. A society is the beginning of a church, and is called Christian Science Society of its locality.

Viewed in another way, The Mother Church consists of members who constitute the local congregation in Boston and of members who reside in other places throughout the world, either where there are branch organizations or where there are not...

[p. 399] The officers of The Mother Church consist of The Christian Science Board of Directors, a president, the first and second readers, a clerk, and a treasurer. The governing body of the denomination is The Christian Science Board of Directors, but each branch church has its own self-government.

The lesson-sermon, which constitutes the principal part of the Sunday services in Christian Science churches, is prepared by a committee connected with The Mother Church and is read in every church by two readers who read alternately, the first reader from Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures, the second reader from the Bible.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership in 1936 was reported at 268,915 (*CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, p. 390).]

### **516. Church of God (Anderson, Ind.)**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 414, 415.

[p. 414] *History*. The name Church of God is used by a number of small religious groups in the United States, and this fact makes for confusion. This particular group sometimes attempts to differentiate itself from the others using this name by inserting [p. 415] the name of its headquarters (Anderson, Ind.), but regards such insertion as no part of the name. At Anderson, Ind., are the offices of its general boards, its college and seminary, its publishing plant, and other promotional organizations. The group uses the name Church of God, which it holds as the Scriptural designation of the church, not in a denominational or exclusive sense, but in an inclusive sense, as the name of the church to which all true Christians belong, and that a recognition of this fact would be a big step forward in the direction of Christian unity, and the name Church of God would then be applied to all Christians in all the world.

From the beginning this group has regarded itself as a movement within the church rather than another denomination or church among churches, working, as it holds, for the restoration of the New Testament standard of faith and life, particularly in the matter of church or Christian unity.

The movement began about 1880 when D. S. Warner, of the Church of God, Winebrennerian movement, began to work in Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and other Midwestern States, and soon found others in various sections of the United States who were possessed of like beliefs and ideals. They believed that the church was too much restricted by human organization and ecclesiasticism and demanded that the church be more directly under the rule of God. The movement was strongly evangelistic and spread rapidly into many States. Considerable emphasis was put upon the doctrine of holiness, and in this the church held many things in common with the various holiness movements of that period, though in other respects differing from them.

*Doctrine*. In doctrine the Church of God would be classed orthodox and evangelical. The members, in common with many groups of Christians, hold: The divine inspiration of the Scriptures; that the Bible is a book at once divine and human; that it grew out of human life in touch with God. They believe in the Holy Trinity; that Christ is the Son of God; that the Holy Spirit is a person, in His indwelling presence in the heart of man, sanctifying and giving power for life and service; that the Holy Spirit gives gifts for the work of God in the world, but that none or all of these gifts are evidences of the presence of the Holy Spirit; that sin separates men from God; in the forgiveness of sin on the basis of the atonement of Christ and by repentance and faith on the part of the person; in the

doctrine and experience of holiness; in a personal second coming of Christ, that this coming has no connection with a millennial reign, but that the kingdom of God is here and now; in the final judgment, the general resurrection of the dead, with reward of the righteous and punishment of the wicked.

Generally, they practice baptism by immersion, the Lord's Supper, and feet washing, but do not regard their practice as an essential basis of fellowship. Perhaps their most distinctive doctrine is that concerning the nature of the church and the unity of Christian people; that the church is the body of Christ, made up of all Christians, and that all Christians are one in Christ Jesus, but the denominationalism and the sectarian system are a hindrance to the expression of this unity, hence are unscriptural. They believe that God is working in this time to restore the New Testament ideal of this church; and that this restoration is based upon the fact of spiritual experience rather than of creedal agreement.

*Organization.* The local churches of the movement, numbering nearly 2,000, are congregational in form of church government... Membership in the local churches is not on a formal basis, and there are no membership lists kept... The ministers of the various States meet in State or regional conventions, but such associations are purely voluntary, and in no way are invested with authority over local churches, but act in an advisory capacity. The General Ministerial Assembly meets annually in connection with the annual convention and camp meeting in June at Anderson, Ind., which has jurisdiction over the business and cooperative aspects of the work, but not in doctrinal matters or over the local churches.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 135,294 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

### **517. Church of God (Cleveland, Tenn.)**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 406, 407.

[p. 406] *History.* The denomination known as the Church of God had its origin in the conviction of a number of people, in different denominations in Tennessee, that existing bodies with which they were acquainted were not strictly in accord with their views of Scripture, and in the belief that their wishes for a body conforming to their own views must be satisfied. The first organization was formed in August 1886 in Monroe County, Tenn., under the name "Christian Union." In 1902 there was a reorganization under the name "Holiness Church," and in January 1907 a third meeting, at Union Grove, Bradley County, Tenn., adopted the name "Church of God," with a membership of 150, representing 5 local churches [p. 407] in North Carolina, Georgia, and Tennessee. From that time the body has grown until it is represented in 45 States and has churches in 11 foreign countries. The international headquarters in 1936 were in Cleveland, Tenn.

*Doctrine.* In doctrine this body is Arminian and in accord with the Methodist bodies. It recognizes no creed as authoritative, but relies upon the Bible "as a whole rightly divided" and as the final court of appeals. It emphasizes sanctification as an experience subsequent to regeneration; also the baptism of the Holy Ghost, evidenced by speaking in other tongues, subsequent to sanctification. Conditions of membership are profession of faith in Christ, experience of being "born again," bearing the fruits of a Christian life, and recognition of the obligation to accept and practice all the teachings of the church. The sacraments observed are the Lord's Supper, foot washing, and water baptism by immersion.

*Organization.* The ecclesiastical organization is described as "a blending of congregational and episcopal, ending in theocratical," by which is meant that every

question is to be decided by God's Word... The officers of the churches are bishops, deacons, evangelists, and exhorters...

When a reasonable number of churches have been organized in a State an annual State assembly is held, not legislative in character, but rather educational and for the advancement and interest of the church in that State. A general assembly convenes annually, and is composed of representatives from all States, provinces, and countries; and this is recognized as the supreme council.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 162,794 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

### **518. Churches of Christ**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 469, 470.

[p. 469] *History*. In their early history the churches which gathered under the leadership of Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, and Barton W. Stone emphasized the distinctively apostolic character of the individual church, not merely as a worshiping congregation and a working force, but as an autonomous ecclesiastical body. As set forth in the Declaration and Address, by Thomas Campbell, they deplored human creeds and systems and protested against considering anything as a matter of faith and duty for which there could not be produced a "Thus saith the Lord," either in expressed terms, approved example, or necessary inference. They also held that they should follow "after the example of the primitive church exhibited in the New Testament without any additions whatever of human opinions or inventions of men." With this basis of action they adopted as the keynote of their movement, "Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent."

As the churches increased in membership and wealth, however, there arose what seemed to some to be a desire for popularity and for such "human inventions" as had been deplored in the beginning of the movement. Chief among these "inventions" were a general organization of the churches into a missionary society, with a "money basis" of membership, and the use of mechanical instrumental music in the worship of the church. The agitation for the organization of a missionary society began soon after 1840 and continued until the American Christian Missionary Society was formed in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1849. Although this movement received Alexander Campbell's approval, yet the literature of that period abundantly shows that he was not the real leader behind the effort nor the same man mentally who had previously opposed such inventions of men. Many of his brethren were dissatisfied with this departure from the original ground and held firmly to the earlier position, quoting his own language in speaking of the apostolic Christians:

Their churches were not fractured into missionary societies, Bible societies, and educational societies; nor did they dream of organizing such. \*\*\* They knew nothing of the hobbies of modern times. In their church capacity alone they moved. \*\*\* They viewed the Church of Jesus Christ as the scheme of salvation to ameliorate the world. As members of it they considered themselves bound to do all they could for the glory of God and the good of men. They dared not transfer to a missionary society a cent or a prayer, lest in so doing they should rob the Church of its glory and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God.

A society with a "money basis" and a delegated membership, it was urged, was the beginning of apostasy from New Testament Christianity. The article in the constitution of the missionary society which gave more offense than any other, because, in the view of some, it established a "money basis" and created a "moneyed aristocracy," read as follows: "The society shall be composed of annual delegates, life members, and life directors. Any church may appoint a delegate for an annual contribution of \$10; and \$20 paid at one time shall be requisite to constitute a member for life." Various and earnest

efforts were made at different times to dissuade them from this “departure from New Testament Christianity,” but without avail.

The question as to the use of instrumental music in the services of the church became an issue as early as 1859, when a melodeon was placed in the church at Midway, Ky. Much opposition was aroused, and the claim was made that instrumental music in the church services “ministered to pride and worldliness, was without the sanction of New Testament precept and example, and was consequently unscriptural and sinful.”

Other matters in regard to which there was controversy were the introduction of the “modern pastor” and the adoption of “unscriptural means of raising money.”

It was inevitable that such divergencies of opinion should result in the formation of opposing parties, and these parties were variously called “Conservatives” [p. 470] and “Progressives,” or “Antis” and “Digressives.” Actual division, however, came slowly. Many who sympathized with the Progressives continued to worship and work with the Conservatives because they had no other church facilities; and on the other hand, many Conservatives associated with the Progressives for a similar reason.

In the census report for 1890 both parties were reported together under the title, “Disciples of Christ.” In the report for 1906 the Conservatives were reported separately as “Churches of Christ,” but the results were not altogether satisfactory, as it was difficult to draw the line between them and the Disciples of Christ. There is now a clear distinction between the two groups, and the statistics for 1936 are far more complete.

*Doctrine and Organization.* In doctrine and polity the Churches of Christ are, in some respects, in accord with the Disciples of Christ. They reject all human creeds and confessions, consider the Scriptures a sufficient rule of faith and practice, emphasize the “divine Sonship of Jesus” and the “divine personality of the Holy Spirit,” and regard the Lord’s Supper as a memorial service rather than as a sacrament, to be observed each Lord’s Day. The church, with such officers as belonged to it in apostolic times, is considered a divine institution. Each local church is independent; it elects its own officers, calls its own ministers, and conducts its own affairs. Membership is on the general basis of faith in Christ, repentance, and baptism (immersion). The ministerial office is not emphasized, and there are no ministerial associations. Each minister is a member of the church which he serves, and is subject to its discipline. In general, the doctrine of nonresistance is advocated.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: Membership (1959), 2,007,650 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

### **519. Commandments, Keeping of, in Relation to Justification—Council of Trent on**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VI (Jan. 13, 1547), Decree Concerning Justification, chap. 11, trans. in H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, pp. 36–38. Copyright 1941 by B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. Used by permission.

[p. 36] But no one, however much justified, should consider himself exempt from the observance of the commandments; no one should use that rash statement, once forbidden by the Fathers under anathema, that the observance of the commandments of God is impossible for one that is justified. For God does not command impossibilities, but by commanding admonishes thee to do what thou canst and to pray for what thou canst not, and aids thee that thou mayest be able. *His commandments are not heavy, and his yoke is sweet and burden* [p. 37] *light*. For they who are the sons of God love Christ, but they who love Him, keep His commandments, as He Himself testifies; which, indeed, with the divine help they can do. For though during this mortal life, men, however holy and just,

fall at times into at least light and daily sins, which are also called venial, they do not on that account cease to be just, for that petition of the just, *forgive us our trespasses*, is both humble and true; for which reason the just ought to feel themselves the more obliged to walk in the way of justice, for *being now freed from sin and made servants of God*, they are able, *living soberly, justly and godly*, to proceed onward through Jesus Christ, by whom they have access unto this grace. For God does not forsake those who have been once justified by His grace, unless He be first forsaken by them. Wherefore, no one ought to flatter himself with faith alone, thinking that by faith alone he is made an heir and will obtain the inheritance, even though *he suffer not with Christ, that he may be also glorified with him*. For even Christ Himself, as the Apostle says, *whereas he was the Son of God, he learned obedience by the things which he suffered, and being consummated, he became to all who obey him the cause of eternal salvation*. For which reason the same Apostle admonishes those justified, saying: *Know you not that they who run in the race, all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize? So run that you may obtain. I therefore so run, not as at an uncertainty; I so fight, not as one beating the air, but I chastise my body and bring it into subjection; lest perhaps when I have preached to others, I myself should become a castaway*. So also the prince of the Apostles, Peter: *Labor the more, that by good works you may make sure your calling and election. For doing these things, you shall not sin at any time*. From which it is clear that they are opposed to the orthodox teaching of religion who maintain that the just man sins, venially at least, in every good work; or, what is more intolerable, that he merits eternal punishment; and they also who assert that the just sin in all works, if, in order to arouse [p. 38] their sloth and to encourage themselves to run the race, they, in addition to this, that above all God may be glorified, have in view also the eternal reward, since it is written: *I have inclined my heart to do thy justifications on account of the reward*; and of Moses the Apostle says; that *he looked unto the reward*.

## **520. Confession, Protestant View of**

SOURCE: W. Caspari, "Confession of Sins," *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Vol. 3, p. 221. Copyright 1909 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission of Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Mich., present publishers.

Confession of sins is an acknowledgment of sin, which may be made by a Christian either to God alone, to a fellow Christian, or to one who holds an ecclesiastical office. Confession as an act prescribed or recommended by the Church is made in accordance with the free decision of the individual (voluntary private confession), in compliance with special rules of church training and discipline (confession of catechumens and penitents), and in conformity with general regulations binding on all (a prescribed confession, either of individuals or the congregation as a whole). The present article is confined to the last-named form; its end is to attain absolution.

The New Testament knows nothing of confession as a formal institution, Jas. v. 16 referring to the close association with the brethren, although the words of Jesus in Luke v. 20, vii. 48 may be compared to ecclesiastical absolution. Individual confession as a part of ecclesiastical discipline was, of course, customary in ancient times, and also served as a voluntary act of distressed sinner. The confession of sin and proclamation of pardon were likewise customary in the service of the ancient Church. But that confession existed in the earliest time as an established ecclesiastical institution is not proved by such isolated instances as are occasionally met with.

## **521. Confirmation, Council of Trent Canons on**

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session VII (March 3, 1547), On the Sacraments, cans. 1, 2, in *Dogmatic Canons and Decrees*, p. 66. Copyright 1912 by the Devin-Adair Company, New York. Used by permission.

Canon I. If anyone saith that the confirmation of those who have been baptized is an idle ceremony, and not rather a true and proper sacrament; or that of old it was nothing more than a kind of catechism whereby they who were near adolescence gave an account of their faith in the face of the Church; let him be anathema.

Canon II. If anyone saith that they who ascribe any virtue to the sacred chrism of confirmation offer an outrage to the Holy Ghost; let him be anathema.

### **522. Constantine, and the Supposed Donation**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 70, 71. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 70] Two mistaken ideas about Constantine must be cleared away. One is that he gave the bishop of Rome sovereignty over the city of Rome and its environs; the other [see No. 1312] is that he made Christianity the established and only legal religion of the empire. Actually he did neither. The first of these fables can be easily disposed of. A document known as the “Donation of Constantine” appeared without previous history in a medieval collection of decretals. It purported to be the original text of an edict by which Constantine transferred to Pope Sylvester absolute sovereignty over Rome and a large territory surrounding it. This seemed plausible enough, for by the time this forged “Donation” was brought to light the popes already had such sovereignty, conferred on the Roman see by [p. 71] Pippin (or Pepin) in the eighth century. In 1440 Laurentius Valla proved conclusively that the Constantine document was a pious fraud and that it had been written several centuries after Constantine’s time. Valla’s argument was never answered and his conclusion is not now disputed.

### **523. Constantine, as First Christian Roman Emperor**

SOURCE: Arthur E. R. Boak, *A History of Rome to 565 A.D.* (4th ed.), pp. 432, 433. Copyright 1955 by The Macmillan Company, New York, and used with their permission.

[p. 432] *Constantine, the Christian Emperor.* By birth and early training Constantine was a pagan. His father, Constantius, was a devotee of the Sun God and Constantine who followed his monotheistic example accepted at first Hercules and later the Sun God as his protective deity. His mother, Helena, in later life a zealous Christian, does not appear to have adopted Christianity before her son. But as we have seen Constantius showed [p. 433] a tolerant attitude towards Christians, and prior to his march on Rome in 312 A.D., Constantine must have become fairly well acquainted with the general doctrines and organization of the Church in his dominions. It is clear that on the eve of the final encounter with Maxentius, he placed both himself and his army under the protection of the Christians’ God, and that he was convinced that his victory then and his later success in winning the whole Empire were due to the power and favor of this Divinity. From 312 A.D., he looked upon himself as designated by God to rule the Roman World. And in return for this divine recognition, he felt the obligation to promote the cause of Christianity in all possible ways... Constantine saw in Christianity the religion which could and should provide a spiritual bond among his subjects as well as a moral basis for political loyalty to himself as the elect of God. It is true that as late as 324 A.D. Constantine’s coins bore non-Christian devices and legends, that he tolerated the imperial cult and other pagan practices, and continued to bear the title Pontifex Maximus. But this attitude is a tribute to his political astuteness. Even up to the time of his death a majority of his officials, soldiers, and civilian subjects were still pagans. He realized his need of

their support and could not afford to antagonize them too deeply by forcing them to abandon abruptly the ideas and symbols of the past. When, in 321 A.D., he declared Sunday a general holiday he had in mind both Christians and pagans, for while the former celebrated it as “the Lord’s Day,” the latter could regard it as the “day of the Sun-god.” But in calling himself “the bishop of those without” he seems to have regarded himself as responsible for the conversion of the pagan elements and he applied direct and indirect pressure to accomplish this although he did not interfere with private, and in some cases public, practice of pagan rites.

Symbolic of Constantine’s acceptance of Christianity was his adoption in 317 A.D. of a new spiritual standard, the Labarum. This was formed by a long-handled cross, having at the upper end a gold wreath enclosing the monogram Chi-Rho, below which from the crossbar hung a square silk cloth with the likeness of Constantine and his two sons, the Caesars. It is true that Constantine only received Christian baptism on his deathbed. But at that time this was not an uncommon practice, and in spite of his declared Christianity it may well be that the emperor, conscious of the wrongs which his violent temper had led him to commit, doubted his ability to fully measure up to the ethical standards that baptism implied.

#### **524. Constantine, Conversion of—Detrimental Effect on Church**

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

The religion of Jesus might have secured a spiritual, rather than a political, victory in the ancient world, but for the so-called conversion of Constantine and his elevation of Christianity by edict as practically the state religion and royal cult with the baneful alliance of throne and altar. This establishment of the State Church and the reinforcement of Caesarism with religious sanctions, which was later carried out more drastically by Theodosius and Justinian, were accompanied by the consequent full equipment of the Church with the sacerdotalism to which the peoples of the Empire, legislated into Christians, had been accustomed and by the external splendours with which a religion purchases popularity.

#### **525. Constantine, Early Religious Legislation of**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 31.

He [Constantine] exempted the Christian clergy from military and municipal duty (March, 313); abolished various customs and ordinances offensive to the Christians (315); facilitated the emancipation of Christian slaves (before 316); legalized bequests to catholic churches (321); enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though not as dies Domini [Lord’s day], but as dies Solis [the Sun’s day], ... (321).

#### **526. Constantine, Favors of, to Christians**

SOURCE: Albert Henry Newman, *A Manual of Church History*, Vol. 1 (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society), pp. 306, 307. Copyright 1933 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 306] The Edict of Milan (313), issued jointly by Constantine and Licinius, proclaimed liberty of conscience and showed partiality for Christianity. His policy at first was not to interfere with pagan worship, but by filling the chief offices with Christians and surrounding himself with Christian teachers to make the condition of Christians enviable...

He ... [p. 307] enjoined the civil observance of Sunday, though only as the day of the Sun, and in connection with an ordinance [see No. 528] requiring the consultation of the soothsayer (321)...

As the Roman emperor was Pontifex Maximus of the pagan State religion, he would naturally assume the same relation to Christianity when it became predominant. This headship the gratitude of the Christians heartily accorded. In all of his dealings with Christian matters the supreme motive seems to have been that of securing unity. About doctrinal differences he was almost indifferent. But he dreaded dissension among those on whom he depended for the support of his government.

### **527. Constantine, Paganism of**

SOURCE: Henry Hart Milman, *The History of Christianity* (rev. ed.; London: John Murray, 1867), Vol. 2, pp. 284, 285.

[p. 284] Up to this period [A.D. 312] all that we know of Constantine's religion would imply that he was outwardly, and even zealously, Pagan. In a public oration his panegyrist extols the magnificence of his offerings to the gods. His victorious presence was not merely expected to restore more than their former splendour to the Gaulish cities, ruined by barbaric incursions, but sumptuous temples were to arise at his bidding, to propitiate the deities, particularly Apollo, his tutelary god. [p. 285] The medals struck for these victories are covered with the symbols of Paganism. Eusebius himself admits that Constantine was at this time in doubt which religion he should embrace.

5

### **528. Constantine, Paganism of—Soothsayers to Be Consulted**

SOURCE: *Theodosian Code* 16.10.1, trans. by Clyde Pharr, p. 472. Copyright 1952 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

If it should appear that any part of Our palace or any other public work has been struck by lightning, the observance of the ancient custom shall be retained, and inquiry shall be made of the soothsayers as to the portent thereof. Written records thereof shall be very carefully collected and referred to Our Wisdom. Permission shall be granted to all other persons also to appropriate this custom to themselves, provided only that they abstain from domestic sacrifices, which are specifically prohibited.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This edict, addressed to Maximus, the Prefect of the City of Rome, is recorded as having been received at Rome on March 8, 321, which was, interestingly enough, the day after the issuance of his first Sunday law. However, this decree concerning the soothsayers was actually issued by Constantine in the east (at Serdica, now Sofia) several months before, on Dec. 17, 320.]

### **529. Constantine, Paganism Retained by, in Transition to New Religion**

SOURCE: Charles Norris Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), pp. 215, 216. Used by permission.

[p. 215] What he [Constantine] saw in Christianity was simply a talisman by virtue of which *Romanitas* [the Roman political system] would be assured of material prosperity such as official paganism had failed to give it; and, as an uninterrupted series of successes appeared to vindicate this hope, he came more and more to identify the promise of the Evangel with that of the empire and of his own house. It was, indeed, in keeping with the pragmatic spirit of his faith that he should have retained on his coins, at least until middle age, the figures and emblems of the traditional pagan gods and that, while forbidding

---

<sup>5</sup>Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.

divination in general, he should at the same time have specifically sanctioned it ‘in the public interest’. Meanwhile, however, he girt himself, so to speak, with the armour of righteousness... These considerations, in themselves, constitute no valid reason for impugning the sincerity of the emperor. But they do most emphatically suggest that his apprehension of Christianity was imperfect. They thus indicate that, whatever his errors, they were merely those of a man who, in the transition to a new [p. 216] world, carried with him a heavy burden of prejudice from the old.

### **530. Constantine, Sun Worship of**

SOURCE: Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. by J. B. Bury, chap. 20, Vol. 2 (London: Methuen & Co., 1896), p. 291.

But the devotion of Constantine was more peculiarly directed to the genius of the Sun, the Apollo of Greek and Roman mythology... The Sun [see No. 1566] was universally celebrated as the invincible guide and protector of Constantine.

### **531. Constantine, Toleration of—Effect on Christians and Pagans**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. 3 (5th ed.; New York: Scribner, 1902), pp. 30, 31.

[p. 30] The Constantinian toleration [of the recently persecuted Christians] opened the door to the elevation of Christianity, and specifically of Catholic hierarchical Christianity, with its exclusiveness towards heretical and schismatic sects, to be the religion of the state. For, once put on equal footing with heathenism, it must soon, in spite of numerical minority, bear away the victory from a religion which had already inwardly outlived itself.

From this time Constantine decidedly favored the church, though without persecuting or forbidding the pagan religions.

### **532. Constantine, Zeal of, for Increasing Church Membership**

SOURCE: Constantine, Instruction to the Bishops at the Council of Nicaea, in Eusebius *The Life of Constantine* iii. 21, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 1, p. 526.

Indeed we should do all in our power to save [unbelievers], and this cannot be unless our conduct seems to them attractive. But you are well aware of the fact, that testimony is by no means productive of blessing to all, since some who hear are glad to secure the supply of their mere bodily necessities, while others court the patronage of their superiors; some fix their affection on those who treat them with hospitable kindness, others again, being honored with presents, love their benefactors in return; but few are they who really desire the word of testimony, and rare indeed is it to find a friend of truth. Hence the necessity of endeavoring to meet the case of all and, physician-like, to administer to each that which may tend to the health of the soul, to the end that the saving doctrine may be fully honored by all.

### **533. Cosmetics, Ancient**

SOURCE: R. J. Forbes, *Studies in Ancient Technology*, Vol. 3 pp. 18–20. Copyright 1955 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands. Used by permission.

[p. 18] Upto [*sic*] the later stages of Egyptian history it was customary to paint the upper eye-lid black with galena and the lower one green. Hence in all texts the black galena is coupled with the green malachite... Both ingredients were found locally in Egypt, but we also hear of imports “from the Asiatics”, from Western Asia, “Punt” (Somaliland?) or Coptos.

The Mesopotamian equivalent ... is usually translated “stibium powder”, but here again analyses of archaeological finds and records of the mines confirm the use of

stibnite or galena. Accadian texts also mention the occasional use of orpiment or realgar ..., the “yellow eye-paint” which is contrasted with red ochre ..., that was more rarely used...

We can trace the gradual change of these eye-paints from a real remedy and defence against eye-diseases and the flies transmitting them to means of beautifying the eye. The older double and quadruple tubes in which the eye-paints were stored still bear the qualifications [p. 19] “good for the sight” or “to stop bleeding”. Later such expressions as “to lay on the lid and the lashes” become more frequent. Then the toxic properties of the ingredients become less important and the colour ranks first. Hence burnt almond shells, soot or manganese dioxide begin to oust the galena and malachite, which latter ingredient is often replaced in later periods by the green resin from conifera ..., which was also used as an ingredient of incense and unguents. Soot later became the most popular ingredient and it still figures in modern mascara recipes mentioning lampblack, paraffin and petrolatum...

[p. 20] In Egypt lips and cheeks were coloured red with red ochre, often with a lipstick consisting of a reed holding a small piece of ochre at one end. The red colour often applied to the palms of the hand, the soles of the feet, nails and hair was derived from henna (*Lawsonia inermis*) made into an unguent or paste with oil or fat. The inhabitants of Mesopotamia used red ochre and henna or *Asa foetida* ..., but their ancestors, the Sumerians seem to have preferred yellow ochre as a face powder ... or also “face bloom” .... The Egyptians were less liberal with their face powders but pictures show that the ladies of ancient Egypt knew how to use a powder-puff.

### **534. Creation, As a Unique Period**

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 223–224. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 223] But during the period of Creation, God was introducing order and organization and energization into the universe in a very high degree, even to life itself? *It is thus quite plain that the processes used by God in creation were utterly different from the processes which now operate in the universe!* The Creation was a unique period, entirely incommensurate with this present world. This is plainly emphasized and reemphasized in the divine revelation which God has given us concerning Creation, which concludes with these words:

And the heavens and the earth were *finished*, and *all* the host of them. [p. 224] And on the seventh day God *finished* His work which He had made; and He *rested* on the seventh day from *all His work* which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it; because that in it He *rested* from *all His work* which God had created and made.<sup>1</sup> [Note 1: Genesis 2:1–3.

In view of these strong and repeated assertions, is it not the height of presumption for man to attempt to study Creation in terms of present processes?

*Here is the basic fallacy of uniformitarianism in geology.* It may be fairly reasonable to use the uniformity principle as a key to decipher geologic history that has taken place since the *end* of the Creation. But when it is used, as it actually is, to attempt to deduce the entire history of the Creation itself (calling it “evolution”), it is no longer legitimate. The geologic record may provide much valuable information concerning earth history *subsequent* to the finished Creation (which Creation includes that of “heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is,” as summarized in the fourth Commandment in Exodus 20:11), but it can give no information as to the processes or sequences employed by God

during the Creation, since God has plainly said that those processes no longer operate—a fact which is thoroughly verified by the two universal laws of thermo-dynamics!

### **535. Creation, Biblical and Babylonian Accounts of—Biblical the Original**

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, p. 37. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

The Babylonian inscriptions and the records of Genesis evidently give us two forms of primitive traditions and facts concerning the beginning of the universe and man. These are not traditions peculiar to Semitic peoples and religions, which have developed out of their common characteristics. They are traditions common to all civilized nations of antiquity. Their common elements point to a time when the human race occupied a common home and held a common faith. Their likenesses are due to a common inheritance, each race of men handing on from age to age records, oral and written, of the primeval history of the race.

Early races of men wherever they wandered took with them these earliest traditions of mankind, and in varying latitudes and climes have modified them according to their religions and mode of thought. Modifications as time proceeded resulted in the corruption of the original pure tradition. The Genesis account is not only the purest, but everywhere bears the unmistakable impress of divine inspiration when compared with the extravagances and corruptions of other accounts. The Biblical narrative, we may conclude, represents the *original form* these traditions must have assumed.

### **536. Creation, Biblical and Babylonian Accounts of—Resemblance Superficial**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955), pp. 60, 61. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 60] The principal resemblance [between the Babylonian creation account and the Bible] is superficial: the Babylonian epic has seven tables, while the Hebrew account covers seven days of creation; the Babylonian text, like many similar ones, starts with the same formula (also found in the second account of creation, Gen. 2:4ff.): When ... then. The cosmological conceptions were also in some respects similar; e.g., all the people of southwestern Asia seem to have believed that there was a great subterranean fresh-water ocean, called *tehôm* by [p. 61] the Hebrews (and by the Jews of rabbinic and mediaeval times) and *apsu* by the Accadians. Otherwise nothing could be more different from the purely monotheistic Hebrew account, where nothing is superfluous, than the verbose, redundant, crassly mythological Babylonian narrative... It is a little difficult to see how this mythological structure can be connected in any direct way whatsoever with the biblical story.

### **537. Creation, Defined by Postexilic Judaism and Christianity**

SOURCE: A. T. Mollegen, "Creation and Fall," in his *The Faith of Christians* (Washington, D.C.: The Organizing Committee, Christianity and Modern Man, 1954), p. 97. Copyright 1954 by A. T. Mollegen. Used by permission.

Creation, as post-Exilic Judaism and Christianity understand it, means that God wills all existence, and it is fundamentally and basically good. Its concreteness; the individuality of human beings; the differentiation of human beings into male and female; bodiliness, physicality; the earth, the rocks, the trees, the water—all this is good. It was brought into being by God out of nothing; and it is maintained in being by God, by his

steady expenditure of energy—he supports it and keeps it going by active willing and continuation.

### **538. Creation—Science Cannot Explain Origins**

SOURCE: C. S. Lewis, *The Case for Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1948), pp. 18–20. Used by permission of the Macmillan Company and Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London.

[p. 18] Ever since men were able to think, they've been wondering what this universe really is and how it came to be there. And, very roughly, two views have been held. First, there is what is called the materialist view. People who take that view think that matter and space just happen to exist, and always have existed, nobody knows why; and that the matter, behaving in certain fixed ways, has just happened, by a sort of fluke, to produce creatures like ourselves who are able to think. By one chance in a thousand something hit our sun and made it produce the planets; and by another thousandth chance the chemicals necessary for life, and the right temperature, arose on one [p. 19] of these planets, and so some of the matter on this earth came alive; and then, by a very long series of chances, the living creatures developed into things like us. The other view is the religious view. According to it, what is behind the universe is more like a mind than it's like anything else we know. That is to say, it's conscious, and has purposes, and prefers one thing to another. And on this view it made the universe, partly for purposes we don't know, but partly, at any rate, in order to produce creatures like itself—I mean, like itself to the extent of having minds. Please don't think that one of these views was held a long time ago and that the other has gradually taken its place. Wherever there have been thinking men both views turn up. And note this too. You can't find out which view is the right one by science in the ordinary sense. Science works by experiments. It watches how things behave. Every scientific statement in the long run, however complicated it looks, really means "I pointed the telescope to such and such a part of the sky at 2.20 A.M. on 15th January and saw so-and-so," or "I put some of this stuff in a pot and heated it to such-and-such a temperature and it did so-and-so." Don't think I'm saying anything against science: I'm only saying what its job is. And the more scientific a man is, the more (I believe) he'd agree with me that this is the job of science—and a very useful and necessary job it is too. But why anything comes to be there at all, and whether there's anything behind the things science observes—something of a different kind—this is not a scientific question. If there is "Something Behind," then either it will have to remain altogether unknown to men or else make itself known in some different way. The statement that there is any such thing, and the statement that there's [p. 20] no such thing, are neither of them statements that science can make. And real scientists don't usually make them. It's usually the journalists and popular novelists who have picked up a few odds and ends of half-baked science from textbooks who go in for them. After all, it's really a matter of common sense. Supposing science ever became complete so that it knew every single thing in the whole universe. Don't you see that the questions "Why is there a universe?" "Why does it go on as it does?" "Has it any meaning?" would remain just as they were?

### **539. Creation—Science Must Presuppose Creation at the Beginning**

SOURCE: George S. Hendry, *The Westminster Confession for Today* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press), p. 59. Copyright 1960 by C. D. Deans. Used by permission.

There can be no conflict between Christian faith and scientific theory if this difference is properly understood. All attempts to account for the origin of the world on the basis of scientific inquiry can only presuppose creation; for science operates with the

data of experience, and being created cannot be an object of experience, since it is the precondition of all our experience. Creation lies beyond the limits of human inquiry, at the point where faith apprehends God. Inquiry into origins is bound to seek them within existence, since the human mind cannot think the thought of any condition of existence which is without an antecedently existing condition. And thus, though scientific inquiry may succeed in tracing the existence of the world back to a condition, the antecedent condition of which cannot be ascertained, this is not creation. Creation signifies the absolute beginning of existence. The Biblical statement that “in the beginning God created” has been rendered in the formula, “creation out of nothing” (*creatio ex nihilo*), which is meant to distinguish it from any idea that God brought the world into existence by giving form to some previously existing but unformed matter, or, perhaps, that he generated it from the substance of his own being. Whenever we speak of any human artist or craftsman as creating, it is always in this sense; for no human being can create except he have some material to create with, whether it be sticks or stones or words or colors or tones. But when God created the world, he did not create it out of *something*; for before the world was brought into existence, there was *nothing*, i.e., nothing but God himself.

#### **540. Creed, The Apostles’**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, p. 45.

I believe in GOD THE FATHER Almighty; Maker of heaven and earth. And in JESUS CHRIST his only (begotten) Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell [Hades, spirit-world]; the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into heaven; and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the HOLY GHOST; the holy catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body [flesh]; and the life everlasting. Amen.

#### **541. Creed, the Athanasian**

SOURCE: Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919), Vol. 2, pp. 66–70.

- [p. 66] 1. Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith:
2. Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.
  3. And the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity;
  4. Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance [Essence].
  5. For there is one Person of the Father: another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost.
  6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty coeternal.
  7. Such as the Father is: such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost.
  8. The Father uncreate [uncreated]: the Son uncreate [uncreated]: and the Holy Ghost uncreate [uncreated].
  9. The Father incomprehensible [unlimited]: the Son incomprehensible [unlimited]: and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible [unlimited, or infinite].
- [p. 67] 10. The Father eternal: the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal.
11. And yet they are not three eternal: but one eternal.

12. As also there are not three uncreated: nor three incomprehensibles [infinities], but one uncreated: and one incomprehensible [infinite].
13. So likewise the Father is Almighty: the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty.
14. And yet they are not three Almighty: but one Almighty.
15. So the Father is God: the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God.  
[EDITORS' NOTE: Bracketed insertions are in Schaff's edition.]
16. And yet they are not three Gods: but one God.
17. So likewise the Father is Lord: the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord.
18. And yet not three Lords: but one Lord.
19. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord:
20. So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion: to say, There be [are] three Gods, or three Lords.
21. The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.
22. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created: but begotten.
- [p. 68] 23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten: but proceeding.
24. So there is one Father, not three Fathers: one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.
25. And in this Trinity none is afore, or after another: none is greater, or less than another [there is nothing before, or after: nothing greater or less].
26. But the whole three Persons are coeternal, and coequal.
27. So that in all things, as aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshiped.
28. He therefore that will be saved, must [let him] thus think of the Trinity.
29. Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly [faithfully] the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.
30. For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man;
31. God, of the Substance [Essence] of the Father; begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance [Essence] of his Mother, born in the world.
- [p. 69] 32. Perfect God: and perfect Man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.
33. Equal to the Father, as touching his Godhead: and inferior to the Father as touching his Manhood.
34. Who although he be [is] God and Man; yet he is not two, but one Christ.
35. One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking [assumption] of the Manhood into God.
36. One altogether; not by confusion of Substance [Essence]: but by unity of Person.
37. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ;
38. Who suffered for our salvation: descended into hell [Hades, spirit-world]: rose again the third day from the dead.
39. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father God [God the Father] Almighty.
40. From whence [thence] he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
41. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies;
42. And shall give account for their own works.

[p. 70] 43. And they that have done good shall go into the life everlasting: and they that have done evil, into everlasting fire.

44. This is the Catholic Faith: which except a man believe faithfully [truly and firmly], he can not be saved.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Bracketed insertions are in Schaff's edition.]

### **542. Creeds, Early, Bear Marks of Free Handling**

SOURCE: William A. Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions of Faith* (New York: Scribner, 1912), pp. 406, 407. Used by permission of T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

[p. 406] Thus by the end of the seventh century the so-called Catholic or Oecumenical Creeds had assumed the forms in which they have come down to us. Sacred as the Church has deemed them, and highly as it has valued them as bonds of unity and defences of the Faith, they bear the marks of free handling, and became occasions of dissension. Their very titles reveal a certain wilfulness and pretension in their adoption. The *Apostles' Creed* is not the Creed of the Apostles: the *Nicene Creed* is not the Creed of Nicaea but the Creed of Constantinople, based on the Creed of Jerusalem, reinforced by elements from Nicaea, Chalcedon, and Toledo: the *Athanasian Creed* is not the Creed of Athanasius, but the anonymous composition of Gallic orthodoxy at least a century later than the champion of the Nicene Faith. Nor is one of them in its current form strictly Catholic or Oecumenical, for the Greek Orthodox Church gives no dogmatic sanction to the *Quicumque Vult*, the *Apostles' Creed*, or the *Te Deum*, and denounces the form of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed which is current in the West, while in the Churches beyond the Greek and Roman pale there is every conceivable variety of attitude towards each and all of them. The application to them, therefore, of the title of catholicity and oecumenicity, involves a similar kind, though not perhaps an equal degree, of pious exaggeration to that which is inherent in [p. 407] its use in the official designations of the great Churches of the East and West.

### **543. Cross, Sign of, in Catholic Practice**

SOURCE: W. Faerber, *Catechism for the Catholic Parochial Schools of the United States* (15th and 16th eds.; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1913), p. 101.

480. *Why is the sign of the cross so very beneficial and efficacious?*

The sign of the cross is so very beneficial and efficacious

- 1) because it drives away the devil who fears the cross,
- 2) because by it we obtain many graces and blessings from God.  
Hence to '*bless oneself*' means to make the sign of the cross.

481. *When should we particularly make the sign of the cross?*

We should particularly make the sign of the cross.

- 1) in the morning on awakening and in the evening when retiring,
- 2) before and after prayer,
- 3) when tempted, especially by bad thoughts,
- 4) in all dangers,
- 5) before undertaking anything important...

482. *When in particular is the sign of the cross efficacious?*

The sign of the cross is particularly efficacious when a bishop or priest, in the name of the Church, makes it over persons or things; because thereby they are blessed and made holy.

### **544. Cyrus, as Conqueror Before Taking Babylon**

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 34–40, 45, 48, 49. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

[p. 34] In 559 this Cyrus II became vassal king in Anshan and ruled [under Media] from his open capital Parsagarda.

Shut off from the hot, unhealthy coastal plain by mountains through which wound tortuous trails, the high plateau of Parsa was well fitted to retain the old Iranian fighting spirit. Scorning a master [Astyages] so weakened by luxury, Cyrus plotted revolt. His own tribe of the Pasargadae could be depended upon, for his family, the Achaemenidae, provided its rulers. With it were associated two other Persian tribes, the Maraphii and the Maspaii. To these were added still other Persian tribes...

[p. 35] Now that the Persians were all united under his rule, Cyrus looked about for an ally against Media among the other great powers. The nearest as well as the most logical was Babylonia...

[p. 36] In this hope, Nabu-naid made alliance with Cyrus, who thereupon openly rebelled against Media. To fulfil his part of the agreement, [p. 37] Nabu-naid promptly levied an army against the “rebels” who lived in the countries once held by Nebuchadnezzar...

Astyages did send out against his rebellious vassal an army under Harpagus, but he had forgotten how he had cruelly slain that general’s son; Harpagus did not forget and promptly deserted to Cyrus, bringing over with him most of his soldiers. A second army, commanded by Astyages in person, reached the capital of Parsa; here it mutinied, seized its king, and handed him over to Cyrus. Ecbatana was captured, and its wealth of gold, silver, and precious objects was carried off to Anshan (550).

Media ceased to be an independent nation and became the first satrapy, Mada. Nevertheless, the close relationship between Persians and Medes was never forgotten. Plundered Ecbatana remained a favorite royal residence. Medes were honored equally with Persians; they were employed in high office and were chosen to lead Persian armies. Foreigners spoke regularly of the Medes and Persians; when they used a single term, it was “the Mede.”

By his conquest of the Median Empire, Cyrus had taken over the Median claims to rule over Assyria, Mesopotamia, Syria, Armenia, and Cappadocia...

[p. 38] On news that his Median ally had been dethroned, Croesus of Lydia hastily collected his levies and crossed the former Halys boundary to pick up remnants of the empire. Cyrus, who had just revived the title “king of Parsa,” felt this a challenge to his own pretensions, and in April, 547, he set out from looted Ecbatana to meet the invader. After he had traversed the pass, high above the city, his road wound steadily downward until he reached the main line of the Zagros at the “Gate of Asia.” Beyond the “Gate,” the descent was even more [p. 39] rapid. The cold air suddenly became warmer, the poplars, cypresses, and plane trees of the plateau gave way to a few palms, and Cyrus was on the edge of the great Mesopotamian plains.

Cyrus might easily have turned south against Babylon, had not the skill of Nebuchadnezzar’s engineers formed that city and its surroundings into the world’s mightiest fortress. Wisely he postponed the assault and marched north into Assyria, already a Median dependency and therefore prepared to accept him without question. Arbela, for so many centuries overshadowed by Ashur and Nineveh, regained its prestige as the new capital of Athura. Cyrus crossed the Tigris below Arbela, and Ashur fell; the

gods of Ashur and Nineveh were saved only through refuge behind the walls of Babylon...

By May, Cyrus was ready to proceed against Croesus. The Great Road was again followed through North Syria, which also was detached from Nabu-aid's recent empire, and into Cilicia; on their own initiative, the hitherto independent Cilicians accepted Persian vassalage and as reward were permitted to retain their native kings, who regularly bore the name Syennesis. Through the Cilician Gates the army entered Cappadocia, which was organized as another satrapy, Katpatuka. At the same time, presumably, Armenia received Cyrus as successor to Astyages and henceforth was the satrapy of Armina.

After an indecisive battle in the land of Pteria, the country about the recently excavated Alaca Huyuk, Croesus retired to Sardis...

[p. 40] After but fourteen days of siege, the supposedly impregnable acropolis of Sardis was scaled and Croesus made prisoner (547).

"In May he marched to the land of Lydia. He killed its king. He took its booty. He placed in it his own garrison. Afterward his garrison and the king were in it." Such was the official report given by Cyrus. In actual fact, Croesus followed oriental custom and immolated himself to escape the usual indignities heaped upon a captured monarch before he was put to death...

[p. 45] Now that Nabu-aid had made his alliance with Croesus, Cyrus might continue openly his whittling-away of the Babylonian territory. On his return from Sardis, we should expect, he would take over the remaining portions of Syria yet held by Nabu-aid's soldiers and perhaps demand some expression of loyalty from the Arabs along the border. If Tema was threatened by these operations, this would be one reason why sometime after 545 Nabu-aid reappeared in Babylon...

Meanwhile, Cyrus himself had turned his attention to the as yet unsubdued Iranians of the eastern half of the plateau...

[p. 48] From Bactria, the most eastern of the truly Iranian lands, Cyrus looked across the boundary river, the Cophen, into the territory of their cousins, the Indians...

[p. 49] By these conquests Cyrus doubled the extent, though not the population or the wealth, of his empire. He was strengthened by so enormous an access of fighting men that at last he might venture to attack even Babylon. The natives were ready to welcome any deliverer, foreigner though he might be. By his archaizing reforms, Nabu-aid had alienated the priesthood of Marduk, at whose expense these reforms had been made. Other priests were dissatisfied. Jewish prophets were predicting Babylon's fall and hailing Cyrus as the Lord's Anointed who would grant return to Zion. The whole land was in chaos.

The way thus paved by the disaffected elements of the population, Cyrus made ready to invade the alluvium as soon as he had returned from his eastern campaigns. Before the snows of the winter of 540–539 could fill the passes, he was on the border [of Babylonia].

### **545. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon**

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, Vol. 2 (6th ed., rev.; New York: Abingdon, 1915), pp. 573, 574.

[p. 573] When Cyrus reached the city of Upi [Opis] the army of Accad opposed his advance, but whether Bel-shar-usur [Belshazzar], who had commanded it, was now in the van does not appear. The opposition was in vain, and Cyrus drove it before him and

moved southward resistlessly. Sippar was taken, without a blow, ... and Nabonidus fled. Two days later the van of the army of Cyrus entered Babylon, as the gates swung open without resistance to admit it. Cyrus himself was not in command, but had remained in the background while Ugbaru (Gobryas), governor of Gutium, led the advance. Nabonidus was taken in the city, whither he had fled from Sippar...

[p. 574] On the third day of Marcheshwan Cyrus held entry into the city. It was a triumphal entrance, and all Babylon greeted him with plaudits and hailed him as a deliverer. So fickle was the populace, so ready to say, "The king is dead; long live the king."

#### 546. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon According to Cyrus' Account (Cyrus Cylinder)

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 175–178.

[p. 175] Another cuneiform document dealing in a general way with the close of Nabonidus' reign and the establishment of Persian rule in Babylonia is known as the *Cyrus Cylinder*. [Transliterated cuneiform texts, which precede each translated quotation, omitted.] ... [p. 176] (1) *Cyrus Chosen as Universal Ruler*

<sup>11b</sup> The totality of all lands he (Marduk) surveyed (and) inspected. <sup>12</sup> He sought a righteous prince according to his heart's desire who would grasp his hands. Cyrus, the king of Anshan, whose name he uttered, he proclaimed for lordship over everything. <sup>13</sup> The land of Kutha, the totality of the Umman-Manda he subdued to his feet. The black-headed people, whom he allowed to approach his hands, <sup>14</sup> he was mindful of in truth and righteousness. Marduk, the great lord, the protector of his people, looked joyfully upon his pious deeds and his righteous heart. <sup>15</sup> He decreed his march upon his city, Babylon, and caused him to take the road to Babylon. Like a friend and companion he went by his side.

#### (2) *Babylon's Submission to Cyrus*

<sup>16</sup> His widespread troops, whose number like the waters of a river is not known, put on their weapons and advanced at his side. <sup>17</sup> Without encounter and battle he caused him to enter into the midst of Babylon, his city. He saved Babylon from need. Nabonidus, the king who did not venerate him (Marduk) he (Marduk) delivered into his hands (*i.e.* the hands of Cyrus). [p. 177] <sup>18</sup> All the people of Babylon, the totality of the land of Sumer and Akkad, the princes and governors prostrated themselves unto him (and) kissed his feet. They rejoiced in his sovereignty (and) their countenances shone. <sup>19</sup> The lord (*i.e.* Cyrus), who through his might brought the dead to life (and) through destruction and *pa-ki-e* protected all, they served gladly (and) revered his name...

The rest of the inscription is in the first person with Cyrus as spokesman. He begins with the usual formula, viz., 'I (am) Cyrus, the king of totality, the great king, the mighty king, the king of Babylon, the king of Sumer and Akkad, the king of the four quarters (of the world),' etc. This is followed by a passage recounting some of the benefits which accrued from Cyrus' assumption of authority:

#### (3) *Cyrus' Interest in Babylon's Welfare*

<sup>22b</sup> When I had entered into the midst of Babylon in peace, <sup>23</sup> I took the seat of lordship in the palace of princes amidst jubilation and rejoicing. Marduk, the great lord, the receptive heart of the inhabitants of Babylon..., while I daily attended to his worship. <sup>24</sup> My numerous troops advanced peacefully into the midst of Babylon. I did not permit an enemy [178] in all the land of Sumer and Akkad. <sup>25</sup> The inner part of Babylon and all its cities I cared for in peace; the inhabitants of Babylon... [I freed] from a yoke which was not fitting. (Asto) their dwellings, <sup>26</sup> I repaired their dilapidation; I removed their ruins. Marduk, the lord, rejoiced on account of my deeds. <sup>27</sup> Unto me, Cyrus, the king who venerates him, and Cambyses, the son (and) offspring of my heart, and unto the totality of my troops <sup>28</sup> he was graciously favorable; in peace before it we gladly praise his lofty divinity...

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

## 547. Cyrus.—Capture of Babylon, Babylonian Record of (Nabonidus Chronicle)

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researchers, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 168–173.

[p. 168] Babylonian literature, as recovered thus far, provides no minute record of the events connected with the capture of Babylon by Cyrus. The *Nabonidus Chronicle* contains the most lengthy cuneiform account of the occurrences which preceded and accompanied the fall of the city. However, the statements in this narrative are so brief that most details are left to the imagination... The sections of the *Nabonidus Chronicle* dealing with the fall of Babylon will now be considered.

### (1) *New Year's Festival Observed*

All authorities agree that the passage about to be quoted represents the beginning of the record of the seventeenth year of Nabonidus' reign. It is highly probable that line 5 began with the words *Sattu 17<sup>kam</sup>*, 'In the seventeenth year.' The text proceeds thus [transliterated cuneiform text omitted here]:

[p. 169] <sup>5</sup> [In the seventeenth year] Nabû came from Borsippa to meet... <sup>6</sup>... The king entered Eturkamma... <sup>7</sup>... The abundance of wine was ample among the [troops]... <sup>8</sup>... Bêl went forth. They kept the New Year's festival as is right. In the month... <sup>9</sup>... [the gods] of Maradda, Zababa (Ilbaba) and the gods of Kish, Ninlil, [and the gods of] <sup>10</sup> Harsagkamma entered Babylon. Until the end of Elul the gods of Akkad... <sup>11</sup> who were above the earth and below the earth, entered Babylon. The gods of Borsippa, Kutha... <sup>12a</sup> and Sippar did not enter [Babylon].

The above passage contains the only intimation in extant cuneiform literature of Nabonidus' presence in Babylon after his stay at Tûmf in Arabia. The *Nabonidus Chronicle* asserts that the New Year's festival was neglected in the seventh, ninth, tenth, and eleventh years on account of Nabonidus' absence from Babylon. His return is indicated in the record of the seventeenth year. Because of his presence in the capital the proper observance of the New Year's festival could take place...

### (2) *Opis Attacked by Cyrus*

In the march of Cyrus' army against Babylon the only real battle of the campaign was fought at Opis [transliteration omitted]:

<sup>12b</sup>, <sup>13</sup> In the month Tishri, when Cyrus fought at Opis on the Tigris river [p. 170] against the troops of Akkad, the people of Akkad <sup>14a</sup> he destroyed by means of a conflagration; he put the people to death.

### (3) *Sippar Captured by Cyrus*

The account of the capture of Sippar is in the form of a mere statement by the chronicler [transliteration omitted]:

<sup>14b</sup> On the fourteenth day Sippar was captured without fighting. <sup>15a</sup> Nabonidus fled.

### (4) *Gobryas in Babylon*

Babylon fell without a drastic struggle into the hands of Gobryas, the main general of Cyrus [transliteration omitted]:

<sup>15b</sup> On the sixteenth day of Ugbaru (Gobryas), the governor of Gutium, and the troops of Cyrus without fighting <sup>16</sup> entered Babylon. Afterwards when Nabonidus returned he was taken captive in Babylon. Until the end of the month the shields <sup>17</sup>, <sup>18a</sup> of Gutium surrounded the gates of Esagila. No one's weapon was placed in Esagila or the sanctuaries, and no appointed time was disregarded...

[p. 171] The reference to the fact that the temple Esagila and the other sanctuaries of the city were kept inviolate indicates that the invaders maintained a punctilious regard for the religious scruples of the Babylonians. There was no tendency to run counter to any of the pious customs of those who were called upon to acclaim the new regime. Every impulse which was sacred in the eyes of the people was allowed its due expression.

[p. 172] (5) *Cyrus in Babylon*

Cyrus entered Babylon in peace. He reorganized the city politically and restored the religious order of the land [transliteration omitted]:

<sup>18b</sup> In the month Marchesvan, the third day, Cyrus entered Babylon. <sup>19</sup>, <sup>20</sup> Ḫarinê were carried before him. Peace was established in the city; Cyrus decreed peace for all in Babylon. Gobryas [Gubaru], his governor, placed governors in charge of Babylon. <sup>21</sup> From the month Kislev to the month Adar, the gods whom Nabonidus had brought up to Babylon... <sup>22a</sup> they returned to their cities.

It should be noted that the entry of Cyrus into Babylon did not take place until seventeen days after the military occupation of the city had been achieved by Gobryas. There had been sufficient time for adjustment to the new situation. If there was a faction in the city which failed to sympathize with Cyrus' aims it was effectually quelled. The Persian king was welcomed by the Babylonians. He reciprocated by proclaiming peace to all in the city. Systematic political control was established under the direction of Gobryas, and the religious policy of Nabonidus was reversed by returning to their proper cities those gods which had been brought to Babylon.

#### (6) *Death and Lamentation*

The joyful acclamation of Cyrus by the Babylonians was followed quickly by the death of a prominent personage and a period of mourning [transliteration omitted]:

[p. 173] <sup>22b</sup> In the month Marchesvan, on the night of the eleventh, Ugbaru (Gobryas) died. In the month. <sup>23</sup> ... of the king died. From the twenty-eighth day of the month Adar to the third day of the month Nisan there was weeping in the land of Akkad... <sup>24a</sup> All the people prostrated their heads.

The original text indicates the 28th day in line 23 instead of the 27th. Several fragmentary lines follow, with an indefinite reference to Cambyses, the son of Cyrus. It seems that Cambyses participated in a New Year's temple ceremony which took place on the fourth day of the month Nisan.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The superior figures in the translated text indicate lines of the original. Bracketed words in the text (except [Gubaru] in [sec. 5](#)) are in the original. For Ugbaru and Gubaru see [SDACom 4:816](#).]

### **548. Cyrus.—Capture of Babylon by Diverting Euphrates (Greek Account)**

SOURCE: Xenophon *Cyropaedia* vii. 5. 10, 13, 15, 16, 26–30; translated by Walter Miller, [Vol. 2](#) (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1943), pp. 265, 267, 269, 271, 273. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 265] 10. Accordingly, he took measurements in a circle round about the city, leaving just enough room by the river for the erection of large towers, and began [p. 267] on either side of the city to dig an immense trench; and the earth from it they threw up on their own side of the ditch. 11. First of all, he began to build towers by the river, laying his foundations with the trunks of date-palms not less than a hundred feet long—and they grow even taller than that. And they were good material for this purpose, for it is a well known fact that date-palms, when under heavy pressure, bend upward like the backs of pack-asses. 12. These he used as “mud-sills,” in order that, even if the river should break into his trench above, it might not carry his towers away. And he erected many other towers besides upon the breast-works of earth, so that he might have as many watch-towers as possible.

13. Thus, then, his men were employed, while the enemy upon the walls laughed his siege-works to scorn, in the belief that they had provisions enough for more than twenty years.

Upon hearing of this, Cyrus divided his army into twelve parts as if intending each part to be responsible for sentry duty during one month of each year...

15. At last the ditches were completed. Then, when he heard that a certain festival had come round in Babylon, during which all Babylon was accustomed to drink and revel all night long, Cyrus took a large number of men, just as soon as it was dark, and [p. 269] opened up the heads of the trenches at the river. 16. As soon as that was done, the water flowed down through the ditches in the night, and the bed of the river, where it traversed the city, became passable for men...

[p. 271] 26. ... They advanced. And of those they met on the way, some fell by their swords, some fled back into their houses, some shouted to them; and Gobryas and his men shouted [p. 273] back to the, as if they were fellow-revellers. They advanced as fast as they could and were soon at the palace. 27. And Gobryas and Gadatas and their troops found the gates leading to the palace locked, and those who had been appointed to attack the guard fell upon them as they were drinking by a blazing fire, and without waiting they dealt with them as with foes. 28. But, as a noise and tumult ensued, those within heard the uproar, and at the king's command to see what the matter was, some of them opened the gates and ran out. 29. And when Gadatas and his men saw the gates open they dashed in in pursuit of the others as they fled back into the palace, and dealing blows right and left they came into the presence of the king; and they found him already risen with his dagger in his hand. 30. And Gadatas and Gobryas and their followers overpowered him; and those about the king perished also, one where he had sought some shelter, another while running away, another while actually trying to defend himself with whatever he could.

31. Cyrus then sent the companies of cavalry around through the streets and gave them orders to cut down all whom they found out of doors.

#### **549. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon by Drawing Off the Euphrates (Greek Account)**

SOURCE: *Herodotus* 1. 191; translated by A. D. Godley, Vol. 4 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1946), pp. 239, 241. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 239] He [Cyrus] posted his army at the place where the river enters the city, and another part of it where the stream issues from the city, and bade his men enter the city by the channel of the Euphrates when they should see it to be fordable. Having so arrayed them and given this command, he himself marched away with those of his army who could not fight; and when he came to the lake, Cyrus dealt with it and with the river just as had the Babylonian queen: drawing off the river by a canal into the lake, which was till now a marsh, he made the stream to sink till its former channel could be forded. When this happened, the Persians who were posted with this intent made their way into Babylon by the channel of the Euphrates, which had now sunk about to the height of the middle of a man's thigh. Now if the Babylonians had known beforehand or learnt what Cyrus was planning, they would have suffered the Persians to enter the city and brought them to a miserable end; for then they would have shut all the gates that opened on the river and themselves mounted up on to the walls that ran along the river [p. 241] banks, and so caught their enemies as in a trap. But as it was, the Persians were upon them unawares, and by reason of the great size of the city—so say those who dwell there—those in the outer parts of it were overcome, yet the dwellers in the middle part knew nothing of it; all this time they were dancing and making merry at a festival which chanced to be toward, till they learnt the truth but too well.

[EDITORS' NOTE: No mention of this is made in the inscriptions; but there is no reason why Cyrus should not have had recourse to this means of entry. The tablets, it must be remembered, were written by

the priestly scribes to magnify the part of Marduk in leading Cyrus into Babylon, and in the interests of Cyrus, to publish to the world how gladly he was welcomed by the people. It would be perfectly in keeping with their style of history to omit reference to the draining of the river. On the other hand, both Herodotus and Xenophon may have gathered information from Babylonian sources. The descriptions of Babylon given by Herodotus, except for the size of the city, have been generally verified by modern excavations, showing that he is a credible authority. These accounts of the draining of the Euphrates by Cyrus are not discredited by the omission of such reference in the tablets. All this may be covered by the statements of both tablets that Cyrus entered without battle; and it would be in harmony with their plan, for the glorification of Cyrus as the chosen deliverer of Marduk's shrine and people, to omit reference to any street fighting after Cyrus' army entered, though they preserve the essential story of the attack upon the citadel.]

### **550. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon Followed by Peaceful Change of Government**

SOURCE: A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, pp. 50, 51. Copyright 1948 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the University of Chicago Press.

[p. 50] Near the beginning of October, Cyrus fought another battle at Opis on the Tigris and burned the people of Akkad with fire. After this example of frightfulness, his opponents lost courage and on October 11 Sippar was taken without a battle. Nabu-naid [Nabonidus] fled, and on October 13, 539, Gobryas [Ugbaru], governor of Gutium, and the troops of Cyrus entered Babylon without battle. Afterward, when Nabunaid returned to Babylon, he was made prisoner.

The last tablet dated by Nabu-naid is from October 14, the day after Gobryas had captured Babylon, but it was written at Uruk, to which the welcome news had not yet penetrated. In the capital itself business went on as usual, for contemporaries had no realization that with the fall of Babylon an era had come to an end and another had begun. By October 26 at the latest, the scribes were dating by the new ruler as "king of lands." This remained the official titulature during the remainder of the "accession year" and for a part of the first full year of reign.

Babylon was well treated by Gobryas. Until the end of October, the "shields" of Gutium surrounded the gates of Esagila. No man's weapon was set up in Esagila or in the other temples and no appointed ceremony was omitted. On October 29 Cyrus himself entered Babylon. [p. 51] Branches were spread in his path, and he proclaimed peace to everyone in the city. Gobryas [Gubar] was made satrap of the new province of Babirush [Babylonia], and he appointed subordinate officials; the administrative documents show us that, as a rule, the former officials were retained at their posts.

### **551. Cyrus—Capture of Babylon, Results of**

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 167, 168.

[p. 167] Cyrus' capture of Babylon brought about far-reaching consequences. Its subjugation by Sennacherib and Ashurbanipal had not removed the balance of power from Semitic control, but the triumph of Persia in 539 B.C. introduced a new predominating influence in ancient Oriental developments. That date marks the turning-point in favor of Aryan leadership, a directing force which has maintained itself at the forefront of civilization down to the present day. The victories of Cyrus culminating in Babylon's inclusion in the Persian empire laid the foundation for later historical developments. It is probable that Greek and Roman conquests in the East would have resulted even if domination by Persia had not prepared the way, but the fact remains that Cyrus assumed the rôle [p. 168] of arbiter in Oriental affairs two centuries before the time

of Alexander. For this reason events connected with the fall of Babylon in 539 B.C. merit careful study.

### **552. Cyrus—Decree for Return of Jews Fulfills Prophecy**

SOURCE: Ira Maurice Price and others, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, pp. 313, 316, 317. Copyright 1958 by The Judson Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 313] When Babylon fell into the hands of Cyrus, he became ruler of the political, commercial, cultural, and religious center of the world. Cyrus assumed the responsibility of administering its government, of satisfying its diverse population, and of keeping peace with the rest of the territory that he had conquered. The inauguration of this new liberal policy was an epoch in the history of southwestern Asia. . .

[p. 316] Cyrus inaugurated a policy of generosity toward his new subjects, . . . to promote in every way their welfare. As a wise statesman, a shrewd politician, and a kindhearted ruler, he planned methods by which he could better the condition of his peoples. He was ready to espouse their cause almost to the peril of his throne. He revered their gods, and where they had been neglected or desecrated, he was solicitous for their restoration to their [p. 317] former shrines and veneration. Babylon and all its precincts bore evidences of his spirit in the rebuilding and rededicating of many shrines and temples. His own appeals to the gods and his avowed support of them reveal Cyrus as a polytheist of a pronounced type.

It was not a matter of monotheism or of a possible Zoroastrianism that called his attention to the Jews, but other reasons of no mean importance: (1) In addition to the restoration and rehabilitation of captive and dethroned deities, he says "All of their peoples I assembled and restored to their own dwelling places." This definitely stated national policy gives us one reason for the royal proclamation (Ezra 1:2-4) issued in favor of the Jews. (2) It is altogether probable that Cyrus caught up from someone in Babylonia the mission which had been assigned him by the prophets:

"Who says of Cyrus, 'He is my shepherd, and he shall fulfill all my purpose'; saying of Jerusalem, 'She shall be built,' and of the temple, 'Your foundation shall be laid'" (Isa. 44:28).

(3) Palestine had been from time immemorial a buffer state between southwestern Asia and Egypt. To occupy and hold the strong fortress of Jerusalem was the first step toward the conquest of the rival power. If Cyrus could secure that advantage by aiding the Jews to rebuild and hold it, he would be setting up one battlement in the face of Egypt's army.

### **553. Cyrus, Isaiah's Prophecy Read by (Josephus' Account)**

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* xi. 1. 2.; translated by Ralph Marcus, Vol. 6 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 315, 317. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 315] These things [that he was to return the Jews to Jerusalem] Cyrus knew from reading the book of prophecy which Isaiah had left behind two hundred and ten years earlier. For this prophet had [p. 317] said that God told him in secret, "It is my will that Cyrus, whom I shall have appointed king of many great nations, shall send my people to their own land and build my temple." Isaiah prophesied these things one hundred and forty years [see No. 250n] before the temple was demolished. And so, when Cyrus read them, he wondered at the divine power and was seized by a strong desire and ambition to do what had been written; and, summoning the most distinguished of the Jews in Babylon, he told them that he gave them leave to journey to their native land and to

rebuild both the city of Jerusalem and the temple of God, for God, he said, would be their ally and he himself would write to his own governors and satraps who were in the neighbourhood of their country to give them contributions of gold and silver for the building of the temple and, in addition, animals for the sacrifices.

#### **554. Cyrus, Peoples and Gods Restored to Their Homes by, According to the Cyrus Cylinder**

SOURCE: The Cyrus Cylinder, [trans.](#) in Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), p. 178.

<sup>30b</sup> From ... unto Ashur and Susa, <sup>31</sup> Agade, Eshnunak, Zamban, Me-Turnu (and) Dūr including the district of Kutha, the cities beyond the Tigris, whose settlements were established of old, <sup>32</sup>I returned unto their (proper) place the gods who dwelt in them and established (them in) an eternal habitation. All their peoples I assembled and restored (to) their dwellings. <sup>33</sup>And the gods of the land of Sumer and Akkad, whom Nabonidus to the rage of the lord of the gods brought into Babylon, at the command of Marduk, the great lord, unmolested <sup>34</sup>I caused to reside in their dwellings, an abiding-place of joy to the heart.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Superior figures represent the lines in the original inscription.]

#### **555. Daniel, as “Third Ruler” in the Kingdom**

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 196, 197.

[p. 196] Although Nabonidus was not present in the imperial capital when it yielded to the troops of Cyrus, he was still *regarded as the king of Babylon*. In fact there were those of his subjects who looked upon him as their sovereign until the second month after Babylon fell. Even if it cannot be substantiated by present data derived from cuneiform sources, there is no reason for doubting, while awaiting further evidence, that Belshazzar was acting as coregent when Babylon was captured. On this assumption there were two sovereigns in the kingdom at that time. Nabonidus was the titular head of the nation, but Belshazzar who had been delegated with royal authority by his father, was the second ruler [see No. 213]. The fifth chapter of Daniel is in remarkable harmony with such a state of affairs. It describes a situation in which a man meriting royal favor could be rewarded by being made the third ruler in the kingdom. Different views have been expressed as to the meaning of the phrase ‘the third ruler in the [p. 197] kingdom.’ The most rational procedure is to interpret it in the light of known circumstances. Cuneiform records have demonstrated conclusively that Nabonidus and Belshazzar functioned as two rulers during most of the former’s reign, and there is no positive evidence that this political arrangement did not last until the final days of the Neo-Babylonian empire. That the account in Daniel takes cognizance of this, although not mentioning Nabonidus, may be regarded as indicating a true historical basis for the narrative.<sup>654</sup> [Note 654: It is clear that Nabonidus was looked upon as the first ruler in the nation and that Belshazzar was regarded as the second. The interpreter of the dream in the fifth chapter of Daniel was given third place in the kingdom... Historical parallels to dual rulership are not wanting.]

#### **556. Daniel, Book of—Accuracy of Daniel 5**

SOURCE: Raymond Philip Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (Yale Oriental Series. Researches, Vol. 15. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 199, 200.

[p. 199] The foregoing summary of information concerning Belshazzar, when judged in the light of data obtained from the texts discussed in this monograph, indicates that of all non-Babylonian records dealing with the situation at the close of the Neo-Babylonian

empire the [p. 200] *fifth chapter of Daniel ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy* so far as outstanding events are concerned. The Scriptural account may be interpreted as excelling because it employs the name Belshazzar, because it attributes royal power to Belshazzar, and because it recognizes that a dual rulership existed in the kingdom. Babylonian cuneiform documents of the sixth century B.C. furnish clear-cut evidence of the correctness of these three basic historical nuclei contained in the Biblical narrative dealing with the fall of Babylon. Cuneiform texts written under Persian influence in the sixth century B.C. have not preserved the name Belshazzar, but his r"le as a crown prince entrusted with royal power during Nabonidus' stay in Arabia is depicted convincingly. Two famous Greek historians of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. do not mention Belshazzar by name and hint only vaguely at the actual political situation which existed in the time of Nabonidus. Annals in the Greek language ranging from about the beginning of the third century B.C. to the first century B.C. are absolutely silent concerning Belshazzar and the prominence which he had during the last reign of the Neo-Babylonian empire. The total information found in all available chronologically-fixed documents later than the cuneiform texts of the sixth century B.C. and prior to the writings of Josephus of the first century A.D. could not have provided the necessary material for the historical framework of the fifth chapter of Daniel.<sup>671</sup>

[Note 671:] The view that the fifth chapter of Daniel originated in the Maccabaeen age is discredited. Biblical critics have pushed back its date to the third century B.C. See Montgomery, *op. cit.*, [J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*], p. 96, on the dating of Daniel 1–6. However, a narrative characterized by such an accurate historical perspective as Daniel 5 ought to be entitled to a place much nearer in time to the reliable documents which belong to the general epoch with which it deals.

### **557. Daniel, Book of, Difficulties of "Antiochus View" of Daniel's Fourth Kingdom, Pointed Out by Advocate of "Greek View"**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1935, Second Impression 1959), pp. 91, 92. Used by permission.

[p. 91] Most of those who in modern times hold the Greek view ["Grecia" as the fourth kingdom of Daniel 2 and 7] adopt the further view that the author—or the interpolator of these chapters—lived in the time of Antiochus, and looked for an immediate catastrophic end of the Greek empire, which, however, failed to materialize...

Not a few of the holders of the Greek view, however, have retained the traditional view of the date and authorship of the book [that is, that the book was written by Daniel in the 6th century B.C.]. To them, therefore, the whole of the visions and their interpretation constitute true prophecies, and no parts can be treated as *vaticinia ex eventu* [predictions from the event]. Upon them, then, just as much as upon the holders of the Roman view of the fourth kingdom, is the duty incumbent of showing exact accordance between the prophecies and the history in which [p. 92] they had their fulfillment. And as little are they able to do so. For the age of Antiochus Epiphanes was in no sense the prelude to the Messianic age, and there was no catastrophic end of the Greek empire in his day.

It has already been noted that some of those who adopt this form of the Greek view of the fourth empire point out that Christ was born at the beginning of the Roman empire, and therefore just after the termination of the Greek empire—which reached its final end

with the annexation of the Ptolemaic kingdom [30 B.C.]. They hold that the fifth and enduring kingdom is the Kingdom of Christ, whom they find to be represented by the stone cut without hands out of the mountain. But while in chapter vii the 'son of man' first appears just after the destruction of the fourth beast, in chapter ii it is the impact of the stone upon the feet of the image that brings about its downfall. The birth of Christ can in no way be causally connected with the end of the Greek empire...

Nor can the insolent words of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is held to be the Little Horn, be related to the destruction of the Greek empire, or to the coming of Christ. It was because of the great words of the Little Horn that the doom was pronounced upon the fourth beast, and the enduring kingdom inaugurated. Moreover the Little Horn made war upon the saints, but the victory was given unto them in the possession of the kingdom. But the birth of Christ, and the establishment of His spiritual kingdom amongst men, can in no natural way be explained as the sequel of the acts or words of Antiochus Epiphanes, nor can His kingdom be supposed to have been given to any of the saints with whom Antiochus warred.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The majority of writers on Daniel in past centuries have held that the fourth empire was not Greek but Roman, while in modern times the majority hold the "Greek view," and many of them regard Daniel as a late author who wrote a pseudo-prophecy after the events had occurred. The "Greek view," it should be explained, exists in two forms. The first outlines the four kingdoms as (1) Babylon, (2) Medes and Persians, (3) Alexander's empire, (4) the divided kingdoms succeeding Alexander's; the second sees them as (1) Babylon, (2) Media, (3) Persia, (4) Alexander and his successors. In the first series, the separation of (3) and (4) is historically unjustifiable (see No. 559); and in the second series the insertion of Media after Babylon is erroneous, for Media fell to Cyrus before Babylon did (see No. 544).]

---

<sup>6</sup>Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.