

642. Earth, Fallen, God's Regard for, Illustrated

SOURCE: J. B. Phillips, *New Testament Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 15–19. Copyright 1956, 1958, by J. B. Phillips and used with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

[p. 15] It may give us a fresh perspective on life, if for a few moments we shed the limitations of earthbound thinking, and detach ourselves deliberately from modern pressures and problems. Let us pretend for a little while; the pretense may be fanciful, but it may help us to let the real truth break over us afresh.***

Once upon a time a very young angel was being shown round the splendors and glories of the universes by a senior and experienced angel. To tell the truth, the little angel was beginning to be tired and a little bored. He had been shown whirling galaxies and blazing suns, infinite distances in the deathly cold of interstellar space, and to his mind there seemed to be an awful lot of it all. Finally he was shown the galaxy of which our planetary system is but a small part. As the two of them drew near to the star which we call our sun and to its circling planets, the senior angel pointed to a small and rather insignificant sphere turning very slowly on its axis. It looked as dull as a dirty tennis ball to the little angel whose mind was filled with the size and glory of what he had seen.

"I want you to watch that one particularly," said the senior angel, pointing with his finger.

"Well, it looks very small and rather dirty to me," said the little angel. "What's special about that one?"

"That," replied his senior solemnly, "is the Visited Planet."

"'Visited'?" said the little one. "You don't mean visited by—"

[p. 16] "Indeed I do. That ball, which I have no doubt looks to you small and insignificant and not perhaps overclean, has been visited by our young Prince of Glory." And at these words he bowed his head reverently.

"But how?" queried the younger one. "Do you mean that our great and glorious Prince, with all these wonders and splendors of His Creation, and millions more that I'm sure I haven't seen yet, went down in Person to this fifth-rate little ball? Why should He do a thing like that?"

"It isn't for us," said his senior, a little stiffly, "to question His 'why's,' except that I must point out to you that He is not impressed by size and numbers as you seem to be. But that He really went I know, and all of us in Heaven who know anything know that. As to why He became one of them ... How else do you suppose could He visit them?"

The little angel's face wrinkled in disgust.

"Do you mean to tell me," he said, "that He stooped so low as to become one of those creeping, crawling creatures of that floating ball?"

"I do, and I don't think He would like you to call them 'creeping crawling creatures' in that tone of voice. For, strange as it may seem to us, He loves them. He went down to visit them to lift them up to become like Him."

The little angel looked blank. Such a thought was almost beyond his comprehension.

"Close your eyes for a moment," said the senior angel, "and we will go back in what they call Time."

While the little angel's eyes were closed and the two of them moved nearer to the spinning ball, it stopped its spinning, spun backward quite fast for a while, and then slowly resumed its usual rotation.

“Now look!” and as the little angel did as he was told, there appeared here and there on the dull surface of the [p. 17] globe little flashes of light, some merely momentary and some persisting for quite a time.

“Well, what am I seeing now?” queried the little angel.

“You are watching this little world as it was some thousands of years ago,” returned his companion. “Every flash and glow of light that you see is something of the Father’s knowledge and wisdom breaking into the minds and hearts of people who live upon the earth. Not many people, you see, can hear His Voice or understand what He says, even though He is speaking gently and quietly to them all the time.”

“Why are they so blind and deaf and stupid?” asked the junior angel rather crossly.

“It is not for us to judge them. We who live in the Splendor have no idea what it is like to live in the dark. We hear the music and the Voice like the sound of many waters every day of our lives, but to them—well, there is much darkness and much noise and much distraction upon the earth. Only a few who are quiet and humble and wise hear His Voice. But watch, for in a moment you will see something truly wonderful.”

The Earth went on turning and circling round the sun, and then, quite suddenly, in the upper half of the globe there appeared a light, tiny, but so bright in its intensity that both the angels hid their eyes.

“I think I can guess,” said the little angel in a low voice. “That was the Visit, wasn’t it?”

“Yes, that was the Visit. The Light Himself went down there and lived among them; but in a moment, and you will be able to tell that even with your eyes closed, the light will go out.”

“But why? Could He not bear their darkness and stupidity? Did He have to return here?”

“No, it wasn’t that,” returned the senior angel. His [p. 18] voice was stern and sad. “They failed to recognize Him for Who He was—or at least only a handful knew Him. For the most part they preferred their darkness to His Light, and in the end they killed Him.”

“The fools, the crazy fools! they don’t deserve—”

“Neither you nor I nor any other angel knows why they were so foolish and so wicked. Nor can we say what they deserve or don’t deserve. But the fact remains, they killed our Prince of Glory while He was Man amongst them.”

“And that, I suppose, was the end? I see the whole Earth has gone black and dark. All right, I won’t judge them, but surely that is all they could expect?”

“Wait. We are still far from the end of the story of the Visited Planet. Watch now, but be ready to cover your eyes again.”

In utter blackness the Earth turned round three times, and then there blazed with unbearable radiance a point of light.

“What now?” asked the little angel shielding his eyes.

“They killed Him, all right, but He conquered death. The thing most of them dread and fear all their lives He broke and conquered. He rose again, and a few of them saw Him, and from then on became His utterly devoted slaves.”

“Thank God for that!” said the little angel.

“Amen. Open your eyes now; the dazzling light has gone. The Prince has returned to His Home of Light. But watch the Earth now.”

As they looked, in place of the dazzling light there was a bright glow which throbbed and pulsed. And then as the Earth turned many times, little points of light spread out. A few flickered and died, but for the most part the lights burned steadily, and as they continued to watch, in [p. 19] many parts of the globe there was a glow over many areas.

“You see what is happening?” asked the senior angel. “The bright glow is the company of loyal men and women He left behind, and with His help they spread the glow, and now lights begin to shine all over the Earth.”

“Yes, yes,” said the little angel impatiently. “But how does it end? Will the little lights join up with one another? Will it all be light, as it is in Heaven?”

His senior shook his head. “We simply do not know,” he replied. “It is in the Father’s hands. Sometimes it is agony to watch, and sometimes it is joy unspeakable. The end is not yet. But now I am sure you can see why this little ball is so important. He has visited it; He is working out His Plan upon it.”

“Yes, I see, though I don’t understand. I shall never forget that this is the Visited Planet...”

Imaginary? Fanciful? Certainly, but a good deal truer than some of our current modern thinking. For in the eyes of the Eternal World this little planet is of the highest importance simply because it is the Visited Planet. We may not realize it at all, but we are right plumb in the middle of a vast drama, a tremendous battle between light and darkness. The whole core and essence of the Christian Faith, which many of us hold so lightly, is that Light Himself visited our darkness, scaled down to fit the human scene... Today, and every day that we live in the here-and-now, we are part of the vast Experiment, the agelong Battle, whose stage and testing ground is the planet which we call the Earth.

643. Earthquake, Lisbon, Described by Eyewitness

SOURCE: Letter of ship captain to ship’s owners, dated Lisbon, Nov. 19, [1755], in Thomas Hunter, *Historical Account of Earthquakes* (Liverpool: R. Williamson, 1756), pp. 72–74.

[p. 72] Almost all the Palaces and large Churches were rent down, or Part fallen, and scarce one House of this vast City is left habitable. Every Body that was not crushed to Death ran out into the large Places, and those near the River ran down to save themselves by Boats, or any other floating Convenience, running, crying, and calling to the Ships for Assistance; but whilst the Multitude were gathered near the River-side, the Water rose to such a Height that it overflow’d the lower Part of the City, which so terrified the miserable and already dismayed Inhabitants, who ran to and for with dreadful Cries, which we heard plainly on Board, that it made them believe the Dissolution of the World was at Hand, every one falling on his Knees, and intreating the Almighty for his Assistance...

[p. 73] By two o’Clock the Ships Boats began to ply, and took Multitudes on board... The Fear, the Sorrow, the Cries and Lamentations of the poor Inhabitants are inexpressible; every one begging Pardon, and embracing each other; crying, forgive me Friend, Brother, Sister! Oh! what will become of us! neither Water nor Land will protect us, and the [p. 74] Third Element, Fire, seems now to threaten our total Destruction! as in Effect it happened.

The Conflagration lasted a whole Week.

644. Earthquake, Lisbon, Most Spectacular of Earlier Times

SOURCE: G. A. Eiby, *About Earthquakes* (New York: Harper, 1957), pp. 141, 142. Copyright 1957 by G. A. Eiby. Used by permission.

[p. 141] By far the most spectacular earthquake of earlier times was that of Lisbon, in 1755. This has some claim to be regarded as the greatest earthquake on record. If it is possible to believe reports, the felt area, which was certainly more than 700 miles in radius, extended from the Azores to Italy, and from England to North Africa. A source of confusion in the reports of this shock, which makes it difficult to judge the real extent of the felt area, was the widespread occurrence of seiches, ... wave movements in ponds and lakes...

Oscillations of this kind were observed in France, Italy, Holland, Switzerland, and England, and reports of the movements even came from Norway and Sweden, at a distance of nearly 1800 miles from the epicentre. In those countries, however, the shock was certainly not felt...

[p. 142] In 1755, the damage to Lisbon itself was very great. At that time, the city had about 230,000 inhabitants, nearly 30,000 of whom were killed, according to conservative estimates. Great numbers of people were in the churches, for it was All Saints' Day, and the time of the first Mass. The shock was followed by a tsunami ["tidal wave"] about twenty feet in height, and by fire.

The disaster shocked all Europe, and the moralists and the wiseacres were not slow to make capital of it.

645. Earthquake, Lisbon, Probably Most Famous of All

SOURCE: Perry Byerly, "Earthquakes," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1961 ed.), Vol. 7, p. 848. Copyright 1961 by Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago. Used by permission.

Probably the most famous of all earthquakes is that which destroyed Lisbon on Nov. 1, 1755. There were three great earthquakes (the first was the largest) at 9:40 A.M., 10 A.M. and at noon. The main shock lasted six to seven minutes, an unusually long duration. Within six minutes at least 30,000 people were killed, all large public buildings and 12,000 dwellings were demolished. It was a church day, and great loss of life occurred in the churches. A fire followed which burned for six days. A marble quay at the riverside disappeared into the river bottom laden with people. Alexander von Humboldt stated that the total area shaken was four times that of Europe.

646. Earthquake, Lisbon, Recognized as Sign of Last Days

SOURCE: John Biddolf, *A Poem on the Earthquake at Lisbon* (London: W. Owen, 1755), lines 187–196, p. 9.

Who can with curious Eye this Globe survey,
And not behold it tott'ring with Decay;
All Things created God's Designs fulfill,
And nat'ral Causes work his destin'd Will.
And that eternal Word, which cannot lie,
To mortals hath reveal'd in Prophecy,
That in these latter Days such Signs should come,
Preludes and Prologues to the gene'ral Doom.
But not the Son of Man can tell that Day;
Then lest it find you sleeping, watch and pray

647. Easter, Not Appointed by the Apostles

SOURCE: Socrates Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 5, chap. 22, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. 2, pp. 130, 131.

[p. 130] The aim of the apostles was not to appoint festival days, but to teach a righteous life and piety. And it seems to me that just as many other customs have been established in individual localities according to usage. So also the feast of Easter came to

be observed in each place according to the individual peculiarities of the peoples inasmuch as none of the apostles legislated on the matter. And that the observance originated not by legislation, but as a custom the facts themselves indicate. In Asia Minor most people kept the fourteenth day of the moon, disregarding the sabbath: yet they never separated from those who did otherwise, until Victor, bishop of Rome, influenced by too ardent a zeal, fulminated a sentence of ex-communication against the Quartodecimans in Asia...

[p. 131] The Quartodecimans affirm that the observance of the fourteenth day was delivered to them by the apostle John: while the Romans and those in the Western parts assure us that their usage originated with the apostles Peter and Paul. Neither of these parties however can produce any written testimony in confirmation of what they assert.

648. Easter—Origin of Name

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1958), p. 211. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

The English word Easter and the German *Ostern* come from a common origin (*Eostur, Eastur, Ostara, Ostar*), which to the Norsemen meant the season of the rising (growing) sun, the season of new birth. The word was used by our ancestors to designate the Feast of New Life in the spring. The same root is found in the name for the place where the sun rises (East, *Ost*). The word Easter, then, originally meant the celebration of the spring sun, which had its birth in the East and brought new life upon earth. This symbolism was transferred to the supernatural meaning of our Easter, to the new life of the Risen Christ, the eternal and uncreated Light.

Based on a passage in the writings of Saint Bede the Venerable (735), the term Easter has often been explained as the name of an Anglo-Saxon goddess (*Eostre*), though no such goddess is known in the mythologies of any Germanic tribe. Modern research has made it quite clear that Saint Bede erroneously interpreted the name of the season as that of a goddess.

649. Easter, Symbols of—Origin

SOURCE: Francis X. Weiser, *Handbook of Christian Feasts and Customs* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1958), pp. 233, 236, 237. Copyright 1952 by Francis X. Weiser. Used by permission of the publishers.

[p. 233] EASTER EGG. The origin of the Easter egg is based on the fertility lore of the Indo-European races. To our pre-Christian ancestors it was a most startling event to see a new and live creature emerge from a seemingly dead object. The egg to them became a symbol of spring. Long ago in Persia people used to present each other with eggs at the spring equinox, which for them also marked the beginning of a new year.

In Christian times the egg had bestowed upon it a religious interpretation, becoming a symbol of the rock tomb out of which Christ emerged to the new life of His resurrection. There was, in addition, a very practical reason for making the egg a special sign of Easter joy, since it used to be one of the foods that were forbidden in Lent. The faithful from early times painted Easter eggs in gay colors, had them blessed, ate them, and gave them to friends as Easter gifts...

[p. 236] EASTER BUNNY. The Easter bunny had its origin in pre-Christian fertility lore. Hare and rabbit were the most fertile animals our forefathers knew, serving as symbols of abundant new life in the spring season. The Easter bunny has never had

religious symbolism bestowed on its festive usage, though its white meat is sometimes said to suggest purity and innocence. The Church has never performed special blessings for rabbits or hares, and neither in the liturgy nor in folklore do we find these animals linked with the spiritual meanings of the sacred season. However, the bunny has acquired a cherished role in the celebration of Easter as the legendary producer of Easter eggs for children...

[p. 237] EASTER HAM...

It is an age-old custom, handed down from pre-Christian times, to eat the meat of this animal on festive occasions. Thus the English and Scandinavians ate boar meat and the Germans and Slavs roast pork on Christmas Day. Also, in many parts of Europe roast pork is still the main dish at weddings and on major feast days. Hungarians eat roasted piglets on New Year's Day. The French Canadians have their traditional pork pie on festive occasions. At Easter, smoked or cooked ham, as well as lamb, has been eaten by most European nations from ancient times, and is the traditional Easter dish in America, too. The first records on the liturgical blessing of Easter ham date from the tenth century.

650. Easter Controversy, Cause of

SOURCE: James F. Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland*, Vol. 1, pp. 211, 212. Copyright 1929 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 211] It is probable that the primitive Christians kept the Pasch on the [p. 212] 14th of Nisan as determined by the Jewish authorities, and regarded it as the anniversary of the crucifixion. But they also observed the first of every seven days, the Jewish week, as a holy day in commemoration of the resurrection. It would seem that gradually a shifting of emphasis took place until in the second century it was generally accepted that the great annual solemnity of the Pasch was the commemoration not of the crucifixion but of the resurrection. Accordingly the majority of Christians celebrated the Pasch not on the 14th of Nisan but on the Sunday which fell on, or first after, that date. The churches of the Roman province of Asia, however, followed the older custom, keeping the Pasch on the 14th of Nisan, whatever the day of the week. The controversy became acute towards the end of the second century, and the observants of the 14th of Nisan, hence called Quartodecimans [Fourteenters], were finally excommunicated.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The word Pasch is from the Hebrew word for Passover, *pesach*. The name of the Christian Easter festival in some European languages is derived from this Hebrew root. For the nature of the Easter controversy see No. 651.]

651. Easter Controversy, Definition of

SOURCE: Kenneth Scott Latourette, *A History of Christianity*, 1st ed., p. 137. Copyright 1953 by Harper & Brothers, New York. Used by permission.

An acute early controversy, one which ran concurrently with those aroused by Gnosticism, Marcionism, and Montanism, was over the time for the celebration of Easter. Although our first certain notice of Easter is from the middle of the second century, that festival, commemorating the resurrection of Christ, was presumably observed by at least some Christians from much earlier times.

Differences arose over the determination of the date. Should it be fixed by the Jewish passover and be governed by the day of the Jewish month on which that feast was set regardless of the day of the week on which it fell? This became the custom in many of the churches, especially in Asia Minor. In contrast, many churches, including that of Rome, celebrated Easter on the first day of the week, Sunday. It was the first day of the week when Christ rose from the dead and which because of that fact was early observed as the

Lord's Day. Disputes also developed over the length of the fast which was to be observed preceding Easter in commemoration of the crucifixion and as to whether Christ's death occurred on the fourteenth or on the fifteenth day of the Jewish month of Nisan.

In various parts of the Empire, probably not far from the end of the second century, synods met to decide the issue. In general the consensus was for Sunday, but in Asia Minor the bishops held to the other method of reckoning. Thereupon Victor, Bishop of Rome in the last decade of the second century, sought to enforce uniformity by breaking off communion with the dissenting bishops and churches. Irenaeus expostulated with Victor on the ground that the differences in practice had long existed without causing a breach in unity. Ultimately the observance of Easter on Sunday prevailed and probably the prestige of Rome was thereby enhanced. Yet the controversy, called Quartodecimanian from the fourteenth day of Nisan, long remained an unpleasant memory.

652. Easter Controversy—Differences in Early Commemoration of Easter

SOURCE: Jules Lebreton and Jacques Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church*, trans. by Ernest C. Messenger, Vol. 2, bk. 3, chap. 17, sec. 1, pp. 718, 719. Copyright 1946, 1947 by The Macmillan Company, New York. Used by their permission and that of Burns and Oates Ltd., London.

[p. 718] The Asiatics commemorated Easter on the 14th Nisan, whatever the day of the week; the Romans celebrated it on the Sunday which followed the 14th Nisan. This diversity of dates involved a diversity of rites and of feasts: Easter was for the Asiatics the day of the death of the Lord; they fasted on that day, even if it fell on a Sunday, and broke bread only in the evening, the solemnity ending with the Eucharist and the agape. The Romans, on the contrary, devoted three days to the memory of the death and resurrection of Christ, Friday, Saturday and Sunday, the two first being days of mourning and fasting; the vigil between Saturday and Sunday prepared them for the feast of the Resurrection, celebrated on the Sunday.

This difference in liturgical usage was the more awkward because of the fact that there were a fair number of Asiatics in the Roman community...

[p. 719] The Church could not maintain indefinitely a duality of usages which involved not only a diversity of dates but also a divergence in interpretation of the paschal festival. As Baumstark has said, "on the one hand Easter Sunday was lacking, on the other, Good Friday; in Asia the Pasch was the crucifixion of Christ, in Rome it was his Resurrection."

653. Easter Controversy—Earlier Tolerance of Differences in Practice

SOURCE: Irenaeus, Letter to Victor, quoted in Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* v. 24. 12–15; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 509, 511. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 509] The controversy is not only about the day, but also about the actual character of the fast; for some think that they ought to fast one day, others two, others even more, some count their day as forty hours, day and night. And such variation of observance did not begin in our own time, but much earlier, in the days of our predecessors who, [p. 511] it would appear, disregarding strictness maintained a practice which is simple and yet allows for personal preference, establishing it for the future, and none the less all these lived in peace, and we also live in peace with one another and the disagreement in the fast confirms our agreement in the faith... Among these too were the presbyters before Soter, who presided over the church of which you are now the leader, I mean Anicetus and Pius

and Telesphorus and Xystus. They did not themselves observe it, nor did they enjoin it on those who followed them, and though they did not keep it they were none the less at peace with those from the dioceses in which it was observed when they came to them, although to observe it was more objectionable to those who did not do so. And no one was ever rejected for this reason, but the presbyters before you who did not observe it sent the Eucharist to those from other dioceses who did.

654. Easter Controversy—Earliest Contender for Sunday

SOURCE: *The Book of the Popes (Liber Pontificalis)*, trans. by Louise R. Loomis, Sect. XI, Pius I, pp. 14, 15. Copyright 1916 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 14] While he [Pope Pius I, c. 142–c. 154] was bishop [of Rome], his brother Hermas wrote a book in which he set forth the commandment which the angel of the Lord delivered to him, coming to him in the garb of a shepherd and commanding him that [p. 15] the holy feast of Easter be observed upon the Lord’s day.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: The only extant book of Hermas is called the *Pastor*, or *Shepherd, of Hermas (ANF, vol. 2, pp. 9–58)*. It does not mention the Lord’s day or Easter. The above extract is from the early section of *The Book of the Popes*, which was composed in the sixth century from earlier records. It was probably written no earlier than A.D. 530.]

655. Easter Controversy—Eastern Insistence on Nisan 14 (Polycarp)

SOURCE: Irenaeus, Letter to Victor, quoted in Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* v. 24, 16, 17; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), pp. 511, 513. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 511] When the blessed Polycarp was staying in Rome in the time of Anicetus, though they disagreed a little about some other things as well, they immediately made peace, having no wish for strife between them on this matter [Easter]. For neither was Anicetus [bishop of Rome c. 157–c. 168] able to persuade Polycarp not to observe it [on Nisan 14], inasmuch as he had always done so in company with John the disciple of our Lord and the other apostles with whom he had associated; nor did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe it, for he said that he ought to [p. 513] keep the custom of those who were presbyters before him. And under these circumstances they communicated with each other, and in the church Anicetus yielded the celebration of the Eucharist to Polycarp, obviously out of respect and they parted from each other in peace, for the peace of the whole church was kept both by those who observed and by those who did not.

[EDITORS’ NOTE: *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, under “Pope,” Vol. 12 (1911), p. 273, lists the early bishops of Rome, beginning about A.D. 100, as: Evaristus, Alexander I, Sixtus I, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius I, Anicetus.]

656. Easter Controversy—Eastern Insistence on Nisan 14 (Polycrates)

SOURCE: Polycrates, Letter to Victor, Bishop of Rome, quoted in Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* v. 24, 2–8; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. I (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Press, 1949), pp. 505, 507, 509. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 505] Therefore we keep the day undeviatingly, neither adding nor taking away, for in Asia [Minor] great luminaries sleep, and they will rise on the day of the coming of the Lord, when he shall come with glory from heaven and seek out all the saints. Such were Philip ... and two of his daughters... [p. 507] There is also John, who lay on the Lord’s breast... And there is also Polycarp at Smyrna, both bishop and martyr, and Thraseas, both bishop and martyr, from Eumeneae... [Also] Sagaris, ... Papirius, ... and Melito... All these kept the fourteenth day of the passover according to the gospel, never swerving, but following according to the rule of the faith. And I also, Polycrates, the least of you all, live according to the tradition of my kinsmen, and some of them have I followed. For

seven of my family were bishops and I am the eighth, and my kinsmen ever kept the day when the people put away the leaven. Therefore, brethren, I who have lived sixty-five years in the Lord and conversed with brethren from every country, and have studied all holy Scripture, am not afraid of threats, for they have said, who were greater than I, “It is better to obey God rather than men.” ...

And I could mention the bishops who are present whom you required me to summon, and I did so. If I should write their names they would be many multitudes; and they knowing my feeble [p. 509] humanity, agreed with the letter, knowing that not in vain is my head grey, but that I have ever lived in Christ Jesus.

657. Easter Controversy—Roman Bishop (Victor) Excommunicates Observers of Nisan 14

SOURCE: Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* v. 24, 9–11; translated by Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 509. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

Victor, who presided at Rome, immediately tried to cut off from the common unity the dioceses of all Asia [Minor], together with the adjacent churches, on the ground of heterodoxy, and he indited letters announcing that all the Christians there were absolutely excommunicated. But by no means all were pleased by this, so they issued counter-requests to him to consider the cause of peace and unity and love towards his neighbours. Their words are extant, sharply rebuking Victor. Among them too Irenaeus, writing in the name of the Christians whose leader he was in Gaul, though he recommends that the mystery of the Lord’s resurrection be observed only on the Lord’s day, yet nevertheless exhorts Victor suitably and at length not to excommunicate whole churches of God for following a tradition of ancient custom [that is, the observance of Easter on Nisan 14 instead of consistently on Sunday].

658. Easter Controversy—Settlement at Council of Nicaea, Constantine’s Report of

SOURCE: Constantine’s Letter to the Churches Respecting the Council at Nicaea, quoted in Eusebius. *The Life of Constantine*, bk. iii, chaps. 18, 19, trans. in *NPNF*, 2d series, Vol. I, pp. 524, 525.

[ch. 18, p. 524] At this meeting the question concerning the most holy day of Easter was discussed, and it was resolved by the united judgment of all present, that this feast ought to be kept by all and in every place on one and the same day. For what can be more becoming or honorable to us than that this feast from which we date our hopes of immortality, should be observed unfailingly by all alike, according to one ascertained order and arrangement? And first of all, it appeared an unworthy thing that in the celebration of this most holy feast we should follow the practice of the Jews [that is, by celebrating it at the time of the Jewish Passover, on a Jewish calendar date, Nisan 14], who have impiously defiled their hands with enormous sin, and are, therefore, deservedly afflicted with blindness of soul... Let us then have nothing in common with the detestable Jewish crowd; for we have received from our Saviour a different way. A course at once legitimate and honorable lies open to our most holy religion. Beloved brethren, let us with one consent adopt this course [that is, the celebration of the resurrection, always on a Sunday], and withdraw ourselves from all participation in their baseness. For their boast is absurd indeed, that it is not in our power without instruction from them to observe these things... Being altogether ignorant of the true adjustment of this question, they sometimes celebrate [p. 525] Easter twice in the same year [because the Jewish calendar year, being lunar, is slightly shorter than the solar year]... How

grievous and scandalous it is that on the self-same days some should be ... present at banquets and amusements, while others are fulfilling the appointed fasts. It is, then, plainly the will of Divine Providence (as I suppose you all clearly see), that this usage should receive fitting correction, and be reduced to one uniform rule...

[ch. 19] Since, therefore, it was needful that this matter should be rectified, so that we might have nothing in common with that nation of parricides who slew their Lord: and since that arrangement is consistent with propriety which is observed by all the churches of the western, southern, and northern parts of the world, and by some of the eastern also: for these reasons all are unanimous on this present occasion in thinking it worthy of adoption. And I myself have undertaken that this decision should meet with the approval of your Sagacities, in the hope that your Wisdoms will gladly admit that practice which is observed at once in the city of Rome, and in Africa; throughout Italy, and in Egypt, in Spain, the Gauls, Britain, Libya, and the whole of Greece; in the dioceses of Asia and Pontus, and in Cilicia, with entire unity of judgment... In fine, that I may express my meaning in as few words as possible, it has been determined by the common judgment of all, that the most holy feast of Easter should be kept on one and the same day.

659. Eastern Churches (Eastern Orthodox Churches)

SOURCE: *CRB, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 549–551.*

[p. 549] *History.*—The Holy Eastern Orthodox Church, known historically as the “Eastern Catholic,” in modern times as the “Greek Catholic,” the “Eastern Catholic Church,” the “Holy Orthodox Catholic Apostolic Church,” and popularly as the “Greek Church,” is the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of the Byzantine Empire. It has always been known as the Old Church, the church of the first Christian era, of the time of the Oecumenical Councils, and considers herself to be the direct heir of the true conservator of this old Holy Church.

In the first period of the development of the Orthodox Church, during the first five centuries, Orthodox Christianity received its basis and direction. The basic truths, the basic forms or constitution, and the foundations of the cult of the Orthodox Church were set forth by the great oecumenical Church Fathers during this period.

Two important historical events, the rise of papal Rome and the advance of Mohammedanism, held the church’s chief attention during the second period, which extended from the fifth to the eleventh century. These two forces threatened the integrity and the existence of the Eastern Church. The heathen Slavs, and the iconoclastic controversy caused more unrest during this troubled period, which finally led to the separation between eastern Christianity and papal Rome.

During the third period, from the eleventh to the nineteenth century, the advancing waves of the Mohammedan storm swept over and destroyed the southeastern empires of the Byzantines, the Bulgarians, the Serbs, and the Roumanians. At the same time, the monstrous flow of Tartars swept over Russian orthodox territory, threatening the existence of eastern civilization and eastern Christianity. Here the church’s iron endurance and its capacity to sacrifice for the faith had a double result—eastern Christianity maintained its own existence, and also secured immunity and safety for the Christianity of the west...

The Orthodox Church consists of a number of so-called autocephalic or autonomic churches, the oldest of which are the four eastern patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. The World War and the resulting national and

political changes have left their mark in many alterations in various churches of orthodoxy, a depressing example of which being that the external substance of the patriarchate of Constantinople, the Mother Church of all orthodox churches, is now reduced to a ruin and shadow. As a parallel to the political changes in the former Russian Empire, the Orthodox Churches in Poland, Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, separated from the Russian Church and instituted themselves as free (autonomous) churches. Thus on the one hand is disintegration and on the other individual unification.

These different organizations, although independent of each other ecclesiastically, agree in doctrine, and essentially, in form of worship, and together constitute what is called the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church.

Of the 11 bodies comprising the Eastern Orthodox Churches in the United States, 8—the Albanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Roumanian, Russian, Serbian, Syrian, and Ukrainian—are headed by a bishop or archbishop under the spiritual jurisdiction of the mother church in their ancestral homelands. The remaining three organizations—the American Holy Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church, the Apostolic Episcopal Church (The Holy Eastern Catholic and Apostolic Orthodox Church), and the Holy Orthodox Church in America, whose distinguishing characteristic is that the liturgy is conducted in English—were formed to meet the needs of American-born descendants of foreign lineage.

[p. 550] *Doctrine.*—The doctrine of the Eastern Orthodox Catholic Churches is founded on the Holy Scriptures, the Holy Traditions, and the dogmatic decisions of the seven Ecumenical Councils. The Holy Scriptures are interpreted strictly in accordance with the teachings of the seven Ecumenical Councils and the Holy Fathers. The Niceo-Constantinopolitan Creed is held only in its original authoritative form without the Roman-Latin addition of the “filioque” phrase. Recognizing Christ as the only head of the earthly as well as the heavenly church, they do not accept the dogma of the Pope as the special representative or Vicar of Christ on earth, and the infallible head of His earthly church. According to their teaching, infallibility belongs to the whole assembly of true believers, to the “Ecclesia,” or church, which is represented by its council legally called together and whose decisions are confirmed by the consensus of the church.

They believe in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone; honor Mary as the mother of God, and honor the nine orders of angels and the saints; do not define as dogma the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, but hold the true Catholic doctrine of the virgin birth of Christ. They reject the doctrine of the surplus merits of the saints and the doctrine of indulgences. They reverence relics of the saints, pictures of holy subjects, and the cross, but forbid the use of carved images. They accept seven sacraments—baptism, anointing (confirmation or chrismation), communion, penance, holy orders, marriage, and holy unction. Baptism of either infants or adults by threefold immersion is recognized as the only proper form, although other forms are accepted of necessity or in the case of converts who have previously been baptized. The sacrament of anointing with “chrism,” or holy oil, is administered immediately after that of baptism and the chrismated infant or adult is thereafter a full communicant in the Eucharist.

The doctrine of transubstantiation is taught. In the Eucharist, leavened bread is used, being consecrated and soaked in the consecrated chalice and then received by all members of the Eastern Orthodox Churches after confession and absolution. Children under 7 years of age, however, receive the sacrament without confession. Holy unction is

administered to the sick, and not alone to those in danger of death. The church rejects the doctrine of purgatory, but believes in the beneficial effect of prayer for the dead by the living and for the living by the dead. It rejects the doctrine of predestination and considers that for justification both faith and works are necessary.

In the Eastern Orthodox Catholic Church, membership has two distinct but frequently confused meanings. All persons who have been baptized in the church and received the sacrament of chrismation (confirmation) which immediately follows baptism, are communicant members of the church, participating in the sacrament of the Eucharist. Parish membership, however, is counted more frequently by males over 21 than by communicants, because the head of each family is the voting member of the parish congregation. This fact gives rise to confusion and uncertainty of statistics of all Eastern Orthodox Churches.

Organization.—There are three orders of the ministry—deacons, priests, and bishops. The deacons assist in the work of the parish and in the service of the sacraments. Priests and deacons are of two orders, secular and monastic. Marriage is allowed to candidates for the diaconate and the priesthood, but is forbidden after ordination. The episcopate is, as a rule, confined to members of the monastic order. A married priest, should his wife die, may enter a monastery and take the monastic vows, and is eligible to the episcopate. The parishes are, as a rule, in the care of the secular priests.

Monks and nuns are gathered in monastic establishments or are scattered out in missionary work. In some monastic colonies the members live in communities, while in others they lead a secluded, hermitical life, each in his own cell. There is but one order, and the vows for all are the same—obedience, chastity, prayer, fasting, and poverty.

The organization for the general government of the different Eastern Orthodox Churches varies in different countries. In general, there is a council at the head of which, as president, is a bishop elected by the ecclesiastical representatives of the people. Historically, and at present in some cases, this presiding bishop is called the patriarch, and has special colleagues and officers for the purpose of governing his flock. The largest or most important of the bishoprics connected with the patriarchate, or synod, are called “metropolitan sees,” though the title now carries with it no special ecclesiastical authority. In early times, both the clergy and the laity of the local churches had a voice in the election of bishops, priests, and deacons, but of late that right has been much restricted, and at present the priests and deacons are usually appointed by the bishops, and the bishops are elected by the clergy.

The service of the Eastern Orthodox Churches is solemn and elaborate. It is essentially that of the earlier centuries of Christianity, and is most fully and completely observed in the monasteries. There are no sculptured images and no instrumental music, although there are pictorial representations of Christ, the apostles and saints, and scenes in Bible history. The most important service is the divine liturgy, the chief part of which is the celebration of the Eucharist.

660. Eastern Churches—Greek Archdiocese of North and South America (Greek Orthodox Church)

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 572, 573.

[p. 572] *History.* During the period from 1890 to the World War the number of Greeks immigrating to the United States increased greatly. Some came from Greece, some from the Greek islands of the Aegean Sea, Dodecanese, and Cyprus, and others

form Constantinople, Smyrna, and other parts of Asia Minor. They were largely unmarried men, or, if married, they had left their families behind them and had scattered over the country, those from the same section usually keeping together.

As they became to a certain extent permanent residents, and especially as they were joined by their families, they felt the need of religious services, particularly in case of marriage, sickness, and death. Accordingly, application was made by the communities to the ecclesiastical authorities of their own sections, and priests were sent to this country, sometimes by the Holy Synod of Greece and sometimes by the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. These priests formed churches in the larger centers and also congregations in places within easy reach, which they visited more or less regularly as convenient.

[p. 573] As in the case of the early Russian churches, there was at first no central organization, each priest holding his ecclesiastical relation with the synod or patriarchate which sent him to this country. In 1908 the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople resigned its ecclesiastical relations to the Greeks in America in favor of the Holy Synod of Greece, which had decided to send to America a Greek (Hellenic) bishop.² [Note 2: ...In view of the very general use of the term "Greek" to describe the entire Eastern Orthodox Church in all its branches, the term "Hellenic" is used to designate specifically the Eastern Orthodox Church of Greece, governed by the Holy Synod of Greece and to the Greeks of Constantinople governed by the Ecumenical Patriarchate.]

Yet the first serious effort to organize the Greek churches of America was made only in 1918, when Bishop Alexander, of Rodostolou, was sent to America by the Synod of Greece as the first bishop and synodical delegate.

According, however, to the holy canons of the Eastern Orthodox Church, the spiritual jurisdiction and supervision over the Orthodox Churches in the Diaspora belong to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople; and the transfer of its rights to the Church of Greece by an act, known as the Tome of 1908, was only provisional and due only to certain special considerations. But, as soon as conditions changed, the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, in March 1922, revoked the measure, took again the churches in the Diaspora under its direct canonical supervision and, in May 1922, by a synodical and patriarchal act, known as the Founding Tome of 1922, established the Greek (Orthodox) Archdiocese of North and South America, consisting of four bishoprics, and promoted Bishop Alexander (formerly of Rodostolou) to the rank of Archbishop of North and South America.

In August of the same year the Second General Convention of the Archdiocese of America convened in New York and adopted the constitution of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, based on the patriarchal Tome of 1922. After this constitution was ratified by the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, the bishops of Chicago, Boston, and San Francisco were elected by the provincial conventions of each diocese.

In 1930, owing to certain dissatisfaction and divisions in the church, the Greek bishops in America—with the exception of the bishop of San Francisco—were translated to various dioceses in Greece, and a new Archbishop of America was appointed, The Most Reverend Athenagoras, formerly Metropolitan of Corfu, Greece, who came here in February 1931.

The Greek parishes in America have been all united under the new Archbishop. The former dioceses were suspended and a new constitution, with slight changes, was granted by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Archbishop Athenagoras retained the Right Reverend Callistos, Bishop of San Francisco, as his assistant bishop.

The Fourth General Convention of the Archdiocese, held in the New York, in November 1931, adopted the new constitution and a number of bylaws for the various activities and departments of the archdiocese.

Doctrine and Organization. The Greek Archdiocese of North and South America is in accord with other Eastern Orthodox churches in doctrine; its polity and worship, while in principle the same as in those churches, vary somewhat in form to meet the peculiar needs.

There are about 250 organized congregations and churches under the jurisdiction of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America. There are also about 50 missions and parishes of the Ukrainian Orthodox Diocese, recognizing the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople and affiliated with the archdiocese, under Right Reverend Bishop Bohdan.

[EDITORS' NOTE: Membership (1959), 1,200,000 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 245).]

661. Eastern Churches—Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 587–590.

[p. 587] *History...* [p. 588] The Russian Church is the only branch of the Eastern Orthodox Church that has undertaken in recent years any foreign missionary enterprise. It has developed quite extensive missions in Siberia, Japan, and China, but its great work has been the care of the churches in America.

[p. 589] In 1759 a Russian merchant, named Glotoff, baptized several Aleuts of Umnak Island. Fifteen years later Schelehoff, the organizer of a company for fur trading in Alaska, baptized 40 Aleuts of Kodiak Island. In 1792, at his request, the Holy Synod sent to Alaska a special mission consisting of eight monks, who established their headquarters at Kodiak and built the first Eastern Orthodox Church in America. In the course of 2 years 12,000 natives were baptized, and almost every hamlet had its church or chapel. During succeeding years a number of additional missionaries were sent from Russia, both to care for the Russians and to do missionary work among the natives...

After the change of political rule, accompanying the sale of Alaska to the United States, many Russians returned to their own country, and with them a large number of priests or missionaries...

In 1872 the see was removed from Sitka to San Francisco, where there were already quite a number of Russians, Serbians, and Greeks. In 1888 Bishop Vladimir came from Russia, remaining until 1891, when he was succeeded by Bishop Nicholas, whose stay was noted for two important features: (1) An exceptional development of religious activity in Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, ... (2) the enlarging of the eparchy to include Canada and the Eastern States of the United States, thus opening a new period in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States.

In the more recent immigration, large numbers have come from the old Austria-Hungary, especially from the former Galicia and Poland, who belonged to what are known as the Uniat churches...

About the same time the immigration from Russia proper increased, and soon purely Russian parishes were formed in New York and Chicago, although in the former city there was an Orthodox Russian Church in existence as far back as 1876. In 1905 the episcopal see was transferred from San Francisco to New York City and the mission was elevated to the rank of an archdiocese with an archbishop and two vicar bishops, one for the diocese of Alaska and the other for the Syrian Mission having its headquarters in the Diocese of Brooklyn, headed by an Arabic-speaking bishop of the Russian jurisdiction.

[p. 590] With the growth of the archdiocese, two additional vicar bishoprics—Pittsburgh and Canada—were added, and the church remained under the administration of these five prelates until after the World War.

The history of the Russian Church in America since the World War and the Russian Revolution has reflected the uncertainty and persecutions characteristics of this period in the church of Russia. As ... mentioned [on p. 588], the pseudo-Sobor of 1923 in Moscow had declared communism essential to Christianity, and the adherence to the Soviets obligatory; it then had appointed a pseudo synod, which delegated to America an unfrocked priest, formerly of the Russian-American clergy, with the title of metropolitan-archbishop, head of the Russian Church in America. That man, armed with all credentials of the pseudo synod, instituted legal proceedings and obtained possession of the Russian St. Nicholas Cathedral, New York City, which was the see of the ruling bishop. At that time in Russia, Patriarch Tikhon and his lawful administration were imprisoned and otherwise isolated by the Soviets; therefore no direct legal evidence could be obtained from them as to the authority or even the existence of the regular church administration in America, which remained faithful to the rules and canons of the Russian Orthodox Church. This is how an agent of the Soviet supporting faction of the church won possession of the Russian Cathedral in America. He has, however, virtually no followers either among the clergy or the laity.

Metropolitan Platon, the then actual ruling bishop of the Russian Church in America, was forced to move his see from the Cathedral, New York City, to the new cathedral, which was offered to him by Trinity Parish of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City. It was one of Trinity's chapels which was rebuilt and transformed into a Russian Cathedral, and now houses also the office of the Metropolitan Council, governing body of the church.

Seeing the impossibility of any further connections with Moscow controlled by Communism, Metropolitan Platon, in an epistle published in 1933, proclaimed the Russian Orthodox Church in North America to be temporarily autonomous. It so remains now.

In 1934, after the death of Metropolitan Platon, an all-American Sobor of the church was convoked in Cleveland, Ohio. Theophilus, Archbishop of San Francisco, was elected Metropolitan and head of the Russian Church in America and Canada...

Doctrine and Organization. The general doctrine of the Russian Orthodox Church is in accord with that of the Eastern Orthodox Churches, as given in the General Statement of this publication [see No. 659].

In the United States the Autonomous Russian Orthodox Church [now known as the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America] is governed by a metropolitan elected to that office for life by an all-American Conclave, or Sobor... That Sobor ... consists of all bishops and of delegates elected from all parishes...

The 10 Russian bishops in America form a council of bishops, with power to rule upon matters of doctrine. That council is also being convened periodically.

The permanent governing body is the Metropolitan Council, consisting of clerical and lay members elected by the all-American Sobor, and/or appointed by the Metropolitan. That council, however, has but consultative power, its decisions becoming effective only after they are approved by the Metropolitan.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Membership (1957), 755,000 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 254).]

662. Ecumenical Movement, Brief History of

SOURCE: Editorial, "To a Greater Christian Church," *Life*, 49 (Dec. 19, 1960), 24. Copyright 1960 by Time, Inc. Used by permission.

What is the ecumenical movement? Swelling for 50 years, its broken thunder is now heard on every Christian shore. It is a series of incomplete but mounting efforts to end what one of the movement's founders, the late Bishop Charles H. Brent, called "the sin and disaster of sectarianism." It is an attempt to restore meaning to the Bible's prescription of "one fold, one shepherd," to expunge the sad irony in the words of the hymn: "We are not divided, all one body we." It would reknit the raveled garment of Christian worship on the twin assumptions that Jesus Christ (the head of all Christian churches) wants this done, and that a united church can better advance His cause than the present scandalous fragmentation.

At its most ambitious, the ecumenical movement aspires to heal the thousand-year-old break between Rome and the Eastern Orthodox churches on the one hand, and the later breach between these and the Protestant denominations on the other. Pope John's recent gestures toward the Ecumenical Patriarch in Istanbul and the Archbishop of Canterbury have added a glitter of hope to this dream.

Only dreamers expect anything like the monolithic unity which the Christendom of the Middle Ages seems to present to nostalgic modern minds. With its increasing claims to its own infallibility, and its near-deification of the Virgin, the Roman Church becomes less accessible to any reunion; the Orthodox churches are no less certain of their unique claim to truth; and few Protestants are ready to sacrifice their special knowledge of God through the Bible. But despite these deep doctrinal differences, these three chief branches of Christianity are on much friendlier terms than they used to be. Their spokesmen are able to meet in serious dialogue without thinking of each other as antichrists; they have learned to know what they believe in common and why they disagree. And these contacts and peaceful dialogue are one result of the ecumenical movement.

It began (not counting 19th Century foreshadowings) at Edinburgh in 1910, in the first of many interdenominational conferences whose subsequent landmarks are Stockholm (1925), Lausanne (1927), Edinburgh and Oxford (1937), Amsterdam (1948) and Evanston (1954). Its memorable names, potential saints of a great church to come, are Bishop Brent, John R. Mott, Archbishop Temple and Archbishop Söderblom, to name only a few and none now alive. Its chief organ is the World Council of Churches, founded in 1948, which includes 178 Protestant, Anglican and Orthodox groups in 50 countries. It conducts a continuous scouting party into all obstacles and paths to union.

The main currents in the ecumenical movement are presently two; minimalists and maximalists... The former would gladly settle for a closer comity, or loose federation, among existing churches. The latter seek the reunion of all churches into one. Although maximalists have no solution to the great East-West and Reformation schisms, they can point to an extraordinary accumulation of modern mergers within the Protestant world.

The United Church of Canada, which joined 8,000 parishes of the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational churches in 1925, is now Canada's largest church, with little or no remaining trace of its original three-way separation. The Church of South India (1947) was even more of a landmark, for it also includes Anglicans, whose episcopal polity is harder to reconcile with congregational church government.

Lesser and more local mergers take place yearly. U.S. Lutherans, for example, are reducing their sects from 16 to 11, largely because the original ethnic or language reasons for division have been worn away by time.

663. Ecumenical Movement—Catholic Hopes for Protestant Reunion With Rome

SOURCES: Gustave Wiegel, *A Catholic Primer on the Ecumenical Movement*, pp. 50, 51, 64, 66. Copyright 1957 by The Newman Press, Westminster, Md. Used by permission.

[p. 50] He [the Catholic] does not want the World Council to continue in definitive existence. He wants it to bring all of its churches into the Catholic Church. He considers the Council good and grace-inspired insofar as [p. 51] it will bring the "other sheep" into the fold of the one Shepherd, visibly represented by His one vicar. He does not at all consider it good if it will only serve to stabilize the alienation of the "other sheep." ...

[p. 64] As long as the Catholic is Catholic and the Protestant is Protestant, there is only one way to union—the conversion of one to the views of the other. If that should happen, either Catholicism or Protestantism would disappear. There can never be a Catholic-Protestant Church, or even a Catholic-Protestant fellowship of churches. This is the basic fact. It does not good to anyone to hope that this fact will somehow sublimate into something thinner...

[p. 66] The Catholic must say to the Protestant that the [Catholic] Church was substantially right, and therefore any endeavor toward reunion will be a return to her unreconstructed, unreformed unity.

664. Ecumenical Movement—Church Union — Blake-Pike Merger Proposal (1960)

SOURCE: *Crusader*, 16 (January, 1961), 2. Copyright 1961 by the American Baptist Convention. Used by permission.

A proposal to merge Episcopal, United Presbyterian in the USA, Methodist and United Church of Christ communions into a single 18-million member denomination exploded like a bomb on American Protestants on Dec. 4 [preceding the National Council of Churches Triennial Assembly]. It was advanced by Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, stated clerk of the United Presbyterian Church in the USA, in a sermon delivered at the 11 a.m. worship service in Grace Cathedral, San Francisco. The overture was endorsed immediately by his host, the Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of California.

As conceived by Dr. Blake, the new church would be both "*reformed and catholic*". In using the word "catholic," he said he referred to "those understandings of faith and order, of church and sacraments which are catholic in contrast to the protestant or evangelical practices and understandings."

In using the word "reformed," he called on "those of the catholic tradition ... to accept and to take to themselves ... all that nearly 500 years of reformation has contributed to the renewal of Christ's church."

Dr. Blake said that the proposal looked “ultimately to the reunion of the whole of Christ’s church.” In a subsequent TV interview, Bishop Pike referred to the Roman Catholic Church and added: “We cannot leave out of our consideration this largest of our Christian communities.”

In attempting to vault the stumbling blocks which have derailed previous merger talks, Dr. Blake proposed that the reunited church would: (1) have “visible and historical continuity with the church of all ages” by providing for “the consecration of all its bishops by bishops and presbyters both in the apostolic succession and out of it ...”; (2) confess the faith set forth in the Apostles’ and Nicene creeds; (3) administer the sacraments “truly as means of grace,” not merely as symbolic memorials; (4) accept “the right place of tradition” so as to allow for a continuing reformation of the church; (5) adopt a semi-democratic form of government; (6) “recapture the brotherhood and sense of fellowship of all its members and ministers”; and (7) accept “a wide diversity of theological formulation ... and a variety of worship and liturgy.”

665. Ecumenical Movement—Church Union—“Catholic, Reformed, Evangelical” Merger

SOURCE: Harold E. Fey, “Catholic, Reformed, Evangelical,” editorial correspondence in *The Christian Century*, 78 (June 7, 1961), 702, 703. Copyright 1961 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

[p. 702] The ... 173rd General Assembly [of the United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.] broadened the proposal that Dr. Blake made last December in Grace Episcopal Cathedral, San Francisco, and then adopted it by a nearly unanimous vote. Moreover, it set up a negotiating committee ... “to explore the establishment of a united Church truly Catholic, truly Reformed and truly Evangelical.” ...

The amendments proposed by the committee clarify and broaden the original proposal that the United Presbyterian General Assembly and the Protestant Episcopal General Convention, which meets in September [see No. 1266n.], invite the Methodist Church and the United Church of Christ “to enter into organic union.” ...

[p. 703] The invitation was also broadened by inviting the general assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, U.S. [Southern], and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church to discuss the “reunion of the Presbyterian churches in this nation” or to participate in the Catholic, Reformed, Evangelical negotiations as negotiators or observers. Finally, the stated clerk is instructed to “communicate with all the other churches with whom this church is in ecumenical relations.” ...

Thus the General Assembly proposal begins with a proposal to one church but widens step by step to include more than 30 denominations.

666. Ecumenical Movement—Church Union Proposal “Not for Us,” Say American Baptists

SOURCE: Editorial, “Not For Us,” *Crusader*, 16 (January, 1961), 2. Copyright 1961 by the American Baptist Convention. Used by permission.

Very frankly, this union proposal [to unite the 18 million members of for churches, the United Presbyterian, U.S.A., [Episcopal, Methodist, and United Church of Christ] is not for, us. American Baptists are not opposed to church union when it occurs happily and naturally, especially at grass root levels. But neither do we have a “must-merge” complex. We do not believe that combining weaknesses will produce strength; or that denominational divisions are necessarily scandalous; or that bigness of itself will produce power...

For many years now it has been customary at ecumenical gatherings for participants to confess the sin of division...

But we do not feel guilty for wearing denominational clothes so long as our heart beats with those of our fellow Christians... Differences in background, understanding and temperament produce “denominations” among psychologists, scientists and historians who must depend upon fallible human interpretations. Why should it be otherwise in religion?

Are American Baptists [see No. 194] second-class Christians because we feel this way?

667. Ecumenical Movement—Hindrances to Protestant and Catholic Union

SOURCE: Karl Barth, in “Protestant-Roman Unity: 25 Scholars’ Views,” *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 29. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

Certain indications seem to point to a possible, perhaps already operative, inner renewal in today’s Roman Catholic church. The holy Scriptures are being read and studied, are being expounded academically and also in preaching with greater delight and accuracy than before. In connection therewith is a deepened attention to Jesus Christ, only Lord and Saviour, as the center and object of all church life and teaching. And we must not fail to appreciate a more earnest understanding of God’s free grace and therefore of the sinner’s justification by faith alone among some forward-moving Roman Catholic theologians, efforts toward a more kerygmatic form of the mass. If and how all this will some day lead to a change with reference to a new interpretation of the Roman Catholic concepts of the mediatorial role of the virgin Mary and of the saints; of the merit of tradition; of the authority of the church, and particularly of the pope; and above all of the sacraments we cannot contemplate at the moment. In our opinion even the best Roman Catholics in no case could and would be expected simply to put aside these peripheral considerations. But neither can we expect them to find those central truths (Scripture, Christ, grace) better preserved and better championed in our Protestant churches than in their own. We ourselves would need to be, think, teach, and live more evangelically, if our Protestantism is to have any attraction whatever for today’s Roman Catholic Christianity that perhaps is newly seeking the gospel. On the other hand, we cannot therefore suppress our estrangement in view of peripheral matters of the Roman Catholic system (Mary, the church, the pope, the sacraments) as they have come to us thus far, inasmuch as we cannot conceive how they (these peripheral matters) can be joined to the central teachings. Therefore church unity between Rome and us cannot yet be in prospect today, but there is possibly a new brotherly discussion concerning what can unite Rome and us, and concerning that which always must divide Rome and us. At the same time we must reckon with the strange possibility that some day it might be apparent that what must and could unite Rome and us is comprehended in certain Roman spheres just as well, if not better, than in large segments of our own Protestant constituency.

668. Ecumenical Movement—Protestant-Catholic “Confrontation”

SOURCE: K. E. Skydsgaard, “On Dialogues Between Roman Catholic and Evangelical Lutheran Theologians,” *Lutheran World*, 7 (September, 1960), 128, 129. Used by permission.

[p. 128] The idea of two, or perhaps even more, churches, divided from one another, was totally foreign to the reformers; to call a church “Lutheran” was an abomination to Luther himself. There was only one holy, catholic and apostolic church in which a terrible struggle had continually to be fought, because the true Christian church, the

regnum dei is always assailed by the false church, the *regnum diaboli*. In this instance, the false church was represented by the names “Rome” and “the papacy,” with their abuses and false doctrine. In the opinion of the reformers, it was their God-given task to fight not against the one church but against Rome and yet the break came, not at once, but, so to speak, in stages, until various church groups, isolated from one another, the so-called confessions, resulted as more or less finished products. However, even the formation of independent churches or confessions which differ from one another not only theologically but sociologically, politically and culturally, has never led to a situation in which the “confessional question” has been resolved or in which the wounds caused by these breaks have been healed. The problem of Roman Catholic versus Evangelical Lutheran has not been solved to this very day. Behind all attempts to resolve this puzzle lay, and still lies, a mystery which cannot be explained by theological interpretations, regardless how profound they might be. On both sides the painful awareness of the division of Christendom has continued in varying degrees, but yet in such a way that the bitterness of the break and the vulnerability in mutual relationships have never been overcome. We, on both sides, can never forget that our individual existence as churches occurred through a break of great depth, accompanied by angry conversations and mutual accusations. We cannot forget that the man who stood in the foreground in this matter was officially excommunicated by Rome and that this very man regarded the pope as the anti-Christ. The power of the papacy never, as Luther had hoped, diminished, nor was the “Lutheran heresy,” as was hoped from the Roman side, merely an ephemeral German affair of short duration. Instead, events took a quite different course...

[p. 129] The fact that a lively confrontation between Roman Catholic and Lutheran theology is taking place today cannot be denied, and is a cause for rejoicing. It is certainly no exaggeration to say that discussions of like intensity, such a mutual questioning and exchange, have never taken place between the confessions since the Reformation...

But unity can mean different things. There can never be unity at any price. There can never be unity merely for the sake of unity. Such a unity could be a miracle of the anti-Christ. It might be a completely false unity which God himself would destroy in his power and his grace.

669. Ecumenical Movement—Protestant-Catholic “Dialogue”

SOURCE: Kenneth Dole, “Theologians Talk of Church Unity,” *The Washington Post*, Oct. 8, 1960, p. B11, quoting from *Lutheran World*, 7 (Sept., 1960), 129. Used by permission.

A “dialogue” has been going on between Roman and non-Roman thinkers, especially in Europe, which at least is leading to better understanding, according to the Rev. Dr. K. E. Skydsgaard of Copenhagen, a Lutheran.

He says “the present lively confrontation between Roman Catholic and Lutheran theology ... is a cause for rejoicing.” He notes it is not exaggerated to say “discussions of like intensity, such as mutual questioning and exchange, have never taken place between the confessions since the Reformation.”

670. Ecumenical Movement—Protestant Hopes for Catholic Agreement on Religious Liberty

SOURCE: A. F. Carrillo de Alborno, *Roman Catholicism and Religious Liberty* (Geneva: The World Council of Churches, 1959), p. 94. Used by permission.

In view of the above comparison of Roman Catholic and ecumenical statements on religious liberty, we think that, generally speaking, the *doctrinal* accord between ecumenism and this stream of Roman Catholic thought on the matter is highly satisfactory. We believe also that, once this Roman Catholic opinion ceases to be only *one of several* admitted within Catholic orthodoxy and becomes *the official attitude* of the Church itself, a *practical* agreement with the Roman Catholic Church on the real exercise of religious liberty in all countries will be possible. And we sincerely hope that that time is not so far away as many fear.

It is most unfortunate that the question of religious freedom has so frequently been treated in a general atmosphere of suspicion and distrust, so far as the doctrine and attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is concerned...

It should be an important task of the ecumenical movement and of the World Council of Churches in particular, to substitute for this general distrustful attitude a truly ecumenical spirit of charity and understanding.

671. Ecumenical Movement—Protestant Yearning for Catholic Cooperation Expressed

SOURCE: Ernst Kinder, "Protestant-Roman Catholic Encounter an Ecumenical Obligation," *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. VII (July, 1955), p. 339. Used by permission.

Any ecumenical thought and action, which definitely excluded the Roman Catholic Church because of the difficulties involved, would no longer be truly ecumenical; it would be pan-Protestant and anti-Roman, which is something entirely different!

672. Ecumenical Movement, Roman Catholic Interest in

SOURCE: Robert McAfee Brown, "The Issues Which Divide Us," in *American Catholics: A Protestant-Jewish View*, ed. by Philip Scharper, p. 117. © 1959 by Sheed and Ward, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

Much of the interest in ecumenical Christianity centers on the World Council of Churches, a group comprising almost all of the significant branches of non-Roman Christianity. Fr. Edward Duff, a Jesuit, has written an excellent book on the social thought of the World Council, and a French priest, Canon Gustav Thiels, has written a doctrinal history of the ecumenical movement.⁸⁵ [Note 85: Duff, *The Social Thought of the World Council of Churches* (Association Press, 1956); Thiels, *Histoire doctrinale du Mouvement OEcumenique* (Louvain, 1955).] In a discussion of the latter volume, Roger Mehl, a French Protestant philosopher, comments:

The ecumenical movement today has valuable collaborators among Roman Catholic theologians. It also means that within a few years the World Council of Churches has succeeded in compelling recognition and has acquired real and indisputable authority... The word "ecumenical" is no longer unacceptable to the Roman Catholic Church; Rome recognizes that the non-Roman churches and confessions present a theological problem... Every page [of Thiel's [*sic*] book] reopens the conversation between Rome and the World Council of Churches, even when all hope had sometimes been lost of being able to continue it.⁸⁶

[Note 86: In "The Ecclesiological Significance of the World Council from a Roman Catholic Standpoint," *The Ecumenical Review*, April 1957, pp. 240, 241, 252.]

Let no one think, however, that in this ecumenical interchange, Protestants and Catholics are easily going to resolve their differences.

673. Ecumenical Movement—Roman Catholic Participation in, Only if Given the Presidency

SOURCE: Leon Cristiani, *Heresies and Heretics*, trans. by Roderick Bright, p. 140. © 1959 by Hawthorn Books, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The Catholic Church has thus no difficulty in closely combining the passionate desire for Christian unity and the certainty that this unity is only possible in the unity of faith, communion and government that she has always preserved through nineteen centuries. This unity is not only her dearest treasure but is the sacred property of the Holy Spirit, who has willed it and protected it, and forms the only hope of mankind. Perhaps one day the Catholic Church will take part in an ecumenical assembly, if she is given the presidency and if to begin with her divine right of directing the universal Church is recognized. And that is obviously the meaning of this declaration by Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, concerning the Assembly at Evanston: "The Catholic Church can take no part in any organization in which the delegates of numerous sects gather in council or conference to discuss on an equal footing the subject of the nature of the Church of Christ or of the nature of her unity."

1

674. Ecumenical Movement—Symptom of Decay

SOURCE: Editorial, "To a Greater Christian Church," *Life*, 49 (Dec. 19, 1960), 24. Copyright 1960 by Time, Inc. Used by permission.

Does this mean that church mergers are just another symptom of the decay or attenuation of Christian belief? Is Protestantism more "ecumenical" because it is less sure or serious about its own theologies? In many cases, this is regrettably true.

675. Ecumenical Movement — World Council of Churches

SOURCE: Robert S. Bilheimer, *The Quest for Christian Unity* (New York: Association Press), pp. 58, 59. Copyright 1952 by Haddam House, Inc. Used by permission.

[p. 58] What is this World Council of Churches? We shall deal with its more external characteristics in a later chapter. Here we are concerned to indicate what the World Council of Churches represents, as it were, in the development of the history of the Christian church, and to suggest that in the realm of action, that is, of commitment made by the churches, it is in a sense parallel to the common message which the churches can present together.

The World Council of Churches is a council, and it is composed of churches. As a council, it has no authority over its constituent member churches. Its authority is wholly moral, and in this lies a part of its true significance. This is to say that the World Council has influence according to the intrinsic weight of the truth which its statements and actions may contain. Its authority does not rest upon coercion of any type, except the coercion of truth. Its deliberations, its actions, and its programs are effective only insofar as they make an impression upon the Christian mind and conscience of its members. It is thus, in the sweep of church history, the modern development of the ancient conciliar theory of church government. That theory involved the power of the council over the constituent parts. The conciliar theory embodied in the World Council does not involve power, but provides a structure within which statements and actions may be arrived at in common and may make their own impact upon the churches. As one speaks of the World Council, it must be remembered always that it is a council of churches; there is no substance to the World Council, or for that matter any true council of churches, except the [p. 59] substance provided by its members. Reduced to its most basic form, therefore,

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

the World Council is the permanent framework within which the churches may arrive at common positions and carry through common programs of action. These common positions and actions stand and are effective by virtue of such intrinsic authority of truth as they may be given by the Holy Spirit.

The World Council is therefore in no sense a superchurch. It is not a Protestant Vatican. It cannot force any member to do what that member does not want to do, nor to believe what it does not want to believe. The World Council cannot negotiate unions among churches. Neither is it able nor does it try to advocate any one theory of church unity. It does not push forward any particular means by which the churches can achieve greater unity.

Nevertheless, the World Council is a structure in which churches have made a commitment to stay together. If the fact that the World Council rests upon moral authority only is the first point in its fundamental significance, the commitment made by the churches to stay together is the second. This commitment, made by *churches*, has profound implications. It means that any one and all of the 148 churches, by agreeing to join with other churches, thereby recognize those other churches in some sense to be churches. It does not mean that every one must recognize the others as full and true churches. It does mean, and it has been explicitly recognized that it does mean, that in some sense every member church recognizes every other member church as a church.

676. Efficacy, of Holy Spirit, Hampered by Ecclesiasticism and Tethered in Impotence

SOURCE: Henry P[itney] Van Dusen, *Spirit, Son and Father* (New York: Scribner, 1958), pp. 27, 125, 126. © 1958 by Henry p. Van Dusen. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. 27] Indeed, we may detect a parallel to what I have elsewhere ventured to call “the logic of spiritual vitality,” re-enacted again and again in the pilgrimage of the Christian Church, whereby a period of intense and creative religious renewal is unfailingly succeeded by an aftermath of gradually diminishing spiritual vigor but increasing theological and organizational rigidity, then by a time of comparative sterility—until revival bursts forth afresh, and the curve of descending life and power is re-enacted...

[p. 125] The fate of the Holy Spirit at the hands of the theologians and Church officials across the centuries ... is, on the whole, a pathetic and tragic story...

[p. 126] The Holy Spirit has always been troublesome, disturbing because it has seemed to be unruly, radical, unpredictable. It is always embarrassing to ecclesiasticism and baffling to ethically-grounded, responsible durable Christian devotion. And so it has been carefully taken in hand by Church authorities, whether Catholic or Protestant, and securely tethered in impotence.

677. Egypt, Kings of, During the Probable Period of Moses

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 144, 145. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 144] Moses was born about 1520 B.C. [that is, 1525 if the Exodus is to be dated in 1445 (see *SDADic*, “Moses”)], probably during the reign of Thutmose I, whose daughter, the famous Hatshepsut, may well have been the royal personage who discovered the infant among the flags by the riverside (Ex. 2:5–10).

Since Thutmose I left no surviving legitimate male heir to the throne, his daughter Hatshepsut was in line for succession. But being prevented by her sex from succeeding as king, she possessed no more than the right to convey the crown by marriage to her husband and to secure the succession to her children. To circumvent a dynastic dilemma

and to prevent the loss of the crown to another family, Thutmose I was obliged to marry his daughter to her younger half-brother, a son by a lesser marriage, who took the throne as Thutmose II.

But the legitimate marriage of Thutmose II, like that of his father, failed to supply a male heir to the throne. Again steps had to be taken to safeguard the survival of the dynasty. Thutmose II, accordingly, named as his successor a young son by a minor wife. Appointing the lad as coregent and strengthening his claim to the throne by marrying him to his half-sister, Thut- [p. 145] mose II's daughter by Hatshepsut, the young prince ascended the throne and was crowned as Thutmose III. But he was not destined for some time to assume the reins of office. Hatshepsut, his stepmother and mother-in-law (by marriage to Hatshepsut's daughter), not only assumed the kingship during Thutmose III's minority, but refused to surrender her regency even after the king became of age.

From the first the energetic queen announced her intention of reigning as a man. Her brilliant reign was characterized by remarkable prosperity and great building enterprises and did not come to an end until about 1486 B.C., when, upon her death the restive and jealous Thutmose III ascended to the throne and forthwith obliterated or destroyed all her monuments. If the plaster with which he covered them had not fallen away, much less would be known of his remarkable stepmother.

The death of Hatshepsut and the accession of Thutmose III doubtless inaugurated the last and most severe phase of the oppression of Israel. The new monarch was one of the greatest foreign conquerors in Egyptian history. In numerous victorious campaigns in Syria-Palestine, he pushed the frontiers of Egypt to the Euphrates River. Lists of his conquests in Asia include many familiar Bible names such as Kadesh, Megiddo, Dothan, Damascus, Hamath, Laish, Geba, Taanach, Carmel, Beth-Shemesh, Gath, Gerar, Ekron, Gezer and Bethshan. Little must the powerful empire builder have realized that in despoiling Palestine and breaking down the strongholds of the Amorites, he was preparing them for the conquest of the land by the humble Hebrew slaves, who were even then toiling under the fierce lash of his taskmasters by the Nile.

678. Egypt, Kings of—Thutmose IV's "Dream Inscription"

SOURCE: Thutmose IV, Inscription on the "Sphinx" *trans.* in James B. Pritchard, ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (2d ed.), p. 449. Copyright 1955 by Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey. Used by permission.

One of these days it happened that the King's Son Thut-mose came on an excursion at noon time. Then he rested in the shadow of this great god [see editor's note]. Sleep took hold of him, slumbering at the time when the sun was at (its) peak. He found the majesty of this august god speaking with his own mouth, as a father speaks to his son, saying: "See me, look at me, my son, Thut-mose I am thy father, Harmakhis-Khepri-Re-Atum. I shall give thee my kingdom... Thou shalt wear the southern crown and the northern crown on the throne of Geb, the crown prince (of the gods). Thine is the land in its length and its breadth, that which the Eye of the All-Lord illumines. Provisions are thine from the midst of the Two Lands and the great tribute of every foreign country. The time is long in years that my face has been toward thee and my heart has been toward thee and thou hast been mine. Behold, my state was like (that of) one who is in *need*, and my whole body was going to pieces. The sands of the desert, that upon which I had been, were encroaching upon me; (but) I waited to let thee do what was in my heart, (for) I knew that thou art my son and my protector. *Approach* thou! Behold, I am with thee; I am thy guide."

When he had finished these words, then this king's son *awoke*, because he had heard these [*words*] ... and he understood the speech of this god. (But) he set silence in his heart, (for) [he] said: "... Come, let us go to our house in the city. They shall protect the offerings to this god which ye will bring to him: cattle, ..., and all green things."

[EDITOR'S NOTE: The "god" was the famous Sphinx, in whose shadow the king's son (later Thutmose IV) rested. The stela bearing this inscription still stands between the great paws of this statue. For the possible Biblical significance of this inscription, see No. 723; also *SDADic* "Exodus," p. 332. and fig. 145.]

679. Egypt, Religion of—Immortality (for the Pharaoh) in Oldest

Writings

SOURCE: Josephine Mayer and Tom Prideaux, eds., *Never to Die: The Egyptians in Their Own Words* (New York: The Viking Press, 1938), pp. 42–44. Copyright, 1938, by Josephine Mayer and Tom Prideaux. Used by permission.

[p. 42] The oldest literature yet known in the world is the Pyramid Texts of which "The Deceased's Journey" is a part. It descends from writing as remote as the thirty-fifth century B.C. Inscribed for the Pharaoh on the inside wall of his pyramid tomb, these words had magical power to help him secure immortality...

[p. 43] A ramp to the sky is built for him
That he may go up to the sky thereon.
He goeth up upon the smoke
Of the great exhalation.
He flieth as a bird,
And he settleth as a beetle
On an empty seat on the ship of Re.
"Stand up, get thee forth, that he may sit in thy seat."
He roweth in the sky in thy ship, O Re!
And he cometh to the land in thy ship, O Re!
When thou ascendest out of the horizon,
He is there with his staff in his hand,
The navigator of thy ship, O Re! ...

[p. 44] He hath gone up into the sky
And hath found Re,
Who standeth up when he draweth nigh unto him.
He sitteth down beside him,
For Re suffereth him not to seat himself on the ground,
Knowing that he is greater than Re.
He hath taken his stand with Re
In the northern part of the sky,
And hath seized the Two Lands like a king.

680. Egypt, Religion of—Immortality—Osiris Myth

SOURCE: George Andrew Reisner, *The Egyptian Conception of Immortality* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1912), pp. 75, 76, 78, 81, 82, 84, 85. Copyright 1912 by George Andrew Reisner. Used by permission of Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

[p. 75] To sum up, the essential idea of the Egyptian conception of immortality was that the ghost or spirit of the man preserved the personality and the form [p. 76] of the man in the existence after death; that this spirit had the same desires, the same pleasures, the same necessities, and the same fears as on earth. Life after death was a duplicate of life on earth...

[p. 78] As a part of the magical provisions of the dead, the Osiris myth, probably built up in explanation of old rites, was drawn into the belief in a future life, and apparently at the beginning *solely for the benefit of the king*. ... The earth-god Osiris, god of the living, had died and had been brought to life as god of the dead. So, also, the earth-king, the Horus, the son of Ra, must die, but he also would live again in the other world and share the throne of Osiris...

[p. 81] Feudalism [during the Middle Empire] extended the possibilities of heaven to the great nobles. In the New Empire, the royal power was gradually absorbed by the priestly organization of the national religion—the religion of Amon-Ra; and the principle comes into practice that any priest having the necessary knowledge could obtain for himself an exceptional place in the future life. The Osirian burial customs spread even among the people...

[p. 82] All but the poorest burials [in the Ptolemaic period] bear direct evidence of their character as Osiris burials...

[p. 84] The priests of the Osiris-Isis religion made their bid to the classical world. They offered immortality by initiation. Learn the proper rites, learn the master words, and secure eternal life among the great gods. It was a religion for the exceptional man down to the last; it required training and knowledge. Even in its most popular form in the Ptolemaic period, a specially instructed class was required, who sold for money [p. 85] the benefits of their knowledge, and men took rank in their security of future life according to their means.

Not until Christianity came, offering eternal life free and without price, did the common people find at last a road open to equal immortality with the great men of the earth.

681. Egypt, Religion of — Sun-god Amon-Re

SOURCE: H. Frankfort, *Ancient Egyptian Religion*, p. 22. Copyright 1948 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

This more than local, this really nation-wide foundation of advanced theological thought is especially clear in the rise of the supreme god of the Egyptian Empire, Amon-Re. Its premise is a multiplicity of answers: the air no less than the sun was seen to exemplify creative power. Thebes, the capital of the empire, from time immemorial had worshiped the god Amon, the “Hidden One,” manifest in the wind which “bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth.” But Amon, the wind, was also, as breath, the mysterious source of life in man and beast. Now the Thebans, in common with all Egyptians, acknowledged the power in the sun, the god Re. And in the second millennium B.C. the belief spread that this god who ruled the days and the seasons and Amon, the “Hidden One,” were one and the same, Amon-Re. The validity of two traditional answers to the question as to where lay the source of existence was not impaired, but the recognition that the two answers were identical, that the creative power of air and the creative power in the sun were one, was more fruitful than any line of thought followed in former times. If this was syncretism, it was also the closest approach to the worship of a supreme and universal god known within the scope of Egyptian polytheism.

682. Egypt, Religion of—Sun Worship and Immortality

SOURCE: Jaroslav Cerny, *Ancient Egyptian Religion* (London, W. 1.: Hutchinson, 1952), pp. 82, 83. Used by permission of The Hutchinson Publishing Group.

[p. 82] The king had become the son of the sun-god Rē, and after death he joined his father in heaven to accompany him in his boat on his daily journey across the sky. It is quite natural that the common folk who, though never [p. 83] calling themselves sons of Rē, believed themselves to be Rē's creations, soon adopted the fate of the king.

What was it in the sun-religion that appealed so strangely to the Egyptian? It was partly that he saw the supreme importance of the sun, with its light and warmth, to the life of man and the whole of nature; Egyptians were aware that the sun was necessary to life and that without the sun there would be no earthly life. But this observation of a fact can hardly explain the final predominance of the solar religion. The cause of its victory lies rather in the supposed parallel which the Egyptian believed to exist between the life of the sun and that of man; and to the benefit and pleasure which he derived from the existence and daily course of the sun he added considerable comfort respecting his own existence after death.

The sun rises in the mornings, shines all day and disappears in the evening on the western horizon. But this disappearance is only apparent and temporary, for the sun has not ceased to "live", the best proof being that it reappears the next morning after having spent the night in an invisible world. The Egyptians formed the conviction that human life is a close parallel to the course of the sun: man is born like the sun in the morning, lives his earthly life and dies, like the sun, which emits its life-giving rays to the whole day and sets in the evening; but the analogy requires that his death should not be final, and that in a certain sense it does not take place at all. Man continues to live after the so-called death in a world outside his perception, and as a logical corollary, will at some time be born again to a new life.

683. End of the World, Belief in, Revived With Nuclear Age

SOURCE: Wesner Fallaw, "Atomic Apocalypse," *The Christian Century*, 63 (Sept. 25, 1946), 1148.

Copyright 1946 Christian Century Foundation, Chicago. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

The Christian view of history makes inescapable a doctrine of events beyond history. God's will is to be worked out in time and beyond time. The kingdom of heaven is within you and within time; it is also beyond you, though you be a saint, and it is beyond the condition of earth as we have known earth. A new heaven and a new earth, when all things that are will have passed away and old things will have been made new—these conditions are possible only after world's end. What the nature of this end will be no man can say.

Christians normally reckon with eschatology [the doctrine of "last things"]. It was Christian abnormality which ignored eschatology for so long... The normality which the atomic blasts over Japan brought back to Christian believers consists of the rightness, the correctness, of not only contemplating but also *expecting* world's end.

684. End of the World, the Effect of Belief in

SOURCE: Wesner Fallaw, "Atomic Apocalypse," *The Christian Century*, 63 (Sept. 25, 1946), 1146–1148.

Copyright 1946 Christian Century Foundation. Reprinted by permission from *The Christian Century*.

[p. 1146] A function of Christian is to make preparation for world's end. For generations this fundamental aspect of the Christian faith has been ignored or relegated to the subconscious. But now eschatology confounds us at the very center of consciousness...

The early Christians had a program of action which they followed while awaiting the expected early end of the world. True, it was a spontaneous rather than a systematized

program. But it was far-reaching. They not only worshiped together and strengthened one another in the belief that Jesus Christ would return and care for them while all things were being finished; they also liquidated their possessions, holding earthly goods in common and serving each person, particularly the orphan and the widow, according to need. These first century Christians were in training for life in a new world. Joy in the Lord of heaven and earth quite overcame anxiety about the cessation of one kind of life and the beginning of another.

The fact that these Christians were mistaken in their belief that some among them would still be alive when all things were finished is unimportant. What is of primary importance for us is the fact that they so strengthened each other in the faith that they could rejoice over the certainty they had that the world was about to end. And no less important for us is the cue which their conduct provides. Awaiting the end which they deemed a new beginning, they were constructively active serving their fellows, putting human need foremost and thrusting property far down the scale in value. Possessions were nothing more than means to an end, tools with which to enrich human life, tangible devices by which man could evidence his otherwise intangible love of God.

One might almost say categorically that there exists a sure test to determine whether or not any given person is a Christian—this: The Christian is not anxious about tomorrow—the scientist’s likely day of world’s end; rather, the [p. 1147] Christian is joyful over the prospect of God’s new era wherein more justice will be realized than the most loving of men are able to achieve, no matter how they exalt the value of persons, serving them devotedly, and subordinating material values...

In the event that the present turbulent period is prolonged by nations’ successfully retaining their tenuous sovereignty, we face increasing tensions, fears, eighty, we face increasing tensions, fears and spiritual blight until, goaded beyond endurance, others than Christians will also begin to cry, “O Lord, come quickly!” ...

[p. 1148] The world is sick. But there is a sickness unto life, as successful termination of crisis always attests. In this Christians find joy. But because they share the sickness of the world unto death, they must be nurtured and trained to minister uniquely as God’s purposes move toward realization beyond time.

685. End of the World, Foreseen by Jesus

SOURCE: Henri d’Espine, Lecture given before the Friends of Protestant Thought, quoted in *Gazette de Lausanne*, Feb. 18, 1944, p. 3.

Far from mentioning anything like the progressive improvement of the world; Jesus on the contrary, foresees *the end of it*, preceded by an aggravation of evil which is to be a sign announcing the return of Christ. And this is the veritable object of the Christian hope that runs through all the pages of the New Testament and which the Apocalypse sets forth in a grandiose fresco before the persecuted church.

686. End of the World—Koran Statements on “the (Final) Hour”

SOURCE: Koran, Suras and verses as indicated, in *The Holy Qur-an*, trans. by Abdullah Yusuf Ali (New York: Hafner, 1946), references as indicated. Copyright 1946 by Khalil Al-Rawaf. Used by permission of the director of the Islamic Center, Washington, D.C.

Sura vii. 185, 187, Vol. 1, p. 397

185. Do they [who reject the signs] see nothing
In the government of the heavens

And the earth and all
That God hath created?
(Do they not see) that
It may well be that
Their term is nigh
Drawing to an end?
In what Message after this
Will they then believe? ...

187. They ask thee about
The (final) Hour—when
Will be its appointed time?
Say: “The knowledge thereof
Is with my Lord (alone):
None but He can reveal
As to when it will occur.”
Sura xxi. 1, Vol. 2, p. 822
1. Closer and closer to mankind
Comes their Reckoning: yet they
Heed not and they turn away.
Sura xxxvii. 170–175, Vol. 2, p. 1214
170. But (now that the Qur-ān
Has come), they reject it:
But soon will they know!
171. Already has Our Word
Been passed before (this)
To Our Servants sent (by Us),
172. That they would certainly
Be assisted,
173. And that Our forces,—
They surely must conquer.
174. So turn thou away
From them for a little while,
175. And watch them (how
They fare), and they soon
Shall see (how thou farest)!
Sura xxxix. 68–70, Vol. 2, pp. 1257, 1258
- [p. 1257] 68. The trumpet will (just)
Be sounded, when all
That are in the heavens
And on earth will swoon,
Except such as it will
Please God (to exempt).
Then will a second one
Be sounded, when, behold,
They will be standing
And looking on!

69. And the Earth will shine
 With the glory of its Lord:
 The Record (of Deeds)
 Will be placed (open);
 The prophets and the witnesses
 Will be brought forward;
 And a just decision
 Pronounced between them;
 And they will not
 Be wronged (in the least).
70. And to every soul will be
 Paid in full (the fruit)
- [p. 1258] Of its deeds; and (God)
 Knoweth best all that
 They do.
 Sura liv. 1–3, Vol. 2, p. 1454
1. The Hour (of Judgment)
 Is nigh, and the moon
 Is cleft asunder.
2. But if they see
 A Sign, they turn away,
 And say, “This is
 (But) transient magic.”
3. They reject (the warning)
 And follow their (own) lusts
 But every matter has
 Its appointed time.
 Sura lxxix. 42–45, Vol. 2, p. 1685
42. They ask thee
 About the Hour,—‘When Will be its appointed time?’
43. Wherein art thou (concerned)
 With the declaration thereof?
44. With thy Lord is
 The Limit fixed therefor.
45. Thou art but a Warner
 For such as fear it.

687. End of the World, Niebuhr on

SOURCE: Reinhold Niebuhr, *Faith and History*, pp. 235, 236. Copyright 1949 by Charles Scribner’s Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner’s Sons and James Nisbet, Ltd., London.

[p. 235] The New Testament envisages a culmination of history which is not, literally speaking, within time-history. It looks forward to a final judgement and a general resurrection, which are at once both the fulfillment and the end of history. They imply an end in the sense of *Finis*; but the end in the sense of *Telos*, that is, as the moral and spiritual culmination of the meaning of history, is not within history itself. We have called attention to the significance of the symbol of the Anti-Christ at the end of history,

as indicative of the belief in New Testament that history remains open to all possibilities of good and evil to the end...

[p. 236] The New Testament looks toward the end of history with faith and hope, rather than with fear, despite its anticipation of increased antinomies and contradictions between good and evil in history. Fear has been banished by the faith that this final climax, as well as the whole drama of history, is under a sovereignty of divine love, which has been revealed in Christ.

688. Eschatology, Increased Emphasis on, in Recent Years

SOURCE: George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions About the Kingdom of God*, pp. 45, 46. Copyright 1952 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 45] Eschatology has been a matter of great concern to conservative Christians. In fact, it has become in recent years one of the most emphasized doctrines in Scriptures. There has arisen a profound interest in understanding the prophetic teachings of the Bible because of the sorry plight into which the world has fallen in the last two generations. While the humanistic, naturalistic, and rationalistic philosophies have been faced by the acute problem of finding the meaning of history in a world in which the catastrophes of [p. 46] the last thirty-five years seem to be without meaning, the evangelical believer has found a ground of confidence in the world-view of the Scriptures that God is indeed the Lord of history because the Son of God who lived on earth is to appear again on the earth to bring history to a victorious and glorious consummation. If this is true, it is at once evident that the nature of the events which will attend the return of Christ is of the utmost importance. Among those who accept this biblical teaching, several distinct positions have been maintained which involve different interpretations of the kingdom of God.

689. Eschatology, Study of, Dangers in

SOURCE: D. H. Kromminga, *The Millennium in the Church*, pp. 291, 292. Copyright 1945 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 291] No one would wish to forbid specialized study of some detail of biblical eschatology [the doctrine of "last things"] for fear that such specialized study would tend to throw the special eschatological subject out of focus as compared with the whole of eschatology. An inquiry into the millennium is, of course, nothing but just such a specialized study in the field of eschatology. Nor would one ever want to ban the study of eschatology as a whole for the reason that such study tends to see the importance of its subject out of proportion to the rest of [p. 292] God's revealed truth. But the danger may grow beyond proper bounds, and against this one must guard.

What increases the danger beyond the normal degree, is one or the other or both of two factors. If in such study our hearts are not primarily interested in the Savior and Lord Whose second coming is the central theme of all eschatology, if we carry not with us into such study the living appreciation of His incarnation and atoning death and glorious resurrection as the eternal Son of God, our danger is bound to be abnormally great. And if we begin to ask all kinds of questions suggested by human curiosity concerning subjects about which God has not deemed it necessary and wise to give us fuller information than the Bible contains, we shall be tempted to allow the play of our imagination to fill the places which God has left blank. In the eschatological field such blind spots and vacant places are perhaps more frequent than in any other doctrinal field.

690. Essenes, Strictness of, in Sabbath Observance

SOURCE: Josephus *War* ii. 8. 9; translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, *Vol. 2* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956), p. 379. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

They [the Essenes] . . . are stricter than all Jews in abstaining from work on the seventh day.

691. Evangelical Bodies—Evangelical Covenant Church of America

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 2, pp. 1574, 1575.

[p. 1574] *History*. The great number of immigrants from Sweden, who during the latter half of the nineteenth century arrived in the United States of America, had in their homeland been connected with the Lutheran State Church of Sweden. On arriving in this country they, as a rule, organized Swedish Lutheran churches in their respective communities. Later on these churches organized the Augustana Synod, which affiliated itself with the Lutheran General Council.

A considerable number of the immigrants, however, had in their homeland experienced a spiritual awakening during the great revivals that stirred the Swedish nation during the nineteenth century. As a direct result of these revivals, laymen began to preach the gospel, and a free church movement developed within the state church of Sweden, a movement that was bitterly opposed by some of the clergy of the state church. Nevertheless, the free church movement gained strength, and mission societies and congregations were organized in various parts of Sweden. The Christians, who had thus been influenced by said revival movements, upon their arrival in America did not fully enjoy the spiritual atmosphere of the Swedish Lutheran churches in this country. For that reason they soon organized other churches that were more in harmony with the ideas prevalent in the free church movement in Sweden. In 1873 some of these churches organized the Swedish Lutheran Mission Synod, and in 1884 other churches of the same character organized the Swedish Lutheran Ansgarius [p. 1575] Synod. These two organizations labored side by side for about 10 years. Efforts were made, however, to unite these groups, and in February 1885 the Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant of America was organized in Chicago for the purpose of uniting the churches of the last-named synods as well as some other independent churches that had sprung up in the meantime. In 1937 the official name was changed to Evangelical Mission Covenant Church of America.

Doctrine. In doctrine, the Evangelical Mission Covenant Church of America is strictly evangelical. The Bible is accepted as the word of God and the only infallible guide in matters of faith, doctrine, and practice. The Lutheran conception of the teachings of the Bible is generally accepted, but full freedom is given to those holding other views in doctrinal matters. The Mission Covenant has not accepted any articles of faith as binding for the churches of the organization.

Organization. In church government, the Mission Covenant is essentially congregational, the local church having full freedom to arrange its own affairs.

[EDITORS' NOTE: In 1957 the name was changed to the Evangelical Covenant Church of America. The membership in 1959 was 59,396 (*YAC*, 1961, pp. 49, 254).]

692. Evangelical Bodies—Evangelical United Brethren Church (Formed in 1946 by Union of the Evangelical Church and the United Brethren in Christ)

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 626, 627; part 2, pp. 1632, 1633.

[a. *The Evangelical Church*]

[p. 626] *History*. The great religious awakening which took place in the United States at the close of the eighteenth century was at first largely confined to the English-speaking

communities. It was inevitable, however, that others should feel the effect of the new spirit; and a number of leaders arose, through whose influence varying types of religious life developed, eventuating in different church organizations. Among them was Jacob Albright, who was born in Pottstown, Pa., in 1759, and died in 1808. Baptized in infancy, and confirmed in the Lutheran communion, he was later converted under the influence of a Reformed minister; but coming into connection with the Methodists, he declared his adherence to them and was licensed to exhort. Albright, who had begun to preach in 1796, felt called upon to devote himself particularly to work among the German people. It had not been his purpose to found a new church.

It was not until 1803 that an ecclesiastical organization was effected at a general assembly held in eastern Pennsylvania, when Mr. Albright was set apart as a minister of the gospel and ordained as an elder.

His training in the Methodist Episcopal Church influenced him in organizing the new movement, and many characteristic Methodist features, such as the circuit system and the itinerancy, were adopted. The first field of operations included the counties of Bucks, Berks, and Northampton, and extended into portions of Northumberland and Centre counties. The first annual conference was held in Lebanon County, Pa., in November 1807. Albright was elected bishop, [p. 627] and articles of faith and the book of discipline were adopted, but a full form of church government was not devised for some years. The first general conference convened in Buffalo Valley, Union County, Pa., in October 1816, at which time the denomination took the name Evangelical Association.

Although, in the beginning, the activities of the church were carried on in the German language only, the scope was soon widened by taking up work in the English language also; and of late years English has become the dominant language, practically displacing the German. The denomination spread into the Central States, and throughout the Northern and Western States from New England to the Pacific coast, and north into Canada.

For some years the missionary idea, which has always been a dominant purpose of the denomination, found its expression in local work; but in 1839 a general missionary society was organized, and a woman's society followed in 1883. In 1854 the church first reached out to Europe, and commenced an important work both in Germany and Switzerland. In 1876 Japan was occupied, and since then missions have been established in China, Russia, Poland-Latvia, and Africa. As early as 1815, a church publishing house was founded, and what is said to be the oldest German religious paper in the United States, *Der Christliche Botschafter*, was founded in 1836.

A division, in 1891, resulting in the organization of the United Evangelical Church, took from the denomination a large number of ministers and members.

Both denominations continued their separate existence until the end of the second decade of the separation when the growing conviction that the two churches should be reunited began to find articulate expression. The General Conference of the Evangelical Association of 1907 and that of the United Evangelical Church in 1910 took definite steps-toward a reapproachment by the appointment of commissions on church union and federation. These commissions, after a series of meetings, agreed upon a partial basis of union in 1918, which basis was ratified by the General Conference of the United Evangelical Church in 1918 and by the General Conference of the Evangelical Association in 1919.

Commissions were again appointed which, in joint session in 1921, completed the basis of union; it was submitted to the annual conferences of both denominations, receiving the required constitutional majority in both churches. At a special session of the General Conference of the Evangelical Association, and at a regular session of the General Conference of the United Evangelical Church, meeting simultaneously during the month of October 1922, the adoption of the Discipline and the Basis of Union was consummated, and on October 14, 1922, in the General Conference of the Evangelical Church. This church is not one of the Lutheran bodies.

Doctrine. In doctrine the Evangelical Church is Arminian, and its articles of faith correspond very closely to those of the Methodist Episcopal Church. They emphasize the divinity as well as perfect humanity of the Son of God and the true divinity of the Holy Ghost; and hold that the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments reveal the will of God so far as is necessary for salvation. Christian perfection is defined as “a state of grace in which we are so firmly rooted in God that we have instant victory over every temptation the moment it presents itself, without yielding in any degree; in which our rest, peace, and joy in God are not interrupted by the vicissitudes of life; in which, in short, sin has lost its power over us, and we rule over the flesh, the world, and Satan, yet in watchfulness.” Entire sanctification is the basis of this perfection, which, however, constantly admits of a fuller participation in divine power and a constant expansion in spiritual capacity.

Organization. The polity of the Evangelical Church is connectional in form. Bishops are elected by the General Conference for a term of 4 years, but are not ordained or consecrated as such... The General Conference, which meets quadrennially, has been, since 1839, a delegated body... The annual and quarterly conferences correspond to the similar bodies in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

[b. The United Brethren in Christ]

[p. 1632] *History.* Among the serious conditions facing the churches of America in the early part of the eighteenth century were the lack of church buildings, church organization, and especially the dearth of able spiritual ministers.

In general, moral conditions were deplorable. In 1746 Rev. Michael Schlatter, a Swiss by birth, was sent as a missionary to the German Reformed churches in Pennsylvania, although under the general direction of the Synod of Holland. In 1751 he returned to Europe to present an appeal for further aid and additional missionaries. Six young men responded to his presentation of the need in the new colonies. Among them was Philip William Otterbein, who was born in the duchy of Nassau, Germany, in 1726, and who had already had some experience in pastoral work. The company arrived in New York in July 1752 and Otterbein soon found a field of labor with the congregation at Lancaster, Pa., at that time the second in importance among the German Reformed churches of the Colonies.

Early in his pastorate at Lancaster, Otterbein passed through a deep personal religious experience which led him to insist upon the necessity of a deeper inward spirituality on the part of his people. This was not always acceptable at that period, barren as it was in spiritual life.

About this time Otterbein came into personal relations with Martin Boehm, a preacher of the Mennonite communion, who had passed through a similar religious experience. They conducted evangelistic work among the scattered German settlements

of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. This was regarded as being irregular by their fellow ministers and resulted in Otterbein's accepting a call in 1774 to an independent congregation in Baltimore. For the next 15 years Otterbein and Boehm conducted their evangelistic labors among the German-speaking communities, holding 2 days' "great meetings." Other ministers of like spirit associated themselves with these men. Under their preaching converts multiplied rapidly, but church organizations were not yet formed, many of the converts uniting with English-speaking churches.

A meeting was held by these evangelistic preachers in 1789. During the next 10 years similar councils convened at irregular times. These ministers did not then intend to form a separate denomination, but in obeying the call of God to win souls and stand for a spiritual church membership they were inevitably drawn closer and closer together until the year 1800, when a conference was held in Frederick County, Md., and a distinct ecclesiastical body was formed under the name "United Brethren in Christ." Thirteen ministers were in attendance at this important conference. Otterbein and Boehm were elected as bishops, and they were continuously reelected to the bishopric until the death of Boehm in 1812 and of Otterbein in 1813. Thus it will be seen that this new organization was in no sense a schism from any other body, but was the natural development on the part of German-speaking congregations desiring a deeper spiritual life and strong emphasis on evangelism.

Bishop Asbury, of the Methodist Church, and Bishop Otterbein, of the United Brethren Church, came into close relationship, but the two bodies they represented remain distinct, and no specific effort to unite the forces was ever made.

The fact that those who joined in forming the United Brethren Church represented different forms of church life necessitated concessions on the part of all. The reformed churches practiced infant baptism, and the Mennonites regarded believers' baptism by immersion as the only correct form. The result was that each generously conceded to the other freedom to follow personal convictions as to the form of baptism and the age of persons baptized.

During the first decade of the nineteenth century preaching places were established west of the Allegheny Mountains, in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.

The first General Conference was held in 1815 near Mount Pleasant, Pa., when a form of discipline was adopted. Up until this time all the churches had used the German language in their services; but the use of English was increasing, and [p. 1633] the conference held in 1817 ordered the confession of faith and book of discipline to be printed in both German and English.

The Church of the United Brethren in Christ early took a positive position on questions of moral reform. It placed in its discipline in 1821 a declaration in condemnation of slavery; and in 1841 definite action was taken against the drinking of ardent spirits and the manufacture and sale of alcoholic drinks.

The General Conference of 1889 revised the confession of faith and the constitution of the church. A few of the delegates believed that this revision was unconstitutional. They withdrew and formed small communion of their own.

The past three decades have been characterized by intensive development of colleges, a theological seminary, homes and orphanages, and missionary agencies.

Much emphasis has been placed on religious education, the promotion of Christian stewardships, and systematic giving through the benevolence budget.

The church is a member of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and is cooperating with other Protestant bodies in State, national, and international relationships.

Doctrine. In doctrine the church is Arminian. Its confession of faith, consisting of 13 brief articles, sets forth the generally accepted view of the Trinity, the authority of the Scriptures, justification and regeneration, the Christian Sabbath, and the future state. Concerning the sacraments, it holds that baptism and the Lord's Supper should be observed by all Christians, but the mode of baptism and the manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper are left to the judgment of the individual. The question of the baptism of children is left to the choice of parents. Emphasis is laid upon a life of prayer and devotion to Christ and His cause...

Organization. Pastoral charges consist of one or more local churches which hold monthly official meetings and quarterly conferences. Annual conferences are composed of ministers and lay delegates in equal numbers. The General Conference is composed of ministers and lay delegates in equal numbers, elected by the members of the churches in their respective conferences.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The Evangelical United Brethren Church had in 1959 a membership of 749, 788 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 254). Its government is Methodistic.]

693. Evangelism—Meaning of Term *Evangelical*

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 11. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

What is an evangelical? An evangelical is a Christian "holding or conformed to what the majority of Protestants regard as the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, such as the Trinity, the fallen condition of man, Christ's atonement for sin, salvation by faith, not works, and regeneration by the Holy Ghost." A subsidiary definition is "in a special sense, spiritually minded and zealous for practical Christian living, distinguished from merely orthodox." Another secondary definition is "seeking the conversion of sinners, as evangelical labors or preaching."

694. Evangelicalism, New Defined

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Theological Education," *Bulletin of Fuller Theological Seminary*, 4 (Oct., Nov., Dec., 1954), 4. Used by permission of the author.

The new evangelicalism embraces the full orthodoxy of fundamentalism in doctrine but manifests a social consciousness and responsibility which was strangely absent from fundamentalism. The new evangelicism concerns itself not only with personal salvation, doctrinal truth and an eternal point of reference but also with the problems of race, of war, of class struggle, of liquor control, of juvenile delinquency, of immorality, and of national imperialism. It even faces the question of creeping socialism and asks, is it Christian? The new evangelicalism believes that orthodox Christians cannot abdicate their responsibility in the social scene.

695. Evangelicalism, Revival of

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 13. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

Is evangelicalism reviving? Is it emerging to challenge the theological world today? A new respect for the evangelical position is evidenced by the emergence of scholars whose works must be recognized. Westminster Press recently published a trilogy on *The Case for Liberalism*, *The Case for Neo-Orthodoxy*, and *The Case for Orthodoxy*. Here Protestant orthodoxy was again recognized as a live option. Great publishing houses

today are not only willing to publish bold by evangelical scholars, but several are actively seeking such books.

This may be due to a change in the intellectual climate of orthodoxy. The younger orthodox scholars are repudiating the separatist position, have repented of the attitude of solipsism, have expressed a willingness to re-examine the problems facing the theological world, have sought a return to the theological dialogue and have recognized the honesty and Christianity of some who hold views different from their own in some particulars.

696. Evangelicalism, With Fundamentalism

SOURCE: Harold John Ockenga, "Resurgent Evangelical Leadership," *Christianity Today*, 5 (Oct. 10, 1960), 13. Copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

Evangelical theology is synonymous with fundamentalism or orthodoxy. In doctrine the evangelicals and the fundamentalist are one. The evangelical must acknowledge his debt to the older fundamentalist leaders. It is a mistake for an evangelical to divorce himself from historic fundamentalism as some have sought to do. These older leaders of the orthodox cause paid a great price in persecution, discrimination, obloquy, and scorn which they suffered at the hands of those who under the name of modernism repudiated biblical Christianity. For deceased these fundamentalists were steadfast to Christ and to biblical truth regardless of the cost. They maintained the knowledge of orthodox Christianity through Bible schools, radio programs, Christian conferences, and Bible conferences. In the true New Testament sense, they were witnesses, or martyrs...

Let it be repeated that there is a solidarity of doctrine between fundamentalism and evangelicalism. They accept the inspiration and dependability of the Bible, the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the creation and fall of man, the vicarious atonement by Christ on Calvary, justification by faith and not by works, regeneration and sanctification by the Spirit, the spiritual unity of the Church, the evangelical, educational, and societal mission of the Church, and the kingdom of Christ experiential, ethical, and eschatological [*sic*]. The evangelical and the fundamentalist could sign the same creed.

697. Evolution—Belief in Supernatural Defended

SOURCE: A. E. Wilder Smith, quoted with editorial comment, in *Christianity Today*, 4 (June 20, 1960), 21, 22. copyright 1960 by Christianity Today, Inc., Washington. Used by permission.

[p. 21] Dr. A. E. Wilder Smith, pointedly criticizes an address by harvard paleontologist Dr. G. G. Simpson to the American Association for the Advancement of Science on "The World into Which Darwin Led Us" (printed in *Science*, Apr. 1, 1960).

Dr. Simpson spurned belief in the supernatural as a warping superstition. The world and man, he holds, have evolved from the nonliving, and "it is in the highest degree improbable that anything in the world exists specifically for his [man's] benefit." The Harvard scientist brushes aside "the world of higher superstition" and reports that, when polled in Chicago, a panel of highly distinguished international experts, considered imminent the experimental production of life in the laboratory, and one panelist contended that this result has already been achieved.

It is remarkable that so few American scientists of stature bother to confute such views. The effort of American Scientific Affiliation, titled *Evolution and Christian Thought Today* (1960), one of the few works by contemporary scientists espousing Christian theism, grapples with the naturalistic bias.

Dr. Wilder Smith, of the faculty of the Pharmological Institute in Bergen, notes the resemblance of Dr. Simpson's argument, in tone and substance, to literature on the same

subject originating behind the Iron Curtain and “regularly sent gratis from Eastern Berlin for some reason.” He continues:

The interpretation of the Chicago poll is interesting and typical for this type of thought. A highly distinguished international panel considered the experimental production of life in the laboratory as imminent. It is the *interpretation* of this information which interests me most, namely that, because this is the case, therefore life was not created by a Creator, who therefore can be dismissed from our thoughts as non-existent.

If the above statement is interpreted with scientific disinterestedness, exactly what does it prove? Surely nothing more than that, *with the necessary interference from outside*, life may result in a previously lifeless system. That the interference from outside in this case takes the form of changing and controlling the experimental conditions no one doubts. What has, however, been rather overlooked, not only in Dr. Simpson’s article but also generally, is the rather obvious fact that, in scientific experiments of this kind, a scientific mind or intelligence at the back of the experiment is the absolute prerequisite for any hope of achieving success. Otherwise, the highly specific ordering of material and conditions will not occur—at least certainly not quickly enough to outstrip the decomposition processes running counter to life’s synthetic necessities. Even to give the various separate parts of, say, a virus system to an oratorio singer or a ploughboy would scarcely be expected, at least among those skilled in the art, to produce the desired experimental objective, namely life. The requirements to set the reaction off are much too specific—this we do know. It is plain scientific nihilism to attempt to replace the carefully planned scientific experiment by the soup stock pot and say that billions of years will do what the planned experiment can do but with the greatest difficulty, effort, and planning. The scientist knows that careful hard work (involving complex thought processes, experience, and intelligence, if you wish) and planning represent the basic necessary exogenous interference in a system, if we are to hope to achieve life from lifeless material. Dare we, as scientist, maintain that delicate reac- [p. 22] tions just ‘happened’ in the past, when we know that in the present, scientific experience has never given the slightest basis for hope of success, unless reaction conditions are meticulously, progressively, and sometimes rapidly adjusted, often in a way chance will not take care of except by undue statistical weighing? And further, the greater the efforts to achieve life synthetically, the greater has the complexity of the problem proved to be. It is just this mounting intellectual effort which has reflected so beautifully and conclusively the mounting refinement in experimental technique required for success, which is just another way of saying that the known intellectually-controlled physical interference from outside necessary to ignite life from the previously lifeless is continually mounting.

Living things are known today to be very much more complex than was thought only a few years ago, to say nothing of thoughts on this subject during Darwin’s lifetime. The mounting complexity brings diminishing possibility for chance ever to have been the Creator. The more laboratory technique is improved and used in the effort to produce life synthetically, the less likelihood is there of this.

All this leads quite simply to something very much approaching the Christian position so much attacked, even though obliquely, in Dr. Simpson’s article. This position simply states that interference from outside took place in matter in the past, resulting in the conferment of order in certain forms of matter to produce life as we know it. In principle, this position corresponds to that which every scientist takes in attempting to attain life in the lifeless in the laboratory; the method is the same in both cases—intellectually exogenously controlled physical interference with matter. Who does the ordering or interfering is immaterial in principle, the main thing is that scientific method has confirmed the mandatory role of exogenous ordering of matter, if life from the lifeless is to be achieved. That this does not occur within our experience endogenously is obvious and as the known complexity of life processes increases so do the statistical possibilities of spontaneous or endogenous ordering to the necessary grade decrease. Man was not there at the start to do the experiment, but why deny that any experimenter did the experiment, when all scientific method demands some sort of an experimenter?

Indeed, the Christian position goes further than this and maintains that the Mind behind Creation endowed his creature with some creative abilities similar to, even though vastly smaller than, his own. It goes even further along this line in calling man a god in some respects. If, however, man succeeds in modern laboratories sometimes, in a small way, in thinking the Creator’s synthetic experiments through again after him, why should this fact be interpreted to prove that, therefore, the Creator does not exist, as indeed Dr. Simpson seems to think? I must confess, I do not follow the logic of this position. If someone succeeds in repeating and confirming my published experiments, who, in the name of Science, would

interpret this feat as proof positive that I do not exist, that I never did the experiments and therefore need never be reckoned with?

It seems to me, therefore, that Dr. Simpson's nomenclature with respect to 'higher superstitions celebrated weekly in every hamlet in the United States' is not only rather lacking in Christian grace and tolerance (surely desirable properties cherished by Christians and others) but is without scientific basis—for the word superstition would no longer be correct if these celebrations were soundly founded on fact.

698. Evolution—Cosmogony—Nebular Hypothesis Falls to the Ground

SOURCE: Harold [Frederic] Richards, *The Universe Surveyed*, pp. 106, 107. Copyright 1937 by D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 106] The [nebular] hypothesis falls to the ground because the planets possess nearly all (97%) of the total angular momentum of the solar system although their total mass is insignificant (a tenth of one per cent) in [p. 107] comparison with that of the sun. For this and other reasons a theory of gradual evolution must be abandoned in favor of a catastrophic action which formed the planets by violence and gave them their great angular momentum at the expense of a body *outside the solar system*.

[EDITORS' NOTE: The author has not abandoned the evolutionary origin of the earth for a nonevolutionary origin; he has simply abandoned one hypothesis in favor of another. The nebular hypothesis was replaced about 1900 by the planetesimal hypothesis, and later by the tidal hypothesis, both of which employ "catastrophic action" to explain the origin of the planets from matter drawn from the sun by a near collision (by one view, a "grazing collision") with an unknown star from outside the solar system a sufficient number of millions of years ago. However, as the once-comfortably complete nebular hypothesis collapsed long ago in the face of increased knowledge, the newer hypotheses have become less and less adequate to accommodate all the known facts. Today the experts admit that no present theory comes anywhere near giving a satisfactory account of the formation of the solar system. Yet they hold to the idea of an evolutionary process. Olivier remarks ("Cosmogony", *The Encyclopedia Americana*, Vol. 8, p. 36) that "we have every reason to believe" that the system rose by "orderly evolution of some sort."]

699. Evolution — Cosmology — Use of Term "Principle" in Certain Contexts Derided

SOURCE: Herbert Dingle, "Science and Modern Cosmology," a presidential address given in 1953 before the Royal Astronomical Society, London, *Science*, 120 (Oct. 1, 1954), 515. Reprinted from *Science* by permission.

I shall refer to the "cosmological principle" as the *cosmological assumption* and to the "perfect cosmological principle" as the *cosmological presumption*, reserving the right, when the "absolutely perfect cosmological principle" makes its appearance, to introduce the terms *first* and *second* cosmological presumption.

Now we have here a remarkable and a very serious phenomenon. I have no time to discuss the meaning of science, so I will here assert of it only that which I think will command universal assent, namely, that *no statement about the universe, or nature, or experience, or whatever term you prefer for the object of scientific investigation shall be made—let alone advanced as a fundamental principle—for which there is no evidence*. What we are faced with now is the quite different claim that *any statement may be made about it that cannot immediately be refuted*. It seems that if you are attracted by an idea for which there is no evidence, all you have to do is to call it a "principle," and then no evidence is needed. We are told that matter is being continually created, but in such a way that the process is imperceptible—that is, the statement cannot be disproved. When we ask why we should believe this, the answer is that the "perfect cosmological principle" requires it. And when we ask why we should accept this "principle," the answer is that the fundamental axiom of science requires it. This we have seen to be false, and the only other answer that one can gather is that the "principle" must be true because it seems fitting to the people who assert it. With all respect, I find this inadequate...

We have, then, the strange position that in cosmology two impostors have usurped the throne of science, worn her crown, and taken her name. Whereas the source and final court of appeal in science is experience, that of one impostor is personal taste, and that of the other, pure reason. Neither is, of course, new: it was one of the triumphs of the scientific philosophy in the 17th century to have apparently routed them both.

700. Evolution, Darwin Not Originator of Concept

SOURCE: John Dillenberger and Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity*, pp. 201, 202. Copyright 1954 John Dillenberger & Claude Welch, 1958 Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. Reprinted with the permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.

[p. 201] The idea of "evolution" was certainly not originated by Darwin. It had been suggested by early Greek philosophers, and it had been championed (in various forms) by Hegel and Comte earlier in the nineteenth century. The significance of Darwin's work was threefold. 1) He supplied a vast amount of data to show that at least within certain areas of the biological world, there had been gradual evolution from simpler to more complex organisms. That is, he proved the notion of organic evolution to be true in so far as any scientific hypothesis is capable of such proof. 2) He offered a plausible suggestion as to how the development from simpler to more complex forms took place, viz., by "natural selection," by the survival of the best adapted forms in the struggle for existence. Among the multitude of variations which appeared in the production of offspring, those strains persisted which were best suited for the struggle against the environment—these were "superior" strains which could successfully compete for existence with similar organisms. The gradual accumulation of such varia- [p. 202] tions resulted in the appearance of new species. 3) Darwin used this theory to account for the origin of the human race.

701. Evolution, Effects of Belief in

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), pp. 109, 110, Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

[p. 109] A tragedy of university life in the last generation was the mood of sophisticated indecision. Encouraged by the analogy of scientific doubt, the pre- [p. 110] dominant attitude on questions of ultimate life purpose and of public policy alike was one of openminded and easygoing tolerance. Fanaticism was regarded as the one real sin, and many professors were noted for their artful fence-straddling on matters of supreme importance. At the same time, encouraged by the analogy of biological evolution, there came into great vogue the doctrine that all true progress, whether of individual or society, was accomplished gradually, by minute increments of advance. This gradualism encouraged the easygoing tendency to avoid decisive commitments, to be content with slight inclinations in the direction of truth and right, and at all times to keep open convenient ways of retreat.

702. Evolution—Evolutionist Labels as Superstition Other Explanations of Origins

SOURCE: George Gaylord Simpson, "The World Into Which Darwin Led Us," *Science*, 131 (April 1, 1960), 974. Copyright 1960 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Used by permission.

A world in which man must rely on himself, in which he is not the darling of the gods but only another, albeit extraordinary, aspect of nature, is by no means congenial to the immature or the wishful thinkers. That is plainly a major reason why even now, a hundred years after *The Origin of Species*, most people have not really entered the world into which Darwin led—alas!—only a minority of us. Life may conceivably be happier

for some people in the older worlds of superstition. It is possible that some children are made happy by a belief in Santa Claus, but adults should prefer to live in a world of reality and reason.

Perhaps I should end on that note of mere preference, but it is impossible to do so. It is a characteristic of this world to which Darwin opened the door that unless *most* of us do enter it and live maturely and rationally in it, the future of mankind is dim, indeed—if there is any future.

703. Evolution—Fossils “Out of Place” in the Supposed Evolutionary Time Order

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 206–209. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 206] Numerous fossils have been found grossly out of place in the time scale [of the geologic strata], despite all its built-in safeguards. Furthermore, many creatures supposedly primitive have persisted to the present day, including many which apparently skipped all the way from very early periods to the present without leaving any traces in the intervening periods.

It is not at all uncommon for the smaller fossils on which rock identification is commonly based to be found out of place in the ex- [p. 207] pected sequences...

[p. 208] But these anomalies are more or less trivial compared to the numerous cases in which “old” formations are found resting con- [p. 209] formably on “young” formations. These phenomena are found almost everywhere in hilly or mountainous regions and have been attributed to “thrust-faulting”. The concept is that great segments of rock strata have been somehow separated from their roots and made to slide far over adjacent regions. Subsequent erosion then modifies the transported “nappe” so that the young strata on top are removed, leaving only the older strata superposed on the stationary young rocks beneath. There are various modifications of this concept, but all are equally difficult to conceive mechanically. As we have seen, many show little or no actual physical evidence of such tremendous and catastrophic movement.

704. Evolution—Geologic Series of Strata (Circular Reasoning)

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, pp. 205, 206. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

[p. 205] One receives the impression from geological textbooks that the [p. 206] strata are essentially harmonious everywhere, with the oldest on the bottom, each stratum succeeded in turn by one representing the next period. Of course this is not so, and everyone familiar with the facts recognizes that it is not so. The geologic time series is built up by a hypothetical superposition of beds upon each other from all over the world... The “fossil successions” constitute the only real basis for the arrangement. And this means, in effect, that organic evolution has been implicitly assumed in assigning chronological pigeon-holes to particular rock systems and their fossils...

And yet this succession of fossil organisms as preserved in the rocks is considered as the one convincing proof that evolution has occurred! And thus have we come round the circle again.

But even this carefully erected system is found to have numerous contradictions in it [see No. 703].

705. Evolution—Gorilla Not Man’s Cousin

SOURCE: [John] Ambrose Fleming, *The Origin of Mankind* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott Ltd. [1935]), p. 75. Used by permission.

The up shot of it all is that we cannot arrange all the known fossil remains of supposed “man” in a lineal series gradually advancing in type or form from that of any anthropoid ape, or other mammal, up to the modern and now existing types of true man. Any supposition or statement that it can be done, and is true, is certainly incorrect.

It is entirely misleading and unspeakably pernicious to put forward in popular magazines or other publications read by children pictures of gorillas or chimpanzees labelled “Man’s cousin” or “Man’s nearest relative,” or to publish perfectly imaginary and grotesque pictures of a supposed “Java man” with brutish face as an ancestor of modern man, as is occasionally done. Those who do such things are guilty of ignorance or deliberate misrepresentation. Neither is it justifiable for preachers in the pulpit to tell their congregations that there is general agreement amongst scientific men as to the evolutionary origin of Man from an animal ancestor.

706. Evolution—Life, Origin of, Evolutionist’s Conjecture on

SOURCE: George Gaylord Simpson, *The Meaning of Evolution* (1960), pp. 14, 15. Copyright 1949 by Yale University Press. Used by permission of Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn, and Oxford University Press, London.

[p. 14] The origin of life was necessarily the beginning of organic evolution and it is among the greatest of evolutionary problems...

Recent work in biochemistry, and especially studies of cell structure and physiology, of viruses, and of gene action are converging hopefully on this mystery... Yet these studies show that there is no theoretical difficulty, under conditions that may well have existed [p. 15] early in the history of the earth, in the chance organization of a complex of carbon-containing molecule capable of influencing or directing the synthesis of other units like itself. Such a unit would be, in barest essentials, alive... Even more impressive is the suggestion that this first form of life was a “protogene” which, after the chance basic chemical combination into an organization capable of reproduction and of mutation, was slowly developed by mutation into the gene combinations of organisms more indisputably alive in the full sense.

There is, at any rate, no reason to postulate a miracle. Nor is it necessary to suppose that the origin of the new processes of reproduction and mutation was anything but materialistic... Once this point is established the origin of life is stripped of all real mystery, regardless of whether it proves possible in a brief time in a modern laboratory to repeat the event that occurred in the course of millions of years when the earth was young.

707. Evolution—Life, Production of, in Laboratory—Evolutionists Speculates on Possibility

SOURCE: Sidney W. Fox, “How did Life Begin?” *Science*, 132 (July 22, 1960), 207. Copyright 1960 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Reprinted from *Science* by permission.

The question “How did life begin?” focuses attention upon subtle but important differences between the verb *begin*, used intransitively, and the verb *start*, used transitively. We assume that someone some day will succeed in producing a cell which metabolizes and reproduces itself and its metabolic pattern in such a manner that no experts will disagree with the conclusion that the unit is alive. When that occurs, a chemical evolutionist will have *started* life, whereas that from which are descended *began*. Will we be able, then, to say that the experimental demonstration reveals how life began? At first glance the answer seems to be negative. It should be possible, however, when life has been synthesized, to determine the latitude of each of the conditions

required for synthetic life, and perhaps the latitude of some of them before life is started... When the full scope of conditions necessary for the synthesis of life is determined, it should be possible to judge whether these are conditions associated with the current earth, with what we believe to have been the prebiological earth, and with conditions prevailing on other planets.

A related thought is that life may be beginning now. Although we can with certainty say only that life arose at least once, there is increasing reason to believe that life can, or even must, arise in many places at many times... There is of course no assurance that life is beginning now on the earth; the point is that we have less reason to exclude this possibility than we had formerly.

708. Evolution—Life, a Spontaneous Generation of, Held Impossible

SOURCE: George Barry O'Toole, *The Case Against Evolution* (New York: Macmillan, 1926), pp. 142, 143.

[p. 142] Waiving the possibility of an *a priori* argument, by which abiogenesis might be positively excluded, there remains this one consideration, which alone is scientifically significant, that, so far as observation goes and induction can carry us, the living cell has absolute need of a vital origin and can never originate by the exclusive agency of the physicochemical forces native to inorganic matter. If organic life exists in simpler terms than the cell, science knows nothing of it, and no observed process, simple or complicated, of inorganic nature, nor any artificial synthesis of the laboratory, however ingenious, has ever succeeded in duplicating the wonders of the simplest living cell.

In fact, the very notion of a chemical synthesis of living matter is founded on a misconception. It would, indeed, be rash to set limits to the chemist's power of synthesizing organic compounds, but living protoplasm is not a single chemical compound. Rather it is a complex system of compounds, enzymes and organelles, coordinated and integrated into an organized whole by a persistent principle of unity and finality. Organic life, to say nothing at all of its unique dynamics, is a morphological as well as a chemical problem; [p. 143] and, while it is conceivable that the chemist might synthesize all the compounds found in dead protoplasm, to reproduce a single detail of the ultramicroscopic structure of a living cell lies wholly beyond his power and province...

With the chemist, analysis must precede synthesis, and it is only after a structural formula has been determined by means of quantitative analysis supplemented by analogy and comparison, that a given compound can be successfully synthesized. But living protoplasm and its structures elude such analysis. Intravital staining is inadequate even as a means of qualitative analysis, and tests of a more drastic nature destroy the life and organization, which they seek to analyze.

709. Evolution—Living Protoplasm, Difficulty of Artificial Production of, Admitted

SOURCE: William Seifriz, *Protoplasm*, p. 528. Copyright 1936 by the McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

The question whether or not living protoplasm can be artificially produced is one upon which many biologists have speculated and usually energetically answered in the negative. We must grant the possibility of doing it, with sufficient knowledge, but he who claims that protoplasm can be made in the laboratory, now or at some later time, might better ask a child to construct a chronometer.

710. Evolution—Limits of Mutational Changes

SOURCE: Richard B. Goldschmidt, "Evolution, as Viewed by One Geneticist," *American Scientist*, 40 (January, 1952), 94. Copyright 1952 by The Society of the Sigma Xi, New Haven, Conn. Used by permission.

Nobody thus far has produced a new species or genus, etc., by macromutation. It is equally true that nobody has produced even a species by the selection of micromutations. In the best-known organisms, like *Drosophila*, innumerable mutants are known. If we were able to combine a thousand or more of such mutants in a single individual, this still would have no resemblance whatsoever to any type known as a species in nature.

[EDITORS' NOTE: What one scientist calls a species another may call a variety, race, or sub-species. Hence many scientists affirm that new species *are* being formed in one way or another. Ernst Mayr (*Systematics and the Origin of Species*, 1942) is one of a number of scientists who have reacted against the modern habit of applying the term to small groups classified by minute differences (as, for example, the six "species" of coyote in the United States). He holds that many so-called species should be considered races. The creationist, though accustomed to new breeds or varieties, is inclined to think of species as large groups, distinguished from one another by obvious differences.]

711. Evolution—Mistakes of Nonevolutionists in Dealing With Statements of Those Who Disagree With One Form of Theory

SOURCE: John W. Klotz, *Genes, Genesis, and Evolution*, pp. 9–11. Copyright 1955 by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. Used by permission.

[p. 9] Some form of evolution is accepted by almost all biologists today. It would be difficult to point to a biologist of national or international repute who does not accept evolution in one form or another. The theory is still very much alive and will continue to be alive for the foreseeable future.

It is not difficult to understand why the erroneous idea that evolution is on the discard has become current. For one thing, we have tended to overemphasize the statements of biologists who have disagreed with one form of the theory of evolution, and inadvertently we have given the impression that they were disagreeing with evolution itself. It is true, of course, that scientists are by no means agreed on the details of evolution. Probably there are about as many [p. 10] theories of evolution as there are biologists. It is this disagreement among the scientists that has been called to our attention so repeatedly and has led us to the idea that scientists were repudiating evolution. Because a man has questioned some phase of Darwinism or has perhaps repudiated it entirely, we have gotten the idea that he was repudiating evolution entirely and championing the Genesis account. But these men whom we quote are still evolutionists, although they may disagree with one another...

[p. 11] Another mistake that has been made in dealing with evolution is that of misrepresenting evolution and what the evolutionists say. This, of course, is not deliberate. Sometimes it is due to a misunderstanding of scientific terminology [see No. 710n.]. In other cases it is due to a mistaken zeal and enthusiasm. Strawmen are set up and then knocked down. Ideas that have been repudiated many years ago are revived, and great delight is taken in showing the fallacies of these ideas, fallacies and erroneous conclusions which long ago were pointed out by the scientists themselves.

712. Evolution, Scientists in Disagreement With Present Theories of

SOURCE: Everett C. Olson, "Morphology, Paleontology, and Evolution," in *The Evolution of Life*, ed. by Sol Tax (Vol. I of *Evolution After Darwin*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 523 Copyright 1960 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the publisher.

During the years of 1958 and 1959 the work of Charles Darwin has been reviewed and analyzed in great detail; the progress of thought about evolution has been

summarized, collated, and related to disciplines far afield from biology; and the future has been explored. In general, it would seem, we feel that the charge implicit in the *Origin of Species* has been well carried out and that much that is to be known about evolution is, at least in broad outlines, now known. There are, of course, degrees of difference in evaluation of successes, from healthy skepticism to confidence, that the final word has been said, and there are still some among the biologists who feel that much of the fabric of theory accepted by the majority today is actually false and who say so. For the most part, the opinions of the dissenters have been given little credence. This group has formed a vocal, but little heard, minority.

These exists, as well, a generally silent group of students engaged in biological pursuits who tend to disagree with much of the current thought but say and write little because they are not particularly interested, do not see that controversy over evolution is of any particular importance, or are so strongly in disagreement that it seems futile to undertake the monumental task of controverting the immense body of information and theory that exists in the formulation of modern thinking. It is, of course, difficult to judge the size and composition of this silent segment, but there is no doubt that the numbers are not inconsiderable. Wrong or right as such opinion may be, its existence is important and cannot be ignored or eliminated as a force in the study of evolution.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: A scientist's disagreement with "the fabric of theory accepted by the majority" must not be interpreted as his disavowal of his belief in evolution as a method. For mistakes nonevolutionists make in this direction, see No. 711.]

713. Evolution—Sudden Appearance of New Systematic Groups, Differing Evolutionist Views on

SOURCE: George Gaylord Simpson, *The Major Features of Evolution*, pp. 360, 361. Copyright 1953 by Columbia University Press, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 360] Among the examples [of fossil occurrences cited as indications of evolutionary phenomena on lower and intermediate levels] are many in which, beyond the slightest doubt, a species or a genus has been gradually transformed into another. Such gradual transformation is also fairly well exemplified for subfamilies and occasionally for families, as the groups are commonly ranked. Splitting and subsequent gradual divergence of species is also exemplified, although not as richly as phyletic transformation of species (no doubt because splitting of species usually involves spatial separation and paleontological samples are rarely really adequate in spatial distribution). Splitting and gradual divergence of genera is exemplified very well and in a large variety of organisms. Complete examples for subfamilies and families also are known, but are less common.

In spite of these examples, it remains true, as every paleontologist knows, that *most* new species, genera, and families and that nearly all new categories above the level of families appear in the record suddenly and are not led up to by known, gradual, completely continuous transitional sequences. When paleontological collecting was still in its infancy and no clear examples of transitional origin had been found, most paleontologists were anti-evolutionists. Darwin (1859) recognized the fact that paleontology then seemed to provide evidence against rather than for evolution in general or the gradual origin of taxonomic categories in particular. Now we do have many examples of transitional sequences. Almost all paleontologists recognize that the discovery of a complete transition is in any case unlikely. Most of them find it logical, if not scientifically required, to assume that the sudden appearance of a new systematic

group is not evidence for special creation or for saltation, but simply means that a full transitional sequence more or less like those that are known did occur and simply has not been found in this instance.

Nevertheless, there are still a few paleontologists, and good ones (e.g., Spath 1933; Schindewolf, 1950a), who are so impressed by how much has been found that they conclude that most, at any rate, of what has not been found never existed, and there are some neontologists, also some good ones (e.g. Clark, 1930; Goldschmidt, 1940), who accept [p. 361] this interpretation. It is thus still too soon for the rest of us to take the discontinuities of the paleontological record for granted.

714. Evolution—Sudden Appearance of Varied Fossil Animals, a Puzzle to Evolutionists

SOURCE: George Gaylord Simpson, "The History of Life," in *The Evolution of Life*, ed. by Sol Tax (Vol. I of *Evolution After Darwin*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960) p. 144. Copyright 1960 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the publisher.

Precambrian fossils are ... widely scattered in place and time and do not constitute a continuous or, as yet, even a particularly enlightening record. Equally scattered but rather numerous animals have been reported from the Precambrian, but all are in serious doubt. There is in every reported instance question as to whether the claimed fossils really are organic, or are animals, or are of truly Precambrian age (Schindewolf, 1956). The best evidence—and it is not impressive—is of trails that may have been made by wormlike animals.

Then, with the beginning of the Cambrian, unquestionable, abundant, and quite varied fossil animals appear. The suddenness can be exaggerated, for the various major groups straggle in through the Cambrian, a period of some 75 million years, and the following Ordovician. There is also some question whether the beds defined as the base of the Cambrian, just because they do contain varied animal remains, are everywhere synchronous. Nevertheless, the change is great and abrupt. This is not only the most puzzling feature of the whole fossil record but also its greatest apparent inadequacy.

Darwin was aware of this problem, even more striking in his day than in ours, when it is still striking enough. He said of it: "The case at present must remain inexplicable; and may be truly urged as a valid argument against the views here entertained" (Darwin, 1872, chap. X). His fear was that the abrupt appearance of many fairly advanced animals in the Cambrian might negate the whole idea of evolution. Only a few near the lunatic fringe of science would now draw such a conclusion, but a problem still remains. Darwin's "case" is still not clearly explained with sufficient positive evidence. Is it explicable on principles illustrated by the Cambrian and later record, or must we consider our usable record as a mere tag-end from which we cannot infer principles operative during much the greater part of the whole history?

715. Evolution—Sudden Appearance of Wholly Modern Phyla, a Problem to Evolutionists

SOURCE: Daniel I. Axelrod, "The Evolution of Flowering Plants," In *The Evolution of Life*, ed. By Sol Tax (Vol. 1 of *Evolution After Darwin*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 227. Copyright 1960 by The University of Chicago. Used by permission of the publisher.

The evolution of flowering plants presented Darwin with a series of problems which could not be answered satisfactorily until an adequate number of fossil floras had been found, described, and analyzed and until certain basic principles of geology, paleontology, ecology, climatology, and evolution had been discovered which would

illuminate the relations shown by the fossil floras. Although great progress has been made along these lines during the past century, the data in hand even now provide only partial answers to most of the problems considered by Darwin. In particular, these included the “abominable mystery,” surrounding their early evolution, notably their center of origin, their ancestry, and their “sudden appearance” in the Middle Cretaceous as a fully evolved, wholly modern phylum.

716. Evolution, Theologian’s Objection to

SOURCE: Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1953), pp. 184, 185. Copyright 1941 by Louis Berkhof. Used by permission.

- [p. 184] a. From the point of view of the theologian the greatest objection to this theory [of the evolutionary descent of man from the lower animals] is, of course, that it is contrary to the explicit teachings of the Word of God. The Bible could hardly teach more clearly than it does that man is the product of a direct and special creative act of God, rather than of a process of development out of the simian stock of animals. It asserts that God formed man out of the dust of the ground, Gen. 2:7. Some theologians, in their eagerness to harmonize the teachings of Scripture with the theory of evolution, suggest that this may be interpreted to mean that God formed the body of man out of the body of the animals, *which is after all but dust*. But this is entirely unwarranted, since no reason can be assigned why the general expression “of the dust of the ground” should be used after the writer had already described the creation of the animals and might therefore have made the statement far more specific. Moreover, this interpretation is also excluded by the statement in Gen. 3:19, “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground: for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” This certainly does not mean that man shall return to his former animal state. Beast and man alike return again to the dust. Eccl. 3:19, 20. Finally, we are told explicitly in 1 Cor. 15:39 that “All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one flesh of men, and another flesh of beasts.” As to the spirit of man the Bible teaches explicitly that it came directly from God, Gen. 2:7, and therefore cannot be regarded as a natural development of some previously existing substance. In perfect harmony with this Elihu says, “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty giveth me life,” Job 33:4 Furthermore, Scripture also teaches that man was at once separated from the lower creation by an enormous chasm. He at once stood on a high intellectual, moral, and religious level, as created in the image of God and was given dominion over the lower creation, Gen. 1:26, 27, 31; 2:19, 20; Ps. 8:5, 8. By his fall in sin, however, he fell from his high estate and became subject to a process of degeneration which sometimes results in bestiality. This is quite [p. 185] the opposite of what the evolutionary hypothesis teaches us. According to it man stood on the lowest level at the beginning of his career, but slightly removed from the brute, and has been rising to higher levels ever since.
- b. The second great objection is that the theory has no adequate basis in well established facts. It should be borne in mind that, as was pointed out before, the evolutionary theory in general, though often represented as an established doctrine, is up to the present time nothing but an unproved working hypothesis, and a hypothesis that has not yet given any great promise of success in demonstrating what it set out to prove. Many of the most prominent evolutionists frankly admit the hypothetical character of their theory. They still avow themselves to be firm believers in the doctrine of descent, but do not hesitate to say that they cannot speak with any assurance of its method of operation.

717. Evolution—Uniformitarianism Inadequate; Biblical Catastrophism Harmonizes the Facts

SOURCE: John C. Whitcomb, Jr., and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood*, p. 439. Copyright 1961 by The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. Used by permission.

The present widely accepted system of uniformitarianism in historical geology, with its evolutionary basis and bias, has been shown to be utterly inadequate to explain most of the important geologic phenomena. Present rates and processes simply *cannot* account for the great bulk of the geologic data. Some form of catastrophism is clearly indicated by the vast evidences of volcanism, diastrophism, glaciation, coal and oil and mineral deposits, fossilization, vast beds of sediments, and most of the other dominant features of the earth's crust. When this fact is once recognized, it can then be seen that even the supposed evidences of great geologic age can be reinterpreted to correlate well with the much more impelling evidences of violent and rapid activity and formation.

But if present processes cannot be used to deduce the earth's past history (and this fact is proved not only by the failure of geological uniformity but even more by the impregnable laws of conservation and deterioration of energy), then the only way man can have certain knowledge of the nature of events on earth prior to the time of the beginning of human historical records, is by means of divine revelation. And this is why the Bible record of Creation and the Flood immediately becomes tremendously pertinent to our understanding, not only of the early history of the earth but also of the purpose and destiny of the universe and of man.

We have, therefore, sought to show how the outline of earth history provided by the early chapters of Genesis, as well as by the related passages from other parts of the Bible, actually provides a scientifically accurate framework within which all the verified data of geology and geophysics fit together remarkably well. The great Deluge of Noah's day is seen to account for a large portion of the sedimentary rocks of the earth's crust and indirectly for the glacial and other surface deposits which resulted from the change in earth climates at the time of the Flood. The reader may judge for himself whether the evidence truly warrants this reorientation of geological philosophy.

718. Existentialism, Brief Definition of Term

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 57. Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men's Christian Associations. Used by permission.

Existentialism is the belief that the truth most worth having is not grasped by objective knowledge or carefully defined ideas, but by a man's own passionately involved existence. Whereas scientists and most philosophers exhort us to seek truth by detached, dispassionate objectivity, the existentialists direct us rather to subjectivity, to taking sides, to living life in its full-blooded depths. Objective knowledge, they insist, is abstract, speculative, and, so far as the most basic questions of our personal existence are concerned, impossible. If we seek answers to our ultimate questions by rational investigation, we shall only withdraw further and further from the reality we seek to know. That reality cannot be "known" in the scientific sense, for our concepts can apprehend only essences, not existence. Existence, however, can be encountered and apprehended by faith.

719. Existentialism, Classes of, Defined

SOURCE: Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism*, pp. 14–18, 21, 22. Copyright 1947 by The Philosophical Library, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 14] What is meant by the term *existentialism*?

Most people who use the word would be rather embarrassed if they had to explain it, since, now that the word is all the rage, even the work of a musician or painter is being [p. 15] called existentialist...

Actually, it is the least scandalous, the most austere of doctrines. It is intended strictly for specialists and philosophers. Yet it can be defined easily. What complicates matters is that there are two kinds of existentialist; first, those who are Christian, among whom I would include Jaspers and Gabriel Marcel, both Catholic; and on the other hand the atheistic existentialists, among whom I class Heidegger, and then the French existentialists and myself. What they have in common is that they think that existence precedes essence, or, if you prefer, that subjectivity must be the starting point.

Just what does that mean? Let us consider [p. 16] some object that is manufactured, for example, a book or a paper-cutter: here is an object which has been made by an artisan whose inspiration came from a concept. He referred to the concept of what a paper-cutter is and likewise to a known method of production, which is part of the concept, something which is, by and large, a routine. Thus, the paper-cutter is at once an object produced in a certain way and, on the other hand, one having a specific use; and one can not postulate a man who produces a paper-cutter but does not know what it is used for. Therefore, let us say that, for the paper-cutter, essence—that is, the ensemble of both the production routines and the properties which enable it to be both produced and defined—precedes existence. Thus, the presence of the paper-cutter or book in front of me is determined. Therefore, we have here a technical view of the world whereby it can be said that production precedes existence.

When we conceive God as the Creator, He is generally thought of as a superior sort of artisan. Whatever doctrine we may be considering, whether one like that of Descartes or that [p. 17] of Leibnitz, we always grant that will more or less follows understanding or, at the very least, accompanies it, and that when God creates He knows exactly what He is creating. Thus, the concept of man in the mind of God is comparable to the concept of paper-cutter in the mind of the manufacturer, and, following certain techniques and a conception, God produces man, just as the artisan, following a definition and a technique, makes a paper-cutter. Thus, the individual man is the realization of a certain concept in the divine intelligence.

In the eighteenth century, the atheism of the *philosophes* discarded the idea of God, but not so much for the notion that essence precedes existence. To a certain extent, this idea is found everywhere; we find it in Diderot, in Voltaire, and even in Kant. Man has a human nature; this human nature, which is the concept of the human, is found in all men, which means that each man is a particular example of a universal concept, man. In Kant, the result of this universality is that the wildman, the natural man, as well as the bourgeois, are circumscribed by the same definition and have [p. 18] the same basic qualities. Thus, here too the essence of man precedes the historical existence that we find in nature.

Atheistic existentialism, which I represent, is more coherent. It states that if God does not exist, there is at least one being in whom existence precedes essence, a being who exists before he can be defined by any concept, and that this being is man, or, as Heidegger says, human reality. What is meant here by saying that existence precedes essence? It means that, first of all, man exists, turns up, appears on the scene, and, only afterwards, defines himself. If man, as the existentialist conceives him, is indefinable, it is

because at first he is nothing. Only afterward will he be something, and he himself will have made what he will be. Thus, there is no human nature, since there is no God to conceive it. Not only is man what he conceives himself to be, but he is also only what he wills himself to be after this thrust toward existence...

[p. 21] The existentialists say at once that man is anguish. What [p. 22] that means is this: the man who involves himself and who realizes that he is not only the person he chooses to be, but also a law-maker who is, at the same time, choosing all mankind as well as himself, can not help escape the feeling of his total and deep responsibility.

720. Existentialism, Classified

SOURCE: John Macquarrie, *An Existentialist Theology* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955), p. 16. Copyright 1955 by John Macquarrie. Used by permission of the publisher and Student Christian Movement Press Ltd., London.

Existentialism is not a philosophy but a type of philosophy, and a type so flexible that it can appear in such widely differing forms as the atheism of Sartre, the Catholicism of Marcel, the Protestantism of Kierkegaard, the Judaism of Buber, and the Orthodoxy of Berdyaev.

721. Existentialism, Defined

SOURCE: Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1959), pp. 37, 38. Copyright 1959 by Daniel Day Williams. Used by permission.

[p. 37] It was the Danish religious thinker, Søren Kierkegaard, who in the last century gave one of the profoundest analyses of the soul-sickness of anxious and guilt-ridden man. Kierkegaard is one of the major influences on Christian theology today. His analysis of anxiety is still classic, as Rollo May shows in his recent work on *Anxiety*. Mention of Kierkegaard leads us from psychology to philosophy for his thought is the most important single source of the modern philosophy of "existentialism" which looks upon man's existence as a finite, dying creature as the central clue to an interpretation of the world. The power of existentialism is that it [p. 38] expresses in philosophical terms man's loneliness, his ultimate fears, his sense that time does not bring progress, his uncertainty about eternal realities. For existentialism man's freedom is the source both of his humanity and of his despair. He must find the courage to take his existence into his own hands and dare to live his life out in a world which threatens him on every side.

Kierkegaard's existentialism was Christian. Man's problem is his relationship to God, and his salvation is God's forgiveness. In contrast, much of modern existentialism like that of Sartre, is atheistic. As has been said for this philosophy, instead of God's creating the world out of nothing, man must create the world out of nothing. In Martin Heidegger's philosophy the question about God appears to be left open. The starting point is still man in his finitude, hurled into a situation he did not choose, faced with the threat of "non-being," and needing desperately to find the courage to assert his own freedom in authentic human existence.

722. Existentialism, Relation of Gospel Content to Our Experience Explained by

SOURCE: Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking* (rev. ed.; New York: Harper, 1959), p. 65. Copyright 1959 by Daniel Day Williams. Used by permission.

The answer which Bultmann himself gives as to how the content of the Gospel can be related to our experience is derived from existentialist philosophy, especially from themes which Martin Heidegger has stressed. Man's creaturely existence with its encircling boundary line of death plunges him into an anxiety which he cannot overcome

by any reliance on his own resources. Heidegger identifies this human state with guilt. Bultmann makes plain that it is guilt before God because it is refusal to accept our creaturely condition with gratitude to its giver. What man needs is the destruction of any understanding of himself which makes him rely on his own goodness or knowledge. He needs courage to venture into the unknown future in spite of all the threats to the meaningfulness of his life. The Gospel declares that God has overcome death and guilt. This is what the resurrection of Jesus Christ means. God offers man a new self-understanding in which life is lived from God as center. In that new life we have courage to face any future.

723. Exodus — Probable Historical Background

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 140–143. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 140] Beside extreme views [of the date of the Exodus], ... only two principal views exist. The first places the event around 1441 B.C. [1445 in *SDACom*] in the reign of Amenhotep II of the Eighteenth Dynasty; the second place it about 1290 B.C. in the reign of Rameses II of the Nineteenth Dynasty...

Any view of the Exodus is vexed with difficulties...

[p. 141] But it is quite clear from a careful survey of all the Scriptural evidence, including the whole time scheme underlying the Pentateuch and the early history of Israel through the period of the Judges to the time of Solomon, that the Old Testament places Moses and the period of the Exodus around the middle of the fifteenth century B.C. rather than a full century and a half later in the first half of the thirteenth century B.C. ... W. F. Albright gives 922 B.C. as the date of Solomon's death, Edwin R. Thiele 931 B.C., Joachim Begerich 926 B.C. And since Solomon ruled forty years (1 Kings 11:42), the fourth year of his reign would be variously computed—958 B.C. (Albright), 967 B.C. (Thiele) and 962 B.C. (Begerich). Taking the year 961 B.C., which cannot be far wrong, we arrive at 1441 B.C. as the date of the Exodus [*SDACom* has 1445; see editors' note below]...

Those who ... [in dating the Exodus later], by a century and a half or two centuries, shorten the period of the Judges, ... virtually rule out the possibility of fitting the Biblical chronology into the frame of contemporary history...

[p. 142] This date [the mid-15th-century date for the Exodus] falls very probably in the opening years of the reign of Amenhotep II (1450–1425 B.C.), son of the famous conqueror and empire builder, Thutmose III (1482–1450 B.C.)⁹ [Note 9: The dates ... are approximate.] One of the greatest of all the Pharaohs, Thutmose III furnishes an ideal figure for the Pharaoh of the Oppression. According to the Biblical record Moses waited for the death of the great oppressor before returning to Egypt from his refuge in Midian (Ex. 4:19). The Exodus took place not very long afterward in the reign of Amenhotep II...

In the contemporary records of Amenhotep II no references, of course, occur to such national disasters as the ten plagues or the loss of the Egyptian army in the Red (Reed) Sea, much less to the escape of the Hebrews. But this circumstance was to be expected. The Egyptians were the last people to record their misfortunes...

If Amenhotep II was the reigning Pharaoh of the Exodus, his eldest son was slain in the tenth plague, "which smote all the firstborn ..." (Ex. 12:29)...

[p. 143] It is clear from this ancient record [the "dream inscription"; see No. 678] that Thutmose IV was not Amenhotep's eldest son, since his hopes of succession to the throne

were apparently remote... In short the possibility is at least open that the heir apparent died in the manner recounted in the Bible.

The general historical situation made the Exodus possible toward the beginning of the reign of Amenhotep II...

The picture of Thutmose III as the great oppressor of the Israelites is quite credible. He was a great builder and employed Semitic captives in his vast construction projects. Many of his building operations were supervised by his vizier, named Rekhmire...

Semitic foreigners are significantly found among the brickmakers and bricklayers [pictured] on Rekhmire's tomb. [In the accompanying inscription] ... the taskmasters warn the laborers, "The rod is in my hand; be not idle."¹¹ [Note 11: P. E. Newberry, *The Life of Rekhmara* (1900), p. 38; James Henry Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, Vol. II, sect. 758f.]

[EDITORS' NOTE: Unger takes 961 B.C. for Solomon's fourth year and arrives at 1441 B.C. for the Exodus by subtracting 480 years (based on 1 Kings 6:1). This is not far from the date of 1445 adopted tentatively in *SDACom* (1:191, 192) and *SDADic* ("Chronology," II, 2).]

724. Exodus, Route of, to Sinai

SOURCE: *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*, ed. by George Ernest Wright and Floyd Vivian Filson (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956), pp. 38, 39. Copyright 1956 by W. L. Jenkins. Used by permission.

[p. 38] There has been considerable debate as to where the Hebrews went after entering the wilderness, since Mount Sinai or Horeb (it was called by both names) has not been located with certainty. The Sinai peninsula is triangular in shape, 260 miles long and 150 miles wide at the north... [To the south] is the apex of the peninsula with its mass of granite mountains, the highest of which rise some 8,000 feet above sea level. Among these mountains were the ancient copper and turquoise mines to which the Egyptians sent regular expeditions. Here also is the traditional site of Mount Sinai where Moses received the Law and bound the people together in a joint covenant with the Lord. The tradition that this is the Mount Sinai of Israel is at least fifteen hundred years old, and it is difficult to see how the tradition could have arisen if it did not have some historical basis. In addition, it is possible to point to several stations along the route to this area which correspond to those mentioned in the Bible, but it is not possible to do this for any other route through the peninsula...

[p. 39] Among the first springs on the ancient road to the Sinai mines is '*Ain Hawârah*' This, therefore, is probably Marah, the first station of the Israelite journey which was reached after three waterless days in the wilderness (v, D-4; Ex. 15:22ff). The next oasis to the south is in the *Wâdî Gharandel*, which corresponds to the Biblical Elim where twelve springs and seventy palm trees are said to have existed (v, D-4; Ex. 16:1; Num. 33:9). The next stages of the journey took them along the Red Sea, and thence inland to the Wilderness of Sin and to Dophkah (Num. 33:10-12). The exact route at this point depends upon the location of Dophkah... While various mountains in the neighborhood have been identified with the Biblical Mount Sinai, the most probable location is the range designated at v, F-5 ..., of which the chief peak is called *Jebel Mûsâ*, "Mountain of Moses."

[EDITORS' NOTE: There are alternative identifications for several of these localities; and the mountain traditionally known as Sinai has two peaks, *Jebel Musa* and *Ras eş-Şafşafeh*. The latter fits the

specifications of the Biblical narrative better than the former, which has generally been identified as the Mount of Moses. For a discussion of these localities, see the articles “Exodus” and “Wilderness Wandering” in *SDADic*.

Map v of the Atlas, referred to on p. 39, appears also in *SDACom*, Vol. 1, facing p. 577.]

725. Exodus—Wilderness Wandering

SOURCE: Harry M. Orlinsky, *Ancient Israel* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1954), pp. 38, 39. Copyright 1954 by Cornell University. Used by permission.

[p. 38] Until recently the Bible has been virtually the only source for the history of the wandering in the Wilderness. As a result, the significance of this stage in Israel’s history has been minimized, when its very authenticity has not been questioned.

A central feature of the Biblical account is the movable Tabernacle, or Tent of Meeting, around which the political and religious life of the wandering Hebrews revolved. This institution used to be regarded as a late fiction, projected back into the past. Recently, however, archaeological and literary parallels have been accumulating which not only explain the origin of this structure and institution in the wilderness of Sinai, but also clarify its history as the “Tent of the Lord” as Shiloh, following the conquest of Canaan. It was ultimately replaced by the Temple which David planned and Solomon built.

Much the same thing happened in the case of the Ark, the acacia chest in which, according to tradition, Moses placed and kept the two stone tablets recording the Ten Commandments. Furthermore, the traditional route of the Wandering, as described in the books of Exodus and Numbers, accords well with the topography of Sinai and with what has been learned of the location of the copper and turquoise mines which were being worked and garrisoned in the thirteenth century B.C. These garrisoned sites, in the hands of the Egyptians, appear to have been situated at just [p. 39] those points which the Hebrews were careful to avoid in their trek through Sinai.⁴ [Note 4: F. M. Cross, Jr., “The Tabernacle,” *Biblical Archaeologist*, X (Sept., 1947), 45–68.]

726. Extreme Unction. Council of Trent on

SOURCE: Council of Trent, Session XIV (Nov. 25, 1551), On the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, Canons 1 and 4, in Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper, 1919). Vol. 2, pp. 169, 170.

[p. 169] Canon I. If any one saith, that Extreme Unction is not truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, and promulgated by the blessed Apostle James; but is only a rite received from the Fathers, or a human figment: let him be anathema...

[p. 170] Canon IV. If any one saith, that the Presbyters of the Church, whom blessed James exhorts to be brought to anoint the sick, are not the priests who have been ordained by a bishop, but the elders in each community, and that for this cause a priest alone is not the proper minister of Extreme Unction: let him be anathema.

727. Ezra and Nehemiah, Chronological Order of

SOURCE: Cyrus H. Gordon, *The World of the Old Testament* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958), p. 276. Copyright 1953 by Ventnor Publishers, Inc., Copyright © 1958 by Cyrus H. Gordon. Reprinted by permission of Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Ezra, on his mission to stabilize the Judean community, was accompanied on the long road to Jerusalem by some 1,760 Babylonian Jews including not-too-enthusiastic Levites (8:15.) and other Temple servitors like the Nethinim (verse 20). The community they found in Judah was pious but badly off. The few well-to-do were concerned with worldly affairs and were entirely too intimate with those outside the fold, including the Samaritans. Ezra decided on a reform that included the putting aside of foreign wives and their children. This brought on the hostility of the non-Judeans, notably of the

Samaritans. Thus it became imperative to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem (cf. Ezra 4:13, 21) against the possibility of attack. But Rehum, the Governor of Samaria, together with his associates and subjects, convinced Artaxerxes that the walls were preparative to rebellion and to the cessation of paying taxes to the King. The upshot was that the walls of Jerusalem were wrecked anew... (See Nehemiah 1:3.)

Late in 446 (?), Nehemiah,² a Jew highly placed in the Persian court, heard of the sorry state of affairs in Jerusalem. He appealed to the King, who dispatched him there as Governor of Judah... Nehemiah ... was a practical, clear-headed and model layman with the desire and power to help the church. He reached Jerusalem in 445 (?) and, after examining the dilapidated walls, summoned the leaders of the people and inspired them to begin enthusiastically the arduous task of reconstruction.

[Note 2: I follow the traditional view that Ezra's mission preceded Nehemiah's. However the sequence and chronology of the two leaders have been hotly contested by inconclusive arguments on both sides. The subject is covered with objectivity and full documentation by H. H. Rowley, "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume*, I, Budapest, 1948, pp. 117-49. My adherence to the older view is not prompted by tradition alone. More cogent are considerations arising from the fact that the practical administrator Nehemiah would be needed to straighten out the failure of the impractical scribe Ezra, rather than vice versa.]

728. Ezra and Nehemiah—Two Views of Dating

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands* (Pittsburgh: The Biblical Colloquium, 1955), pp. 102, 104. Copyright 1955 by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York. Used by permission.

[p. 102] Two theories about the relative order of Ezra and Nehemiah are held by competent scholars; Catholics and Protestants, conservatives and liberals are found on both sides of the discussion...

[p. 104] While no recent discovery has conclusively settled the debate with regard to the priority of Ezra or Nehemiah, the writer maintains the order Nehemiah—Ezra with increasing conviction.

2

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